

HORIZON

The magazine
of useful and
intelligent living

AUGUST

1941

Articles by MANLY PALMER HALL Philosopher

HORIZON

The magazine
of useful and
intelligent living

AUGUST 1941

VOLUME 1, No. 1



Published monthly by HORIZON PUBLISHING Co., 3341 Griffith Park Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 35c a Copy, \$4 a Year. Two Subscriptions, Your Own and a Gift Subscription, \$7.

Entire Contents Copyright 1941 by Manly Palmer Hall. — For permission to reprint or translate address The Editor of HORIZON. No consideration can be given to manuscripts submitted for publication; HORIZON is published solely to circulate the lectures and writings of Manly Palmer Hall among those interested in the re-statement and modern day application of the Ancient Wisdom philosophy.

Subscribers ordering a change of address must observe the requirement of two weeks' notice. Numbers missed can not be supplied after 30 days. When ordering a change please give both the new and the old address.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

*A year or more under a top sergeant is not
a bad start toward living a normal life*

Emergency Training for Philosophy

OTHER nations have had compulsory military training, but we know practically nothing about it. From now on we are going to have this equation as part of the chemistry of our national compound.

The equation is not necessarily bad, any more than evil could be charged up to the Boy Scout movement because technically it has certain military disciplines, uniforms, some precision of training and patriotic gestures. The Boy Scout movement has been of incalculable good to a horde of young Americans, and the compulsory training of the Army is now about to do similar good for our older young men. If only because it takes up a lot of slack.

American youth of today has not been trained at home. The majority of young persons today are without discipline, and without experiencing discipline the hope for individual success in life becomes remote. To be fit to give an order one must first have taken orders. American youth has desired fondly to have other things hop in obedience to it,

without having experienced any snappy toeing of the mark itself.

Tyranny is the natural result when a person is placed in a position of authority who has not grown up on the disciplines imposed downward from that position. Beyond question of doubt today's average young person needs discipline, and without a shadow of a doubt only a few have been getting it. Where it has been administered, it has most often been evolved in parental anger, or whim, directed by personal motive geared to an adult perspective. It is instinctive and intuitive with the young to detect and reject the directional guidance that is grounded in prejudice or thoughtlessness or ignorance, or is self-serving of adult convenience and whim. The priceless ingredient that gives effectiveness to any order or direction is the base of intelligent recognition that a good result grows out of impartially beneficial motive. Personal discipline administered from personal motive can never challenge the supremacy of impersonal discipline of impersonal motive.

Most problems of this life are problems of adjustment. There is nothing particularly revolting or unfortunate in the prospect of a year or so of military training for a young man. The past decade has been difficult for parents in their selection of the way to accomplish transition between school graduation and an intelligent entry into the world of economics. Only very recently, and due almost wholly to defense emergency, has industry been in any position to absorb our school graduates, find a place for trained workers, or theoretically trained workers, and in the waiting period and by the tens of thousands our youngsters have had education extended artificially in enrollments for one specialized school course after another, in order to keep them busy, keep them off the streets. Youth, subject to the racking pains of that inferiority which is seemingly inescapable through adolescence, welcomed the escape out of reality offered in extension of the years of its formal education. And youth was coming dangerously near to acceptance of protracted education as an established right—because the elder generation had blundered things into an economic chaos that provided no place for youth, left no openings for newcomers ready to accept the responsibilities of self-supporting manhood. All that now has been fixed. Youth has been given both place and purpose under a system of conscription that knows no preferentials, that starts all young men off equal. On a serious note and in proper regulated restraint, life has begun in a positive orientation for our youth.

An outstanding virtue of compulsory service is its principle of equality for all. Its huge impersonality—which in certain quarters makes it particularly obnoxious—is sure to provide the most beneficial experience imaginable to those who consider themselves 'different.'

Consider the effect on the mother who dotes on her only son. She worries that he will not have the proper diet; she feels that lack of cultural environment will unstabilize him, is sure that the officers will not understand him—if anyone in

the world should have military training, that young man should have. By walking out of his present environment he is escaping a conditioning which in later life would be sure to cause him endless trouble. These indispensable children who bolster up home life for the older generation become incredible sufferers in the tragedies of life that await us all. Breaking abruptly with home life and family ties is the clearly indicated preventative for a large percentage of the world's neuroses and psychological abnormalities such as insanity.

WITHIN our families and in the social order itself we have been busily developing a collection of super-sensitive human beings who are just too sensitive to exist here. Fondly believed by those who dote on them to be of very advanced type, belonging perhaps to the Sixth Root Race or the Eighth Root Race, something little less than a cherubim, the net of the matter is they are just plain spoiled children. From constant coddling they have been prevented from developing strength, and weakness is interpreted as sensitivity. When an individual cannot stand the shock of life he is sensitive, but sensitivity is not in reality weakness, it is a matter of acuteness of function. Humanity's fineness is not destroyed by roughing it; there is no genuine refinement at all in human nature that cannot withstand a pushing around. The pseudo refinements can generally be accredited to malnutrition or something of that order.

The stresses and difficulties of living in today's world makes it imperative that our youth has strength to face problems of appalling complexity; no one ever found strength by keeping away from experience. There is nothing to be gained by trying to protect young people from life. A better notion would be perhaps to try to protect life from young people. How to fit the individual to live is the real problem, and to this end we can observe how nature does it. Throughout the animal kingdom and in all the world of the primitive, the young are set upon their own resources

as soon as possible. It is always nature's way to create strength by demanding resourcefulness. It is part of the nobler concept of the human family that it has no right to neglect its young, that every possible advantage should be given to the generations that follow after, so that future men may be wiser and nobler and better than we are. It is quite possible so to distort this concept that we protect these generations out of survival. In no way can compulsory military training be considered a neglect of the young; it combines the experience of exposure to a wide cross-section of humankind, and the disciplines set up to protect an existing social order.

Subjected to what we are pleased to call a regimented service, the youngsters most vitally affected are the metaphysically minded. Prejudices set up an inner conflict, and so do so-called conscientious beliefs and natural segregative instincts. Practically all who lean toward the metaphysical are self-constituted recluses. They are generally of the opinion that the world does not understand them, seldom that they do not understand the world. They consider themselves students; what they do not consider is, it progresses the student none whatever to go on year after year living vicariously.

The average metaphysician's idea of Nirvana is to get off somewhere by himself with his Sanskrit book and study and study and study. Due to interruptions caused by economics he is already forty rounds and races behind. Leaving the world behind he could spend the rest of his life working with Sanskrit verse. Glorious—for he too could take all the correspondence courses in the world at one time on everything, eat according to all the dieticians, meditate according to all systems, study philosophy in

the light of everything that came into his mind; life would be just one glorious absorption of knowledge . . . far away from the conflicts of civilization, the conflict of war, almost out of reach of the tax collector. Out of a sort of detachment which consists merely in dropping away from the world, arise the visionary Shangri-Las of metaphysics.

Seldom do such purposes achieve actual expression. Once in a while someone tries it, and it only lasts a month. The universal longing of human beings is sometime to be absolutely peaceful. In such peace they would expire of boredom; conflict is absolutely necessary to human existence.

When the mystically minded individual is picked up and yanked into the army the prospect he faces is horrible. All of material life is unbearable; his thinking has so far progressed that it is no longer possible for him to associate on terms of equality with the unenlightened; now his daily contacts are to be set among people not one of whom believes in metaphysics! In high states of agitation, not a few mothers have come to me with this problem; and strangely enough, not one has even asked me if I thought it likely the end of things would be in her son getting shot. The perturbation and concern is over the contaminating influence of worldliness upon the sensitivity of a metaphysical personality.

The metaphysician who is starting out in life so sensitive that he will be contaminated by army life is almost bound to get contaminated somewhere else along the line. Where there is not strength of character to resist possible contamination in army life for two years or so, things are going to be pretty terrible for him in his next 300 or 400 incarnations.



It is to his great intellectual benefit to come face to face with a world that does not believe in metaphysics. With a distressingly large number of metaphysicians the unbeliever is some quaint individual who does not believe as he does. There is himself, and the subnormal. Out of which is produced a definite type of orthodoxy that is as hidebound and intolerant as any that have graced and disgraced orthodoxy in religion for ages. None can be more certain of the infallibility of their premises than two conflicting schools of metaphysical enthusiasts; they will extend even to persecution of each other in amazing expression of their realization of the brotherhood of man.

Anything that tends to break this up is good. Close and continued contact with those who have no metaphysical philosophy whatever is even better than good, it is perfect. To be pulled out of a completely smug viewpoint, to be brought definitely face to face with the realities that make up the life of the rest of the world, is an important experience, and one that will never hurt anyone engaged in the process of building character, which is an eternal process.

Because metaphysicians who have reached a point beyond mature life lose contact with the younger generation, the metaphysically minded who are coming up are not shown the need of working with ideals by confronting life itself. Any average person today finds out at fifty that he needs to be a philosopher; he regrets that he did not know this at twenty-five. But he has had to experience facing life, he has had to find that life itself is unendurable without philosophy. It might be thought that philosophy can be taught, and it is; but those whose philosophy is the result of being taught are a sorry lot. The successful ones are those who experience.

PHILOSOPHY is a doctrine of building character, not of nourishing weakness. Strength of character comes from contact with life and not from running away. Religion has for centuries sought to bring man to a state of peace by teaching him formulas for running away

from life, on the assumption that by embracing religion he becomes acceptable in the light of the Lord. The difference between that viewpoint and philosophy is practicality. Philosophy's place for working is right here, in this world, offering a most indispensable tool for intelligent living. Philosophy conceives its duty as helping people in community existence, in individual life, in business associations, and in every branch of daily affairs, in the aim to live as normally, intelligently and constructively as possible. It can not be applied by the individual who is overshadowed, spoiled, and untrained.

Among people who today are studying various branches of so-called occult sciences and mystical philosophy are many who bring to bear on the subject a most startling and lamentable lack of ability and trained faculties. They come to me with a great deal of hope, but are hopeless in lack of training.

These people do not even know how to study. It constitutes study to them if they merely sit down and read a book for an hour. Haphazard reading takes form with them as a course of study. They simply know nothing of the process of consistent, careful mental application, not even how to begin. These people have never been disciplined; they have never been ordered into any mode of life. Most of them have had very sketchy business experience, or else have had their individuality smothered under a dull routine. Not that the man who has been in business for himself has much the better of it, for those who have been their own masters in an economic sense are less likely to succeed in the study of any art or science than those who have worked for someone else. And this is because the man who has worked for himself as master of himself has been the servant of hours only, not otherwise has he been subjected to obedience.

Plato and Pythagoras and Buddha taught that obedience is the beginning of wisdom. The first thing to learn to do in this world is to obey, which is the last thing anyone wants to do—surely the last thing our younger generation

had in mind, if at all. It is obedience, willing and instantaneous to authority, that is the basis for training individuals for philosophy. Philosophy is obedience from beginning to end; its adherent first obeys his teachers, then obeys Law, and finally obeys the Universal Law. Philosophy is gained out of obediences to required training and discipline.

