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As Democracy Awakens

WITH so many things happening so rapidly in world affairs, it is very difficult to keep our history straight. It is even more difficult to evaluate and take the greatest possible advantage of the significance of what daily is taking place.

Applying the principles of observation and reflection to the aspects of the international scene, we have always three considerations to bear in mind: The first is the application of history and world policies to our own personal experience. How are we going to use what happens outside of our personal experience as a means of furthering our own living as human beings, philosophically minded? Second, how are we going to arrange the pattern of things taking place around us in order that they may reveal to us the motion of history, the motion of evolution, so we may gain an understanding of the philosophy of empire? And, third, how are we going to use annoying and disconnected happenings as an instrument for a complete understanding of waves of evolution, karma, and the great time intervals between the visible and invisible?

Trying always to see patterns, to see the relationship between incidents and purpose, reasons and the things reasons produce, what is produced and what produces, it is a great mistake to permit ourselves the extravagance of considering any incident by itself. There is nothing in the world that is not related to something else. Yet, no thing in the world is related to everything else.
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In playing at God, which has been the
great game of tyrants since the beginning of time, it is difficult to
determine when the reasonable boundary of possibility has been
reached. There have been moments in the lives of all great conquerors when had they stopped they might have been very powerful forces for world good. There seems to be a moment when there is an almost invisible line in nature where the leader, as a prophet, having brought his people forward to a certain new growth, a new release, could go into constructive en

davor and make a truly immortal con
tribution. But about the time when he
might accomplish a vast good, this dis
case of madness sets in upon him, and he goes on recklessly destroying all that he has done, and taking the progress he has made, he changes it into .. complete chaos.

There is no doubt that Mussolini made a very valuable contribution to the life of the Italian people; he amended his country's laws until they were far more equitable, made better educational and cultural opportunities, made vast improvements in hygiene and sanitary conditions, and rebuilt the dilapidated and corrupted communities. He gave the Italian people a new and wonderful
state, and then, unable to bear the
weight of his ambition, became in
volved in an international situation which will destroy him and will bring his people down to ruin. It would be quite wrong also not to realize that Adolf Hitler made vital and important contributions to German life, rescued the German people from the slough of

post-war despond; but just when it seemed as though he might have made a permanent place for himself as a re-maker or re-civilizer of Eu
rope, the divine disease struck him. It is very difficult for a man to succeed in anything without feeling that he can succeed in every
thing. This strange mania for power afflicts those most who are in a humanitarian sense least ready; we never know which of the innumerable human creatures who populate this earth is going to be the next to try to rule. We tolerate would-be despots when they first appear because it is easier to laugh at them than to worry about them; then belatedly
find it necessary in one way or an
other to remove them. This fallacy of individual power is one with which Europe has afflicted itself since the be

ing—in a history which is basically the recording of one long war inter
rupted occasionally by brief armistices. Europe has been fighting since the
famous Gallic Wars of Caesar; Europeans are warlike; people given to feuds and battles, their history, their legends, their mythologies, their cultures, are all of strife, warfare, and pillage. Constant
has been the repetition of the disease of ambition.

We have just as many ambitious people in America as in Europe. Why should Europe be so much more ambitious from a military standpoint?—as we find it difficult to reconcile to keeping even a small peacetime standing
crystallized communities, well larded
with hates, prejudices, and suspicions, the
disease of imperialistic ambition has
seemingly found a particularly fertile
ground for development.

Then, of course, European conscious-
ness has a greater veneration for author-
ity than we have. Europe produces despots and tyrants because Europe vener-
ates them. If we were to try and imagine
people getting up and starting acting like a Dic-
tator and everyone starts to laugh; which
of course, sort of spoils things. But in
Europe, no one laughs; they take
Mr. Loudspeaker at face value; if he says
he is a Dictator, he is. They have never
run their own affairs, and never hope
to. The best they hope is that the next
dictator will be a little less of a tyrant
than the last one.

The nearest thing we have is the poli-
tician, but he has to get along with Am-
erican refusal of any profound veneration
for the individual who is a sublime ego-
ist. We do not have dictators here as in
Europe because we are all egoists!—we
say to ourselves, let him play dictator if
he wants to; okay; he thinks he is good. I
know I am good. The game is not
played here according to European rules;
we do not take it seriously, and there is
no pleasure in it.

Instead of dictatorship, which is not
popular here, we all try to be rich.
The one thing we do take seriously
is money. We do not pay much at-
tention to gold braid, except to go up
by greater neighbors; peoples constantly
maintaining little individual existences,
keeping their ranks, keeping their tradi-
tions, cultures, and beliefs, and so re-
maining each of them apart, intermarry-
ing in their own small tribes, maintain-
ing their traditions, and lore, and art,
and music, and industry, at a tremen-
dous personal sacrifice. This has re-
sulted in strong nationalistic feelings,
strong family ties, but most of all it
made Europe very provincial. How
could it be otherwise, with a mass of
small peoples struggling to be them-
selves against any general forward cur-
rent toward internationalism.

With the exception of a few isolated
cases there is no internationalism in
Europe, regardless of what we may
hope in that direction. Altogether, in
one way or another, these nations have
committed the unforgivable sin of be-
ing provincial. For, it does not make
any difference whether it be a narrow
minded nation, or a narrow minded in-
dividual, both come to grief. There
is no virtue in isolation, so far as mental
procedure is concerned, if we do not
necessarily go out and insist on mingling
ourselves in other people’s con-
cerns; but the mental iso-
lization of thinking our own
thoughts, whether the rest
of the world approves or
not, does not pay any div-
idents at all. In these

ably destructive of property, of human-
kind. He kills; corpses pile up in his
wake and train. His methods are those
of a horrible insanity. As we look
upon the toll of death today we think
of it of course as a sort of climax of the
ages. Never was there anything so bad
as this, because there will be anything
as bad again. There is due to lack of perspec-
tive. In the Dark Ages, history tells us,
one epidemic of the bubonic plague
killed three-quarters of the population
of the earth. We do not realize that
this happened within the last five hun-
dred years. How many people reading
history have found out that three-quar-
ters of the population of the earth died
of plague alone? We do not realize
those things, because our miseries of to-
day are supreme. We do not realize
the world has always been passing
through crises, that the great bubonic
plague was one thing the gods could
send to clean off the surface of the earth
—or that it did a perfect job, by a long
way; but it did bring man’s mind forc-
ibly to the necessity of sanitation.
Three or four hundred millions of peo-
ple had to die from the plague alone to
remind human beings that it was neces-
sary to depa rts from the old Florentine
custom of throwing the garbage under
the beds.

Now, it may take the lives of three or
four hundred million people again be-
fore human beings will find out it is
not necessary to settle war in the way
we do it. There is no need for war.
Everything man does can be arbitrated.
A billion persons may have to die before
we will accept that fact. And that is
not because the Uni-
verse is unkind; it is
because human beings
are inconceivably stupid
when it comes to learn-
ing things that are good
for them. Good habits
are painfully acquired, as
we may well real-
ize in our chaos of to-
day created out of am-
bitions and counter-am-
bitions.

Not many months ago it looked as
though a great way of life was going to
come to an end; it looked as though,
as far as man was concerned, democracy
was just about done for. It was boasted
in Europe that the whole theory of the
rights of the people was absolutely
exploded. Why? Well, a European
dictator had a very good answer for
that. He said—and this is almost paraphras-
ing Adolph Hitler—the reason why de-
cracy was failing was because demo-
cratic people were incapable of adminis-
tering it unselfishly. In other words,
democracies were used as an opportunity
to exploit rather than to cooperate. Thus
the democratic nations were going no-
where. And that criticism was not entirely
unfounded. All democratic nations had
interpreted democracy as the right to
exploit under the guise of being free. It protected us so
we could not be prevented from the
free and unassailable right to exploit
others up to a certain point—and there
has always been a question just where
that point was, where freedom left off,
say, and crime began. One of our most
famous gangsters, after murdering half
doz en other gangsters, took refuge in
the fact this was a free country; to him
that meant he ought to be able to do
what he wanted to do. He was very
hurt when he found freedom did not
include murder. This condition exists
in some democratic states, not neces-
arily to the degree of gansterism of course,
but to the degree where the majority
of the population is using democracy as
a basis for personal advantage and ex-
plotation, rather than the basis of a
common fraternity of growth and develop-
ment. We have not been specially aware of
our responsibility to the
state; only aware of the
state’s responsibility to
us. At the moment
when law interfered with our ambitions we
wanted to reject it; when it served our ends
we wanted to hide be-
hind it. So more or less lax, and through success and its attendant evils, we were slipping very comfortably into a position of decadence; and had this decadence become general, there is no question but that democracy would have died. It was dying fast.

