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The Riddle of Russia

WHAT is going on in the back of Stalin's mind? It is very difficult to say what is going on back of the mind of an Oriental. It is in fact almost as difficult to say what is going on in the front of the mind of an Oriental. If you scratch a Russian you find a Tartar underneath.

A great part of Russia is dominated by Asiatic culture, and the peculiar Asiatic reticence makes it difficult for us to estimate the political condition that exists in Stalin's country; the psychology is different from ours.

In Russia we confront one of the most remarkable social phenomenon in history. We cannot dismiss Russian civilization easily or lightly; there is something tremendously fine about Russia. It is an important country, and one very sensitive and cultural and while its people have been greatly held back, politically and socially, they are a people of tremendous strength. And in the consciousness of
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Russia itself is also the courage of a great experiment. Some day Russia is going to be one of the world's really great nations. It is now passing through a sort of political adolescence in which values are hopelessly confused and distorted. It may take fifty or five hundred years, but the Russian consciousness is going to make a great and valuable contribution to human progress in the course of time.

An amazing, mysterious, and involved people, Russians today present a number of problems of great interest to our current thought. One of the most interesting is the curious alignment of nations by which a people avowedly opposed to capitalistic theories are fighting side by side with capitalistic powers against another socialist State. Presumably Germany has much more in common with Russia than have the capitalistic powers. That two socialist States should drastically oppose each other is not what we would normally expect.

But as they exist, neither Germany nor Russia are socialist States. They are both dictatorial. Dictators cannot unite, parallel their courses, and work to common ends. The reason is obvious. The psychology and the whole theory of dictatorship is based upon the domination of one over others. Wherever dictators work together, one must work for the other. If they appear to form a pact, as in the case of Germany and Italy, in the inevitable battle of wits one ultimately controls the other. Democracies working side by side and not ambitious for each other's States or each other's powers can cooperate. In the relationship between Germany and Italy there is no sense of security or actual friendship. The Germans have no love for the Italians, and the Italians have less for the Germans. Mussolini's position is that of a political prisoner in a Gestapo dominated Italy.

There is no possibility of two dictators meeting with honest intentions and purposes; they meet for individual advantage at the expense of the other.

The strong dictators in Europe are Stalin and Hitler. These two men could not possibly work together. They both want the same thing.

And so we have an intriguing situation: two dictators of entirely different personal culture. Hitler is emotional, hysterical; he has a very peculiar divinity complex. His life has been a comparatively uneventful one as far as true, actual, personal experience is concerned. Up to the time of his political ascendancy he was a disturber, a wrangler, a soap-box orator; he had done nothing of importance or significance, and his personal life was certainly not a rich one, either in cultural achievement or emotional accomplishment. Hitler's was a very limited perspective, his whole consciousness was dominated by the German culture of the superman—with himself as it.

Russia's dictator, Stalin, is a rather short, square, stocky man, whose entire life has been close to the earth. He is infinitely more practical than Hitler, because he is not disturbed by any vivid imagination, he has no inward complex of hysterical emotions, he is not bothered by ideals of any kind—good, bad, or indifferent. Simply stated, he is an intensely practical member of the proletariat. He has the shrewdness not only of the Asiatic, but of the man close to the soil, the farmer, the agrarian thinker. Anyone who has ever done any horse swapping with a New England farmer knows what I mean. This shrewd, very natural, sequential thinker, whose mind is not bothered with education or the lack of it, whose mind is not complicated by any religious belief or opposition to it, who functions entirely on the plane of biological procedure, simple, direct and natural, has power over 165,000,000 persons and one-sixth of the land surface of the globe. The enormous expanse of Russia, more than 8,000,000 square miles, with its innumerable States and nations, has never been really united in its history; it was never united under the Czars, nor since the Revolution, into anything that might be termed a true union. It is held together by certain geographical localities and largely bounded by hypothetical national cultures; but as far as the innumerable Asiatic tribes of Russia are concerned, they know almost nothing about what goes on at Moscow, and care less. They do not know a Communist from a Lama Priest. European Russians have been completely dominated by the State, but those in Asiatic Russia are practically untouched by it. So Russia is a country of contrasts, with what might be called the head in Europe, and the rest of the body, seven times larger than the head, in Asia.

This great sprawling nation has been functioning for the last twenty years under a series of cooperative ideas, cooperative in name, dictatorial in actual fact and procedure. After the Revolution and the abdication of the Grand Duke Michael, a series of political vicissitudes arose in Russia; of these the Kerensky regime was probably the closest to our form of Government. It fell, and then followed the regime of Lenin, to become the dominant popular note in Russian life. In between were the second, third, fourth and fifth revolutions of Trotsky, and finally Stalin assuming the toga of Lenin and carrying on the dead leader's dictatorial purpose and pattern. This we know as the Russian State, really a democracy within an autocracy. It is socialistic in principle, operated under a system of absolute autocracy.

Strangely, up to very recent times, Joseph Stalin, politically, and as far as the State was concerned, held a comparatively inferior office. But Stalin's personal powers have been long the Dictator of Russia, and as Dictator he is definitively an autocrat. By very simple processes he discovered in his own personal life in Georgia, in the Caucasus, something every leader must discover some time, that it is impossible to administrate a State without a head. He seems never to have held the belief, the very fond belief, that any group of people consisting of two or more can be united on the ground of absolute equality, one of the roughest and fondest delusions of the human mind. It is too much to expect that an individual with power will preserve the sense of true relationship to his associates; human beings are simply incapable of doing this. Stalin and his group were intelligent enough to follow the bucolic realization of the necessity for a bell-flock for the flock.

Stalin's way of governing would not be workable in a true democracy. But we have had the acceptable example in Mahatma Gandhi, who has had power equal if not greater than Hitler. Gandhi has no bodyguard nor Gestapo; he has been followed by those only who voluntarily desired to follow him. He has been essentially the type of leadership for a democracy. We Americans have not actually gotten around to that yet, but it is one of the things we dream of. We dream of the time when our citizens will be unified on a realization of the outstanding merit of certain of their countrymen and will follow them because they have confidence in them, rather than voting a choice of candidates selected through the elaborate political connivances of modern politics. The galial, kindly, Gandhi type of leadership is just as final in its authority, but is not motivated by fear; it is constructively based upon respect and admiration.

Dictators are not motivated into power by such genial emotions. A dictator is a self-appointed leader; he is not good old kindly Bill whom everyone likes. He is the one who is whispered about behind his back as the climber, the exploiter; but he has insinuated himself into his position so securely that no one can get him out. Many do not like him, but no one knows what to do about it. Gradually this type of leader surrounds himself with office holders who will follow him implicitly because it is profitable to themselves. When the dictator is no longer profitable to them they will of course remove him, and squabble
over the remains. This, a condition we have in all dictatorial nations, makes it very obvious that Dictators by the necessity of their own aggressiveness are incapable of cooperation one with the other. Every motive within the constituent bodies they have built up is one of personal ambition.

The next thing that is intriguing in our consideration of Russia is the striking contrast between the Finnish campaign and the German repulse. Russia made anything but a dignified appearance in the earlier engagement with the Finns. Russia appeared to be hopelessly without organization of a military nature. It led to a great underestimation by most nations of the military strength of Russia. If Russia could not make a better showing against three or four million Finns, what would happen against the might of the German Reich—almost instant annihilation.