So, a year or two or even more under a top sergeant is not at all a bad start for our young people; it will concentrate for

them more discipline and training than most of them would otherwise experience in their normal life. Out of world confusion and conflict has arisen the imperative need for obedience, and it will result in a new human and racial strength. Never can we be truly wise until we have brought strength to wisdom. We are on the way to acquiring it through obedience which in turn will build up the philosophical faculties of man.

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE)

*"If I had two coats, I would
sell one of them and buy
white hyacinths for my soul."
—Mohammed.*

Art Minus Idea

CVILIZATION complicates all issues, and under the intensiveness of our modern culture even the simplest values become involved in a confusion of opinions. We have lost the power to enjoy beauty.

The arts have become confused and, for the most part, discordant. They no longer minister to our common need; rather, they torment us with their asymmetries. When false standards are set up, the intrinsic fineness of things is sacrificed.

Generally speaking, modern esthetics is corrupt. Artists are failing art, and, for that reason, art is failing man.

The first principle of art is beauty. The work must be beautiful to be art. Technique and skill can exist apart from art, but technique and skill are not art in themselves. They are merely the means by which art is released into tangible expression. The beginning and end of art is always beauty.

What then, is beauty?

The noblest speculations on this subject are contained in the celebrated treatise of Plotinus *On the Beautiful*.

From this great Neo-Platonist we learn that beauty is essentially perfect order—in things and of things.

Beauty is a certain virtue present in all bodies, in all forms, and in all substances.

Beauty is the true being which animates all living creatures. It is the dynamic pattern, the esthetic framework by which the world is supported.

Beauty is that peculiar fitness by which perfected natures are distinguished from imperfect natures, and perfect forms from imperfect forms.

The human mind, itself composed of the Divine Nature and imbued at least subjectively with the principle of esthetics, accepts the proportions of nature as a certain artistic canon, thinking and estimating in terms of this canon. The intellect carries what may be termed a certain expectancy toward proportion, rhythm, and normalcy. The intellect, therefore, experiences a definite disappointment if the expectancy be not fulfilled.

We interpret this disappointment as

displeasure or esthetic offense. If, on the other hand, the expectancy be fulfilled, there is a satisfaction which we interpret as pleasure.

For example, a gently curving line presumes the continuance of that curve or its development into some logical form. If a sudden angle be interposed, there is a definite shock to the esthetic sensibilities. A broken arch is a disappointment.

It is true that a broken line is more powerful than a continuous one because of the blow which it administers to the subjective awareness. But strength is not always beauty. The purpose of art is not merely to attract attention or to force comment. The true purpose of art is to satisfy soul hunger.

As Socrates has so wisely observed, a thing must be necessary to be beautiful. Nature has devised each thing to serve some purpose. This is the highest form of art. The universe, which is a perfect example of utility, is also the most beautiful of all the structures cognizable by man.

In esthetics that which is impossible, improbable, or deformed offends.

In character, that which is ignoble offends.

That which offends cannot be beautiful.

The grotesque may teach a lesson, but it cannot serve as a direct inspiration to consciousness.

To the philosopher, divinity itself is the absolute standard of all perfection.

One philosopher said, "Only God is good." And in another age another philosopher said, "Only God is beautiful."

By the term God we must understand the all-knowing, all-animating spirit of the world by whose wisdom universal law is maintained.

The beauties of nature and of man, therefore, are really the beauty of God in nature and God in man. The word

God means good and good infers perfection in all the virtues.

To the ancients, virtue inferred obedience. "The beginning of wisdom is to revere the gods through obedience," declared the Platonic doctrine. To be good, therefore, is not a platitudinous injunction. It means to fulfill the Law, and to fulfill the Law means, according to the Socratic philosophers, to do that which is necessary and beautiful.

This brings us to one of the major issues of esthetic philosophy: idealism versus realism.

The idealist affirms that all things are essentially good and that divine wisdom, essentially beautiful in its workings, is present throughout nature; all life is moving towards unity, beauty, and virtue.

The realist, on the other hand, maintains that nothing is really any better than it seems to be.

Realism as a doctrine is the most disillusioning of all codes. Realism is established upon the testimony of unrefined sense perceptions, while idealism is established upon a sympathetic and enlightened recognition of the

true values which lie beneath appearances.

What then, asks the modern artist, is the highest expression of art? Is it the effort to depict a beauty which is often not apparent or the attempt to copy asymmetry which is usually painfully evident?

This argument brings up still another issue. When considering esthetics as art, how shall we define an artist? Is he a creator or a copyist? Is he a depicter or an interpreter? Is he an educator or merely a technician?

Should he portray what he sees or what he feels? If he portrays what he sees, with what kind of eyes does he see? If he portrays what he feels, with what kind of a soul does he feel?

Is art merely design, a distribution of masses, or a clever combination of light and shadow?



These questions are seldom satisfactorily answered in the schools of modern art.

There is a great division in modern opinion as to whether or not art should serve as a medium for the communication of ideas. In other words, should painting, sculpture, music, or the dance tell a story, or does its excellence depend upon its meaninglessness?

The modern tendency in art is to depart from all preachment and interpretation. To the average critic, a picture is worthless if it tells a story. To the true esthetician, modern art is therefore for the most part unsatisfying, because it contributes nothing to the intellectual or spiritual values of life.

In a recent exhibition a place of honor was awarded to a painting which represented a side of beef hanging in a butcher's window. A small canvas of a badly drawn orange on a cracked plate was also regarded as exceptional. Fried eggs are also regarded as an enchanting form of still life, with paintings resembling Spanish omelettes labeled creative realizations of sunsets.

Such productions not only lack interest, they actually lack technical merit. The creators of these so-called pictures never have mastered the technique of draftsmanship, and for the most part have no fundamental knowledge of color. Even these shortcomings might be forgiven, if the artist really possessed an idea.

There is something glorious in even an imperfect effort to do something that is noble and beautiful. We are all imperfectly striving toward noble and beautiful ends.

The greatest shortcoming of the average modern artist is the lack of an idea; he breaks the ancient Chinese axiom that nothing should be done without an adequate reason. There is good modern art, but it is comparatively rare due to the present superficial attitudes which dominate racial culture.

All modern artists to the contrary notwithstanding, there is no satisfying art which does not tell a story, create a

beautiful mood, or reveal a high inspirational quality in the soul of an artist.

Of course, only a few highly evolved mortals possess the soul power to achieve greatly in the arts. Nevertheless beauty is necessary to every human being. If we cannot perform, we must at least appreciate. No one can be truly normal unless he has some esthetic appreciation. The love of the beautiful and the expression of beauty through some art enriches the life and protects the spiritual values of man from the corroding influences of this present commercial era.

Every serious student of the spiritual sciences should realize the full import of beauty as a ministering force in life. The ancient Egyptians cultivated esthetics in all of its branches as part of the state religion. The Greeks passed laws prohibiting the construction of asymmetrical buildings or the exhibition or performance of art, drama, or music which did not conform to certain esthetic standards. The Greeks punished with exile and disgrace anyone who wilfully perverted any standard of beauty.

The absence of art or esthetic consciousness in the average home is a greater tragedy than may at first appear. This general indifference to beauty is an important factor in the widespread decadence of culture and integrity throughout the so-called civilized world.

People who are content to live in a home filled with gaudy cheapness and evidences of bad taste will find that their personal standards of life and thought are infected and corrupted by this unfitting and unlovely atmosphere.

As a homely but literal illustration of this point, study the average home.

The rooms are filled with cheap chromos in over-gilded frames and inexpensive trifles accumulated at holidays and bridge parties. Ten dollars would be a high price for the total collection.

Few fine books ever invade the premises. Cheap editions, if any, badly printed and in gaudy covers fill the library shelf.

Practically no good sculpture ever

reaches the average private home in America.

The excuse is, by the time the rent is paid, the installments on the frigidaire, radio, automobile, et cetera, are met, and the pressing bills of the month taken care of, there are no funds left with which to indulge an esthetic urge. *The truth is, there is no urge.*

If a true urge existed it would take precedence over creature comforts, conveniences, and luxuries.

Any person who can afford the creature comforts such as are common in the average American home can afford, by careful planning, to possess at least one fine and beautiful example of esthetic art to inspire him and to become a part of his life. If the man who has been buying a new car each year will forego this luxury for a season and buy a good painting, a fine piece of sculpture, a rare book, or some object of beauty which pleases him, he will discover that the satisfying of the esthetic sense is one of the most practical ways of spending money.

The radio takes the place of music in the home. Few persons are willing to train themselves in vocal or instru-

mental performance, or in the dance. There is no adequate financial future for such talents.

No thought is given to the really important issue—the development of the esthetic nature and the personal satisfaction and improvement to be derived from the ability to perform.

The average individual does not make a constructive use of his emotional energies. Nearly all of the evils of human disposition arise from the repression or misapplication of emotional energy. Under esthetic laws and principles instinct and appetite transmute into creative impulse and artistic expression.

The hates, fears, griefs, and worries of mankind bear witness to undirected and transmuted emotional energy. The disciplines of esthetics give legitimate expression to the impulsiveness of human nature.

Truly dedicated to beauty we cannot fail to develop a certain inward grace. *The esthetic arts are the normal and natural channels for the manifestation of man's complicated emotional reflexes.*

(EXCERPTS FROM THE CHAPTER ON ESTHETICS, "FIRST PRINCIPLES OF PHILOSOPHY" - A NEW AND ENLARGED EDITION IS NOW ON THE PRESS.)

Recent Additions to the Library

Several interesting items have been added recently to the Oriental collection of the Los Angeles Library of the Philosophical Research Society. These include a Japanese manuscript on paper, in scroll form, entitled *Teachings of Genku, Founder of the Japanese Buddhist Sect of Jodo*. The manuscript copy was written by a priest named Zenna, of the Zedoji Temple, and is dated A. D. 1237.

Another interesting piece relating to the Jodo sect is a manuscript, in book form, entitled *Ohara Mondoshon, Dialogues of the Founder of the Jodo Sect*. This manuscript copy was executed in the year Sho-o I (A. D. 1288), by a young monk named Jiji, who carefully signed his manuscript and stated his age to be 22 years. The calligraphy is excellent and the writing is heightened with red throughout. The manuscript is in perfect condition.

The group of manuscripts includes two early Buddhist sutras, written in roll form, and a curious manuscript on Buddhist funeral prayers. These are manuscripts of great interest to students of Japanese Buddhism and the history of Oriental cults.

He does not view business the way we do; of his Asiatic viewpoint we have no practical appreciation, little grasp.

The Jew Does Not Fit In

THE Jew today wants to know what he has done that has brought upon him the misfortune of being a stranger in the land of his birth. He is in danger of violence in many countries, faces the certainty of unhappiness and racial stigma in others.

