



## KEY NOTEBOOK

### IV

(Continued from January Issue)

(Section III— continued)

[Key, p. 44.]

In order to awaken brotherly feeling among nations we have to assist in the international exchange of useful arts and products, by advice, information, and cooperation with all worthy individuals and associations — doing this, moreover, with no benefit or percentage to the Society or its members for such services.

For instance, to take a practical illustration. The organization of Society, depicted by Edward Bellamy in his magnificent work, *Looking Backwards*, admirably represents the Theosophical idea of what should be the first great step towards the full realization of universal brotherhood. The state of things he depicts falls short of perfection, because selfishness still exists and operates in the hearts of men. But in the main, selfishness and individualism have been overcome by the feeling of solidarity and mutual brotherhood; and the scheme of life there described reduces the causes tending to create and foster selfishness to a minimum.

Key, p. 45

What is also needed is to impress men with the idea that, if the root of mankind is one, then there must also be one truth which finds expression in all the various religions — except in the Jewish, as you do not find it **expressed** even in the Kabala.

This common origin of religions applies to practical brotherhood because that which is true on the metaphysical plane must be also true on the physical.

There is no more fertile source of hatred and strife than religious differences. When one party or another thinks himself the sole possessor of absolute truth, it becomes natural that he should think his neighbor absolutely in the clutches of Error or the Devil. But once get a man to see that none of them has the **whole** truth, but that they are mutually complementary, that the complete truth can be found only in the combined views of all, after that which is false in each of them has been sifted out — then true brotherhood in religion will be established. The same applies in the physical world.

Take an instance. A plant consists of a root, a stem, and many shoots and leaves. Humanity, as a whole, is the stem which grows from the spiritual root. The stem the unity of the plant. Hurt the stem and it is obvious that every shoot and leaf will suffer. So it is with mankind.

Key, p. 46

True, one might object and say that if you injure a leaf or a shoot alone, you do not injure the whole plant, and therefore, by analogy, that the injury of one man only does not injure all humanity. To such objection we would say, "How do you know?" Are you aware that even materialistic science teaches that any injury, however slight, to a plant will affect the whole course of its future growth and development? Therefore, you are mistaken, and the analogy is perfect. If, however, you overlook the fact that a cut in the finger may often make the whole body suffer, and react on the whole nervous system, I must all the more remind you that there may well be other spiritual laws, operating on plants and animals as well as on mankind, although, as you do not recognise their action on plants and animals, you may deny their existence.

We call them Karmic laws; but you will not understand the full meaning of the term unless you study Occultism. However, my argument does not rest on

the assumption of these laws, but really on the analogy of the plant. Expand the idea, carry it out to a universal application, and you will soon find that in true philosophy every physical action has its moral and everlasting effect. Hurt a man by doing him bodily harm; you may think that his pain and suffering cannot spread by any means to his neighbors, least of all to men of other nations. We **affirm that it will, in good time.** Therefore, we say, that unless every man is brought to understand and accept **as an axiomatic truth** that by wronging one man we wrong not only ourselves **but the whole of humanity** in the long run, no brotherly feelings such as preached by all the great Reformers, pre-eminently by Buddha and Jesus, are possible on earth.

Key, p. 47

#### OUR OTHER OBJECTS,

To carry out the second object, we propose to collect all the good works upon the world's religions that we can. To put into written form correct information upon the various ancient philosophies, traditions, and legends, and disseminate the same in such practicable ways as the translation and publication of original works of value, and extracts from and commentaries upon the same, or the oral instructions of persons learned in their respective departments.

As to the third object, our duty is to keep alive in man his spiritual intuitions. To oppose and counteract — after due investigation and proof of its irrational nature — bigotry in every form, religious, scientific, or social, and **cant** above all, whether as religious sectarianism or as belief in miracles or anything supernatural. What we have to do is to seek to obtain knowledge of all the laws of nature, and to diffuse it; to encourage the study of those laws least understood by modern people, the so-called Occult Sciences, **based on the true knowledge of nature,** instead of, as at present, on **superstitious beliefs based on blind faith and authority.** Popular folklore and traditions, however fanciful at times, when sifted may lead to *the* discovery of long-lost, but important, secrets of

nature. The Society, therefore, aims at pursuing this line of inquiry, in the hope of widening the field of scientific and philosophical observation.