If there is much more democracy in the world today than there was a few years ago, it is because more people are vital and actually believe in freedom and the rights of man, and are willing to make the supreme sacrifice for it. There are ten ready today where there was one two years ago, because of the simple fact we have become aware of that which we were in danger of losing. The principle of democracy is now safe for another twenty-five years at least; it is safe until we get prosperous and secure again. From a democratic standpoint we are safer today than we have been since the World War I. Not only has the march of totalitarianism failed to stamp out democratic forms of government, it has not put under in any way the democratic philosophy of life. In those countries which have been subjugated, and those countries that have been brought into line with totalitarian thought, there is more democracy than ever before. Today, in exile and in France; astronomically speaking we are not; but we are gradually being forced to accept the reality of the situation.

The Magna Charta was the first declaration of modern democracy. The intrinsic democracy of England thus has had a good case, but I do not think England has been democratic in the sense we understand the term. Among the European nations England was probably outstandingly democratic, but in comparison to the United States very tradition bound, very aristocracy conscious; and so not essentially democratic internally and in relationship to the rest of the world. But the England of today is not the England that went into the war. England is a hundred times more democratic. A strong alliance of principles is emerging from this whole war pattern, with the possibilities of destroying England by military means becoming less every minute—because the British people are now becoming strongly democratic.

Some people think we are already in the Aquarian Age; astronomically speaking we are not; but we are gradually approaching it. What is the keynote of this new age? The cycle of the rights of man. It is possible that civilization is really going to emerge as a democracy, become for the first time in history truly democratic in spirit as well as in policy.

One of the things we are doing now, is that going to come? I am inclined to think that some new types of international patterns are in the offing. I think when this war is over the world will be so tired of autocracy we shall be able to go at least twenty-five years without a new epidemic of it. By that time we will have a new generation that will not be tired of anything. Europe is seeing in the sacrifices of this great struggle the need for more emphasis on democratic rights and privileges. The motion of civilization forward demands democracy, but how long would it have taken to achieve democracy according to the way the world was moving from 1920 to 1930, or from 1930 to 1938? The war has moved in that period of nearly two decades we would not have been any further along a thousand years from now. We were concerned only with ourselves and small personal things. We had no particular patriotism toward anything. We were disillusioned with our leaders, tired of everything, bored to distraction. The financial situation was the only thing that really perturbed us. No how long would we have had to go on like that to be parents of the New Age? We would have had to go on indefinitely, and then never be anywhere. We were all trying in one way or another to exploit each other rather than serve each other. We were selfish in the extreme, self-centered, inconsistent, and unkind.

If we can arise from the emergency of this time to a clear statement of democracy, but how long would it have taken to achieve democracy according to the way the world was moving from 1920 to 1930, or from 1930 to 1938? The war has moved in that period of nearly two decades we would not have been any further along a thousand years from now. We were concerned only with ourselves and small personal things. We had no particular patriotism toward anything. We were disillusioned with our leaders, tired of everything, bored to distraction. The financial situation was the only thing that really perturbed us. No how long would we have had to go on like that to be parents of the New Age? We would have had to go on indefinitely, and then never be anywhere. We were all trying in one way or another to exploit each other rather than serve each other. We were selfish in the extreme, self-centered, inconsistent, and unkind. It is such a terrible thing to have world war force us into destructive patterns. What about the destruction that went on when there was no war? We were not actually taking men out and shooting them, but we were wearing and grinding them to pieces through unkindness, cruelty, and indifference. We were denying them opportunity for employment; in the field of economics, industry and politics we were actually slaughtering mankind by the millions, for we were killing everything within men that made life worth living. The American way was to do anything that was profitable; nothing otherwise. Democracy would surely have died, had something not come along by which our own fallacies precipitated us into the condition we are in—military war. By death from guns and bombs suddenly we began to realize how vital soul things are. War is a crude way of learning a lesson, but man is cruel. A French statesman said, many years ago, the only thing worse than the cruelty of war is the cruelty of peace. Man without a high purpose finds a thousand unworthy things to do. So periodically we fill up the container. We precipitate crises; and then we have to survive them. Nature has but one purpose, and that is, the accomplishment of ultimate. If we will not accomplish in one way we shall be forced to accomplish in another. What is the reason for this war, all wars?

Some day we should all study the philosophy of democracy. What it meant as a religious philosophy. How it came into existence. What it implies in the life of the individual. Then we will have a weapon with which we can approach any problem. All policy is ultimately political philosophy. The purpose of the philosophy of life is to explain the reason of things as they are, and to live in harmony with those reasons. If we can arise from the emergency of this time to a clear statement of democratic principles so that we can live them, we can assure the world a better sphere of philosophic purpose. To improve most rapidly we must have as much freedom as is possible. Individual thought is destroyed by regimentation; it destroys individual responsibility, and to destroy individual responsibility is to prevent man from developing the most important faculty of his mind, the faculty of thinking for himself. When the community thinks for the individual, he grows weaker.
As he becomes an exact machine he ceases to use his own mental faculties, ceases to be a human being. Where the right of free thought does not exist, philosophy is all distorted, deformed by the very environment that produced it. Such is the case with the Marxian philosophy, which was deformed by environment, and therefore is incapable of leading mankind to any ultimate. A philosophy to be sufficient must arise from one of two conditions. Either from an environment appropriate to it, or from an individual greater than his environment. There have been a few individuals in history who so transcended their own environment that they created their own. But, more commonly, philosophy emerges through peoples as the result of national conditions.

We have had democratic ideals ever since our nation began, but only on rare occasions have we released them under dominant action. Under world war pressure we are beginning to think definitely in democratic terms, which we have always known but have not so often used. I think we are safe in saying that England will emerge after this war a nation far more like our own, and the demand for human beings working together for survival is going to profoundly affect all of the artificial standards of life by which social orders have been corrupted. I think we shall see the emergence of a Europe much changed, and very much more capable of sustaining democracy.

Adolph Hitler thought democracy was dead; he made a very important contribution to democracy by opposing it; for he has made people see it and become aware of it. Attacking it he brought out its whole strength. By declaring it to be useless he has shown a thousand ways it can be useful. By declaring it to be undesirable he has made it desirable to the whole world. As Mephistopheles says in Faust, "I am part of the power that still works for good while ever scheming ill." As ever, the attack that would destroy the hopes of men has given men new hope; the attempt to take our liberty from us has brought out the strongest in us; those who would have persecuted us have brought us together. Nothing releases strength like humiliation. So instead of being, as Adolf Hitler thought, a very sick and dying creature democracy is the sleeping giant. By its very nature it is not bombastic. It does not always tell how great a force it is, or how often it can act. But it is part of an inevitable and irresistible motion in society, and because it is an irresistible motion human beings will sometime emerge into a condition of peace and security. Since the mid-Atlantic conference of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill we have become possessed of a great new constitution of democracy. Two great democracies united to produce it. They never would have united if it had not been for the world war crisis. So out of the stress and strain of opposition is emerging a great new strength; democracy tried and tested has been proven, and goes on now to the inevitable, backed by the increasing integrity of world peoples; all justice is natural and orderly; in the end that which is right inevitably asserts itself; but man must ever defend his beliefs by living them. To the degree he lives them he will no longer have to fight for them.

(Condensation from a public lecture. Suggested reading: Facing the Future.)

The miners' lanterns of Lidice have been blackened out by Hitler, but they have cast tongues of flame to light the whole world with tomorrow's freedom—Leo Kropycki, president American Slav Congress.
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axioms, the law of analogy. It is the law which determines the values and estates of things by their correspondences to their superior correspondences and their inferior correspondences.

The law of analogy comes to us today in its medieval dress as the doctrine of the macrocosm and the microcosm. The basic tenets of this doctrine are that all things are similar in principle, identical in basic pattern, but differ from each other in magnitude, which is size, and multitude, which is in number of parts involved in their constitution. Each of the parts is like the whole. Each of the forms of life that we perceive are parts of a great pattern. Each is built upon the same plan. Each reveals the same laws to its own being. Each bears witness to the same eternal principles. Though forms may differ in their appearances, in their energies they are alike. And not only are they alike, but as small fragmentary mirrors they all bear witness to one Universal Plan.

The Hermetic doctrine is founded upon the realization that the universe is dominated by law, law absolute and unchangeable. That all forms and manifestations are manifestations of that law. That everything that is, is a witness to inevitable and unchangeable principles. That, as Plotinus has so beautifully described the world, "It is a great bouquet of magnificent flowers with their roots in heaven, effulgent blossoms suspended by invisible threads from great universal principles." Each flower is bearing witness to its own cause, and through its unfoldment revealing the invisible world which lies behind it and which is the source of its life.

Medieval mystics term this invisible world a macrocosm, the larger cosmos. They declared that in it as principle abode together all the energies of nature; that these principles were the gods; that religion was the generation of universal principles, the discovery of the laws behind the forms, the substances behind the shadows.

They further believed that this material world was a reflection of the invisible spiritual sphere, which was its source and substance. And that everything that exists in this mundane nature is in some way a witness of the supermundane orders from which it is descended.