I suspect he is mainly guilty of the crime of being an Asiatic. As such, his is a viewpoint which he should have made more understandable to non-Jewish people. Either through inability or unwillingness he has not educated the non-Jew to what his problems really are; too much has been left to chance, too much to hope and optimism.

He has also been at fault in too much segregation. Segregation is common to all people, and yet it is the basis of the karma by which most races, nations and individuals get into trouble.

Persecution of the Jews has been largely charged up as retribution for the Jew's economic attitude, and many have been the rebuttal explanations that the Jewish attitude is the outgrowth and result of his persecution in Europe. In my belief, this has had little to do with the way a Jew does business. I believe rather that he is governed by an Oriental psychology of living; it is important to recognize that he does not view business the way we view business.

This fundamental psychological difference is one of the subtle problems of human life, and one not taken suf-

ficiently into consideration by either Jew or Gentile. For, essentially the Jew is an Oriental, and as such he has the Oriental consciousness, Oriental viewpoint. Of these, we of the western world have no practical appreciation, little grasp.

If you have ever seen a Mohammedan sell rugs, or an Armenian sell rugs, or watched an Arab barter; if you have ever tried to buy anything from a real Japanese, Chinese, or Persian, if you have ever tried to do business in Irak, in Northern Africa, Tripoli or Morocco; if you have ever tried to do business in Korea, Mongolia or Tibet, in the Caucasus and Georgia, in about half of the great Soviet area — in other words, if you have ever done business in Asia — you then realize that you are not dealing with an artificial economic trait built up by the desire to destroy, but are observing an operating principle in a basically Oriental attitude, a foundational part of the Asiatic philosophy of life.

In the Orient, business is part of the joy of life. It is more than something to work with; it is the basis of personal happiness. We of the West make a job hard work, odious and something to be gotten away from just as quickly as possible. Work is a form of inferiority from which we are all trying to escape. In the Orient business is part of the pleasure of daily existence.

It is inconceivable for an Oriental to make mere buying and selling the whole



of a transaction. There must be a bargain. So, when the Main Street merchant flaunts a sign, One-half Price Sale—and everyone knows his goods are not half price—he is playing the game, perhaps subconsciously, that is played throughout all of Asia.

The Asiatic does not try solely to undersell his competitor. Working on a different basis, he is going to ask the customer three times what he expects to get, and he hopes he will get one-half of what he expects; and if it takes all day to transact the business, everyone is happy. If you pay his price and it is twice too much, he is heart-broken; he knows you are a fool. He respects you most when you show an appreciation of values. Instead of going to a store and picking up something, and saying, "How much is this?" the Oriental goes in and says, "I know the length of this and how much wool there is in it. This is worth so-much." Immediately the merchant's ego goes up. He has come in contact with a man of affairs, he is prepared now to win or lose.

So buyer and seller haggle, and haggle, argue, hate each other and call each other names, and loudly despise each other's relatives for about nine generations both ways. Finally, but only after long argument, arbitration; arm in arm they go to the nearest coffee house and settle down to a nice cup of coffee so thick you can scarcely stir it, and now they are the best of friends.

JEWES exist within our midst as a group of people who are essentially Oriental. They do not look particularly Asiatic, and since they do not speak an Oriental language or something of the kind, we do not recognize for them a series of motivations expressing a fundamental psychological difference. We are trained in intolerance, and if they disagree with us we do not know what to do correctively about it. If they do things differently from the way we do them, we bristle with belligerency. Persecution of the Jew would disappear under a changed viewpoint; there would be no more reason for it than to stigmatize the whole Hindu race as wrong because they believe some-

thing we do not believe. All lives and all people have a powerful contribution to make to life; one of these days we are all going to realize that.

Agitation over the Jewish religion and beliefs is currently the concern of only a few people. The economic issue is the problem, with the Jewish business man standing accused of inflicting serious inroads in the Gentile's industry. The average Occidental is not terribly intolerant religiously, nor will he be as long as the Old Testament is common to both Christianity and Judaism.

Much more definite is the cleavage with the Jewish problem viewed from the social angle. The average person has no understanding of how to contact, or become acquainted with, or react to the Asiatic. There are obnoxious Jews. But there are obnoxious Gentiles. Obnoxiousness is no respecter of race; unpleasant people are to be found everywhere. If we were to exterminate any race because of unpleasant members there would not be a race left on earth. The hope for complete placidity is not to be realized in persecution.

The history of the Jews is common knowledge with practically everyone; from the earliest period of his historical existence the Jew has been the victim of minority persecution. Is this because he has never been an empire builder—has never been in a position to dominate any political or social order? From the time of the shepherd kings on down, the position of the Jew in world history has never been one of great temporal power, with the exception of a short period in biblical times. And yet, Jewish tradition for a long time has assumed a certain sanctity for the Jewish race as custodians of the old Mosaic Law.

The trouble with that is, Christianity did the same thing exactly. Christianity reaching a majority position, became dictatorial in domination; its beliefs became the basis of normalcy. The Jew, remaining a minority, had his orthodoxy rated a form of infidelism. The record shows that of all the religions on earth the religion most active in persecution, the most intolerant, hidebound and sect-

conscious, is Christianity. But it dominated and wrote history, so Christians have been told how noble they are and that everyone else is wrong. And this, after all, is but a normal and human reaction.

To be politically in a position to force dominance upon the rest of the world is more important than to have racial superiority in numbers. Antagonism and violent misunderstanding of Oriental views of life that differ from ours continues, although on this earth the white race is outnumbered two to one. No basic truth supports the white man's standard as the standard for the whole world; it is the world's standard only because he thinks it is. All that would be subject to change, should another race get strong enough. That *can* happen.

THE work of humanity is toward one human family. Nature insists upon it. Everything which exists as separateness, separation, segregation, or barrier, receives a terrific battering. Nature is determined at all costs to unite the scheme of the Universe and break down segregation. It is a misfortune that deeply rooted in the history of Judaism is the principle of segregation; it specifically bears upon today's situation and the present plight of the Jews.

It is not within the desire of the average Jew or the Gentile to break apart humanity. But as long as violent racial ideology exists, as long as race consciousness remains, there will be *for* and *against*. The karma of the individual is built up around his own ego. The sense of *I*, the desire for *I* to dominate, to be the center of life and the world, for *me* and *mine* to rule, is something that will take hundreds of cycles of lives to destroy in human consciousness. The sense of the world moving about *me*, the intense awareness of *I* which makes us say, "I am a Presbyterian," before we say, "I am a human being," is that false ego which sees small things first and large things not at all, and is the enemy.

Through self-chosen activities of past centuries and through transplanted environment, the Jews have been the pe-

cularly race-conscious people of western civilization. Karma is breaking down this race consciousness to make room for human consciousness, in the only right we have—to recognize one humanity, one life under the sun. Each of us in this life is working out karma of some kind, and I firmly believe that the karma of the Jew holds a gradual dying out of racial persecution of Jews as a class in the degree and with the rapidity that the Jew forgets he is a Jew and remembers that he is a human being.

Races and nations must go ultimately. It must be accepted that the Universal Plan is for one human family, even though in realization it will require an infinite period of time. The ego of the individual will meantime undergo a relentless battering. For it is our ego that destroys us. It is the ego in Judaism which causes the Jew to say, "I am a Jew," and it has been his destroyer. And the man who says, "I am a Gentile," will ultimately destroy the world of the Gentile. The man who says, "I am a Chinese," will ultimately destroy China or destroy himself. The individual who is race conscious, nation conscious, or conscious of any segregational grouping, must finally go down. Humanity is essentially one life, one race, one purpose, and one destiny. Anything that tries to break that up, will be broken itself.

I believe that race consciousness is all too true of the Gentile, and that the struggle Christianity is now making to maintain itself against the dictatorship for a changed and new world order has its cause in an egotism that has long antagonized the rest of the world's peoples.

World war and the distress of nations may destroy progress for ten, fifteen, or twenty-five years. But it will have no effect upon permanent values, upon the motion of nations. The normal condition is for a coordinated social order to function together in perfect harmony. Numerous races working together, but only one life.

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE.
Suggested reading: THE SACRED MAGIC
OF THE QABBALAH.)

Suspects and Aspects of Astrology

THE modern student of astrology is confronted with a most difficult situation. By his own researches and experiments he has proven to himself



that astrology actually works. By the systematic application of the basic rules of the art he can, and does, make accurate predictions of events to come—events over which he has no possible control. The frequency with which his predictions are fulfilled rules out the possibility of coincidence.

In some research carried on recently, a friend of mine—a scientifically-trained practicing psychologist in good standing in his profession and among his associates—became interested in the use of astrology. He brought me the birth data of a number of his more difficult problem cases. From the data alone the temperaments and difficulties of the various patients were described with approximately eighty-five per cent of accuracy. The psychologist was generous enough to say that astrology accomplished in from fifteen to thirty minutes results which required from six to eight weeks using the technique of psychology.

The serious astrologer keeps records

of most of the cases which come to him for advice. He often preserves a file of horoscopes and he conscientiously checks his predictions against the events which take

place. In the course of years he accumulates abundant proof that the laws of astrology, if intelligently applied, can indicate the course of human events. By the checking method he also learns to correct mistakes of his own judgment, discovering why in some cases his predictions miscarry.

The astrologer, having no feud with science, does not understand why the scientific world is so critical of his endeavors. The average astrologer is not dishonest; he believes firmly and sincerely in the importance of his art, and applies to himself the same rules which he uses with his clients. I know many enthusiastic astrologers. They are devoted to the subject and are trying constantly to increase their ability and their knowledge.

Not so long ago an encyclic was published permitting all Catholics to study astrology. A friend of mine who has dependable knowledge of matters in Rome says there are ninety priests in

the Vatican working on astrology. This attitude of religion of openminded investigation is in striking contrast to the stand in condemnation taken by the men of science who hold positions of responsibility in our college astronomical observatories.

In recent months, astrology has been attacked through a series of articles prepared by scientific groups and individuals scientifically minded. Typical of these attacks and the attitude they represent are the opinions of Dr. John Q. Stewart, of the Department of Astronomy of Princeton, and Dr. Bart J. Bok, Associate Professor of Astronomy of the Harvard College Observatory. These gentlemen are determined to rescue a delinquent world from the evils of horoscopy. They have assembled a number of choice observations and remarks which have been given considerable national publicity.

A number of astrologers feel that Dr. Stewart and Dr. Bok have been undiscriminating, if not incorrect, in some of their conclusions. These gentlemen have become far more heated than the sober impersonality of science should allow. In the cause of fairness, therefore, let us examine some of their findings and see if they have presented their case in a manner appropriate with the dignity and the thoroughness of the learned.

The essence of the displeasure of these scientific gentlemen—and, for that matter, the usual arguments against astrology—fall into traditional pattern. They can therefore be considered in the order of their frequency and answered as simply and directly as possible. Dr. Bok's first perplexity seems to be that it is beyond his understanding how apparently intelligent persons can possibly believe that the planets can affect human life. Dr. Stewart concurs.