Key, p. 48

#### ON THE SACREDNESS OF THE PLEDGE.

The ethics of Theosophy are there, ready and clear enough for whomsoever would follow them. They are the essence and cream of the world's ethics, gathered from the teachings of all the world's great reformers. Therefore, you will find represented therein Confucius and Zoroaster, Lao-tze and the BhagavatGita, the precepts of Gautama Buddha and Jesus of Nazareth, of Hillel and his school, as of Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and their schools.

Dissensions and quarrels are not totally absent from our ranks, for though our reform in its present shape may be called new, the men and women to be reformed are the same human, sinning natures as of old. As already said, the earnest **working** members are few; but many are the sincere and well-disposed persons, who try their best to live up to the Society's and their own ideals. Our duty is to encourage and assist individual fellows in self-improvement, intellectual, moral, and spiritual; not to blame or condemn those who fail.

Key, p. 49

We have, strictly speaking, **no right to refuse admission to anyone — especially in the Esoteric Section,** wherein "he who enters is as one newly born." But if any member, his sacred pledges on his word of honour and immortal Self notwithstanding, chooses to continue, after that "new birth," with the new man, the vices or defects of his old life, and to indulge in them still in the Society, then, of course, he is more than likely to be asked to resign and withdraw; or, in case of his refusal, to be expelled. We have the strictest rules for such emergencies.

No Fellow in the Society, whether exoteric or esoteric, has a right to force his personal opinions upon another Fellow. As regards the inner section, now

called the **Esoteric**, the following rules have been laid down and adopted, so far back as 1880. "No Fellow shall put to his selfish use any knowledge communicated to him by any member of the first section, violation of the rule being punished by expulsion." Now, however, before any such knowledge can be imparted, the applicant has to bind himself by a solemn oath not to use it for selfish purposes, nor to reveal anything said except by permission.

A member expelled, or resigning, from the section is by no means free to reveal anything he may have learned, or to break any clause of the pledge he has taken. His expulsion or resignation only relieves him from the obligation of obedience to the teacher, and from that of taking an active part in the work of the Society, but surely not from the sacred pledge of secrecy.

To any man or woman with the slightest honourable feeling a pledge of secrecy taken even on one's **word of honour**, much more to one's Higher Self — the God within — is binding till death. And though he may leave the Section and the Society, no man or woman of honour will think of attacking or injuring a body to which he or she has been so pledged. If this seems unduly strict, it is only due to the low standard of the present time and morality. But if a pledge does not bind as far as this, what use is a **pledge** at all? How can anyone expect to be taught secret knowledge, if he is to be at liberty to free himself from all the obligations he has taken, whenever he pleases? What security, confidence, or trust would ever exist among men, if pledges such as this were to have no really binding force at all? Believe me the law of retribution (Karma) would very soon overtake one who so broke his pledge, and perhaps as soon a -the contempt of every honourable man would, eve on this physical plane. As well expressed in the N.Y. "Path," "**A pledge once taken, is for ever binding in both the moral and the occult worlds.**" If we break it once and are punished, that does not justify us in breaking it again, and so long as we do, so long will the mighty lever of the Law

(of Karma) react upon us." (*The Path*, July, 1889.)

Key, p. 52

#### IV.

### THE RELATIONS OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY TO THEOSOPHY.

#### On Self-Improvement.

He who would be a true Theosophist must bring himself to live as one. Moral elevation is the principal thing insisted upon in our ranks. If the behaviour of some members strangely belies this fundamental rule, this is no fault of our statutes rules, but that of human nature. A true Theosophist ought "to deal justly and walk humbly," to strain every nerve to the end that their **Divine Self** shall guide their every thought and action. In short, the one self has to forget itself for the many selves. Let me answer you in the words of a true Philaletheian: "What every man needs first is to find himself, and then take an honest inventory of his subjective possessions, and, bad or bankrupt as it may be, it is not beyond redemption if we set about it in earnest." But how many do? All are willing to work for their own development and progress, very few for that of others.

"Men have been deceived and deluded long enough; they must break their idols, put away their shams, and go to work for themselves — nay, there is one little

Word too much or too many, for he who works for himself had better not work at all; rather let him work himself for others, for all. For every flower of love and charity he plants in his neighbor's garden, a loathsome weed will disappear from his own. It does not require a new revelation. **Let every man be a revelation unto himself.** Let once man's immortal spirit take possession of the temple of his body, drive out the money-changers and every unclean thing, and **his own divine humanity will redeem him**, for when he is thus at one with himself he will know the builder of the Temple."