We have never been able to disprove the great truth inscribed upon the emerald tablet. There has been much controversy in more recent years as to the validity of the doctrine of macrocosm and microcosm, but after years of arguing modern thought is again drifting back to the old way. With all our thinking we have stronger thought more nearly to the real than these old priests of ancient times, who, meditating upon the mysteries of the universal nature, declared the world to be the mirror of an Infinite Purpose.

It is when we realize that all that occurs in this mundane sphere is suspended from its adequate spirituality that we have a new vision and a new viewpoint with which to combat the attitude of our present times.

It is when we realize that all that occurs in this mundane sphere is suspended from its adequate spirituality that we have a new vision and a new viewpoint with which to combat the attitude of our present times.

Attributes reveal themselves most accurately under stress, and today we see at a great point of stress in our national and international existence. Thousands of persons who had been living quietly, satisfied with insufficient knowledge, have suddenly discovered crumbling about them the world that they believed in. They find that they do not possess an inward reflection strong enough and wise enough to sustain them through the chaos of their times.

In today's emergency we have great need of philosophy, need of the comfort that philosophy brings, but most of all, need for the order which philosophy reveals. We have need to re-state again and again within ourselves that this universe is a planned purpose, not an accident. We must orient ourselves and realize that the moment we see law in life, and in the universe at large, all the old fears and despair melt away. We become that universe, that world fulfiling itself in us and through us, a law eternally manifesting our own nature—of the very substance and essence of that law.

In the ancient system, analogy was the key to this realization. It bound all things together, in recognition not only of the existence of a plan, but of the possibility of the discovery of that plan by the human intellect.

It is not enough that men should know there is Law; it is necessary he should learn to obey the Law; that he should learn to love Law; and to learn realization of Law as the nearest and dearest of his friends, closer to him than any living thing, more necessary to him than food. And, that Law is his one security, his one hope, the one proof that his own small life is not a vanity; that every action performed, every impulse felt, every thought that rolls through the mind has its place in an eternal plan.

According to ancient belief the discovery of that plan was made possible through contemplating the law of analogy. Man cannot grasp the whole of the universe; neither can he understand any of its parts; for all of the parts are like unto the whole. He cannot grasp the subtle substances of space, either with his finger or with his mind.

The ancient said there is an answer to this. If we seek to understand any of its parts; for all of the parts are like unto the whole. Who solves the mysteries of the atom, solves the mysteries of the sun. Who discovers the life of one creature, discovers the life of all creatures. Who sees the law working in any plane of action, perceives the Law and by analogy may discover its working in every other plane.
The ancients contemplating this profound reality have left us their ancient testimony concerning these matters, in these words: "Eternal wisdom in its protestation concerning these matters, in eternity." These words have left to men three books by which they may read the secrets of eternity.

The first book is the world, where written in living letters, letters made of planets, stars, and constellations are all the secrets of eternity.

The second book is man, the microcosm, the little world, whose wonders include within themselves all the wonders of space and time. And this, the smaller book, the book that caused Socrates to exclaim with the gentle, kindly, deeper thinking which marked the ancient viewpoint. We need to perceive clearly that we are confronted by a life which is a textbook; that all the actions and experiences of men are expressions of universal energy; that all the mistakes that men make are part of the revelation of that which is real and that which is unreal; and to know that we should truly regard this world as a book, in which we may read eternal values from the faces of temporal things.

And so, from the words of the wise, from the contemplation of man and his nature, and from the observations of space, human beings may gather at least a faint comprehension of this universal mystery in which we live and move and have our being. Bearing witness to that which produced it, through man, through the microcosm, made in the shadow of its great cause, may come the realization of the world mystery.

This is the implication of analogy, and the reason why the ancients regarded it as the most sacred of all laws; it is the law of the analogies of things, the law in which the greater and the lesser are alike in principle, differing only in number and in size. This great Platonian axiom still inspires the serious student who would explore where science does not dare tread, who seeks to escape from the little material world to which he has been bound by a materialistic theory that denies to him a purposed universe and would substitute for the great panorama of universal wisdom from the narrow concept of accident and chance.

In our present emergency of worldwide conflict we need the gentle, kindly, deeper thinking which marked the ancient viewpoint. We need to perceive clearly that we are confronted by a life which is a textbook; that all the actions and experiences of men are expressions of universal energy; that all the mistakes that men make are part of the revelation of that which is real and that which is unreal; and to know that we should truly regard this world as a book, in which we may read eternal values from the faces of temporal things.

If we look upon this world as a book of instruction, we shall then be glad that it is possible for us to open its pages and participate for a little while in the experience of learning. In the today of everybody's crisis we are privileged to be part of a time which other generations can know only from the printed page. We are living the history that other ages can only read. We are privileged, not afflicted; we are blessed, not injured by the advantage of being alive today. Ours is a magnificent opportunity to see unfolded before us the panorama of a Law-governed world.

We shall see the fruits of ambition; see the rewards of despotism. We may look about us and perceive Law asserting itself eternally; and if our eyes see correctly and our perception is sufficiently skilled, we may perceive even daily the eternal victory of right over all that seems to be occurring in the world about us.

And so do we regard analogy as the father of the laws, as from some ancient deity, the other laws spring god-like from the body of the father. In analogy we see the key to the use of laws. We see the method of applying the different institutes that have been given to us, revealed out of the meditation of the past. This is our instrument of discernment and discrimination, the most priceless tool that we can possess for the understanding of that which is occurring in space.

We, too, have other aids to understanding.

In the remnants and ruins of ancient Assyria there was one day found a statue of the god Nebo, the Hermes of Assyria. A figure of black basalt, it held in its hand a tablet inscribed with the words:

"That which has been, shall be. I am Nebo, Lord of the Writing Table."

Three thousand years later a German historian, Oswald Spengler, wrote a book The Decline of the West and he was hailed as a discoverer of a new instrument of philosophic thought! It is better said that he descended from a tradition, a knowledge that is an invaluable axiom, and, by a magnificent panorama of world history, showed the cyclic motion in the progress of mankind. He revealed how each civilization passes through birth, youth and maturity, and decay. His book has shown how human experience solving its own problems follows inevitable patterns. These patterns are laws, and these inevitable patterns bear witness to the eternal plan and to the eternal Planner.

From out of the realization of analogy, which we must apply to all specific forms of incident and accident, we thus pass to the consideration of the law which, after analogy, was most universally admired of the laws of ancient peoples. It is a law to which mankind is in common agreement, with very few exceptions. It is the law of evolution.

Evolution, in its philosophical and esoteric interpretation, means the expansion of all natures from within themselves, through the process of growth. Evolution is not something moving from one place to another. It is not a simple migration through forms, through continents, or through spheres. Evolution is an unfoldment, from within outwardly, of the potentials which are resident within every atom of space. Evolution is the law by which all space grows up in space. Evolution is the law which demands that all things that live must grow, and this growth is a revelation, through form, of the principles within that form.

Evolution is light piercing through. It is the unfolding of the petals of the flower. It is the tree extending its energies through its branches and twigs. It is life building ever more noble mansions for itself, exuding these mansions from within itself. All forms evolve as the snail builds his shell, by exuding from within themselves the substance of their own houses.

Evolution is eternity growing up in time. It is spirit growing up in matter, wisdom growing up through ignorance. It is space coming of age through form; it is the eternal expansion of that which is eternally moving toward the fullness of itself.

Evolution is more than that which is implied by Darwin, or Huxley, or Spencer. It is not merely a sequential motion from form to form. It is not merely eternal adjustment to environment. It is not merely conformity to the requirements of survival. Evolution is the spontaneous outburst of life. It is the inevitable pressure by which all things are eternally becoming.

Yet, with all their becoming, it seems
that they never become; for no matter how much of growth there is, there is always growth beyond. And what is growth? It is not increasing the number of the parts, nor the magnitude of the whole, but increasing the qualitative manifestation of consciousness through matter.

Growth is consciousness released through all its forms. Atoms grow up to become stars; men grow up to become gods; forms evolve through hundreds of millions of years from simple unicellular organisms to the great complexes of continents and types. Yet all this motion, all this eternal growing, is in reality the release of one life through its innumerable manifestations. It is the resurrection of the eternal through the corporeal. With it comes the inevitable refinement of all forms. We may say then, that evolution is the refining of organisms, so that the principles behind these organisms may have ever fuller manifestation and expression.

The difference between the dry horse and the race horse is in nerves, in sensitiveness, is a matter of refinement. Refinement is a matter of breeding; and breeding in turn is a process of accomplishing evolution by means of a plan and purpose. Men breed better cattle by understanding the laws governing the growth of forms, and so do men breed better men, by understanding the laws that govern the development of human life. It is the purpose of philosophy to cooperate with nature in the production of the divine man.