The fiasco in Finland brought a great deal home to the Russian consciousness. Joseph Stalin is no fool; he saw the ignominious and pitiful showing which the Russians made in the Finnish War, and hardly were the guns silenced when the entire structure of the Russian military machine was given a thorough going over. It called for quick compromise of the great Proletariat vision; the Russian army could no longer remain an aggregation of Comrades, particularly proud of their social equality. Russia didn't have an army; it had a huge aggregation of individuals. It had Generals, but it also had numberless Comrades, and the private in the rear rank was just as good as the General. Any mass organization, such as Russia had, could not hope to successfully oppose the completely submerged individuality of mechanized and robot-like Germans on the battlefield. Stalin learned that lesson in Finland. It was impossible to make Socialism work, if socialism on the battlefield meant there were no leaders.

One of the problems Stalin was confronted with was the reorganization of the Russian army, and he went to work on it with enthusiasm. Stalin was a straight enough thinker to realize that political ideology was one thing, but that national survival was more important than the survival of notions, especially when the notions don't work. It is strange that the average conception of Communism is definitely the freedom of the individual, absolute equality. Absolute equality, of course does not exist. You can find no evidence of it anywhere. That which nature cannot sustain, man cannot sustain. So what happened? The army was put back on a capitalistic basis.

It was not a capitalistic basis as we know the term, fantastic economic commercialism; it was a shift over to a sound economic basis, reorganization to a sound political and social basis; the officers had authority, the General was in command of his army. It was Russia's recognition of the necessity that you must centralize power, if you are going anywhere.

The result of the reorganization was a miraculous military achievement. For the first time Germany has been outnumbered.

Hitler is also at another disadvantage. He has not been able to condition the Russian people. They had already had about all the conditioning they could take on, at home. The Russian Secret Police are just about as well organized as the German Secret Police, so all attempts at undermining Russia by fifth column technic simply did not work. The Germans had another handicap. Many Germans speak French or English, but it is very hard to find anyone but a Russian who speaks Russian. Stalin's people were lost. So they transferred their affections to Lenin, deified him; he became as much a Father as any Czar. After the death of Lenin, Stalin was wise enough to preserve the idol of the people, Lenin, their hero, and the tens of thousands of Russian people who yearly walked by the embalmed remains of their leader gave clear indication of the consciousness of the Russian people. They want to adore, they want to worship; and under proper leadership they are a tremendous force, for they have that stubborn, unconquerable quality which belongs to people close to the earth.

Russia is not decadent, but a large part of Europe is. Russians are still a primitive race. It is the lesson of history that decadent people fall under the yoke and sway of primitive people. Decadence, bringing luxury, sophistication, and a certain type of culture, destroys the vitality, which is the basis of survival of a State.

Joseph Stalin has more than military worry; he is probably wondering what is to be the outcome of Russia's plan for the building of the great experimental State. Russia, as a kind of socialistic laboratory, is something the rest of the world was watching with confused and mixed attitudes. To some, the Russian experiment was to be the panacea for everything, Russia simply could not fail, Russia was a divine revelation. Then, to others, Russia was in one way or another an eternal challenge, and more than that, a menace to political existence. Some hoped that the Russian experiment would fail, others were afraid it would succeed. The anxiety was bedded in the implications of the Russian economic victory in the world order.

Those who were very smart, who had really emancipated themselves from prejudices so they could see fairly clearly, knew the Russian experiment could not succeed in the form in which it started. The assurance was in the basic reason already given: that equality does not exist in nature. But that something would come out of Russia was almost universally agreed upon by intelligent persons. The Russian Revolution, like the French Revolution, had resulted in making one bad situation into another one equally bad. If there was any class more corrupt, more cruel, and more degenerate than the aristocrats it was the proletariat; they simply vied with each other to excel in underhand striving for position. The difference was merely between one kind of savagery and another, with the proletariat more obviously cruel and aristocrats more subtly cruel. Russia, oppressed for centuries by
the decadent aristocrats, and very decadent clergy, rose in righteous wrath to cast off these bonds and limitations. This loss of faith in temporal and spiritual power left Russia ethnically and culturally bankrupt. Russians under revolution, by either execution or exile destroyed enemies within, but also some great friends, the literates. The revolutionists did not try to distinguish between good and bad but presumed all cases to be identical, a great fallacy. Swept away was class after class, not only was the aristocracy destroyed, but the bourgeoisie, the more secure and stable elements of Russian life. In the place of one tyranny it put another, for it was by virtue of the one despotism it substituted another. They had tried it and failed, but between good and bad but presumed all cases to be identical, a great fallacy. The Russian experiment also confronted the world with a curious economic phenomenon. Russians were resolved to get away from the capitalistic theory of life on the assumption it has failed. What they really meant was, they had failed it, for it was by virtue of the peculiar aristocracy of the Czars that the average Russian had never had any participation in wealth. It was not that the economic system of the world was impractical in Russia, but the aristocrats and clergy in Russia had made any widespread form of capitalism impossible. Russians did not reject capitalism because they had tried it and failed, but theoretically because it was never tried at all.

The 165 million Russians occupy a strategic land, very important in immense natural resources. Russia probably has more potential wealth than any nation on earth. It was impossible for such a people to remain in a state of chaos long without other nations taking advantage of this chaos, preparing to nibble off fragments of this great land. Russia had to have a united front. Gradually, after twenty years, by means of one five-year plan after another, Russia accomplished incredible things. If in this period Russia had been a hundred years older as a people, with the culture not of a few years but many, if there had been another hundred years between the Czars and the first five-year plan, Russia would have emerged as one of the greatest States ever known. Russia was too young to be completely successful in her attempted experiment in economic individuality. She lacked maturity of viewpoint, had destroyed too many of her good minds; too many inferior minds were in high position. But she was successful in part. Amazingly, in twenty years Russia made more progress than any other civilized nation in one hundred years. The feebleness of the great powers, in a comparatively short time Russia emerged as a great nation, in terms of tremendous building projects, mechanical industries, housing. Some attempts at various forms of economics were sound, others fantastic. Amazing were the developments in art and drama, in all forms of research and chemistry; it was a new civilization successful because of the absolute dedication to the single premise, Russia for the Russians—everybody sacrificing in order that the State may emerge. Revolution and unbelief were deified; it was a Godless Russia, a nation that had no faith in anything except machines.

For such a nation Russia survive would be a great tragedy. Russia like Germany was building a Frankenstein, which only a few far-seeing people could perceive. To those who were crazy about social equality Russia could do no wrong. To the capitalist Russia could do no right. Somewhere between the two was right.

The truth was, Russia was creating the most dangerous form of materialistic empire, taking something no nation can afford to do any more than an individual can; and that is, to create a highly efficient unmoral structure. That is dangerous. After all, efficiency is the skill to do, but if the skill to accomplish is not dominated by a purpose that is worthy and meritorious, then you have not progress but chaos. There is no progress in mechanical development alone. No basic progress even in socialist success is inherent in the sphere of economics. Progress was by virtue of motives. Unless physical structures are built for a purpose, and that purpose is right, nothing really good ever comes out of it. Russia was building up from below a tremendous physical structure, but Russia was not building downward from above a trans-physical structure, an ethical structure great enough to sustain civilization.

Russia, had it continued on its way, would have produced a great nation of efficient, well fed people, who had possibly solved the problem of mechanical, physical, and social adjustment. So far as solving the creative phases of life, it would have been thwarted in that by one factor; namely, that if you do not need to solve it, and can accomplish your physical security without it, you will never solve it. If a successful civilization could be built from materiality, materiality would rule the world.

It is not possible for the world to go on and be happy, to progress, grow, and develop under the materialistic system of Russia, or under the dictatorial system of culture expounded by Germany. The Gods of High Decision, wherever they may be, are gazing down on the sorrowing intrigues of mortals, never showed their hands more completely than by pitting two menaces against each other. Two of the most dangerous forces existing in the political life of society have been thrown against each other, the two giants that hazard progress are fighting each other. That is one way in which nature protects integrity. The substance of fact is constantly increasing, and the substance of error is constantly negating itself.