If only one Theosophist out of ten practised the above, ours would be a body of elect indeed. But there are those among the outsiders who will always refuse to see the essential difference between **Heaven-born Theosophia** and its imperfect embodiment among individual Theosophists. Such would visit every sin and shortcoming of the vehicle on the pure spirit which sheds thereon its divine light. Is this just to either? They throw stones at an association that tries to work up to, and for the propagation of, its ideal with most tremendous odds against it. Fair-minded people, at any rate, ought to remember that the man who does all he can, does as much as he who has achieved the most, in this world of relative possibilities. This is a simple truism, an axiom supported for believers in the Gospels by the parable of the talents given by their Master: the servant who doubled his two talents was rewarded as much as that other fellow-servant who had received five. To every man it is given "according to his several ability." Thus between the abstract ideal and its vehicle there is a most important difference.

Key, p. 56

### **The Abstract and the Concrete.**

The band of Theosophists is a great body of men and women, composed of the most heterogeneous elements. Theosophy, in its abstract meaning, is Divine Wisdom, or the aggregate of the knowledge and wisdom that underlies the Universe — the homogeneity of eternal GOOD, and in its concrete sense it is the sum total of the same as allotted to man by nature, on this earth, and no more. Some members earnestly endeavor to realize and, so to speak, to objectivize Theosophy in their lives; while others desire only to know of, not to practise it; and others still may have joined the Society merely out of curiosity, or a passing interest, or perhaps, again, because some of their friends belong to it. How, then, can the system be judged by the standard of those who would assume the name without any right to it? A group of Theosophists can be regarded as the embodiment of Theosophy only in its abstract motives;

it can never presume to call itself its concrete vehicle so long as human imperfections and weaknesses are all represented in its body. If Eastern comparisons may be permitted, Theosophy is the shoreless ocean of universal truth, love, and wisdom, reflecting its radiance on the earth, while Theosophical Societies are only a visible bubble on that reflection. Theosophy is divine nature, visible and invisible, and its organizations are human nature trying to ascend to their divine parent. Theosophy, finally, is the fixed eternal sun, and its Societies the evanescent comets trying to settle in an orbit to become a planet, ever revolving within the attraction of the sun of truth. Lodges are formed to assist in showing to men that such a thing as Theosophy exists, and to help them to ascend towards it by studying and assimilating its eternal verities.

Ideally, such a group of Theosophists would have no wisdom of its own to support or teach. It is simply the storehouse of all the truths uttered by the great seers, initiates, and prophets of historic and even prehistoric ages; at least, as many as it can get. Therefore, it is merely the channel through which more or less of truth, found in the accumulated utterances of humanity's great teachers, is poured out into the world.

Key, p. 58

Isolated individuals cannot incarnate such truth without the guidance of a master at first. But most of the followers of such, when they became masters in their turn, have dwarfed the universality of the original teachings into the narrow groove of their own sectarian dogmas. The commandments of a chosen master alone were then adopted and followed, to the exclusion of all others — if followed at all, note well, as in the case of the Sermon on the Mount. Each religion is thus a bit of divine truth, made to **focus a vast panorama of human fancy** which claims to represent and replace that truth.

Theosophy is not a religion since it is the essence of all religion and of absolute truth, a drop of which only

underlies every creed. To resort once more to metaphor. Theosophy, on earth, is like the white ray of the spectrum, and every religion only one of the seven prismatic colours. Ignoring all the others, and cursing them as false, every special colored ray claims not only priority, but to be **that white ray** itself, and anathematizes even its own tints from light to dark, as heresies. Yet, as the sun of truth rises **higher and higher on the horizon of man's perception, and each colored ray gradually fades out until it is finally reabsorbed** in its turn, humanity will at last be cursed no longer with artificial polarizations, but will find itself bathing in the pure colorless sunlight of eternal truth. And this will be **Theosophia**.

Our Theosophical Society is the humble seed which, if watered and left to live, will finally produce the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil which is grafted on the Tree of Life Eternal. For it is only by studying the various great religions and philosophies of humanity, by comparing them dispassionately and with an unbiased mind, that men can hope to arrive at the truth. It is especially by finding out and noting their various points of agreement that we may achieve this result. For no sooner do we arrive — either by study, or by being taught by someone who knows — at their inner meaning, than we find, almost in every case, that it expresses some great truth in Nature.

What we describe, is the coming age of Krita, the Golden age, but it will not be realized until humanity, as a whole, feels the need of it. A maxim in the Persian "Javidan Khirad" says: "Truth is of two kinds — one manifest and self-evident; the other kind demanding incessantly new demonstrations and proofs." It is only when this latter kind of truth becomes as universally obvious as it is now dim, and therefore liable to be distorted by sophistry and casuistry, that the two will become once more one, and all people be brought to see alike.