The answer is by no means difficult. The deeper aspects of astrology have

never been of interest to the mentally unsound. During the last several thousand years of recorded history, astrology has appealed principally to the educated and intelligent classes. It has been studied by the learned and patronized by the great. It would be only fair to accept that thinking people are in a position to estimate the accuracy of predictions made to them. When we know something to be true through personal experience, the contrary opinions of even the greatest scholars have little weight. The reason why neither persecution nor legislation has been able to destroy astrology is the accuracy of its findings. The testimony of experience does not go down before attacks by those who are evidently without experience.

The astronomers' next dilemma is no more difficult than the first. These astronomers insist that the planets are far too distant for their rays to trouble worldly affairs. As one of them so elegantly states it: "If we are to believe that the influence of a mere mass of matter affects human character, then certainly the Empire State building would have vastly more effect on the people of New York than would a planet millions of miles away."

The astrologer meets this sage observation with what seems to me to be a very reasonable contention. The universe is one vital organization, all the parts of which are related to each other and indispensable to the complete economy of



existence. It was Kepler who pointed out that astrological influence results from the patterns set up in space by the motions of the heavenly bodies in reference to each other. These patterns result in what the astrologer terms aspects. Kepler wrote at considerable length on the nature of these aspects, which constitute the elements of a sidereal chemistry. The distance between a planet and the earth does not necessarily prevent subtle rays from reaching the earth's atmosphere. What are cosmic rays? How completely has science charted the magnetic sphere of the world? Is any man in a position to deny that the various bodies in space may be bound together by energies as yet unknown or, at least, inadequately understood?

Again, the astrologer knows by experience that some subtle energy *does* connect the planets with the earth. He may not be able to explain his findings in the approved terminology of science, but, given a fair opportunity, he can demonstrate the truth of his theory.

The remarks about the Empire State building are a bit infantile. The only subtle emanations which have been observed in this connection emanate from the magnetic Al Smith. Plato might be used to challenge the Empire State building analogy. According to the Greeks, all forms, whether they are natural or man-made, do emanate a subtle influence according to their mass and proportion. Pythagoras observed that architectural asymmetry could demoralize a community or a nation.

A favorite objection raised against astrology advances what is supposed to be a real poser: Thousands of people are born every day at the same hour—and yet no two of these people have the same characters and abilities, or achieve equal success in life.

The difficulty in answering this objection is that the elements are quite abstract. I cannot but wonder how or when it has been scientifically proven that human beings are so astonishingly dissimilar that no two are alike. Personal observation over a number of years in a rather wide public field has led me

to the conclusion that most human beings are very much alike. The man or woman who is truly individual is the exception rather than the rule. The majority are dominated by almost identical impulses, characteristics and convictions. There is nothing to prove that a number of separate individuals born at approximately the same time would not have lives that closely parallel each other, at least in the more important events.

If many are born every hour, many also die every hour. For the most part, life is a routine experience, falling into traditional patterns and all too often into traditional disasters. Astrology has kept records of several authentic cases of persons born close together in time and place. The results of these records would likely astonish even Professor Bok and Professor Stewart. I gather from their writings that these learned astronomers did not happen upon such reports when compiling their displeasure into printed form.

Incidentally, it is not so easy to secure records of two persons born in the same locality within a few moments of each other. Even large hospitals are unable to furnish such information. The astrologer insists that four minutes in time and fifteen miles in distance can materially affect a birth data. With this qualification, which is universally acknowledged by serious astrologers, science's objection is considerably modified.

Another traditional argument which sums up scientific feeling can be quoted from a recent article: "The only feeling scientists have about astrology is one of disgust, that in a nation of free schools such hocus-pocus should have so many believers. During the last three hundred years, not one recognized scientist has believed in astrology."

There is no answer for a scientific feeling of disgust. But there is remedy in a suggestion made centuries ago by a very learned man: We dislike most what we understand least.

A little learning may incline the mind to an excess of displeasure, but greatness

of learning results in a desire to search everywhere for truth and fact. Possibly it is our free schools and increased opportunity for a broader education that has brought to some in the nation a realization that astrology is necessary for intelligent purposed living.

Is it so important whether or not modern scientists have believed in astrology? Is a fact more true because many disbelieve it? Nearly every great truth that has been given to mankind was denied for centuries by the learned before it won acceptance. Pioneers in every field of endeavor have been persecuted by the nearly wise. No one believed that Fulton's steamboat would run. The 'well informed' and those of 'weighty reputation' gathered to witness Fulton's Folly and ridicule it. When the boat did go, what was the result? Those not abounding in common sense were angry not at themselves but at Fulton, irate because he had proved to them that they were wrong.

It has been wisely observed that the superstitions of one age are the sober scientific realities of the next. I believe the time will come when what Francis Bacon called *astrologia sana*, or sane astrology, will be taught in those previously referred to public schools.

I have too my doubts about the last sentence of the quotation, that no recognized scientist in the last three hundred years has believed in astrology. It is more likely that the great German orientalist, Professor Max Muller, came nearer to the fact when he declared that, to his own personal knowledge, many men of the deepest scientific training believed in astrology but did not dare to publicly avow their interest, because it would hazard their scientific standing with intolerant contemporaries. An examination of Dr. Muller's scientific status will convince the most uninformed that he was held in high esteem by hundreds of learned societies all over the world. It has been my sad observation that the modern scientist determines, by a very arbitrary formula, whom he will acknowledge as a recognized scientist. The formula works like this: Does

Professor Dokes believe in astrology? He does! *Ergo*, he is no scientist.

Chatting one day with an astronomer, I remarked that Isaac Newton once rebuked Dr. Halley, who had a comet named after him, for making a rather flippant remark about astrology. Newton, who was a very gentle soul, turned his big, soulful blue eyes on Halley and remarked softly: "I have studied the subject, and Dr. Halley, you have not."

My astronomer friend looked pained beyond expression. The anecdote crushed him. But after several moments of depressed silence, he brightened perceptibly. "Oh, yes," and now he positively beamed, "Newton did lose his mind in his old age, didn't he?"

The ancient problem relating to the hen-and-the-egg and the matter of their priority also finds a parallel in the astrological-astronomical controversy. Science, usually indifferent to such problems as involve the antiquity of knowledge, now solemnly affirms that astronomy came first, astrology was a sort of deluded after-thought. Dr. Bok makes quite a point of this.

To my mind, all aspects of the hen-and-egg controversy are barren of productive results. One can say: If astronomy came first, then astrology bears witness to a higher degree of civilization. Or, the reasoning shifted into reverse: If astrology came first, then astronomy may have put in its appearance in those decadent ages when knowledge fell into materiality and lost the name of action.

The fact is, astrology has flourished among all the great civilizations of the world, enjoyed its greatest preferment during the most enlightened of times. Professor Richard Proctor, a scientist of some reputation, grudgingly observed that no nation ever reached a high degree of civilization without astrology.

Dr. Stewart administers what he hopes will prove to be the *coup de grace*. His wording can hardly be regarded as subtle. "It is difficult," he says, "to answer scientifically because the astrologers have no scientific evidence to examine."

It is my understanding that the pur-

pose of science is not only to examine evidence *but also to accumulate it*. Scientific expeditions travel to all corners of the world to dig up subject matter for somber reflection. How does it happen, then, that these learned gentlemen have never seriously explored the jungle of astrological lore? According to textbooks which I studied in my youth, the process of thinking *from* conclusions went out of favor with the Dark Ages. Instead of affirming that astrology is a baseless delusion, and then being content merely to reaffirm this affirmation, might it not be better to make an adequate unprejudiced survey of the entire matter?

The astrologer feels that he is a victim of unfairness. He has been persecuted for centuries, but where is the evidence to indicate that astrology has actually been disproved by any qualified body of scientific men? There is none.

Meanwhile, Dr. Bok is visibly affected by the contaminating influence of astrology not only upon the young, but also upon the whole body of modern society. He decries the numbers of newspapers that print daily astrological columns, bemoans the fact that astrological magazines not only have a wide circulation but actually are displayed on newsstands right alongside respectable publications! As a sort of Exhibit A, he publishes a photograph showing Evangeline Adams' textbook prominently displayed on the book table where Harvard students buy their literature, and it's right alongside the *Life of Louis Pasteur*! Evidently he fears that this proximity of the sacred and profane will contribute to the delinquency of Harvard undergraduates. I noticed something, however, that Dr. Bok appallingly failed to mention, in the one-pointed focus of his scholarly mind. The *Life of Pasteur* is framed on the other side with what is indicated by the book jacket to be an unabridged life of one of the world's most ribald gentry, Benvenuto Cellini! In my lay mind arises the suspicion that the affairs of Cellini might complicate college life rather more than the comfortable grandmotherly essays of Evangeline Adams.

Dr. Bok thus summarizes Kepler's indigence and motives: "Two years before his death, when his salary was three years in arrears, he took to drawing up horoscopes for the 'astrologer-soldier' Wallenstein as a means of supporting himself and his dependents." It should be incredible even to a mind in a science rut that Kepler merely for the sake of money would practice seriously an art which outraged his integrity and common sense. And was it necessary for Kepler to write a book on the subject?—which throughout the text bespeaks a serious interest together with long study and proficiency. Why should the modern astronomer infer this discreditable action to one of the world's greatest thinkers? How much more likely it is that Kepler was both an astronomer and an astrologer, and quite sincere in his devotion to both subjects. Kepler was known to have said that years of research and thought had forced his unwilling acceptance of the truth of astrology.

The present revival of anti-astrological agitation has brought together some strange bed-fellows. Among those named as presenting a united front against this loathsome superstition are the committee of the Boston and Cambridge Branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers, under the chairman of Professor B. J. Bok; the Society of American Magicians; the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues; Good House-keeping Magazine, and the inevitable and irrepressible Dr. Fishbein, of the American Medical Association! Surely this is the first time that this impressive accumulation ever united its resources.

In spite of the accumulated weight of opinion represented by all this learning, the serious student of astrology is not profoundly impressed. He is so accustomed to opposition that he will remain unaffected by the intolerance of those about him. Knowing the truth which he has discovered by the practice of his art, he will continue to explore the mysteries of his "moral sphere." He is satisfied that in the fullness of time astrology will come finally to universal acceptance.

(WRITTEN SPECIALLY FOR HORIZON)

*Some day we will know that 25,000 years ago
on this earth dwelt human beings of great culture
who governed according to the laws of rational democracies*

Atlantis: and the Origins of Civilization

IN a world troubled with imminent problems, full fascination remains in the theme of the sunken continent of Atlantis. Atlantis is still a word to conjure with, and it is not because people have read Plato; the word seems to have a connotation strange and mysterious, conveying to many individuals something of what they

were a part of, in some past time.

But many think of Atlantis incorrectly. It was not a continent, but a distribution of land. It was the whole map in a different pattern from the pattern it is in today. The distribution lay in America, in Africa, Asia, and China, all over the earth—Atlantis was not a particular area in one place on the earth's surface. Atlantean remains may be found anywhere; Atlantis was a period not a place.