That is all wisdom seeks today, for wisdom is dedicated to this end: That man grows most rapidly when consciously and purposefully he cooperates with the plan of growth. There is no release from pain, limitation, or insufficiency, except growth. Expressions of the terms of the alchemists of the 17th century, Nature achieves its wonders in two ways: either by natural means, or by art. By natural means is meant the inevitable growth of things through eternities of time and space, in which the laws themselves bring about their own fulfillment. By art is meant man’s philosophical cooperation with the natural order. It is man choosing to grow. It is man throwing every resource of his purpose into the great purpose of his own perfection.

Evolution is not only a law to be accepted; it is a challenge; for if we believe in law, we obey law. If we believe in growth, and believe growth to be the eternal purpose for existence, then we must naturally and consequently cooperate with growth. Recognizing our destiny, it is our duty to fulfill that destiny, to release through ourselves all knowledge and all wisdom. Evolution therefore assumes another important premise. It assumes that locked within the humblest form that exists in nature is the potential of universal perfection. All forms as we see them and know them today are seed-like. Each one of them is like the seed which contains the tree. He is that itself, but a small thing now, but through it can be manifested eternal things.

Evolution is the growing up of the seeds of worlds in space. Space is the dark earth in which the seeds of life are strewn; and the suns and moons and planets, the constellations and the galaxies are like fruit upon one tree—flower, and blossom, fruit; and seed again, bearing witness to the growing up of space.

This concept of evolution has many implications that are valuable to us in our present time. It reveals to us our own estate. It explains to us why we are, where we are, and what we are. We are a moment in the eternity of things; we are an instant in the growth of something that is timeless.

All that has been, we have been. We have come up from the abyss of the unknown. We have grown up through the seeds of the plants. We have struggled on from the primal era to our present estate. We are still growing, eternally growing, and will continue to grow through eternity.

Our joy, our happiness is in our growing. The reward for our development is the release through ourselves of greater potentials for development.

We are most content when we are fulfilling our purpose; and our purpose is to release life through ourselves. Evolution for its understanding demands also an appreciation of the ancient concept of God. It means that we must realize the principle which is behind this eternal motion, this eternal process. To the ancients, God was not a being, a great celestial king ruling from some distant throne in the firmament; God was not apart from his cosmos; but was his cosmos. God was that universal life that is growing up in all that is. God is the father of life, living in his sons, reborn through all that emerges from himself. He is space. He is all that is revolving in space, and through space. He is the form without, and the energy within. He is the law, and he is the Lawmaker. And he is that which must obey the law. He is time and place; and he is timeless, essence. He is that which grows, and he is the world through which it grows. He is the cause of all things, their ultimate end, and their mid-most state.

In this concept of deity the ancients found an intimate divinity. It was one which they could see in the stone and in the flower. It was one which they could hear in the air, a deity present in all things that are, a deity speaking through all forms, released through every manifestation of existence. The ancients did not turn merely to their books to discover God, nor to their priests to observe the divine handicraft; surely and truly they discovered the laws of life in everything that lives.

Pythagoras saw the universal pattern in the branches, in the leaves, in the fern. Orpheus discovered the universal laws in the strings of his lute. Alchemists found in the divine principle the immutable part of the immutable principles. All ordered earning bears witness to the order which is behind learning. Every man, in his own life and in his own work, searching for values and solutions, is eternally in the presence of the ancient concept of God. For God is manifested in all that is, and is the law behind every action that is performed in space.

The law of evolution also brings us for serious consideration the observation that growth cannot be forced. Nothing can be more than its own release has brought to it. Nothing can be added to man; all must emerge through man. Neither civilization, nor culture, nor education, nor knowledge, in any of its kinds, can be added to the outward part of man. All wisdom must come through the structure of the individual and he can never release more of knowledge than the organic quality of his own structure will permit.

We are angered, dismayed, disappointed at the shortcomings of each other; but we have no right to be. We have no right to an attitude which is inconsistent with the realization that we are not perfect, but only that we are potentially capable of achieving perfection. Each individual bears witness to his own accomplishment, and each individual is doing the best he can for what he is. He accomplishes the degree of evolution that he has reached, the degree of understanding which he has released.

We should realize that we must expect no more from man than his growth justifies. If we expect more, we shall eternally be disappointed. In the same way, we must recognize evolution as a very gradual process. Physical evolution bears witness to eternal patience. Man has been hundreds of years growing up through the mysteries of his physical environment. He has been hun-

hundreds of millions of years developing from the little monocellular spore with which he first came to this earth. Through infinite patience nature has molded him to his present state; through infinite patience nature will continue to mold him towards his ultimate state. Nothing that is important is done quick-
All growth is eternal, but few are fitted to become reality through slow but inevitable procedures. We are so anxious to escape from the now into some other time, but we must grow up through the now into any other time that we desire; tomorrow is built upon the foundation of today. There can be no future growth apart from present progress. Man can never build great temples without foundations. Yesterday was the foundation of today. Today is the foundation of tomorrow. There can be no happiness tomorrow that is not caused by today.

Evolution is the increasing understanding by which we increase understanding. As we evolve we gain new faculties. As we gain new faculties we evolve more. The more we evolve, the more we are faced by the challenge of the unknown. The more we discover, the more power we have for future discovery.

So growth is going on through peace and war, through prosperity and adversity, through life and death. All these things are incidental. All these things are illusions that have taken strange proportion in our minds.

There is nothing real but eternal motion, and that eternal motion is toward the real. There is nothing that really matters but the growing up of souls in space; and if it is necessary to that growth that man shall be confronted always with problems, he shall be so confronted. If only by dying can he learn to live, he will die, if it be ten thousand times ten thousand times. If only by disappointment can he discover law, then he will be disappointed until he discovers law.

This world is the schoolroom, the lessons are fitted to the mentalities of the students. We have chosen to grow the hard way. We choose eternally difficult solutions and must abide by them; but this is perfectly as it should be, for nothing is important but the growing. It is not important where we grow, or when we grow, or how we grow; but it is eternally important that we grow. And nature has made this universe precisely so uncomfortable that men cannot endure it; they have only the inspiration to get out of it.

If men could find comfort in their present state there would be no growth. If any form of life could find security as it is, cosmos would end. It is because there is no security but perfection, that all forms of life are driven on by irresistible impulses towards adequacy. Only when we are sufficient can we endure life. It is our insufficiency that drives us on.

After the law of evolution comes another, a law greatly honored by the ancients, a law which has intimate relation to the other, and that is the law of cause and effect.

Cause and effect is the basis of our concept and understanding of universal justice. It is the strong and sufficient staff upon which the wise man leans his weight. The law of cause and effect declares that there is an intimate relationship between every action and its inevitable reaction; that nothing can occur in the form of action which is without appropriate consequence. The slightest deed that can be performed brings after it results like unto itself, equal in every respect to it, neither more nor less. We cannot sow a little good and reap a great good; nor can we sow a great evil and reap a small evil. We must sow according to Law and the harvest is according to the sowing. Every action produces its results, and each of these results in turn inspires to other action producing the mysterious Homeric chain that binds the world to the pinnacle of Olympus.

The law of cause and effect is worthy of our greatest thoughtfulness. It is the law which most of us can most easily comprehend, and most gallantly ignore. We are convinced that there is some ratio between sowing and reaping. Our Scriptures have told us, that as we sow, so shall we reap. Yet in some fantastic way this is the law we most desire to disregard.

Jacob Boehme, the great German mystic, declared that the root of our disobedience was self-will. We so desire to do those things that we want to do, that we often try to blind our eyes to those things we have to do. A Greek philosopher has said of the difference between natural and ignorance: The wise man does joyously those things which foolish men are forced to do with great misery. In both cases, the things must be done. It is not that the foolish man escapes the law, it is rather that as he tries to resist it he brings upon himself attendant sorrows.

We have heard people say that their misfortunes are due to the fact that they have broken natural laws; but they have not done so. Their misfortunes are evidence that natural laws have broken them. Laws are not broken. But whatever attempts to exist or survive contrary to law is inevitably broken. There is no escape from the law of cause and effect.

Anything that we desire to become we can become, if our energy is equal to our desire. For any reward which we are willing to earn, we may have hope of accomplishment. For every effort that we make, there is a result comparable to that effort. No motion is wasted. No effort is lost. No dream disappears in space. The greatest and the humblest accomplishments are perfectly preserved, but the law is inevitable. And the law declares that those who would achieve certain good ends must earn those ends in appropriate ways.

The law of cause and effect and in its universal aspect rules the planets and the stars. It is present everywhere in space, moderating and sustaining the course of every great structure in nature. The law of cause and effect is a certain assurance that good cannot fail; that evil cannot succeed; that effort cannot be lost.

In practical application the law of cause and effect tells us something. It tells us that these struggles through which we pass in daily living do not go down to the oblivion of the grave. The ancients did not believe that men labored for their three score years and ten, and then common dust blotted out all their works. The ancients believed that all we have been, we are forever. That every fragment of accomplishment is an eternal enrichment. And that no matter how slight our effort, its significance remains; and to the degree that we extend our constructive purposes and vitalize our constructive impulses, to that degree we bring about the changes that we desire.