## V.

### THE FUNDAMENTAL TEACHINGS OF THEOSOPHY.

#### *On God and Prayer.*

We reject the idea of a personal, or an extra-cosmic and anthropomorphic God, who is but the gigantic shadow of man, and not of man at his best, either. The God of theology, we say — and prove it — is a bundle of contradictions and a logical impossibility. Therefore, we will have nothing to do with him.

Form implies limitation, and a beginning as well as an end; and, in order to create, a Being must think and plan. How can the ABSOLUTE be supposed to think — i.e., to have any relation whatever to that which is limited, finite, and conditioned? This is a philosophical, and a logical absurdity. Even the Hebrew Kabala rejects such an idea, and therefore, makes of the one and the Absolute Deific Principle an infinite Unity called Ain-Soph. In order to create, the Creator has to become active; and as this is impossible for **ABSOLUTENESS**, the infinite principle had to be shown becoming the cause of evolution (not creation) in an indirect way — i.e., through the emanation from itself (another absurdity, due this time to the translators of the Kabala) of the Sephiroth.

How can the non-active eternal principle emanate or emit? The Parabrahm of the Vedantin does nothing of the kind; nor does the Ain-Soph of the Chaldean Kabala. It is an eternal and periodical law which causes an active and creative force (the logos) to emanate from the ever-concealed and incomprehensible one principle at the beginning of every maha-manvantara, or new cycle of life.

*Thus we* are in no sense Atheists, unless the term is to be applied to those who disbelieve in an anthropomorphic God. We believe in a Universal Divine Principle, the root of ALL, from which all proceeds, and within which all shall be absorbed at the end of the great cycle of Being.

Nor are we Pantheists, unless one etymologizes the word Pantheism esoterically. We neither take into consideration this objective and material nature, which we call an evanescent illusion, nor do we mean by "Pan," Nature, in the sense of its accepted derivation from the Latin **Natura** (becoming, from **nasci**, to be born). When we speak of the Deity and make it identical, hence coeval, with Nature, **the eternal and uncreate nature is meant**, and not your aggregate of flitting shadows and finite unrealities. Our **DEITY** is neither in a paradise, nor in a particular tree, building, or mountain: it is everywhere, in every atom of the visible as of the invisible Cosmos, in, over, and around invisible atom and divisible molecule; for IT is the **mysterious power of evolution and involution, the omnipresent, omnipotent, and even omniscient creative potentiality.**

However omniscient IT may be, however, we deny the power of thought to the **ABSOLUTE**, since thought is something limited and conditioned. In philosophy absolute unconsciousness is also absolute consciousness, as otherwise it would not be **absolute**. So, too, the Absolute does not think for the reason that it is **Absolute Thought** itself. Nor does it exist, for the same reason, as it is absolute existence, and **Be-ness**, not a Being.

Read the superb Kabalistic poem by Solomon Ben Jehudah Gabirol, in the Kether-Malchut, and you will understand: — "Thou art one, the root of all numbers, but not as an element of numeration; for unity admits not of multiplication, change, or form. Thou art one, and in the secret of Thy unity the wisest of men are lost, because they know it not. Thou art one, and Thy unity is never diminished, never extended, and cannot be changed. Thou art one, and no thought of mine can fix for Thee a limit, or define Thee. Thou ART, but not as one existent, for the understanding and vision of mortals cannot attain to Thy existence, nor determine for Thee the where, the how and the why," etc., etc. In short, our Deity is the eternal, incessantly

evolving, not creating, builder of the universe; that **universe itself** unfolding out of its own essence, not being made. It is a sphere, without circumference, in its symbolism, which has but one ever-acting attribute embracing all other existing or thinkable attributes — ITSELF. It is the one law, giving the impulse to manifested, eternal, and immutable laws, within that never-manifesting, because absolute LAW, which in its manifesting periods is **The ever-Becoming.**

Key, p. 66

### Is it Necessary to Pray?

We do not pray, we act, instead of **talking**. Being well-occupied people, we can hardly afford to lose time in addressing verbal prayers to a pure abstraction. The Unknowable is capable of relations only in its parts to each other, but is non-existent as regards any finite relations. The visible universe depends for its existence and phenomena on its mutually acting forms and their laws, not on prayer or prayers.

We do not believe in the efficacy of prayer such as that taught in so many words and repeated externally, if by prayer you mean the outward petition to an unknown God as the addressee, which was inaugurated by the Jews and popularised by the Pharisees.