Atlantis disappeared gradually; the geodetic and geographic changes which caused some areas to sink and others to rise occupied a period of millions of years. Even as what we call the Aryans of our modern world came out of a distribution, involving all lands from South America to Africa and from Europe to China, so was Atlantis an arrangement of a continent—part of an arrangement that is still changing, that will continue to change until the end of the earth. There will never be a time of change ceasing.

Geography's modifying force has been the rotation of the earth on its axes, which causes areas of land to move



constantly, soft land crumpling up against hard land; and this change will some day result in the loss of the continent we know and evolve for our world other continents. The rate of change is slow, map readjustments would not be apparent to people in one lifetime; but there are symptoms to be observed, and one of these

is climatic change. It is obvious that the temperature of various localities is changing; New England no longer has the snowbound winters of 50 years ago, New York now has snow flurries in the months when in an earlier period the countryside was solidly snowed under. We know too that there is dry land today in areas in Texas which in the 16th and 17th centuries were under the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. We have other areas which have been above water since 1900 B. C., others which were under water for billions of years. There are seashells on the top of Mt. Blanc, other seashells on the highest point reached on the Himalaya Mountains.

The search for Atlantis is not solely a search under the ocean, nor is it confined to the great areas in China and India and certain parts of Europe; here in our own country we can find Atlantis. It should be thought of as a great kingdom or empire, a world power that traded and dealt with other nations. The mercantile of the age was not so inferior to our own, ships, though powered differently, journeyed to the most distant areas, despite beliefs to the con-

trary. That no one knew the earth was round up to the time of Columbus is one of the myths of history—like the story of Columbus making the egg stand on end. Columbus in fact had opportunity to read that our world was round, and he might have read of its diameter and circumference. He may not have, but he could have. Nor was the coming of the Vikings to America the beginning of the exploration of the New World. We know the Greeks were here long before them and sailed up the St. Lawrence River, according to Plutarch; they navigated the northern coast of New England, penetrated inland as far as the Great Lakes, and the record of their discovery of this continent was established in Greece 1,500 years prior to Columbus's famed visit.

As to the lost continent of Atlantis and its approximate location, the Chinese knew of it and the Greeks and the Hindus. Fiji Islanders, acknowledging that they participated in the catastrophe, have preserved a complete record of the destruction of Atlantis. The Indians of Madagascar have their stories of the cataclysms and changes which produced the Atlantean deluge, and records have been preserved among the American Indians. Because the cataclysm affected an enormous area, all peoples of antiquity knew of it.

Certainly in some mysterious way this cataclysm took place. In efforts and attempts made to explain the relationship between the geological discoveries of modern science and the continental distribution according to the Oriental mystic, the one thing determined with reasonable certainty is that the last glacial sweep was later than the Atlantean continent—land distribution was largely in its present shape in the Glacial Period—but the Island of Poseidon had not then sunk. Poseidon, almost as large as Australia, sank in a single night, according to the old myths, carrying with it 60,000,000 people, and this was the end of the Atlantean Continent.

The sinking of that area which resulted in our present land distribution must have caused terrific ocean agitation,

the Atlantic Ocean cutting up no end, with resultant floods in Europe and South America and Africa. The Lisbon earthquake of 1755 caused the waves to go around the world eleven times before they died out, and Lisbon's cataclysm was nothing compared to the sinking of the Island of Poseidon. It appears that there was some realization of the impending catastrophe for a large part of the Atlantis population had left the Island of Poseidon and gone to the continental mainland. The mainlanders, continuing to thrive, interest us, for they have survived up to the present time. As an instance, the populating of America has always been a great scientific riddle. Mongolians are supposed to have come across from Asia by the Bering Strait and into British Columbia and down through the United States to Central and South America. This theory of an enormous migration has in it little of significance or sense. Of great import, on the other hand, is the significance to be attached to uncovering of remnants of Atlantis in areas not generally supposed to contain these remnants.

California, from San Francisco south and into Mexico, is an area which was up during the Atlantean Period. Hundreds of discoveries of very ancient remains have been uncovered in careful excavations that have extended from California to Arizona and New Mexico.

Africa, another area up during the Atlantean Period, has remained one of the most mysterious continents on earth. Explorers fly over it and go across it, but little has been done in scientific exploration of African records which go back to inconceivable antiquity. The African we hear about is a native dancing with his spear and covering shield, but in Central Africa only a few years ago two explorers discovered what they believed to be the remains of a great city. This city would compare favorably in size with some of the ancient cities of Central America; it must have had a population of two or three millions. This was no mass of native huts, but a great city of carved stone, a city that could not have been built by aborigines.

It was a city architecturally planned, and in one of the most inaccessible areas in Africa. There is no possible doubt that it is an Atlantean city.

The Atlantis records of Central Africa we now know are not feats of memory carried along by aborigines but are the concern of an elaborate priesthood, (one with which our missionaries have had little success), a priesthood that celebrates mystical rites, has a profound knowledge of magic and is capable of producing mysterious phenomena that every explorer confronts and every scientist denies—in denials that have nothing to do with the elements of the fact.

No utterly primitive people could evolve this knowledge. It was derived from somewhere; it had to come from a legitimate origin. Interestingly, it is magic and shamanism identical with that of the American Indian. It is a fair assumption that at some remote period there was a wide distribution of knowledge, since hopelessly lost in the mysteries of time.

This knowledge was not original; it was carried from somewhere else. But where are the records? If it was only 15,000 years ago, or less, when the great Atlantean Continent sank, why not more elaborate literary remains? Records should have been uncovered sufficient and explicit on the history of these ancient peoples. Why, without exception, do ancient civilized nations retire into a darkness to emerge already civilized but leaving no record? Egypt emerged civilized 7,000 years ago; no one has any records of how Egypt came to be great. Not even the record of where the Egyptian language evolved could be found by the great Egyptian authority, Maspero. The great civilization of Egypt stands, but no one knows where it came from. There is no record of a primitive Egypt.

The same for Greece. Greece emerges already capable of philosophy and art, without record of a barbaric period. India emerges historically with a language, with sacred books. No one knows where

India got them. Out of vacuums in history nations emerge with their knowledge thoroughly established.

When was the curtain drawn across the origin of ancient nations—was it 10,000 B. C.? Beyond this there is no history. Are we to conceive all civilizations emerging with their knowledge at approximately the same time, all ready to become great civilized powers? It is like picking up an adult without a childhood, coming out of nowhere ready to vote; without family to trace, nor place to come from, how can he be accepted just emerging and saying with a theatrical bow, "Here I am!" Something about it doesn't sound right.

We establish first thinking man at a period of gnawing at a bone and throwing a stone ax. Not so long after, man wrote the classics. Where is the sense to that, and where did the transition take place? Back 25,000 years ago, even 50,000 years ago, there were great artists — their jumping elephants on cave walls would paralyze the modern artist. They could not have

been barbarians. Yet when we pick them up again, they are killing mastodons with stones. Once more they disappear, to come out as philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle.

You would think that there would be one period in the life of a people that would be remembered, and that is the period of discovery. Somewhere in the interval between Stone Age and Moderns, man discovered two times two makes four. As a discovery, it should have been preserved; but it isn't.

The origin of writing, the evolution of ideographic pictures is lost.

The origin of language is lost. We do not know where grammar comes in. We have Egyptian hieroglyphs, then grammar—some jump, with a people suddenly become very intelligent.

The only evidence that we have that this knowledge was carried from somewhere else is in legends and myths that do not calculate in time of things hap-

What of the possibility that Neanderthal man was merely one of the primitive peoples sharing the earth with more highly evolved contemporary races?

pening, but tell of the Fathers who came from far across the water with teachings and wisdom. So, what of the possibility that while the Neanderthal man was wandering around and the Heidelberg jaw still had its owner—through the period of long heads, flat heads, and square heads—that these represented merely the primitive races, abiding as contemporaries of more highly evolved people? That nations were civilized by outsiders, and that is the reason we cannot trace civilization in them, seems possible and reasonable.

Not so long ago two skulls were discovered. They were over a million years old. Instead of being flat heads, as Mongolians are, the brain capacity is as good as we have today. That was a blow. Science has supposed skulls of that period to be very large in front and small behind—organized solely for grinding food between jaws set like a bear trap. But here were two skulls, delicately formed, highly evolved, and they were a million years old. That was an embarrassment. According to scientific rules, no one had much to say about it. A good general rule is, when you do not know anything keep quiet. The scientific rule is, keep it quiet. Skulls of highly evolved peoples, one million years old, pose a problem, possible entrance any day into a new period of archeology.

Not every answer to the problem lines up simple, obvious and straight. Suppose a couple of millions of years from now someone digs up Los Angeles—presuming it is not the capital of the world at that moment—and the digging happens to strike into the precise location of the Southwest Museum, turning up a collection of bones belonging to the creatures of the lava pits. They might decide we of today were contemporary with the saw-tooth tiger. The skeleton of a monkey might cause them to inquire what kind of people were we? Should they dig up a billboard and con-

clude we worshipped that, then come upon a mummy case—well, we were either Egyptians or very remarkable people, perhaps both.

The whimsy is not far off from the story of exploration in the Near East. Exploring archeologists found nine cities, one underneath another, and stopped digging only because funds gave out. There might be fifteen cities underneath these! On a day when we will scratch deeper, we will not be satisfied with the tombs of Egyptian kings. The search downward will be for a sub-strata of a high civilization, and the discovery that while a large part of the ancient world was primitive (which is true also of today) a great civilization existed with peoples who disappeared from this earth 25,000 or 50,000 years ago. We are going to find out just that; for it is the only reasonable explanation to the origin of our arts and sciences.

We may find what we seek in our own Southwest. Maybe in Mesopotamia. Maybe we will have to dredge for it under the ocean. But we are going to find it; it is necessary to find it. It is no longer a hypothesis; it is necessary. That which is necessary will be manifested. And then we will know that 25,000 years ago on this earth dwelt human beings who could read and write, build cities, teach the sciences, tame and train animals for their use, build great monuments, write books, and govern according to the laws of rational democracies.

And the evidence we will find will justify all the legends and traditions which have come down to us with the gods who dwelt upon the earth in ancient times. Science is in for more headaches such as the skeletons found of humans 20 feet tall, which because not understood is a discovery which has been hushed up. And there will be the matter of finding that all the old legends and traditions are based on history, that nothing is counterfeited of which there has not been an original.

● About one-third of Americans are without medical attention; a moral issue

Ten Dollars for Health



ABOUT medical care of Americans, opinion splits into wide divergence, with most of the opinion being either based upon hearsay or grounded in advantage. As with many great and vital questions, the people who sincerely believe they have an opinion are usually falling back on the solidly expressed opinion of some one else.