Out of this struggle we are already beginning to see the devastation wrought. Russian Communism, as it was before the present war, is dead. Russia will never again be the same materialistic, isolated state, attempting to function at the expense of the rest of the world. Russia as a grand and constructive experiment, with probably a great deal more world
sympathy, world attention, and world understanding, will probably emerge. Only those in an informed position understand that this war is removing Russia as a hazard to the security of the world. At the same time it is removing Germany. The fruit of Russia's tremendous amount of actual physical labor in the last twenty years is being destroyed. Destruction of the great Dnieper Dam, representing millions of dollars and years of toll, not only represents a physical disaster but a psychological disaster. It reveals beyond any question of doubt to Russia the fallacy of physical accomplishment, the idol to which the nation was wed. Machines, monuments, apartment houses, cooperative dwellings, factories, cooperative farms—these were her progress. I saw a film put out some years ago as propaganda by the Communists, in which Russia was shown before and after the Revolution, shown in this manner: Before the Revolution a number of peasants were bowling before an orthodox Russian priest; the peasants with shawls over their heads, the priests in robes. Then followed three or four scenes in a countryside where poverty was obvious. Then, the Promised Land, the new Russia. And what did they put on the screen? An immense dynamo. First Russia bowing before a priest, and then bowling before a dynamo; and that was progress! Every scene used in this long film to represent progress in Russia was industrial. Not one foot of this film was devoted to any other form of progress.

It has been the Russian idea that after they have reached an economic solution they will then turn to culture. But this is not true reasoning. If they ever solve the economic problem, if anybody ever solves it, nobody will be looking for culture, because, after all, culture is only one way of trying to be happy. He who learns to enjoy good books does it because he wants a wider window through which to look, a vicarious participation in happiness, in something he is not a part of. But if he concentrates upon physical things and finds in them everything he needs, he will satisfy himself in this way, and will be set back centuries. It is not intended that man will be comfortable until he is intelligent, and any effort to solve the problem of physical life without solving the problem of inner life. We see it around us every day. There has never been an exception in history.

So, Russia going in for mechanical things was headed up a great blind alley. Russia could have had twenty more five-year plans, constructing more railroads, building more this and more that, developing the physical structure and vitality of people by mass training in the arts, but it would only have been Russia in a thousand things still thinking in terms of a great economic vision. No matter how much money we could do in the time it would take. Economics is not big enough. Economics is not big enough to be the purpose in life of any individual or social order. Economics exist for one purpose only, and that is to be a convenience to the human being who is doing something more important.

World civilization has collapsed very largely because we mixed up economics with life's purpose. The problem of creating a perfect economic pattern, presuming we could do it, would be the time it would take. Economics is a tremendous problem in our life, but we are not here for the purpose of creating a method of barter and exchange. We have to have one; we are not going to carry elephants in our hip pockets; we cannot actually use the methods the Ancients used and swap commodities; we have to have a symbolical method of exchange; but this method of exchange, which is the basis of economics, was never any more important than a convenience. To have an economic problem shake civilization to its foundation would be as stupid as for a whole civilization to be massacred over the problem of styles. In a cold country a man must have a coat, but that is no reason why he should live and die with one thought in his mind, and that is, how many coats he should own. A man must have a roof over his head, but it is not his life-work to see how many.roof can get. If we did not worship our economic system enough to either love it to death or hate it to pieces we would have time to live; and the economic situation would straighten itself out. We exercise toward it an undue amount of emotion. To some people economics is something that must be worshipped, and to others it is the pet hate of their lives. Both are wrong; it is not important enough to be either. We must realize that no economic solution solves anything that is important, any more than whether a man is wearing a blue coat or a brown coat determines the quality of his living. Russia was headed toward idolatry of economics. It was going to correct something. It had an idealistic viewpoint, but it was economic idealism.

Came the German invasion, and forced removal of a large part of the physical structure of Russian consciousness. What the Germans were not destroying the Russians were themselves tearing down. Very smart from a military standpoint, but it hurt Russia no end. To build for years and years and then put a bomb in it and blow it up is very difficult. It is very heroic medicine, but a cure for ills; for there is nothing more valuable for any human being to learn than the impermanence of the passing glories of the world. Whenever we invest our hopes, beliefs, and desires in any physical thing or person, we are doomed to disappointment. Only one universe stands immutable, the universe of principles. There will never be a permanent empire until we have one built upon the inner life of man and not upon the outer. Our physical civilization should be the simplest possible mechanism, liberating the individual as much as possible for the process of perfecting the inner consciousness. There is no virtue in an elaborate material civilization, there never has been, and never will be.

What is it Adolph Hitler wants? Is it the internal character of man? No. He wants their gold, their petroleum, their world trade, he wants their lands, their political influence, their military strength. He wants the things men have, but not the things men are. What is it that Communism has wanted of world revolution? A real basic change toward Truth in the life of man? What the Communist first wanted was to break the power of Capitalism.

Two great nations very much bound to the fetish of things material are now in a difficult situation. Russia is having twenty years of materialist work wiped out, her younger generation decimated, and is in for the Lord knows how much more misery before it is over. Russia has been set back not twenty years but a hundred years by this war. It is sacrificing its choicest political and industrial plans. Germany is passing through the same thing.
cracy. Up to the moment democracy has gone further in the establishment of liveable principles than any other form of government in the world. If Russia wants to go beyond democracy, she must go through democracy and not around it. Instead of jumping from aristocracy into Nirvana in one leap, Russia must discover she must go gradually from the peculiar aristocracy of the Czars to the democracy of the people, and then from the elective government of a democratic nation, gradually move into whatever else her dreams may be, making use of the steps that have gone before. As a child must pass through certain learning before it can begin its own career, so Russia needs a certain amount of experience to be gained from contact with others before it attempts to build its own new empire.

There is no reason why this should not be accomplished. In all probability Russia will emerge from this world war very much closer to democracy in principle, and a group of nations such as the United States, the British Empire, China, and Russia, can establish the foundation of a permanent world Democracy. Those four powers are potentially suited to be loosely united in the establishment of a great Democracy, and I think it looks very much as though that is going to happen.

Russia is going to come out of this war with a new sense of values of Capitalism and a newly learned that she must pay uneven wages. She has to learn people do not want to be regimented. No one wants to be No. 2872 in a collective. Most individuals would rather starve on their own than to have three meals a day on that basis; because something within them would be warped and destroyed. Thinking and being an individual is more important than physical existence, and most people know that inside themselves. The individual who has the right to think is a richer man, though he starve to death, than the man who has three square meals a day and no right to think, because the power of thought is the basis of true wealth; the power of thought and the use of thought is the foundation of all morality that exists in Nature. The average individual would rather starve as a thinker than survive in a sphere where he is denied the right of thought.

To me, the problem of Russia is the outworking of natural law. Russia must learn that physical empire is not enough, and the rest of the nations involved in the same problem must learn their own lessons in their own way. We have a lesson to learn. We have to learn that Democracy is a responsibility as well as an opportunity. We have to learn that in order to preserve the freedom of the people we must voluntarily unite behind principles. Nature has no place in its function for excuses and apologies.

I believe we shall live to see— at least some of us— Russia a great nation, far greater than it could possibly be under Communism. The principles that Communism fought for were right, and good in the Communist experiment, will survive; that which is inadequate will perish. But Russia, like all living things, must have sorrow in order to be truly great. The old Czars in Russia had much sorrow. This is the first serious obstacle Communist Russia has faced, the greatest test of external strength. It is a terrible test, a horrible thing, but out of it also must come experience, the experience that is necessary for all of us, that we discover in this world how temporary and impermanent is the civilization that builds only physical empire, for it cannot survive.