The ancients did not believe in our doctrine of heaven and hell, of eternal reward or eternal punishment. They believed that man's own action is eternally rewarding him and punishing him according to its own merit.

Man needs no greater punishment than to live with the consequences of his own deeds. It is adequate perdition that he has to exist with himself. If he chooses arbitrarily to be ignorant, then he must abide in and with his ignorance. If he chooses to be hateful, he must live in the midst of the cankering of his own hate. The man hated may never know it, but the man who hates is devoured by his own acids. He who in various ways evades the inferences of intelligent living escapes nothing but improvement.

(This is the first section of a public lecture discussion of three of the seven great laws that rule the world; it will be concluded in a second article in a succeeding issue.)
We have discovered a certain international genius which belongs to the world

The New War Attitude

Up to the present the propaganda front of the democratic powers has been under very excellent control. Nothing is in evidence that even remotely resembles the wild outbursts of the last war; there is none of the bitterness of personal feeling against people, the unkindliness of spirit, the intolerance that disfigured the last war. If there is one proof of the evolution of man in the last twenty years it is that people are showing far more discrimination in placing responsibility for the present disaster; we are not accusing whole nations or races, but picking out the troublemaker. One help is a medium not known in the last war, radio. We are able to hear for ourselves the words of important political personalities, able to keep in constant contact with the situation as it exists daily in various parts of the world. This improved facility of communication has a great deal to do with this better attitude, and is part of the evolutionary pattern, in which all great inventions and discoveries, at first permitted to play American officers! without a moment’s hesitation the entire audience burst into applause. I wonder how many German audiences would have done this if a group of actors were permitted to play American officers!

The Moon Is Down.

This play involves a very interesting current play representing a certain international genius which belongs to the world. Remarkably in this time of war we are beginning to realize that there is an international estate in which men become citizens by their own greatness. And when they have achieved that greatness, nothing applies that might be regarded as a stigma upon them due to the insignificance, inferiority and general inadequacy of their races. Greatness dominates races, nations, and time. We have progressed since the last war, and now recognize we are fighting the ideology of littleness, that we are no longer blindly opposing great political motions. We are dedicating ourselves to the achievement of victory over the smallness in other nations and peoples, and in this we have discovered that within all peoples is a certain international genius which belongs to the world.

(Condensation from a Public Lecture)
Einstein: A Close-Up

By Basanta Koomar Roy

THOUGHTS of our great ones are never affected by time, so it matters little that what I now write is a happening of quite a few years back, when destiny, in a way almost miraculous, gave me the opportunity for an intimate interview with Professor Albert Einstein.

I had thought of asking him many questions on many subjects, but forgot them all for a moment, so absorbed had I immediately become in a study of his face. We kept looking into each other's eyes in absolute silence. I felt as if I was looking at a man from another planet, one who might purposely withhold some secrets of creation from us here on earth because we were not yet ready for the revelation of those truths.

I broke the silence with the sudden remark: "I look upon you and Marconi as the missing links between God and Man. You two have given us glimpses of God through the majestic mysteries of his creation."

Professor Einstein's smile was inscrutable; there was no interpreting its meaning. Had he already fathomed the depths of my ignorance of both God and science? Against the smile I managed to ask:

"Have you ever met Marconi?"

Professor Einstein said he had not. I suggested, "It would be nice if you two could meet, and discuss things."

Perhaps to discourage further unfoldment of my ignorance Dr. Einstein remarked: "Our lines of work are of a quite different nature."

"I believe," I countered, "that all the lines of all the works of all the sciences, of all the arts, and of all the philosophies, consciously or unconsciously, lead only to the One." To this I added the direct question: "Dr. Einstein, do you believe in God?"

"I have not seen him yet." "To me," I explained, "God is formless consciousness. One can never see him," I said. "But I am sure some day He will stand revealed before your mind's eyes, in the innermost chamber of the soul of your cosmic investigations."

"I am always seeking new revelations of truth in my work," said Dr. Einstein quietly.

"How can I feel proud? When I look at the distant stars and try to learn a few secrets of the universe I feel so insignificant that I am ashamed of my ignorance. What is there," added Dr. Einstein, "for a scientist to get proud about, when he cannot reveal the final secrets of a ray of light, a flash of lightning, or the birth of life?"

It was time for the usual question, How did he like America?

"I love America," came the quick reply. "But the great artists you hear here mostly come from Europe."

I spoke of the well known Einstein love for music, asked, "Dr. Einstein, why do you love music?"

"Because of its aesthetic value; but music also is soothing, comforting. When I am tired of mathematics, physics, and astronomy, I seek music for a change, and as a mental tonic."

"I am told that you play the violin very ably."

"Who told you so?"

"One, who knows the violin very, very well," and I added, "none other than my dear friend Fritz Kreisler."

Dr. Einstein laughed. "So, you know Kreisler? He is such a good friend of mine. He is greater even as a man, than as a violinist; and the whole world knows what he is as a violinist. And he is so kindhearted! Please do not take his kind words about my violin playing too literally. I love music so I learned to play the violin; but only for my own entertainment."

I asked which among the great composers he liked the best.

"I like them all. Each has much to give. Beethoven, Brahms and Bach; Schubert, Schumann, and Chopin, Wagner, Tschaikowski and Scriabin—and others—they are all great."

"Then you haven't a favorite composer?"

"I am afraid not. I am an amateur musician. If I had taken up the study of music as a profession, I might have favorite composers. As it is, I love them all."

I wanted to know, of all the musical instruments did he like the violin best? He did; and he gave his reason. "It is so sympathetic." I agreed that it is certainly the most soulful of all the musical instruments.

"By the way," I added, "speaking of the soul, would you be so kind as to tell me if you believe in the theory of the reincarnation of the soul?"

"I do not; for I have no proofs of it. I believe in only what I definitely know myself. Knowledge is so vast; and my own experiences are so limited!"

I wanted to know if he thought that a brain like his could possibly be the product of the evolutionary process of only one birth.

"Why, every human brain is the same," was Dr. Einstein's reply, "only different brains function in different lines. I cannot play the violin as well as Kreisler does; and in the same way, Kreisler has not specialized in mathematics as I have done."

I agreed with him, I said, in that the formation of the brain may be the same; but felt that the thing that operates on the brain is not the same whether in two different mathematicians or two different musicians. My point was, in this world of ours there are countless mathematicians, but only one Einstein; and again, there are countless violinists in the world, but only one Kreisler; even as there are countless poets on earth, but only one Tagore.

"I would indeed like to know what that thing is that operates on the brain," was Dr. Einstein's comment. "It is mind."

"Mind, of course. But a name does not signify the nature of the thing named, if we do not know the thing itself. We all are using, and making use of the thing, and yet we do not know what it is. It is maddening, Mr. Roy, maddening!"

"That's why I want you to come to India," I urged upon the great savant, "when you have finished your mathematical researches. There you may carry on a little research work on your own self, by studying with a Hindu sage." I pursued the subject. "By the study and practices of Hindu philosophy, you shall be able to look upon your own self as you now look upon your own face in a mirror. And then you will be able to see universes that neither your mathematics nor astronomy, neither your physics nor chemistry, can ever reveal. The infinite dwells within you; and you are a mirror for the cosmos. India has indeed the most elaborate laboratories and the most accurate observatories for
the study of the Self. So, please come to India."

Dr. Einstein considered the invitation. "The problems that confront me today," he said thoughtfully, "will take much time for their solution. I do not know when I shall be able to go to India to study philosophy."

"We Hindus," I told him, "are never in a hurry. We are the children of Eternity. If it takes you ten more rebirths to finish your mathematical researches in time, space, and matter, still there will be time enough to begin the study of philosophy—in your eleventh rebirth." I gave him our opinion that his cosmic researches are scientifically proving the philosophical teachings of the sages of India of ages and ages ago, in the philosophy of Vedanta—the fundamental Unity of all in the phenomenal diversity of many. "We understand philosophically what your scientific theories are driving at," I assured him.

Then I asked the question: "Now, please tell me frankly, in spite of your non-belief in the theory of reincarnation, if you were forced into being born again on this earth, would you like to be born as a mathematician or as a violinist?"

"Of course as a mathematician," Dr. Einstein replied without the least hesitation, adding with much enthusiastic emphasis, and an air of finality, "always there will be so much work for me that will remain to be finished."

I laughed. Mrs. Einstein looking at her illustrious husband, laughed too. "There, Mr. Roy has cornered you." I quickly pressed the advantage. "In the legitimate desire of yours," I said to Dr. Einstein, "and in the essential necessity of it, lies the foundation of your rebirth. Dr. Einstein, Nature is most economical in developing its process of physical, mental, and spiritual evolution. So, after evolving your mind to such a superhuman pitch, it would be foolish for Nature (or God) to allow your mind to go to nothing by the mere accident of death, while much important work still remains for you to tackle, and for you alone to solve. If there are no other proofs (and there are many) of the theory of reincarnation, your very desire to be born again as a mathematician to finish your unfinished work is the paramount proof of this philosophy of Life."