Organized groups do most of the thinking for the populace at large. In a natural antipathy to thinking, which is hard work, practically every person depends upon some organization to do his thinking for him. The individual seldom knows where he gets his so-called facts; along with opinions, they are absorbed either through the columns of a newspaper habitually read, or are jammed into consciousness by the insistent radio. This reduces individual opinion to something largely made up out of hearsay, or propaganda, which is organized hearsay.

Not one person in a thousand is in any way qualified to have an opinion on matters medical, but always somewhere the discussion goes on, with argument pro and con as to what's med-

ically best for humanity. One side echoes the standpat stuff of entrenched position and tradition—nothing should be changed, for it might get worse. In adoption of the attitude of the progressives, the other side argues that if you never do anything, conditions anyhow will change, with the possibility of getting better, and then it'll be you that'll be out of step. To the standpatters all progressives are radicals, and to the progressives all standpatters are mummified. On which basis we try to run things—mostly conversationally.

People in the main are non-intelligently honest, if such a thing can be. They are honest, let's say, but not to blame for it. On any question of what is good for humanity they are likely to have an opinion, but seldom with it any realization that what they violently defend and believe to be a personally arrived at conclusion is but opinion conjured up for them and effectively distributed. Now, irrespective of what side is taken, one fact cannot be denied and on it should begin all discussions of the nation's medical problem. The fact is: About one-third of the American people are without medical attention.

Obviously not a right condition, it has become a moral issue with a vast number of medical men. Someone is to blame, and there are those who think that the cudgels should be taken up by the medical profession itself when a

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE.

Suggested reading: ATLANTIS: AN INTERPRETATION; THE MYSTERY OF ELECTRICITY)

large sector of humanity is prevented by economic necessity from participating in the advantages and privileges of modern science, blocked from their share of what we are pleased to call progress.

Various communities are seeking the way to help people who are sick, acknowledging sickness to be a by-product of the world we live in. As surely as we are here, we will be sick; some of us continuously, some many times; some only once, and then fatally. It stares us in the face that there are millions of people, and the number constantly increases, who are in need of medical treatment, surgery, dentistry and optometry, and they cannot secure it. Surely they are not to remain in suffering, victims under an economic system for which they have no responsibility. Within the economic condition lies the real problem. What the answer is, is not so evident.

Disputing the path of adjustment to humanitarian progress are two factions. The standpat bloc is headed up by certain members of the American Medical Association, which has numerous auxiliaries all over the nation. The other faction, the opposition, progressive, is made up largely from a group of men emerging out of the same association, men who believe in cooperative medicine—if a man can't pay his doctor bill, let him paint the building; let him get what he needs for what he knows.

The principle here is sound. But to make it widely operable requires some form of cooperative organization. Start something along that line and immediately you run into opposition; enormous blocs of society are ready with vigorous and even malicious opposition to any form of cooperation organization. They maintain that cooperatives interfere with private business. Here someone might inquire, what today is private business? There are indications that we no longer have any. In majority, we the people, haven't seemed to get that yet, as we hold lovingly to the past, dancing along on old beliefs, continuing with the old conception of economics that introduced to us the delightful peculiarity of 1929.

If the problem of health is definitely the physician's, consider what he can do and what he can not. A doctor is a man trained and dedicated by traditions and re-dedicated by his Hippocratic oath that he will serve the sick, that he will preserve the ethics of his profession. He still takes the Oath—they are beginning to change it in places—and so he binds himself to the same declaration instituted for the physicians of Ancient Greece, twenty-three centuries ago. As stated by Paracelsus, one of the greatest chemists of all times, the purpose of medicine is to heal, and not take money. Fine, if workable. It costs money to become a doctor. Building up a practice requires spending years and money. It is costly to carry on the books the sixty percent who never pay doctor's bills. Patients expect time-consuming professional attention, the most up-to-date equipment. In the scheme of the doctor's economics, the thing reaches an impasse.

MOST young doctors starting out are idealistic, admirably honest. Almost invariably they are disillusioned by contact with the older school; nor can the optimism of the proverbial archangel which they start out with, long survive the disillusionment that comes in unselfed service to human beings in the mass. Humanity as a whole is always good. But the individual human you meet always has something the matter with him. Humanity as a whole can be loved with great devotion, but break humanity down into individual human beings, and the dilemma arrives once expressed by a friend of mine: "I love humanity but I hate individuals."

If that was the attitude among doctors, they would be in a fix. Doctors dedicate themselves to serve humanity in the mass, care for all alike. But in a high percentage of his contacts the doctor meets people incapable of doing the things he knows should be done. He visits a home where a sick child needs long treatment, \$10,000 worth of services and medicine; the father is a low wage earner and there is no hope for the child. To those who have nothing, organized charity gives medical attention

free; the wealthy of course can have all the medical attention they want, but to the mass of humanity that lives on a limited income the wherewithal of medical attention must remain the ever unprovided item in the family budget because of its year to year dollars spread being unpredictable.

A newspaper not long ago had a cartoon about a new kind of telephone you did not have to dial. You lifted up the receiver and told the operator the number wanted. It suggests the possible timeliness of re-stating a new kind of doctor. We see him heading in his jalopy to wherever it is anyone is sick, sleeping in the spare room where the dead are laid out, shaking pins and pennies out of the children's throats betwixt times of serving as father confessor, translator and linguist. Annual earnings for him \$600 cash and the balance in farm produce and the product of calloused hands in a barter of one kind of skill exchanged for another, and never for a moment has he the feeling that his medical education was time wasted, nor is he at all convinced that the humanitarian primitive destroys its adherents, results in economic breakdown.

Today's visit from the city doctor is price-tagged \$15—for coming in the door, giving a look, and calling an ambulance. In a hospital the ailing one will be quiet and comfortable, and not get well too quickly. Whatever it is that is the matter with you, you are better off in a nice quiet room. Its cost about equals rental of the bridal suite at the Waldorf, but the doctor is convinced that hospitals do the greatest amount of good to the greatest number.

All doctors are not like that. Many even seek the way out of the undignified and unreasonable but almost universal system of charging the bankrolled three times what they ought to, so as to take care of two other underprivileged patients. I honestly believe that ninety-five percent of doctors, given an environment consistent with integrity, would want little more than the opportunity to fulfill their life's desire to be of mass

service to suffering humanity. If they can gain a public consciousness that most of the evils inherent to medical science are rooted in economics, the physicians who believe in themselves will find that a whole world of people believe in them.

IT is none too well known of the average physician that while he has the inclination, he has not the power nor the time to resist the influence brought to bear upon medicine by the pharmaceutical houses in their control of the making and sale of drugs. The problem of breaking up the Citadel is not an easy one either, for it has almost unlimited resources and, in an enormous combine, the powerful financial backing of the great medical supply houses. American medicine is dominated by one of the greatest monopolies ever known. It has established itself as absolute dictator of what is right and wrong. I have talked to a great number of physicians, and every one has had his dream. He knows the way things ought to be done, and he knows that he can't give his patient even adequate consideration under the restrictions of scope imposed upon him.

Upon the dissolving of all monopolies depends the survival of our social order. It doesn't make any difference whether the combine affects food, aluminum, housing, or medicine, a combination that exists for purposes of control and restraint is illegal. Our social system prohibits a minority employed to exploit a majority. This democratic country, as someone has said, is a free country—almost. In a free country, when you interfere with a monopoly right away you interfere with the constitutional rights of the individuals who make up that monopoly. Interfere with the individual, and you interfere with the free man, and you interfere with business. Now, the individual may be interfering with the rights of millions, but he has his constitutionally protected status as an individual; so it is only by criminal prosecution that he can be made to cease and desist. It has to be an actual crime—making money in itself is not a crime. What has to be proved is, that certain individuals in combination have through

agreement conspired to control and restrict the rights of other individuals, interfered with their freedom of opportunity in the land of free opportunity, where in ideal at least, competition is wide open to all. No neater subject could be conceived for endless legal haggling.

Who are the people the doctors would like to treat, in their own manner and in accord with their need, these people who are sick? They are three out of every four persons that make up the population of the United States! And in most cases they are conscientious, intelligent, but overworked, worn down in the struggle to provide for their families proper housing, proper food, and for themselves, proper rest. Against them having every attention good health demands is a great monopoly demanding \$10 for something that costs 10 cents.

Sickness is principally due to the presence in the body of unusable refuse, commonly known as toxine. By being cleansed ninety people can be cured, to one cured by being doped. But it isn't profitable. The medical profession is ready to embrace preventative methods as greater than curative. But what then of the thousand serums on the market?

IN science, as in art, there is only one way we can liberate talent. We must free it from economic limitation. A number of people have devised schemes of socializing medicine, so that the person who is not in good health can have every attention necessary. He would pay for it in the same way he pays his insurance premiums, at regular periods, monthly or yearly. This is sound from the standpoint of economics, unrestricted of general business. If every person in the United States paid \$10 a year, and some went all their lives without needing a doctor, every emergency for all the others would be covered. Great laboratories could be built, adequate hospitalization fully achieved, and thousands of doctors on starvation earnings provided with reasonable salaries and freed from economic stresses for life.

Sound organization of the problems of healing would begin with giving to all citizens thorough and complete knowl-

edge of physiology. People should understand their bodies, how they work, the intelligent realization should be reached that health depends on the preservation of health—to do certain things is to blunder into slow suicide. Out of \$10 a year all our people could be educated in the full theory of preventative medicine.

Who can bring about socialization of medicine? The Government. It alone has the right under its constitutional privileges and powers to protect the people. Just as it can crack down on any exploitation of the necessities of life, such as food and shelter, it can move to abolish exploitation of health; for it is a necessity to good citizenship. Government does not go into business when it accepts responsibility for protection of the essentials of human existence. Luxuries are something else. If a man wants his own airplane, a woman a sable coat, that's all right, that's their business. But if children want milk, it's very much the Government's business to see that they get it. It is equally the duty of the Government to see that its citizens' teeth do not fall out. In governmental control of essentials lies an important step forward toward placement of this nation on a foundation which will not sway in political policy either to the right or to the left.

For it will be only when we put human good above private advantage that we will have the democracy we profess to believe in, in a nation to be honored and supported above all others on earth. The day is not far distant when the rest of the world will be looking to the United States for a pattern of living that it will profit it to follow—if we are going to be worthy of our vaunted high standard of living it must be a standard set to the principle of first concern for human good, of free men consecrated to unrestricted distribution of necessities first, with rugged individualism turned only then to hot and vigorous competition in the open market for its share of the profits in the devices of convenience and the goods of luxury.

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE)

*He gave to the Bible its literary excellence;
in philosophy he transcended time*



Francis Bacon: The Incredible Lord

Politician - Poet - Scholar
Dramatist - Philosopher
Founder of Modern Science

he left his good name... and a great philosophy.

To the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy I shall add nothing at this time, nor even touch upon the honors that the ages have brought to Francis Bacon; it is the man and his philosophy that holds a challenge of adequate estimation, for he was one of the greatest intellectuals the modern world has produced.