Life is lessons about living. We live while we learn, and the moment we cannot learn Nature will refuse to permit us to live. From the experiences of Russia, Germany and all other nations we can learn a little something of Universal Law and apply what we have gained to the understanding and solving of our own problems. That constitutes philosophy, which is the right of the individual to grow by the collective experience of his race.

(Concordance from a Public Lecture)
In the horoscope of the United States, as far as we know in astrology, 1942, strangely enough, is not a seriously afflicted year. The principal problem lies in the transit of Uranus.

In 1865 Dr. Broughton said that in 1942 the United States would again feel war upon its own continent. He based that prediction upon the eighty-four-year cycle of Uranus. In the eighty-four years since Dr. Broughton first began to meditate upon his prediction, astrologers have been trying to figure it out. The one thing we did not believe could happen did happen, the exact fulfillment of the prophecy. It is dangerous not to accept planetary testimony on face value. The prediction of war has been fulfilled after eighty years, and there is no reason why most of the others that belong to the same cycle should not be fulfilled. When we face incredible positions of planets we wonder if we are seeing right or not; it is hard to get the human equation out of thought patterns.

The most important aspect of the year 1942 lies in the transit of Uranus in the opening degrees of Gemini. That has always always been our war, a war regarding the survival of rights and liberty, a war fought over principles rather than territorial gain, a war in which there was a strong division in the internal structure. During the Revolutionary War, which took place in the Uranian cycle, we had the Whigs and the Tories; during the Civil War we had the North and the South; during the present war we have a strong division of feeling in labor and industrial fields, a marked disunion in individual attitudes toward the coming
form of world government. The chart for the United States beginning with March shows Mars, which is a war planet, as the Lord of the Year. Mars has been the Lord of the Year in a number of years when there was no war, but recent years show results in internal dissension, contention and discord. It is associated with a high rate of accidents. Also considerable political and social agitation. Mars, as the Ruler of the Year, is a natural combative quality. It irritates, stimulates, and invigorates, and also releases an immense amount of combative impulse.

With Mars as the Lord of the Year from March 20, 1942, to March 20, 1943, it is going to be a year of extreme activity. Activity is the positive keyword. The planet is also the patron of iron, smelting, heavy manufacturing, machinery; there will be a great deal of emphasis on these elements in our national life.

The horoscope for the United States from the Equinox in 1942 is not heavily afflicted, not as much afflicted as in the horoscopes for the last several years. There is nothing whatever to indicate any possibility of defeat. Everything points definitely toward the war, so far as we are concerned, being certainly a war that will not get out of hand. Our danger lessens with the Equinox in 1942.

The Uranus cycle, however, brings with it a common threat which we must not overlook, the time threat. Each time Uranus has transited Gemini and involved us in war—and it has done so in the case of the horoscope of the Western world ever since Cortez took Mexico City—the period of war has always been approximately eight years. Now, that is a very broad figure in comparison with the various opinions of experts in the field. Government spokesmen have estimated the probability of the war lasting from two to six years. A well known Chinese statesman, whose opinion has the greatest weight in diplomatic circles, declares the war cannot last over fourteen months. We are in the same position we were in regard to the possibility of invasion—the planets say eight years. All we can do is wait and see.

Revolutionary War actual hostilities did not exist for the full period of eight years, but approximately eight years did pass before the signing of the final treaties of peace, when the country emerged into a free and independent sovereignty on a basis of amity with European powers. The same was true of the Civil War. The Civil War did not last eight years, but it was nearly eight years before the final consummation of an enduring peace. The same may be true in the case of the present catastrophe. It is not of course indicated that there will be constant bloodshed for eight years, but rather that eight years, or thereabouts, will elapse before the complete coordination of international affairs into the pattern of peace.

The general pattern, as is apparent from the stars, for the coming year for our nation is something as follows: For the people of the country, as a group, for the citizenry and the nation, there is nothing in the form of a great or major catastrophe. Any possible invasion of our mainland coast seems from the horoscope exceedingly remote.

The House that governs the death rate is not afflicted and there is no indication of an exceedingly high death rate, comparative with what might be normally expected in time of war. The House of enemies contains no planets this year—which certainly does not bespeak too much for the adversary. The monetary situation for the country is rather upset, and we shall feel some financial strain, but nothing in comparison to that which has been felt by most of the other nations. The restrictions of personal liberties will not be as great as we might fear.

It is possible we may send an expeditionary force to territories outside this country, but there does not appear to be impending, at least for 1942, any grave dis...

aster, military or otherwise. Nothing points to a horrible state of affairs.

In the early part of March, 1942, from the 1st to about the 20th, we are favored with a couple of eclipses, which are apt to prove somewhat disconcerting. These eclipses will be felt particularly in matters relating to land, and might coincide with some effort to bombard or attack our shores.

The 1942 horoscope shows the emergence of a national hero of major proportions for our country. He will probably be a military man, but not basically in temperament; he will occupy military office, but will not by any means emerge merely as a professional soldier. He will be a person of temperament much more given to cultural arts and peaceful pursuits than to war, but he will emerge as a military leader. This is indicated through the horoscope of the army.

As to the disposition of our army, there will be a tremendous emphasis in our air corps work.

Sabotage, as far as I can tell from the 12th House, will be kept at a minimum. Remember, however, we deal with practical horoscopes. When a horoscope for a nation at war is read it must be read upon the level of a nation at war. No unusual indications of sabotage therefore means no violent outbreaks, but a certain amount is inevitable in time of war; there is nothing to indicate that we shall be especially victimized or suffer great loss through it.

The horoscope relating to the educational participations in the war is rather encouraging. I believe before the end of 1942 we shall definitely see a very serious trouble in military operations corrected; namely, the general ignoring of intelligent factors. Today the technical military man appraises the intellect as not only useless but a real debit, seems to believe that the intellectual person has no military significance, and is merely some one to be defended at the expense of other lives. Of course, if we had enough clear thought in the world we would not have wars. It is necessary to the survival of the modern military structure that the intellect be recognized as essential. I believe by the end of 1942 we will definitely have some of the scientific organization that we need. With Mars and Uranus strong in the 1942 chart, there is every indication we will have emphasis on mental warfare and the use of psychology in the administration of war.

There is also heavy emphasis on transportation and communication, and we will still be strongly problematics in the matter of shipping and convoying. I gravely suspect that conditions in the Philippines will not as well as we hope will they. Not that it will have any effect upon the final outcome of the war, but temporarily it might prove to be a reverse. The Philippines are in some danger. Singapore also.

Last year, looking over the horoscope of Russia, I said the fall of Moscow could not be found; it just did not show up; and yet common sense seemed to indicate that it ought to—which shows how much good common sense. You could have found it very, very interesting odds that Moscow would fall. In the same way there are reasonable suppositions that things should be very difficult for us—but we simply do not find them in the horoscope. Our own conclusions might lead us to feel that the British Empire situation in Asia is in a desperate condition; but we cannot find that astrologically predicted. Japan has nibbled off several pieces of Asia and is going to keep on trying to nibble them off. Temporarily Japan may extend itself over a considerable part of Eastern Asia. But with all the associated nations crowding upon Japan, it will in time be just too bad, no matter how much she grabs in the first onslaught. She cannot possibly hang onto it. It is quite possible for the first six months or year of this war that there will be quite an appearance of successes for the Japanese military machine, which has the advantage of the German military organization back of it. But, dictatorship is not a world policy, it is not in the world plan; it is just not going to succeed. The democratic powers of the world are in line with...
progress, and progress will sustain them. Furthermore, each of the nations now fighting Democracy has ever increasing democratic tendencies within itself. Japan, Germany, and Italy are all centers of internal unrest, with the people way out of harmony with their military dictatorship. This is bound to be felt at the conclusion of the present military activity.