There is, however, another kind of prayer. We call it **WILL-PRAYER**. This kind of prayer is rather **an internal command** than a petition. Thus we pray to "our Father in heaven" — in its esoteric meaning, a meaning entirely different from the one given to it in theology. An Occultist or a Theosophist addresses his prayer to **his Father which is in secret**, not to an extra-cosmic and therefore finite God; and that "Father" is in man himself. The inner man is the only God we can have cognizance of. And how can this be otherwise? Grant **US** our postulate that God is a universally diffused, infinite principle, and how can man alone escape from being soaked through by, and in, the Deity? We call our "Father in heaven" that deific essence of *which*

we are cognizant within us, in our heart and spiritual consciousness, and which has *nothing* to do with the anthropomorphic conception we may form of it in our physical brain or its fancy: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of (the absolute) God dwelleth in you?"<sup>1</sup>

Key, p. 68

Yet, let no man anthropomorphize that essence in us. Let no Theosophist, if he would hold to divine, not human truth, say that this "God in secret" listens to, or is distinct from, either finite man or the infinite essence — for all are one. Nor, as just remarked, that a prayer is a petition. It is a mystery rather; an occult process by which finite and conditioned thoughts and desires, unable to be assimilated by the absolute spirit which is unconditioned, are translated into spiritual wills and the will; such process being called "spiritual transmutation." The intensity of our ardent aspirations changes prayer into the "philosopher's stone," or that which transmutes lead into pure gold. The only homogeneous essence, our "will-prayer" becomes the active or creative force, producing effects according to our desire.

What we describe is an occult process bringing about physical results; **Will-Power** becomes a living power. But

<sup>1</sup> One often finds in Theosophical writings conflicting statements about the Christos principle in man. Some call it the sixth principle (Buddha), others the seventh (Atman). If Christian Theosophists wish to make use of such expressions, let them be made philosophically correct by following the analogy of the old Wisdom-religion symbols. We say that Christos is not only one of the three higher principles, but all the three regarded as a Trinity. This Trinity represents the Holy Ghost, the Father, and the Son, as it answers to abstract spirit, differentiated spirit, and embodied spirit. Krishna and Christ are philosophically the same principle under its triple aspect of manifestation. In the Bhagavatgita we find Krishna calling himself indifferently Atman, the abstract Spirit, Kshetragna, the Higher or reincarnating Ego, and the Universal SELF, all names which, when transferred from the Universe to man, answer to *Atma*, *Buddhi* and *Manas*. The *Anugita* is full of the same doctrine.

woe unto those Occultists and Theosophists, who, instead of crushing out the desires of the lower personal ego or physical man, and saying, addressing their **Higher** Spiritual **EGO** immersed in Atma-Buddhic light, "Thy will be done, not mine," etc., send up waves of will-power for selfish or unholy purposes'. For this is black magic, abomination, and spiritual sorcery.

While universal belief in the efficacy of prayer is universal, it has several other meanings besides that given it by the Christians. It means not only a pleading or **petition**, but meant, in days of old, far more an invocation and incantation. The **mantra**, or the rhythmically chanted prayer of the Hindus, has precisely such a meaning, as the Brahmins hold themselves higher than the common **devas** or "Gods." A prayer may be an appeal or an incantation for malediction, and a curse (as in the case of two armies praying simultaneously for mutual destruction) as much as for blessing. And as the great majority of people are intensely selfish, and pray only for themselves, asking to be **given** their "daily bread" instead of working for it, and begging God not to lead them "into temptation" but to deliver them (the memorialists only) from evil, the result is that prayer, as now understood, is doubly pernicious:

Key, p. 70

- (a) It kills in man self-reliance;
- (b) It develops in him a still more ferocious selfishness and egotism than he is already endowed with by nature.

I repeat, that we believe in "communion" and simultaneous action in unison with our "Father in secret;" **and in rare moments of ecstatic bliss, in the mingling of our higher soul with the universal essence**, attracted as it is towards its origin and centre, a state, called during life *Samadhi*, and after death, *Nirvana*.

We refuse to pray to **created** finite beings — i.e., *gods, saints, angels*, etc., because we regard it as idolatry. We cannot pray to the ABSOLUTE for reasons explained before; therefore, we

try to replace fruitless and useless prayer by meritorious and good-producing actions.