"If I have to be born again" said the greatest mathematician the world has ever known, "please ask those in charge to see to it that I am born a mathematician."

"The Law works on its own merit," I suggested, matching his good humor. "It needs no asking and no coaxing. And, it needs no recommendations. If the Law of cosmic evolution is true, you may have to be born as a mystic in India in your next incarnation, perhaps so that you may understand the inner meanings of your own mathematics much better than you do now. I do not want to discourage you, but you may even have to be born again with a greater mind to disprove your present theories. Only thus may you reach the final destiny of your own mind—who can tell?"

"That certainly would be interesting," said Einstein's comment. I spoke of a poem Tagore wrote, a poem about being born again as a literary critic, required to criticize his own poems. I asked the great scientist if he had read much of Tagore.

"Yes, I enjoy reading his writings very much. I have read his Gitanjali, The Gardner, Chitra, and other books."

"Which book of Tagore do you like the best?"

"The Home and the World."

"You should read his Sadhana for a better understanding of the purpose of life." I added, "And we have another great man in India today."

"Gandhi, you mean?"

"Yes, Gandhi. What do you think of him?"

"He is a great man; and is carrying on a great experiment, a noble experiment. Such an experiment on such a scale is possible only in India, where people live philosophically."

"Who do you think is the greater man of the two—Tagore or Gandhi?"

"One cannot compare such personalities! How can one compare the mountains with the ocean? Both Gandhi and Tagore are great men."

Mrs. Einstein remarked at this point, "Tagore is not a man."

"What is he then?" I inquired.

"Tagore is a god-man. Yes; to look at his face is to purify one's soul. And Gandhi, he is doing godlike deeds of toleration and forgiveness. Doctor is right, yes, when he says that one cannot compare the mountain with the ocean."

I thought aloud: "I suppose Tagore is the mountain of intellect, and Gandhi the ocean of kindness.""

"Well said," remarked Professor Einstein.

This gave me a good opening for my next question. "Dr. Einstein, can the planets move about without freedom?"

"The planets have no freedom," said Dr. Einstein quickly. "The poor fellows have no freedom at all! They are the slaves of a Law, and they keep spinning on their orbits through space with uncanny punctuality."

"Then certainly a planet could not move on its own orbit, if a physical force chained a planet to one spot in space."

"Great disturbances would occur."

"Isn't the same true," I asked "of a nation or a race that is forbidden by force to travel on its owns destined orbit of progress?"

"I understand what you mean," said Dr. Einstein; a flicker of a smile flashed under his black moustache.

My next question had to do with the daily habits of the great scientist. "Dr. Einstein, I am curious to know what you eat, and what you drink. As a man catteth so he thinketh; and as a man thinketh so he is. Do you drink liquor?"

"No, not at all."

"Not even beer?"

"No, not even beer."

"Do you drink milk?"

"I don't like to drink milk."

"What do you drink then?"

"Coffee, and water."

"What do you like to eat?"

"I live mostly on vegetables and fruits."

"Do you eat meat?"

"Now and then; once in a while. Left to myself, I am happy if I do not eat any animal food at all."

"Would you kill a chicken to eat its meat?"

"No, never," said Dr. Einstein. "I will kill neither a chicken nor a fish to eat. Vegetables give me enough nourishment; then why should I kill to eat?"

"Vegetables too pulsate with life," I suggested. "Our great scientist, Dr. J. C. Bose, is proving that. Vegetables cry with agony when we boil them in hot water."

"Dr. Einstein sighed, with a shudder at the very thought of vegetables crying. "Well, at any rate, killing a chicken is not as cruel as killing a child; so, killing a carrot is not as cruel as killing a chicken."

The remark somehow reminded me of Buddha, the compassionate one. I asked: "Have you read anything about Hindu philosophy?"

"No, nothing about Hindu philosophy. But I have read a little of Buddhism. I find enjoyment in Buddha and his philosophy."

"You look like Buddha.""

"Have you read Buddha?" challenged Einstein. "No; then how do you know that I look like Buddha?"

I expressed the idea differently. "It is the composure of your face and the compassion of your heart that create an
atmosphere of Buddha around your personality." Then I added, "As Tagore looks like Christ, so you look like Buddha. It is perhaps just a returning of the compliment between the Hindu and the Hebrew." And we all laughed.

I thought it time to ask my final question: "You know the universe so well, now suppose all the nations of the world voluntarily and unanimously should elect you the Dictator of the earth, what would be your program of action?"

"If I could persuade myself to accept so degraded a position as the dictatorship of the earth," said the savant thoughtfully, "I would at once issue a decree for the abolition of poverty, and the annihilation of war."

I voted it a splendid program, but observed that the task of enforcing it would be strenuous.

Professor Einstein had an acute attack of bashfulness. He kept smiling, but looked at his shoes and pumped his pipe hands at parting: "The best one can do, is to try his very best."

W O H O said this: "National socialism is savage barbarism; in common with barbarian hordes, it allows no rights to the individual; the chieftain is lord over the life and death of his people. Murdering and killing, loot and pillage and blackmail are all it can produce. The abominable and repulsive spectacle of Hitler and Mussolini will put up with such things."

Mussolini said it in 1934 in an interview with Prince Starkemburg, with whom he was making a deal to unite Austria and Italy against Germany.

Out of the misery of the German occupation a new body of humor has arisen— the resistance joke. Like the songs once sung by the troubadours, these stories spread from the top of Norway to the tip of Greece, varying in content but similar in framework, and always reflecting a sense of humor that manages somehow to function under adversity and make a butt of the oppressor. For example, there's the one about the Nazi soldiers who got drunk in a Norwegian coastal village, commandeered a car, and drove wildly through the streets. Finally they careened down a dark pier and into the sea, promptly sinking. The Gestapo hurried to the scene and questioned an old fisherwoman at the end of the pier. "Did you see the car coming?" they asked her. "Yes," she said. "Well, why didn't you stop it?" they demanded. "Why should I?" said the old lady, shrugging her shoulders. "I thought they were on their way to England!"

---

The Art Of The Double-Cross

WHO said this: "National socialism is savage barbarism; in common with barbarian hordes, it allows no rights to the individual; the chieftain is lord over the life and death of his people. Murdering and killing, loot and pillage and blackmail are all it can produce. The abominable and repulsive spectacle of Hitler and Mussolini will put up with such things."

Mussolini said it in 1934 in an interview with Prince Starkemburg, with whom he was making a deal to unite Austria and Italy against Germany.

Out of the misery of the German occupation a new body of humor has arisen—the resistance joke. Like the songs once sung by the troubadours, these stories spread from the top of Norway to the tip of Greece, varying in content but similar in framework, and always reflecting a sense of humor that manages somehow to function under adversity and make a butt of the oppressor. For example, there's the one about the Nazi soldiers who got drunk in a Norwegian coastal village, commandeered a car, and drove wildly through the streets. Finally they careened down a dark pier and into the sea, promptly sinking. The Gestapo hurried to the scene and questioned an old fisherwoman at the end of the pier. "Did you see the car coming?" they asked her. "Yes," she said. "Well, why didn't you stop it?" they demanded. "Why should I?" said the old lady, shrugging her shoulders. "I thought they were on their way to England!"

---

The Beginning Of All Things

Eight million Bibles were sold last year, to be read and studied by countless people in the hour of our nation's peril. For a better understanding of The Book, a philosopher's interpretation of obscure and puzzling passages has been given timely publication. The brief excerpts which follow are indicative of the value of correct cognizance of the Bible's meaning and message.

THE cosmogony of the Jews is derived directly from the Chaldean and Egyptian. This has been proved beyond any question of doubt by the discovery of cuneiform tablets much older than the Jewish Bible which contain many of the stories set forth in the opening chapters of Genesis. It is quite possible that the Old Testament originally contained a much more amplified account of the creation, but certainly it is still possible to make much more of the Book of Genesis than the average churchman has accomplished. With the aid of the Jewish and Cabalistic commentaries, Genesis is amplified into a rational account of the beginning of the universe—far more vital, significant and impressive than the accepted theological version. A great scholar observed in the last century that Christian theology, and of course he included Jewish cosmogony, was the only system believed by the more advanced races of the earth to insist that God made the universe out of nothing.

THE GODS. The Book of Genesis opens with a simple and dramatic statement which has been Anglicized into the most impressive sentence in English literature:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

This verse seemingly presents no problem, but the more a searching student thinks about it the more fully he will realize that into ten words has been compressed a cosmic process involving hundreds of millions of years of time and innumerable complicated mysteries. Only an elaborate commentary can make this verse partly intelligible to the human mind entirely ignorant of divine and cosmic procedures.