We must be exceedingly careful in connection with the protection of the life and person of our Chief Executive during this coming year. We are in danger of loss in high places. Our ascendancy as a world power is quite obvious.

Today, the United States and Russia are the two great nations in the world. Russia at the moment because of a great military victory, and the United States because of immense psychological and industrial potentialities. These two nations, combined with the British Empire which has an immense sense of endurance, and with the other powers, present a picture of certain eventual triumph. The Nazi-Fascists and the other members of the Axis powers are capable of a potential 28,000,000 man power. The man-power of the nations united against the Fascist states—United States, Great Britain, Russia, The Netherlands, China, and other independent countries, not counting the ones now under the German yoke—combined 160,000,000 persons. The Axis was outnumbered in man-power and in resources. The great combination of democratic powers is ultimately undefeatable. From an astrological standpoint it has been undefeatable since the first gun was fired, but it did not seem that way at first.

The position of the United States in the matter of food is secure. There is no need to expect famine or anything of that nature in the coming year. There is every probability of the regulation of prices, and from an economic standpoint the horoscope indicates it is very possible that we will escape the greatest danger we could face, and that is a serious inflation.

There does not seem to be any great danger to the general structure of labor. A great deal of national authority will be in force, and I think before 1942 is over we shall feel the necessary weight of pressure. It is essential to our national survival that we have unity, if not voluntary motion, then as a legislated motion.

The farmer and the producer of basic materials will have a good year. This is a very good year in which to spend with reasonable discretion. There is nothing to indicate a financial panic, nothing to indicate anything close to a national collapse. There is nothing to indicate that the country's financial condition is as sound or sounder than any other nation of major importance.

There is nothing to indicate we need to fear organized attacks from our Southern neighbors. For the most part the South American countries are for us—why is a little mystery, but they are seemingly able to forget some slights possibly in the interests of self-preservation. There is every indication that difficulties will break out in South America which will be quickly checked; I do expect to see an outbreak of corruption and incompetence in South America in 1942. Adolph Hitler's program-moving into Dakar and invading across the Atlantic by air I do not believe will be attempted in 1942. If it is, it will result in failure. Our greatest danger, as far as our personal security is concerned lies in the Asiatic situation.

We will probably take some naval losses; in fact, these losses will be the principal source of worry to us in 1942 from a military standpoint.

The possibility of America becoming a great diplomatic center is also strongly marked by the position of the Sun in 1942. Governments in exile may move to lower broader prob." The position of the Papacy in this war has been very difficult. Certainly the Papacy has nothing in common with the atheists in Germany and almost nothing in common with the atheists of Russia. The tendency is more and more to shift the political power of the Papacy to the New World, and it is going to be felt more and more intensely. I should not be at all surprised to see an important conference of the Papacy and the democratic nations held here in America.

In connection with the United States, and also in connection with the relationships between powers, I have a suspicion that in 1942 Italy may be ready to ask for peace, would have done so long ago if she had been able to. Finland, not actually the war-maker, has only been overrun; and which five divisions of the German Army have been working. These divisions departing in past haste have left Finland holding the proverbial sack. I think Finland realizes this, and that war can be settled with reasonable speed.

The financing of the war in this country will be far easier than the Government realizes. Unquestionably our people are ready to be exceedingly generous. And by the middle or latter part of 1942 the United States will be on a military production footing second to no power in the world.

All of which brings up another interesting problem. People say, "Yes, but what will happen if the same things happen that occurred in the last war? We get nicely geared into war production and then the war is over." Everyone is thinking much more in those terms than they like to say, because we are still thinking in terms of money. But in that respect there are hopeful indications.

When this war is over, two-thirds of the earth will be in some form of demoralization; man-power and natural resources exhausted; cities bombed, railroads destroyed, harvests lost—everything in one incredible confusion under the great psychological and similar emotions the world has ever known. The reconstruction program will challenge every resource, industry, and moral and intellectual emphasis the world can concentrate upon the subject in the next twenty-five years. There will be work for every type of human being for years after this war. The increasing demands of individuals and shortage of materials to supply private requirements will have been, and will be further curtailed—should mean there should be nothing resembling an economic collapse following the present world situation.

The position of Jupiter for the year indicates a very good possibility of American people becoming definitely internationally minded, which is one of the most important things that could possibly happen to us. We are no longer the proverbial agrarian gathered around the small farm house; we are a great nation and a great world power, and we cannot hope to avoid or evade the implication of world leadership. We have tried to dodge that responsibility for years. We cannot do it.

Remaining aloof destroyed China two thousand years ago. "China for the Chinese" ruined China. Asia for the Asiatics is going to destroy Japan. If we fail for "America for Americans" we are going to go down also. This is a world, not a continent. We are a melting pot of fifty nations and a score of religions. We cannot survive by an isolationist policy. We are gradually being forced into that realization.

What was right in the horse and buggy era is not applicable in an aviation era. We are gradually going to be forced to assume world dominance and the position which the strength and dignity of our nation entitles us, and will more and more "America for Americans." We must sit in the seat of the mighty. The idea that we can pat other nations
on the shoulder, but that they must run the world, will not work any longer.

Looking over the detailed implications, I do not feel justified in predicting a bad year for American life, but a serious one in which we build foundations for things to come. I see the year stretching out ahead as much more profound and significant than 1941.

The principal virtue of this year lies in the awakening of integrity and stimulation of the forces now at work in our life. For the average man living the average life the year will be a year of responsibility, of some curtailment, some business worries. He will have increased taxes, he will have all those things to plague him that business is always worrying about; but his life will not be impossible, his difficulties will not be incredible and inconceivable, and for the most part his privileges will endure.

There is no prospect of any foreign alliance dominating our national life. Any attempt to invade our country or injure our national mainland in the next twelve months will meet with a very hot reception. There is nothing in the chart to indicate a national disaster. After a brief period of fencing back and forth, with a few losses and a few gains, and the possibility of some minor mishaps, this country will finally gear itself into a pattern that will make it practically invincible. The greatest danger is not to our land or country directly; our greatest danger lies in the domination of foreign spheres of influence in Asia.

Our greatest danger at the moment lies in the possibility of Great Britain losing Singapore. After many months of arguing with ourselves as to why we should do anything for England, we suddenly wake up to the realization that the English are in a position to do an awful lot for us—so often it happens that way; selflessness is its own reward, and so is stupidity. That Great Britain is able through the help of the democracies to hold Singapore, is as important to us as the food we are sending to Europe is important to Europe. A study of the map will show why, Singapore is invaluable to the United States; also Malaya and Borneo and that sea area which was the scene of the first attack of the Japanese. If these points are held, the war is not serious; if they fall, then we shall be confronted with the necessity of an all-out war on our own part.

It is interesting to find in a time like this the placid face of a well ordered United States horoscope looking back at you. Instead of a horrible muddle of planets looking all afflicted and aggrieved, they really make quite a decent showing. You would say an individual born with such a horoscope would not have too hard a time of it; he probably would not get out of the world alive, but who does? So, looking at it from a strictly astrological standpoint, away from all personal interpretations, considering everything, we shall have a pretty fair year. How or why, don’t ask me! That is the way it looks, and only time will show how it will administer itself. It could definitely be the horoscope of a year of peace and an all-out war. Unless there are planets we do not know about, or factors that have concealed themselves very adroitly, there is not going to be anything too bad; and we can live with the reasonable expectation that the world will right itself.