MUCH of the time a heavy mist hangs over the bleak English moor lands, and trees hollowed by age cast fantastic shadows over the waste. Sheep graze in small and scattered herds. A hundred miles to the south the *lustwaffe* roars over the city of London.

Only a short time ago men were busied here with excavations that were to restore the early Roman city of Verulamium, close beside the estate and modern castle of the present Lord of Verulam. A mile and a half beyond is the ruin of Gorbambury, the site of the house of the great Lord of Verulam, Francis Bacon. There is not much to be seen; just one small corner stands, ruins giving evidence of deep basements and heavy beamed floors; only one arch remains, and on it is the Crest of the family. Scant, hushed, and neglected, these are all left of the physical estate of the great thinker, man of action, practical idealist, England's High Chancellor in the reign of King James.

Two miles away, at St. Albans, is a little church where Bacon is supposed to be buried. Few come there to pay homage to the man with a mind that transcended time and brought together the ages of the past to join them to the ages yet to come. But by the hundreds of thousands the pilgrims go each year to Stratford-on-Avon and the tomb of Shakespeare; and the sexton at the little church at St. Albans shakes his head and sadly wonders why Bacon remains comparatively forgotten by the English people, to whom in legal will and testament

Francis Bacon was born in the year 1561. In the 16th Century education was not an advantage; it was the symbol of mediocrity, not at all as it is today, something our young people fight for; it was rather something to be fought against. It was the time when to be educated was to be in a profession or trade, and gentlemen did not take part in professions or trades. It was not seemly for a nobleman to read or write, and many could not write their own names. A Chaplain was hired to do that, and on a pittance to read and answer all letters, so that those under royal influence could concern themselves with the affairs of the court, with sails constantly trimmed to match the varying breezes that blew from Hampton and Windsor.

Because the position of Sir Nicholas Bacon was none too lucrative as Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, it seemed best that the boy Francis should go to school. Had he been born to a little higher estate this would not even have been considered. But since as a man he would have to earn a living, off he went to Oxford. From what records we have of Oxford at that time the principal concern of the students seemed to be the number of barrels of beer consumed dur-

ing a semester. The mind of young Francis from infancy had been constantly directed toward the accumulation of knowledge, at any early age it had satiated itself in the deteriorated learning of his time, and so at sixteen he left college in disgust. No one there could teach him anything. Already he knew as much as his masters.

As a child a portrait of Francis had been painted, which was unusual, for portraits were made usually only of children of royal birth.



The painting shows a boy with a head large for his body, a high domed brow, a face already moulded to the extraordinary erudition that was to come. At sixteen, through with formal education, Francis extensively traveled the Continent and then returned to England to settle down to the semi-respectable career of a lawyer. Gray's Inn was at that time the mecca of lawyers and it was there that Francis Bacon established himself and began his career, one among the various attorneys, advocates and lawyers of the Crown. To the end of his life he reserved his quarters at Gray's Inn.*

Little honor came to Bacon during the life of Queen Elizabeth. He achieved the rank of Advocate, and that was all. The British Museum has preserved many of his letters to various persons, inquiring why obstacles were put in his way, why the conspiracy of purposes under which no one would let him amount to anything. By startling contrast is another letter written when James the First came to the throne; from the new monarch he received nine honors, six of preferment and three of person, and under this advancement he was made Viscount of St. Albans, and in time, Lord of Verulam. His public career was of gradual ascent to the climax of being named Lord

* As we go to press word is received from London that Gray's Inn has been bombed. Its 16th Century hall has been utterly destroyed, most of the library and 20,000 volumes burned.

Chancellor of England, the highest honor that could be conferred by the king and a post which made him virtual ruler of England and the most powerful man in the kingdom.

It is rare to find a great politician a great philosopher. Bacon was both, and also a great scientist. He was a master of language as well, and achieved incredible feats of literary accomplishment. As the greatest scholar in England, it was to him the translators of the bible brought the famous King James version, entrusting the manuscript to him for editorial revision; for a year and a half he worked on the editing to achieve for us the bible as we know it in all its extraordinary literary excellence throughout. Bacon too was a great lawyer; it was he who amended the Magna Charta, one of the magnificent documents of the English language, the pattern for our Bill of Rights. In a world where it is hard enough to make one career a success, Bacon achieved prodigious success in fields of accomplishment so many-sided that in versatility and profundity he stands unmatched.

Lord Francis Bacon, at the time when he was most brilliant as a statesman, wanted to be a scientist. The Aristotelian vogue had gained dominance over science, and with a mind that had the peculiar faculty of ever thinking straight, he rebelled. His scholarly pen produced *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, or the Advancement of Learning; and the masterpiece, *Novum Organum*, or the new instrument of human reason. By these works the whole theory of scholarship was revolutionized; he gave to the world the very foundation upon which all modern science is based, won the title of "the father of modern science" so definitely that, even if grudgingly and with little heart, modern science is forced to admit the solution of its numerous mysteries rests in the foundation supplied by Bacon.

But even while succeeding so admirably in science, his great mind, according to his Chaplain, had turned to fantasy and he became a poet. We know that

he wrote plays, for one of them was performed before Queen Elizabeth; he could hear the pleadings of offenders of the Crown and with equal facility edit and paraphrase the psalms of the bible and conduct experiments in music.

Those of smaller mind could not stand up before such brilliance, and centered in him was too much of the power of England to meet the ambitions of scheming men; the treasons and stratagems began that were to end in persecution. In the midst of his career Lord Bacon was charged with accepting bribes. He knew that the charges were framed by jealous men who feared his power and he made little effort in defense when tried in a court composed principally of his enemies. They found him guilty, stripped him of his estates and honors, imposed a fine many times greater than his whole fortune, sentenced him to the Tower. Which availed them exactly nothing, for King James released him in a signed blank pardon to be filled out by Bacon himself. Estates and honors were restored, the fine set aside, everything was back as before. Except that Lord Bacon requested of the king that he be permitted to end his public career. The letter James wrote in reply is still in existence; the king agrees that it would be better for posterity that his lordship should devote his remaining years to completing his priceless contributions to human knowledge, and not continue with political activities: "You are more valuable to England and the Ages as a scientist than you are even as Lord Chancellor."

So Bacon returned to Gorhambury, to begin his fifteenth rewriting of his great book, *Instauratio Magna*, the sum and substance of all knowledge from the beginning of time. And at Gorhambury, where now is to be seen only one small corner of the ruins of his house, he died, in popular belief, in the year 1626, aged 66.

The historical records give the cause of his death as quinsy of the throat, result of a cold caught in somewhat unbelievable manner—he caught cold by plucking a frozen chicken in midwinter.

It would indeed be a curious circumstance if the Lord Chancellor of England had stopped at a farmer's cottage as related to select a pullet for his dinner; that he would pluck the frozen fowl himself seems no less peculiar; and with much evidence on hand and an increasing body of testimony that Lord Bacon did not actually die in 1626, the pullet episode is hauntingly reminiscent of the satires of the old Greek mysteries and Socrates' wish that a chicken be offered on the altar of the gods as a symbol of approaching death. There is reason to believe that Lord Bacon just disappeared, that he left England and spent the remainder of his life somewhere in central Europe. One version is that he lived to the advanced age of 87 and died in Holland. Various historians have him dying in three different places.



In support of the possibility that he arranged the presumptions of his death and tacked on to it the notion of a mock funeral is a picture in an old book in the British Museum showing Lord Bacon dressed in woman's clothes, but with a beard and plumed hat tilted to one side, stepping off the map of England and on to the map of Europe—in affirmation of the report that he was present and wept at his own funeral. Dressed in black and disguised as a woman, he was heard sobbing gently as his bones were laid to rest.

It is reasonable to suppose that there is something to all this; the atmosphere of England had become oppressive; against the king's favor his enemies were still determined to discredit him; Bacon lived in a day when it would be a great convenience to disappear far from the lowering shadow of the Tower.

He was a very great man in his country; it therefore seems quite odd that in his supposed illness no physicians were called. On a par in oddity, is the difficulty in finding just where the tomb of Lord Bacon is. One place it is sup-

posed to be is above a ruined Roman wall, which certainly would be no place to put a tomb. Practically everyone in St. Albans thinks he knows where it is, but no one is really sure. I was shown several places where it was supposed to be, but these proved to be not the right places. The little church at St. Albans is not more than 20 feet wide and hardly 60 feet long, but in it they cannot find the tomb. One of the townfolk told me, "It's in the graveyard." Another said, "It's under the altar." A third in disagreement assured me, "It's under the edge of the wall." A fourth was positive "It isn't there."

An astonishing thing has happened to the most likely spot, the little elevated platform, the altar of the church; in some recent time it has been done over in bathroom tile. Bathroom tiling was so completely inconsistent with everything in the old building that, the church being empty and deserted, I did some exploring out of native curiosity. It required little time and scarcely any physical effort to discover that someone—I hardly think out of reverence to Deity—had laid this fantastic colored modern tiling over where the inscribed tablet was supposed to be, so that whatever inscription might have been there no longer could be read.

Bacon seems to have been buried everywhere and nowhere. For several hundred years it seems to have been one of England's problems to keep his tomb from being found. In total of many peculiar circumstances it seems probable he did not die in 1626, he merely disappeared. On the European continent somewhere he continued to function in his own inimitable manner. The achievements of Bacon are the monument to the man, he stands a beacon light of erudition unequalled, unsurpassed. Given recognition as the founder of modern learning, it must remain comparatively unimportant where Bacon's bones were actually laid to rest—Lord Francis Bacon is best perpetuated by promulgating the dynamics of his philosophy.

Bacon's philosophy is representative of the inductive process of thought. Lord

Bacon was a religious man. That is held against him by modern science. Bacon said: "I would rather believe all the fables of the Koran, all the fantastic stories of the Talmud, all the miracles of the scriptures of the world, than to believe that this Universe was without a soul." He believed in a Divine Presence in the Universe. In his *Novum Organum*, his magnificent new Organization of Thought he is scientific without being materialistic. Bacon was consistent. He presented learning dominated by God.



Evaluating the existing writings of all great men, not a great deal has been contributed to permanent knowledge by the atheists and the agnostics. As necessary to science as its laboratories and textbooks is a great religious realization.

If we are ever to know the mysteries of life, we must not only be mentally and physically educated; we must be spiritually enlightened. Lord Bacon knew that. Upon the solids of a great rationalized faith he built his foundation of knowledge. He recognized God not as part of the Universe, but as the Universe. His was the God accepted by Plato.

Deity to Bacon was not some mysterious being sitting off in space, ruling the world, but was the world itself—inclusive of all parts and members. He further believed that the wisdom and will of God, as Infinite Being, was in essence absolutely unchanging, and that upon the unchanging realities of existence a great science or philosophy could be established. Men can be inconsistent, change their minds, but Deity is eternally consistent and goes on forever. What we call the Laws of Nature were recognized by Bacon as the Attributes of God. In these were the Will of the Creator, and the Will would go on and never change.