Buddha says, "seek nought from the helpless Gods— pray not! **but rather act**; for darkness will not brighten. Ask nought from silence, for it can neither speak nor hear." And Jesus recommends: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name (that of Christos) that will I do." Of course, this quotation, if taken in its **literal** sense, goes against our argument. But if we accept it esoterically, with the full knowledge of the meaning of the term, "Christos," which to *us* represents **Atma-Buddhi-Manas**, the "SELF," it comes to this: the only God we must recognise and pray to, or rather act in unison with, is that spirit of God of which our body is the temple, and in which it dwelleth.

Key, p. 71

#### **Prayer Kills Self-Reliance.**

When Christ prayed, his "prayers" were precisely of that kind of communion just mentioned with one's "Father in secret."

Some Christians argue in this way, "I feel that I am not able to conquer any passions and weaknesses in my own strength; but when I pray to Jesus Christ,

I feel that he gives me strength, and that in His power I am able to conquer."

To this we would answer, "No wonder. If 'Christ Jesus' is god, and one independent and separate from him who prays, of course everything is, and **must** be possible to 'a mighty God.' But, then, where's the merit, or justice either, of such a conquest? Why should the pseudo-conqueror be rewarded for something done which has cost him only prayers? Would you, even a simple mortal man, pay your labourer a full day's wage if you did most of his work for him, he sitting under an apple tree, and praying to you to do so, all the while?

This idea of passing one's whole life in moral idleness, and having one's

hardest work and duty done by another — whether God or man — is most revolting to us, as it is most degrading to human dignity."

We do not doubt that those who believe do feel themselves helped and strengthened. Nor is there any more doubt, that some patients of "Christian" and "Mental Scientists" — the great "**Deniers**"<sup>2</sup> — are also sometimes cured; nor that hypnotism, and suggestion, psychology, and even mediumship, will produce such results, as often, if not oftener. Proponents of these methods take into consideration, and string on the thread of their argument, successes alone, ignoring the tenfold larger sum of failures.

A Theosophist looks to the divine spirit, or the God in him, and to his **Karma**, for power to subdue his passions and selfishness? In due time there is a fruition of effort in all this, and truly, the tree is known by its fruit, the nature of the cause by its effects? 4 Where do we find more virtuous, guiltless people, abstaining from sin and crime, in Christendom or Buddhism — in Christian countries or in heathen lands? Statistics are there to give the answer and corroborate our claims. According to the last census in Ceylon and India, in the comparative table of crimes committed by Christians, Musclemen, Hindus, Eurasians, Buddhists, etc., etc., on two millions of population taken at random from each, and covering the misdemeanours of several years, the proportion of crimes committed by the Christian stands as 15 to 4 as against those committed by the Buddhist population. (Vide Lucifer for April, 1888, p. 147. Art. Christian lecturers on Buddhism.) No Orientalist, no historian of any note, or traveller in Buddhist lands, from Bishop Bigandet and Abbe Huc, to Sir William Hunter and every fair-minded official, will fail to give the palm of virtue to Buddhists before

<sup>2</sup> The new sect of healers, who, by disavowing the existence of anything but spirit, which spirit can neither suffer nor be ill, claim to cure all and every disease, provided the patient has faith that what he denies can have no existence. A new form of self-hypnotism.

Christians. Yet the former (not the true Buddhist Siamese sect, at all events) do not believe in either God or a future reward, outside of this earth. They do not pray, neither priests nor laymen. "Pray!" they would exclaim in wonder, "to whom, or what?" We may call them Atheists, but they are also the most virtue-loving and virtue-keeping men in the whole world. Buddhism says: Respect the religions of other men and remain true to your own; but Church Christianity, denouncing all the gods of other nations as devils, would doom every **non-Christian** to eternal perdition.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

## On the Lighter Side

### "Tater People"

Some people never seem motivated to participate, but are just content to watch while others do the work.

They are called "Speck Taters".

Some people never do anything to help, but are gifted at finding fault with the way others do the work.

They are called "Comment Taters".

Some people are very bossy and like to tell others what to do, but don't want to soil their own hands.

They are called "Dick Taters".

Some people are always looking to cause problems by asking others to agree with them. It is too hot or too cold, too sour or too sweet.

They are called "Agie Taters".

There are those who say they will help, but somehow just never get around to actually doing the promised help.

They are called "Hezzie Taters".

Some people can put up a front and pretend to be someone they are not. They are called "Emma Taters".

Then there are those who love others and do what they say they will. They are always prepared to stop whatever they are doing and lend a helping hand.

They bring real sunshine into the lives of others.

They are called "SweetTaters".