If individuals act their years and live up to what they know, there is no reason why we should not have a good, constructive, and happy year, in the sense that people who do not know what to do, will have something to do. People who didn’t know which way they were going will decide, and go. People who didn’t know how the world was going will try to find how they want it to go. We shall probably come out of this with formula, pattern, and purpose which we did not previously have.

(Condensation from a Public Lecture, December 21, 1941
Suggested Reading: Your Life in a Wartime Year (New); Facing the Future: Astrological Essays)

Today's Religion

Religion is not Christianity, nor Judaism, nor Buddhism; religion is an instinct, an impulse in human nature to revere; it is basically man's veneration for the unknown, man's veneration for the evidence of strength, and man's veneration for intangible ideals which dominate action.

Religion is not something entirely within the classification of dogma or morals; it is the instinctive tendency of all living things to fall down in the presence of that which is stronger or greater than themselves. It is associated with homage, it is associated with pomp and circumstance; and it is certainly associated with the power of the unknown. It is the unknown translated in the terms of Good, or the terms of Strength, or in the terms of Wisdom, or in the terms of Beauty.

The primitive savage groveling before his medicine man, the sophisticated New Yorker, with tall hat and cutaway coat going into his favorite church on Sunday morning, both are activated by their fear of the unknown, their respect or their veneration for power. Both have experienced a sense of personal insufficiency; both demand the right to lean on something. Each has found in his own world that he cannot lean on physical and visible things without these things failing him. Religious belief is consistent, in that the intangible cannot fail, the tangible can. Religion, an instinct in man, is the loneliness in the human heart seeking solace and strength.

If we can understand religion in this sense, we see it cannot be stamped out by mandate or legislation, any more than out of the human soul could be stamped the sense of its own insufficiency. But, the human mind can be adapted religiously, consciousness can be conditioned religiously; religion lies definitely within the zone and sphere of psychological influence. Today, therefore, we are experiencing a new type of religious impulse. It appears to me that which we have called religion in the past, and have identified with theology, is now emerging in a new role under the name of world ideology.

There is observable change in religious polarities; the force which the individual has termed religion, and previously identified with theology, is now being identified with social motion—what he has termed his progressive, political culture, economic and industrial trends.
Talk for a few hours with an individual of modern social convictions; he is not a scientist, a philosopher, nor an industrialist, not even a politically minded person; in many cases he is merely a religious person, and frequently to be recognized as the same old religious fanatic who got a terrible attack of hell-fire-and-damnation sociology. He has merely a dynamic social problem. He has an economic and social convictions. This is religion, whatever we may call it. Probably no greater example of this conviction is to be found than in Communism in Russia. It is quite useless for any Russian sociologist to deny that Russia is religious. The Russian peasant is intensely religious individually, and the story of Russian religion and folk belief is one of the great books yet to be written. There are hundreds of mystical sects flourishing in Russia; there are all forms of Second Adventists, and all sorts of mystical beliefs that are the most fantastic mingling of Oriental and Occidental traditions with strange hero tales that would shame the mythologies of almost any nation. The Russian also is intensely superstitious. A great many of these Russian peasants have subscribed the doctrines and expounded by their leader Lenin. The proof that Communism is a religion in itself is the fact that the icon has disappeared from many Russian homes; and in the place where it stood with the holy water in front and the candles on either side, is now the portrait of Lenin. It is the likeness of the great vibrator that now stands in the family shrine and receives daily the prayers of the superstitious peasant—a definite indication of emphasis.

Many of the so-called intellectual class of Russian socialists would like to deny that Leninism is a religion; but even while they are denying it and defending their denial with all the fervor in them, their own voices raise to the pitch of religious fervor. They exemplify the very thing they deny. We may as well accept the fact—regardless of what we think about it. It is a great good or a great evil—to those who are addicted to its convictions, Communism is essentially a religion. As the final stamp of religious emphasis it involves within itself one of the cardinal tenets of absolute religious fanaticism: To accomplish which is desired, the end justifies the means. That is a religious argument, one that was behind the Inquisition, behind the massacre of the Huguenots, behind the Massacre of the Knights Templar—the end justifies the means.

Without such a religious factor young men can not be readied to die for a social idea, to plot, steal, and murder for their social convictions; prepared to sabotage and to turn as spies against their own families, ready to sacrifice career and life, to face imprisonment and the firing squad—because they are fired with a great social message. It is not a great social message; it is a religion. It is one that makes a man feel the divine significance of the thing he is doing, that makes him feel the sense of his own sovereign state, the religious aspect which makes him believe he possesses the power to affect the world, as he whispers with veneration the names of his saints, the heroes of his party, and the Third Internationale, the Fourth Internationale—it is these things that in our modern life take the place of the stasis of religion.

Germany presents another aspect of the same problem. Hitlerism definitely is a religion. Hitlerism is not a political movement. Today it is a spiritual conviction through which is being released into social expression the usual array of religious intensities. It has all that is necessary to be regarded as a religious belief. And Joseph Hitler is without doubt the greatest Medicine Man alive today. He employs the psychological equipment of the Shaman's rattle and drum with the same mysterious power to create emotional frenzy that has been practiced by the religious Shamar for thousands of years. He is producing one of the greatest religious phenomena the world has ever seen, a mysterious spectacle which the world is only occasionally permitted to see: a religion being born.

We hope it is going to be a bit short-lived, but nevertheless it is going to pass through a very intensive cycle of culturing as it proceeds.

Because Hitler is essentially a religion he has been forced to oppose religion.

Go back and consider the early development of the Christian church. The first thing done by the early Apologetics, particularly in the Ante-Nicene period, was to prove the superiority of their own belief. Second, the Post-Nicene Fathers tried to prove the importance of everyone else's belief. It is intrinsic to the nature of every theological system that it desires to remove all other theological systems.

The political movement that feels its survival demands the destruction of other political movements, always does so from the conviction of the superiority of its own belief. It does not mean to be intolerant. What we call intolerance in religion is the insistence of a religious person who feels convinced that he alone is right. He does not mean to be intolerant. All he is trying to do is remove
error upon the perfectly natural assumption that everything that disagrees with him is error. So, he admits that he is liberal, that he is broad-minded, that he is honest; and that there was never a more generous soul than himself. He does not want to do anybody any harm. He merely wants to exterminate anyone who disagrees with him. The one thing wrong with him, is being right.

The National Socialist of Germany is so full of right he knows but one thing to do about it--become the custodian of the new world. He is the keeper of the great Revelation, is the hope of the future; he alone carries with him the banner of human progress. And thus gradually he works up to a high pitch of religious fervor. And whether we want to believe it or not, the whole of the National Socialist policy is being carried forward by young people who have thought and dreamed and have had their religious inclination and aptitudes directed toward national socialism; each one of them is more a missionary than he is a soldier. And precisely as the devout missionary goes forth among the cannibals of the South Sea and takes a chance on being eaten in order to carry the Gospel to someone who never wanted it, so the young National Socialist feels that it is his spiritual duty to convert the world.

We have the same phenomenon in Christianity. Illiterate missionaries have sought for years to convert a highly intelligent and highly cultured Chinese, whose standard of thinking was so much above that of the missionary as to be out of his mental reach. The missionary felt and the folks at home agreed that if they did not keep on paying his salary another block of human souls was going to slide right into the pits of perdition. The one hope was that the Mongol could be converted. And, if here and there a slow-witted cooie joined the flock we felt that we had accomplished our Christian duty; and the Rev. Jeremiah Jinks, himself a conscientious man, and entirely devout and sincere, felt that this mission to China was his call. God had directly pointed a finger at him and called him forth to greater labors at a tremendous discomfort to himself as well as the Chinese. The Reverend in a non-religious capacity often accomplished a great deal of good. He may have spread some necessary hygiene and necessary education, and may have been a very good man; but the thing that took him there and kept him was the fire of a great spiritual zeal. It is the same thing that sends European sabotage agents to the United States. They come here prepared to face possible imprisonment and death to undermine our defense industries, because of a spiritual conviction they are part of a new world order, they must come, the Gods have ordained it, and their master, the Reich Führer is the prophet of the Lord! Essentially they motivate on a religious foundation. Theirs are new gods and new orders of gods; theirs are new creeds, cults, and sects. In a great religion of socialism and sociological agitation, the human mind in its spiritual convictions is moving away from the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God to the problem of the human relationships of man.