The purpose of existence is to learn, says Bacon in his *New Atlantis*; the purpose of knowledge is that all men may discover everything that is knowable to man in the Universe. He was not one of those religious people who were afraid of science, nor was he of the opinion that science conflicted with religion. Not afraid either of straight thinking, he saw science and religion as one body and essence, the differences being incidental, the unity evident—unity in every sense of the word.

What is the method by which we find Truth? Bacon took the example of human beings. How are we going to find out what man is? Meeting someone on the street we say, "he is six feet tall and he is wearing a brown suit," but only in a way does that tell us what he is. What he wears is an evidence of his taste, the way he walks is an evidence of his health, the words that come out of his mouth are in evidence of what he thinks; heroism in time of disaster give evidence of his courage; the books he reads are an evidence of his inclinations, and so are the people he associates with. Everything he does is evidence of what he is; nothing that he does is what he is.

Examine a man's shoes for years, and you will never find the man; but the shoes bear witness to the kind of a man he is. There are all kinds of shoes and he picked that pair. All right, if he picked them as you might say because of the shape of his feet—the shoes bear witness to the foot. Everything we do tells something about what we are. There is no way of finding out what we do except by a systematic accumulation of data concerning what we do.

So, Bacon divided knowledge into three types: observation, experimentation, tradition.

Tradition is the evidence of previous ages. It must not be overlooked, because that which is the common knowledge of mankind is not to be safely dismissed. Tradition is what men have always done from the beginning of time, which is the long distance view of what men are doing. Observation is seeing what they are doing now. Experimentation is

trying them out to see if they will do it again.

Another important thing about knowledge is that from what men do, we find what men are. Bacon did not dare overlook Julius Caesar, although he had been dead for centuries, because Julius Caesar did things. Bacon checked the past, and rechecked it; and finally proved it by experimentation. But this was not done with man alone; he checked and rechecked the animals, the plants, the birds, the stars—all of these had to be subjected to testing. What could not be tested could not be checked, and could not be regarded as knowledge. Bacon was very careful not to dispose of the unprovable. Its place is to remain in suspension, waiting until it is proved or disproved. What was unproved Bacon did not reject, but he did not assume it proven fact. It must wait until time and condition and the ages justified it.

Thus Bacon knew that the greater part of knowledge has to be in suspension; it will remain in suspension during the tens of millions of years to come. Beyond everything we know lies the immense field of the unknown. Bacon believed nothing useful could be gained by an effort to understand that which is beyond the capacity of



man to understand. Man has to build up capacity first.

Examining men according to the Baconian theory, we observe all the different things they do, and divide these into two categories, relevancies and irrelevantancies.

Some things we do are not really good evidence. A man tips his hat, for example, not because it is in his soul to do so, but because of custom, tradition, breeding, gentility, or habit. The action that has no direct tie-up with the individual's subconscious mind must be carefully examined in the desirable purpose to exclude the irrelevant fact when

estimating man. Science and theology today mistakingly lack the ability to carefully examine or remove or exclude those things which are not testimony. Bacon's work was to strip away those things which were not relevant and then to try to find out what things were left. His system was largely the removal of irrelevancies. His theory was, if you took away everything, God remained. In practice, you would not go that far. All you could do was remove certain of the superficial elements and search for Being... Reality... the Fact... the Truth... the Substance behind the shadow.

It never occurred to Bacon to doubt the immortality of man. He was not able to demonstrate it, but those who were the world's wisest had accepted it, and he was in no position to disprove it. Science, whether it can prove immortality or not, is not able to disprove it. So, Bacon continued in his method of removing things that did not count, eliminating superficialities; he followed in the footsteps of the old beliefs: beneath the robe is the body; beneath the body the vital organs; behind them, the living spiritual essence.



Continuing with removing the form, trying to find the substance, he discovered something. He discovered that the substance of Reality was so infinitely refined it could not be analyzed. He saw that behind all organizations were intangible things which could not be changed. He became a Platonist. He examined and accepted the realities of intangibles. Suddenly he came face to face with what we will all discover some time if we search long enough—that we can not find absolute fact.

Thus was Bacon forced to make a line of demarkation between the absolute and the relative fact. Absolute fact is not susceptible either of analysis or examination. You can examine the vertebra of a fish but you cannot examine Truth. The very intangibility of Truth

is that which resists any effort to grasp it, to analyze it, to build upon it. It is like some mysterious essence that seeps as in alchemy through the very glass of the test tube and disappears. Upon Bacon's foundation modern science has built up our present scientific system. But science is not dealing with absolute fact. It can't. It is wholly ridiculous for anyone to think otherwise. All scientific truth is relevant. It is phenomenal and not noumenal truth. It is truth regarding the obvious, and not the causation.

As instances: It is true that there are a certain number of bones in the human body. That is true, but it is not a Living Truth. As a fact it is a dead fact. There may be 6,576,000 books in the public library; but if the little boy in the back row says, "So what?" he has said the right thing. It is a figure that does no good. If there were 14,000,000 it would make no difference except to the librarian. It is a fact that we sleep and eat—and what's vital about that? Factually we can know it forever, and still be an ignoramus. And even if people are born with the instinctual ability to recognize certain things, that is not necessarily valuable.

You'll remember Plato didn't know how many teeth he had; when he was asked, he had to go off somewhere and count them. That was supposed to be evidence that Plato was ignorant.

It is no evidence whatever. If we have thirty, thirty-six or forty-two teeth, what difference does it make? The crux of things is, we have elevated unimportant facts and have come to worship them. We have satisfied ourselves that we know all there is to know because we have found out how many elements there are in a certain chemical compound. If it is a great discovery that it takes three or four legs to hold up a stool, what of it? We know approximately how many people there are in the world, but what of it? We go to school and learn the heights of various mountains, and we learn there are verbs, nouns, past and present participles, and we put various words together and they either make a good sentence or a bad

one—and seldom does it occur to the individual that education's facts and the facts of science are for the most part very stupid. Fact means something only when it confers the power to do something.

This means there are dynamic facts and static facts. The dynamic fact helps to build something, it creates something, it contributes to progress. A static fact is merely an acknowledgement of something, which even if acknowledged still remains unknown.

Suppose we speak of life. Things live. A cow is alive. We have used a word—alive. The word is the right answer to certain questions, but what does it mean? You look up *alive* in the dictionary, where it is defined as "something living." Then you look up *living*, and there it says, "something alive," and where are you? You have been given the answer but you are just as ignorant as you were when you started—you do not know what life is. In words are the answers to things, but not facts.

Two kind of facts are clearly defined by Bacon. There are facts which are in the possession of the educated. There are facts which are constantly dangling in front of the noses of seekers after Truth. It is the tendency of education to stress static facts. Static facts have a place in the universe, but they are useless unless they are ensouled and made to live by some power. In the static fact we have the body without the soul. Words not understood are forms without a soul. The problem of ensouling has been skipped over generally. People say why worry, because you cannot find out anything about it anyway; it's useless to try to find Reality.

Bacon said you can discover one type of Reality. Consider that in the Universe everything created does something, with one exception—and the exception is man. Of all the parasites of the earth man is the worst. The reasoning to this conclusion is simple. All creatures below man are governed by instinct; they do the thing they feel, and can not do anything different. Man, having a mind, is no longer able to respond completely

to instinct. But he is a thinking creature that has not learned to think. Man, greater than the animals, has not yet learned that reason takes the place of instinct. The animal obeys because it knows nothing else. What man must learn to obey is, that which he knows is right. Man has not orientated himself in this great mysterious world. Bacon saw science as the way to orientation. Science has the virtue of making you see clearly.



That many of his followers in glory would be near-sighted was not anticipated by Bacon. He didn't realize words would be

accepted in place of ideas. The plan for which he laid the foundation was for men to rise up to reason, and so would man save himself—by coming gradually to a glorious cooperation between himself and nature. To Bacon, science was at-one-ment with Nature, and men would learn to be too wise to kick the stone or break the plant, would learn to live in a world of conscious adjustment with all the things that live. All knowledge is the servant of man. Men must learn to use it. Out of knowledge comes a new Universe. The *New Atlantis* of Bacon is a Universe ruled by reason, governed by the wise—because only the wise are fit to rule.

Breath-taking in the intensity of their factuality are Bacon's simplicities of thought—only the wise are fit to rule. We know this is true, even in the small things of life, but we do nothing about it. About to do something, we do not consult wisdom. We go off and do it. Then suffer the consequences. We have philosophy and we have science, but we have not brought things down from the clouds and made them facts. The uneducated man is afraid of knowledge, afraid of long words. The wise man casts the long words aside. They are of no use to him. He has the facts.

The *Novum Organum* of Bacon is dedicated to one great principle: If you

strip away the false you find the Real; if you strip away illusions you come to facts; if by a method of trial and error you eliminate mistakes, that which is real will remain. All men learn by the trial and error system, live by it. But when they try a number of things, and they are not right and they hurt, they blame the gods for their suffering.

The experimental system to Bacon was the great school. The universities of his time could teach him nothing. He envisioned a school where the things that were taught were the things that are real, where great, strong, wise men were not afraid to pray, where God and the telescope went hand in hand, where the physicians prayed before they operated, the school where the realization of Divine Purpose and the possibility of human accomplishment went hand in hand—the school of wise, deep, gentle thinkers. To him that was the college, the true collegium. That was the school of tomorrow. It is still the school of tomorrow.

Bacon knew that behind all the Facts, behind all Truth in the Universe,

is that mysterious power we call God. That, to him, was the Supreme Fact. The supreme knowledge of knowledge, the wisdom of wisdom is, that we shall find Living Truth, Divine Truth, under all the forms that exist. And never shall we stop searching and never stop seeking until ultimately we discover God in the Universe.

Bacon re-stated the dream of Plato, which was a world ruled by Wisdom and Virtue, with Living Truths taught men to make them conscious of their responsibility. It will come. We may not live to see it. We probably won't live to see it. We may be back to see it. But, here and now, it rests now in our hands to help make it true, to press on to a new order of man's knowledge by which he shall perceive inwardly that which is not to be found externally.

This then is the substance and essence of the Baconian life: That man should know. By knowing should live. By living should teach others to live. So that in time the whole world shall become the City of Peace, the World of Brotherhood and Fraternity.

(CONDENSATION FROM A PUBLIC LECTURE

Suggested Reading: FRANCIS BACON: THE CONCEALED POET)



CONTENTS AUGUST 1941 ISSUE

An identifying footnote to each article indicates whether it is an original article, a condensation from a Manly Palmer Hall lecture, or an excerpt from his writings. *Suggested Reading* is a guide to his published writings on the same or a related subject. A list of Manly Palmer Hall's published works will be mailed on request.

Emergency Training for Philosophy.....	1
Art <i>Minus</i> Idea.....	5
Recent Additions to the Library.....	8
The Jew Does Not Fit In.....	9
Suspects and Aspects of Astrology.....	12
Atlantis: and the Origins of Civilization.....	17
Ten Dollars For Health.....	21
Francis Bacon: The Incredible Lord.....	25