We must first define the word GOD as it is used in this case and throughout the first chapter of the Bible. The word in Hebrew is not God, or Jah, or Jehovah, but Elohim. God is a reverent but entirely insufficient word to convey the true meaning of Elohim. Most important to be considered are the facts. First, in Hebrew, Elohim is an androgynous term inferring a combination of male and female attributes. Second, the word, by its termination, is plural. Actually, therefore, the word Elohim means "the male-female creators," representing a host or at least a group of powers and not, under any condition, a single personal entity.

The words "heaven and earth" are also misleading, through inadequate translation. By heaven and earth should be understood a superior and inferior condition; a separation of qualities, not a division of the universe. The average reader will think of heaven as the firmament and earth as the planet; and this interpretation will destroy entirely the significance of the verse. It would be better to interpret heaven and earth as spirit and matter, or the subtle and the gross, in the sense of vibration or qualities of life and vitality.

The words "In the beginning" also present difficulties. The wise student will interpret them as "from that which is first" or "in eternal principles" or "that which was in the beginning." This leaves only the word "created", and here again misunderstanding is al-
most inevitable. The human mind customarily conceives creation as the making of something that is new. But if we think of it, we will realize that in creating any physical thing creation is only a new pattern made up of already existing factors. Thus if a man creates a picture he requires the aid of paints and brushes and canvas; the creation is the inward inspiration which applies these instruments for the release of an idea. Creation in this verse implies Formation, or Manifestation, the arranging of ever-existing elements into new patterns to be the vehicles of purpose.

With these thoughts in mind, let us read again the verse according to a fuller understanding of its meaning:

From the eternal principles and essences the androgynous creator-gods manifested forth the positive and negative aspects of Being.

THE SEVEN DAYS OF CREATION

The description given in Genesis I: verses 1 to 31, must be understood to represent the gradual development of the physical universe. The Elohim, the gods of the Dawn, mold the negative substances of being into the form and pattern of the solar system. Having brought the planets (including the luminaries) into objective existence, the Elohim then take up their thrones in the planetary bodies, and, according to the Chaldean genesis, circle about in their orbits age after age, governing with their celestial splendours the creatures of the lower world.

The pattern for the creation of our own solar system applies to all other solar systems in our universal chain. The pattern also applies to all forms of life evolving within solar systems, from suns and planets to grains of sand, electrons and atoms. This is the Cabalist teaching concerning the Macrocosm and the Microcosm, or the greater and the lesser creations, each patterned according to the other.

This led the Cabalists to say, comparing man (a microcosm) with the universe (a macrocosm) that "man is a little universe and the universe is the Grand Man." This did not mean that the universe actually resembled man in his physical form, but rather that the same system of geometry which patterned man also patterned the world, and that the same forces principles, and forces were in both. The Elohim say: "Let us make man in our own image" etc. That is, let the lesser creation be patterned after the greater creation, and be similar to it in principle.

Medieval theologians insisted that the seven creative periods called "Days" made up together a week similar in time to a week of mortal calculation. This was the view of the ancient philosophers always denied that the term "Day" in Genesis referred to an age, cycle, or great period of time.

Science uses such terms as "period" or "age" to signify one of the major divisions in the evolution of the earth and the life evolving upon it. Thus, such terms as the Miocene, or Pliocene Age, or the Glacial Period. Modern science of the opinion that the physical earth has existed for from 500 to 1000 million years. A recent discovery of fossil remains indicates animal life upon the earth at least 75 million years ago. When these figures are compared with the theological opinion that the earth was created by the arbitrary will of God in the 5th millennium B.C., it is apparent that science and theology come to a parting of the ways.

The Biblical scholar does not harbor the delusions however which afflict the pious and fanatical theologians who cling desperately to the jott and title of the "revised version." There is abundant confirming evidence to indicate that the Genesis given in the Bible describes processes occurring over a period of at least a billion years; and that it describes how the creative forces of nature brought forth successively the solar physical bodies of the solar system, then the material planets; and then, shifting perspective to the planet earth, unfolded the life upon it up to its present state.

The descent of the Elohim with their hosts of spirits into the swirling mists of Primordial Substance, and their molding of the mists into the sidereal patterns and bodies, constituted the involutionary process or the descent of spirit into matter.

The unfolding of the worlds through the manifestation of ever-improving types of life, or the release of consciousness through a concatenation of improving vehicles, constitutes what Darwin called Evolution. There is no real argument between science and religion. The difficulty is principally due to the extremely compressed description of the creative processes given in Genesis. If the reader can take such a statement as "And God created" and read instead: "And the forces of nature, over a great period, caused to manifest"—most of the difficulties will be overcome.

It should be clearly realized that the ancients understood by their "gods" creative hierarchies, not personal beings performing sorcery in space; but rather, aspects of creative intelligence gradually unfolding through their own creations.

The Egyptian rites is it said the gods impregnated space with themselves, and then the seeds of the divine natures sprouted and grew up to form the universe. The proper attitude is to realize that divinity is evolving in and through the universal formation. Evolution is really eternal life idealizing or shining through material organisms, as a light might shine through a lamp. Evolution is also, therefore, inward life building ever more perfect forms through which to express its own potentialities.

The Book of Genesis, Chapter I, verse 24 to 26, inclusive, reveals that the ancients were fully aware of man's relationship to the animal world. In the sixth day both the animal and the human kingdom is formed, the animal manifesting first, and finally man, created in the image or likeness of the Elohim.

The first part of verse 26 requires special emphasis:

"And God said let US make man in OUR image after our likeness."

Then in the last part of the 27th verse it says: "Male and female created he them.

This is a very confused picture according to the King James version. That the word God is intended to be plural is evident in the statement "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. Here, of course, God should be read Elohim, the creator. By the word "said" in each case is to be inferred not to speak, but to will, or to inwardly determine.

The condensation of the earth from its nebulous fire-mist state required many millions of years. In those ages there was no time with which to measure the infinite processes; time is man-made. At last the body of our planet was formed, with the surface of the earth in a molten state, and vapors surrounding the whole planet. The earth was not habitable by any creatures that man has recollection of, although it is taught in old records that fantastic beings drifted about in the flames. The physical globe floated in a sea of super-physical humidity, termed by the Greeks "aether." This gives us the origin of the primitive belief that the continents of the earth floated in a great sea. This aether was not physical humid vapors arising from the earth's surface, but the vital ethereal element in which were evolving the forms that were later to descend upon the earth as species and races of living things.

(Excerpt from the opening chapter of How to UNDERSTAND YOUR BIBLE, just published. A notable philosophic interpretation of the least understood yet the most important book in the English language.)
**Detachment**

In the adoption of a personal philosophy one of the most difficult things to accomplish is a proper perspective on incidents or occurrences. There are three ways to get perspective. Through Distance. Through Time. Through Detachment.

Perspective is seeing the larger part of a picture; it means the capacity to get back far enough, or to get away far enough, from a series of incidents that we see the relationship between them, discover the pattern upon which any collective design is built up. If in an airplane we fly over a city we are no longer limited by the same perspective that binds us while we walk the streets of that city. Most of us can not see the city for the streets.

Most of us are limited in our perspective by the things of our daily life. We do not get far enough away from close problems to realize they have other aspects, other viewpoints than the ones with which we are familiar. Perspective is therefore breadth of realization. It is the capacity to develop an inclusiveness of viewpoint which is no longer troubled by separate things, but perceives that all things are parts of a larger pattern. The perspective we need today relates to the bringing together in order and sequence of a number of separate incidents which in themselves appear to be unkind and destructive. Perspective alone can bring these together into an orderly, purposeful design.

The purpose of philosophy is to impress upon the consciousness the existence of world design. There are laws, patterns, archetypes, and ideas behind all the incidents which occur. It is the duty of philosophy to teach people to rise above a fragmentary experience in life and strive toward a life dominated by a viewpoint which is broad enough, and deep, and beautiful, and wise enough to embrace within itself all that is necessary to bring order out of apparent chaos.

We look upon incidents of the past impartially; we can see world civilization as it unfolded through countless ages; but as the past approaches the present and we come nearer and nearer to it, perspective becomes worse. Finally we lose all sense of perspective. We ourselves have become a part of the pattern.

So, we can be quite honest about that part of history in which we play no part, but not when we consider any incident in which we ourselves are involved. Even historians to a certain measure fall into this error; through instinctive partiality they have a certain limitation to intellectual integrity. An historian who is writing a history of the world is, quite likely to favor his own race, explaining problems to realize they have other intellectual integrity. An historian who has traveled widely he will favor many; if he has lived a comparatively quiet existence he will favor those communities with which his daily contacts acquaint him. He is difficult also to withstand the temptation to indulge in hero-worship. The hero-worshipping historian can find no fault in the personality he admires. Another historian with a different set of heroes will write an entirely different history of the same time.