This motion is inevitable. We have preached the realization of spiritual values for thousands of years with our physical relationship with each other not exhibiting any particular religious virtues. The interval between religion as theory, and religion as practice, is incredibly wide. We have reached a point where human life is becoming so complicated that the average individual is becoming less and less interested in the geography of heaven and much more interested in the sociology of earth. But he is still religious. Therefore, he is taking out religious inhibitions by becoming a social religious fanatic.

A German today is not fundamentally a National Socialist because he is patriotic to Germany, but because he is patriotic to National Socialism. It is not his nationality that holds him today, it is his religious ideology. Tell a person of any nationality with a great religious conviction you do not think so much of it, and he is fighting mad; you have not only assailed him, you have insulted the Universe, you have absolutely offended Spagu, you mortally wounded the Gods, and he is ready to claw, fight, scratch, bite or anything else, because in religion anything is fair, because of the great spiritual purpose behind it. If you do not like what he is saying you are persecuting him, which readies him for martyrdom or murder. He believes as long as it is in the name of belief he can do no wrong; you cannot reason with him; your position is like that of the man who, when one of Jehovah’s Witnesses gets his foot in the front door. These callers are entirely sincere, but a lot of housewives are busy in the morning. It is rather disconcerting to lean out the upstairs window inquiring, "Who is there?" and have a voice come back solemnly from below, "Jehovah’s Witness’. Something about the whole idea transcends the nobility of faith; there is something that seems terribly cheap being done in the name of religion. Yet these people are sincere—most of them—and yet they are caught up in a strange belief. If we do not agree with them they are insulted; to agree with them would insult us; if you argue they put on the phonograph record; give them the slightest encouragement and they will sell you a bunch of books you don’t want. What are you going to do? If you do not let them in, you are a heathen; if you do let them in, you are a dupe.

You are in the same situation identically when you come into the presence of an old friend who has a bad dose of the solution to all social ills. He is interested in single tax, double tax, war tax or thumb tax, or something, and with all the fervor of a theologian selling salvation, he will try to convince you that the particular thing he has on foot is the only panacea for the world’s woes. If you do not agree with him you are stupid, if you even question the divinity of his idea then you are a culprit; if you cannot see the sublimity of his idea, you are a moron, he looks pityingly at you. We have here just the same thing as in religion, where ninety nine people out of a hundred cannot give you one good reason for the way they feel; they just feel that way “because.”

It is obvious to the unprejudiced person that the present world war is an out-break of misplaced religious emphasis, or at least the result of the failure of proper religious emphasis. The world is disillusioned with a large part of its religious convictions, because theological convictions have never been made to work. The world is not satisfied with the total loss of the principal elements of life in the religion of the individual.

What are the elements of life in religion? The first thing the individual has to do is gratify man’s love of the sublime. There must be some outlet for the normal impulse of the human being to venerate. He wants to worship something. He must either worship worthy ideals because they are placed
before him, or else he will grovel before the crystallization of his ideas, which we call idols. An idol is a tangible symbol of an ideal.

In our own country today where is the person who is religion conscious to find the beauty, the sublimity, the dignity and the emotional release of a healthy religious expression? What is religious art in this country?—one of the very highest and noblest expressions of life, and sung by people. Of course, there is something on every hand that is not religion, and music and art are gone; but the great principles of religion which have not been applied are equivalent to the parts of all religions which have not been applied. It is not exactly fair to say Christianity has not been applied; but the great principles of religion which are neither Christian nor Pagan but are eternal facts, those are the things that have not been applied. Man must either find release for himself through constructive and beautiful expressions of life, or else he is going to tear down the world which denies him the right.

The great emotional experience of life is religion. People today turn to motion pictures and the theatre for emotional experience, yell their heads off at ball games as opportunities to get something emotional out of their systems. And this, mainly because religious convictions have no expression. It is the seeking for adequate spiritual release that similarly makes possible the dictator, set up by his people as a religious idol.

The solution of the present world crisis from a religious standpoint is that we need and must have idealism that will attract and hold the human mind to courses of constructive action. When we have this idealism we will have a proper religious life.

(Condensation from a public lecture)
All men get hungry at the same time, all need work; all need to dream, to plan not for conquest but toward a common security; we expend our energies in the effort to reform a derelict minority

Night Court

Some people believe in the equality of men, and it is a marvelous idea, but not exactly a workable idea, for the reason that men are not equal.

Nor is the supposed equality the simple problem, as Edwin Markham states it, of men needing a chance; many of our greatest industrialists and leading capitalists once sold newspapers and shined shoes, and we know it was no accident that their lives worked out differently than others. The quality in some individuals that forces accomplishment must be attributed to a deeply mysterious faculty, a certain impulse of will; the absence of it leads to failure more than greater or lesser degrees of school education, opportunities and privileges. One requirement is the ability to think, something which astonishingly few people possess. It is probably correct to say that of the whole population of the world a fraction of one percent think and the rest do not. The intellectual crust of mankind is a very thin layer on top.
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any ethics with which we are acquaint-
ed. And what can be done for them? Our institutions are already so crowded
that it is hardly possible to get in an-
oder delinquent. The unpleasant fact has to be faced that a certain percentage
of our citizens are of a type that is fundamentally lawless; the percentage is
too large. These people can be called
the victims of circumstances, but that
avails nothing; for 'circumstances' are
made up of our social relationships in
all the factors which make up modern
conditions of living.

When you get the story of the lawless
character, probe for the contributing fac-
tor in the moral collapse, it invariably
seems that this particular citizen would
not have gone down had he strength of
character. We are sure we have, for we
are law-abiding; but how many of us
have actually been tested? Would we
have continued to be respectable if we
had been faced with the same circum-
stances and conditions the lawless one
has had to face?
The conditions under which we live
make it more profitable to be dishonest
than honest. We act according to the
degree of pressure brought against us,
and if this is very great and we haven't
courage or constructive impulse of will,
if we are placed in situations we can not
face, then we become dishonest. Under
such circumstances a man steals a mil-
lion and becomes a financier; another
steals a can of beans and becomes a thief.

For the civilization which we have built
rests in the theory of privilege resulting
from wealth as the primary consideration
of living. Money itself has become the
very essence of our reason for being.
Without it we are a delinquent, with it we
are reasonably safe from being picked
up by a policeman. Civilization—its
basis in the word civil—means, the pro-
cess of being civil to each other, which
of course means considerate in actions.
Money's main use is exploitation of oth-
ers to the betterment and comfort of
ourselves.