Almost any emphasis of an interest we have in life results in a form of partiality. The religiously sees the history of the world as an unfolding of religion. The economist sees in it the development of an economic theory. The politician sees the development of the world as a magnificent panorama of plunder from which he can learn much. Every department of life sees all life through its own eyes. We are all intensely egotistic, regardless of how much cultivating and nurturing we receive. The final proof of the accuracy of an outside idea is in its agreement with our own internal convictions. If something which happens agrees with us, then we know that happening is true, correct, and dynamically important. If it disagrees with our preconceived opinions, or goes contrary to our expectations, then the universe has failed. There is of course nothing wrong with us; it is nature that has fallen into disgrace.

This intense egotism is disastrous to perspective. It causes us to so distort values of life about us that we constantly see dishonesty where it is not, and overlook it where it is. We dismiss as impossible that anything should be good that is injurious to us. And by injurious we mean uncomfortable primarily. The average person's greatest tragedy is mental, emotional, or physical discomfort. The same viewpoint extended, causes us to feel that society departs from all its foundations when it departs from what we believe! It is inconceivable to us that a world can be running well if not running according to our perception of how it should run. Now, this would be quite all right if we all had clear conceptions as to how it should be run.

Strong egotism makes us certain of ourselves, yet we have not yet developed the type of mind that permits us to perfect a philosophy in ourselves. We little realize that what we call our personal viewpoint is not really ours at all, but something we have inherited, or accumulated by processes not in the least philosophic. Many people formulate their philosophies of life according to their reactions and reflexes to current news, in which partisanship is ever prominent. In the tendency toward hero-worship, it is not exactly a proof of the world's intellectual perfection that millions of people should form clubs to perpetuate the activities of their favorite movie stars, baseball players, or prize fighters. There are people who just love to do that. And if these people are the victims of considerable criticism from others, these others in turn dash madly to their radios at a certain hour to listen to their favorite commentator. One radio listener to a favorite newscaster recently turned to me and said, "Wasn't he wonderful? He says just what I believe!"

We do not recognize that process in ourselves, nor how desperately we long for the gratification of having others agree with us, and how willing we are to pay in allegiance, time and money, not for information but for agreement. The verified suspicion that we are right makes the whole day a success.

This type of thing is very hard on the development of proper perspective, because we are always standing in our own light, always between ourselves and the sun. It is unconscious awkwardness that detracts greatly from our ability to live intelligently. And so it is necessary in various ways to step back, or aside, and look at things impartially, making use, as instruments of our determination, of the three factors of Distance, Time, and Detachment.
Distance is the actual physical interval between a point of view and the object of that point of view. If we climb a high mountain and look down upon the town we gain perspective through Distance. We perceive much of the pattern that is invisible to us while we are on the streets. Philosophy contributes the viewpoint of Distance by lifting the mind from particulars to generalities.

It is a philosophic assumption, and a good one, that the more completely we assume philosophic rules, the more universal our viewpoint will become. The easiest and quickest way—we say easy, but it is not very easy—is to increase the area of toleration. The less intolerant we are, the more tolerant we are of other people's opinions. The more tolerant we are of other people's race, of other people's customs and habits, the more inclusive our viewpoint is. Philosophy, by bringing us into contact with the larger world, lifts us out of the limitations of the smaller world. So, philosophy accomplishes a kind of Distance. It enables us intellectually to rise above the fogs that are constantly lying in the lowlands, let us perceive distant horizons and the relationship between the communities of the earth.

That which can be accomplished intellectually by thinking, can thus also be paralleled by a second kind of interval, Distance. Distance is twofold, it is either Distance from a point of view, like the man on the mountain looking down, or it is Distance from an interval standpoint, like the relationship between today and last year.

Distance having definitions in dimension, we can think of Distance as Time—as the interval between now and some other point, past or future. As we retire in Time from an incident or circumstance, we gain perspective upon it.

We are much better qualified today to interpret Greek history than the Greeks were. The Greeks too were Greek. In the same way a civilization living five hundred years from now will be able to do a much better job in interpreting us than we can. Because we are all limited by our own time, we assume the virtues of our time—as Aristotle said. The virtues of Time are the styles of living which dominate generations. Our peculiar attitudes on sociological and economic problems, our sense of propriety, our morals, our ethics, are all parts of these limitations of Time. To us they are cosmic truths, but to the universe they are nothing.

Concerned with our little cosmic truths, as we see them, we have no time for universal truths. This is a constant process going on in civilization, a conflict between human interpretation and universal fact. We all mean well, we all interpret the laws of life according to ourselves, but we over-estimate these interpretations, in their conflict with the universe, which we completely underestimate. It seldom occurs to us that our particular interpretation could be one hundred percent wrong. And we would not want to discover the error, for then we should be forced to change our ways. To do so would publicly reveal that at some previous time we were not doing right; and that is embarrassing. So, to defend that which we have done which was wrong in the past we will do ten more things that are wrong now. We do not want it to be discovered that we were wrong; yet each error we commit makes it more obvious to everyone but ourselves how wrong we are.

As Time shifts and the scenes shift the victory is revealed of the cosmic over the inconsequential. The universe is eternally asserting itself, regardless of what anybody does. Given time, the universe always wins. Therefore, the greater perspective we have, the greater the Distance from a Time factor, the more we shall see that incident aligning itself into its proper relationship.

As Distance applies to static objects, such as places, so Time applies to fluid objects, such as occurrences. Occurrences are incidents flowing through Time; they are like streams flowing through their beds; they are moving with Time and in Time, Time is eternally moving them to its own ends. So, Time is the creator of events, Time is an integrator of facts and revealer of motives. That which is meaningless at the moment is completely solved and meaningful in Time.

The human being thus must test everything he believes by the test of Time. History is the record of the test of Time. What we call research is very largely a problem of working with the elements of Time. Some years ago a large corporation decided to develop a new kind of house paint. They set aside a considerable sum of money and engaged a staff of technical experts to perfect a house paint that would hold its color—at least until the painting job was finished. This was an innovation, and the research staff went into a solemn session, and not long afterward in the backyard of the factory—I presume it was not called a backyard, but that was what it was—a long row of planks appeared, each one smeared with paint. Having put out all the samples on the boards there was then nothing the scientists could do but sit down and wait. The great experiment was tested; Time; how long would the paint stay there? Time; there are ten to peel in six months, some lasted a year, and some lasted so long it was discarded as not practical. A paint had to be discovered that would last just long enough, and only Time could solve the problem. Nearly all research is experiment with a Time factor in it.

A physician with a new drug can only wonder what the after-effects will be, and must wait and see. The publicist with a program for putting over an idea in enterprise can only use the rules he knows, and then wait and see. Time is the perspective which reveals the consequences of action. Time alone will tell.

The third kind of interval is Detachment, and Detachment is a fourth dimensional Distance. It is a mental interval by which the individual penetrates into fact by rising above and retiring from too close proximity to the object of his belief, conviction, or conclusion. Detachment is the ability to forget self in the contemplation of something else. And that is hard, because everything we see and hear about reminds us of ourselves. When we see people that are not doing well, they remind us of ourselves—we are so different. Contact with the rich reminds us of what we ought to have. Contact with the poor reminds us of what we actually have. Contact with the learned reminds us of our own unsuspected abilities. In contact with the ignorant we give thanks because we are not like they are. When we see the sick we are reminded of our own pain. The happy reminds us of our own misery. The miserable bring to our mind all the causes we too have to be miserable. Whatever happens, reminds us of us. With ourselves always underfoot, it is no wonder we get nowhere.

History, which is one of our critics, has proved conclusively that those in the world who accomplish things are the people who forget themselves. In Detachment is gained the mentality, the courage, and strength to penetrate the heavy mist of the self; or, more accurately, the illusion of the self. It is the power to look over the edge of personality into the world beyond. One of the principles that bestows Detachment is impersonal interest. The musician loves music more than he loves himself; he forgets himself in his art and becomes great. His music is impersonal, and while he is thinking about it he is impersonal; it is in those impersonal moments that his ge-
nium is revealed. A moment later he may become intensely personal, and in that moment he ceases to be a genius, for there is nothing personal in genius. It is impossible for a human being to normally function constantly on a plane of genius; alterations in the human mechanism are necessary for equilibrium. It is not that we should never think of ourselves, but rather that we should be temperate in our self-thoughtfulness. Most people subconsciously think of nothing but themselves, although they call it something else.

Detachment also infers not only separation from the limitation of the personal, but the ability to separate the consciousness from the true objects of personal desire. The objects of personal desire are numerous. The most important object of personal desire is not possessions, as most people think, but ego. The satisfaction which arises from being right makes our most sacred possessions our opinions. For those we will sacrifice everything else in life, and everyone else in the world. Our opinions, may they always be right... but whether right or wrong, they are ours. And we intend to fight for them. If we were one-tenth as devoted to truth as we are to our conception of it, Nirvana would be at hand. Opinion is man's half-informed conviction concerning something. It depends largely upon himself to what degree error dominates in the opinion, but it is safe to say that as long as the opinion is an opinion it is diluted with error. When this dilution has been removed it is no longer an opinion, it is a fact. So our opinions are half-completed facts, it is always to be remembered—in which there is still enough of incompleteness to destroy the pattern.
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