The Judge on the bench is forced by
law to convict unfortunate people, know-
ing that in the same circumstances and
without opportunity he would have com-
mitted the same misdemeanor himself.
The Judge knows that he could solve
many of these individuals' life
problems in fifteen minutes, but the law
doesn't permit him to do that. He
knows what's the matter with the law,
and so do a great many other people.
The one cure—and no one dares to ad-
vocate it—is a complete re-statement of
our entire system of economics. Who
dares even to whisper that! It would
mean being branded as a dangerous an-
archist. And it would impose a great
uneasiness of thought as to what might
happen to you, yourself, if the system of
money's dominance were changed and we
could go back to the days when a
man's house had a leather latchstring
instead of today's Yale lock and a chain
bolt. Temptations have increased as
'should be used rightly, but this we do
not do; we are afraid the dollar we give
away will not come back. Having the
privilege of great things, we put above
them our own personal desires. The
common error of today's civilization is
that it is rooted in selfishness. Collective
selfishness may be nationalism, but in-
dividual selfishness is crime.
The proper attitude for man is this:
We are all one human family, hopeless-
dy tied to a little ball whirling through
space which is our earth. All men get
hungry at the same times, all need
money at the same times, all need
work; all need to dream, to plan not
for conquest but toward a common secu-
rity. All people could be happy as one
great family, but instead they have iso-
lated themselves into groups, large and
small, each dominated by special conceits
and motivated by special prejudices un-
der which are to be sought special privi-
leges. All are interested wholly in their
own survival, and each believes he is
superior to the rest, a mathematical im-
possibility. Having lost sight of a com-
mon humanity we have lost sight of the
factual factor of technological substitu-
tion of mechanical power for manpower.
We will have to do something, and it
will not be fascism. It will begin by our
individual recognition that we have cer-
tain common responsibilities, that we
must secure the lives of people, and on
a corrected standard of values. The
principle behind Christianity can
solve the problem, even if in practice it
does not do it. We know that money
should be used rightly, but this we do
not do; we are afraid the dollar we give
away will not come back. Having the
privilege of great things, we put above
them our own personal desires. The
common error of today's civilization is
that it is rooted in selfishness. Collective
selfishness may be nationalism, but in-
dividual selfishness is crime.
The proper attitude for man is this:
We are all one human family, hopeless-
dy tied to a little ball whirling through
space which is our earth. All men get
hungry at the same times, all need
money at the same times, all need
work; all need to dream, to plan not
for conquest but toward a common secu-
rity. All people could be happy as one
great family, but instead they have iso-
lated themselves into groups, large and
small, each dominated by special conceits
and motivated by special prejudices un-
der which are to be sought special privi-
leges. All are interested wholly in their
own survival, and each believes he is
superior to the rest, a mathematical im-
possibility. Having lost sight of a com-
mon humanity we have lost sight of the
fact that regardless of which side of the
tracks we live on we can all be hungry
and the need for shelter and clothing is
a common need. We must discover that
there is no civilization until it can take
care of its own people. It is time to
come out from under the hypnosis that
economic supremacy gives security.

The common good, which is the great-
est idea of civilization, can not be made
workable or even possible by legislation.
It will come when humanity is assured
of rational effort in living the integrity
of the individual. You can work it out
in your own mind. You may not make
it a law, but a way that you, yourself will
live. If enough people live that way, the
good way, a marked change will come in
our national life. A nation is made
up of individuals, and their attitude re-
veals the temper of the nation. We must
move from an economic to an ethical
foundation.

And if the Night Court will have to
continue to have its few who require
special attention, ninety-nine out of a
hundred people will have acquired and
be guaranteed a reasonable security and
a real right to happiness. The wrong
way to go about this is to expend our
energies in the effort to reform the dere-
lict minority. Each one of us has the
more important job of setting our own
lives straight. The real need of civilization
is recognition of the necessity for re-form-
ing modern life as it is lived now by the
majority—in self-serving selfishness.

(Condensation from a public lecture)

MICHEL Nostradamus, who lived in the 16th Century, not only described condi-
tions in his own time, but described the Civil War to come to America in the
19th Century. He wrote prophecies that applied to a hundred years or more after
his own death. In his works is a description of the French Revolution and he
gives the name of the man who would betray Louis XVI. Incredible. Unbelievable.
But these things actually came true. And we can read in his works equally accurate
discussions of the affairs of the 20th Century. Doubt as we will the integrity of
these prophecies, many were made 400 years before the events occurred.
The scientifically trained man dismisses Nostradamus' accuracy in the light of coinci-
dence. That he gave the name of the man 300 years before the event occurred—and
the name is an odd one—that is coincidence. That he hit the fact in hundreds
of predictions in a row, is still coincidence.
How to Think

Many people say they would like to know how to think. They are usually those who have for a long time been thinking they were thinking. But now they are harboring the suspicion that very little hard mental exercise was being done, that most of their thinking has been of an instinctive order, in an endeavor to try to think themselves out of work.

The sixty cents worth of chemicals that comprise our physical selves prefer to remain in a horizontal position; no doubt about that; and when raised up they would like to fall again. In this they are aided by devotion to a certain type of opinion which has been called the falling sickness of reason. And there are many types of thinking which arise in self-defense, in desperate struggles to get out, in plots and schemes to escape. None of these things are necessarily thinking; they belong to primary impulses inherent in man.

Thinking, in order to be thinking, must be for its own sake. Its purpose gets sidetracked when the intent is to gain from it. Great musicians do not write music to sell, nor is the man who paints a picture to sell a great artist; they are men forced to express a beauty they have seen inwardly. Thinking hinged to an economic program is never true thinking.

The thinking that is for its own sake, for improvement and for service others without reward, is a rare commodity to run across. Only occasionally today do we find an idealist. An idealist is one who thinks toward good, for the sake of good. We are trained to think economically, profitably for ourselves, to achieve our ends by scheme and plot. A plot is not a plan.

How to think.... In an old book is the anecdote of a man who suffered from a bad memory approaching Apollo, hopeful of a panacea for forgetfulness. He says he has read greatly, but cannot remember what he has read. Apollo's instruction is: "In order to remember you have to remember."—And what more is there to it? In order to think you have to think.

Thinking is the mind's legitimate purpose. One way to begin is to study the thoughts of those who have thought well. We all have the capacity to think; what is mostly needed is gradual stimulus through exercise. All faculties become keener if they are used. If you work on a good book or two of philosophy, in the course of time you will think; once you start to use the mind to its legitimate end, thought will flow right along; it will be found that the more you think the better you can think.

Thinking is not something that explodes in the mind and swooshes off like a skyrocket. Thinking is continuity of mental effort. A thought needs a following thought. The average person thinks of a dozen things in as many minutes and never goes through with any of them. This is why we have bad politics, poor religions, and imperfect science. The thinking that is continuity of mental exercise takes hold of an idea and the mind continues with it until it is finished. It doesn't drop it somewhere. Ideas are anywhere where you can see what humanity is doing; Socrates said the best place to get them is on the street corner. A good place, I have found, is the night court.

All things are accomplished by trying; that is the way the child learns to walk; the person who does not know how to think but tries long enough will succeed. Nothing will be accomplished in the first five minutes, but he who keeps on will finish up a thinker.
The building of a commonwealth or a state that can continue from generation after generation because its purpose has been great enough, its foundation strong enough, and its light clear enough to see through uncertainties to the purposes that lie ahead.

For millions of years we have been struggling with the mystery of thought. We have been groping out from ourselves in the darkness of a prehistoric world into the light of an intelligent existence. We have been struggling out from ourselves into the universal, into a fraternity of purposes. And whenever we have had little interludes of peace and success and prosperity we have slipped back a little into the old ways. We have lost a little of our dreams.

In the history of the world this is the greatest crisis that man has ever known. For the first time in recorded history the whole world is united in a great struggle for survival. Out of this great struggle must come a great destiny. Out of the problems that we are facing today must come a world richer than ever before because the problems are greater than ever before. We grow according to the problems, according to the stress and according to the strain. Now our problem is great and our reward will be equally great.

(The full message runs 15 minutes; Manly Hall's voice was recorded as he broadcast; and if a sufficient number of persons indicate a desire to purchase phonograph records they may be made available. Only by ordering in quantity could the price be brought down to a reasonable figure.)