



SCIENTIFIC OCCULTISM

DAVID HATCH

Global Grey ebooks

SCIENTIFIC OCCULTISM

A HYPOTHETICAL BASIS OF LIFE

BY

DAVID HATCH

1905

Scientific Occultism by David Hatch.

This edition was created and published by Global Grey

©GlobalGrey 2018



globalgreyebooks.com

CONTENTS

Introduction

Unity Polarized

Force Is Conscious

The Law Of Rhythm

The Doctrine Of The Law Of Opposites

The Law Of Ethics

Criminology

Mind And Matter

Immortality Individual And Universal

The Will

INTRODUCTION

Belief in a Law that has ever been and must forever be the basic and fundamental principle of life has always existed. Thinkers and philosophers in all ages have exerted their ingenuity and genius to discover this Law, which would solve the various and multiple manifestations called life, with divers degrees of success or failure. The very effort to discover this Law is self-evident proof of its existence. Yet the great mass of mankind is asking this question at the beginning of the Twentieth Century: "What is the fundamental Law or Principle underlying the countless phenomena known as life."

We do not hope to answer this vital question to the satisfaction of all; we do expect, however, to state a Hypothesis upon which the various phenomena of life may be shown to have an explanation that is in no way antagonistic to the established principles of modern science; but is, in fact, in perfect harmony with the very essence of modern science, so far as science is established in its various branches; and broad enough and sufficiently comprehensive to be called a philosophy of life.

In stating our position we realize that the value of any hypothesis depends upon its capacity to reveal facts before unknown, and to account for those already known.

In order to make clear our understanding of the terms Law, laws, and life, we will define them in their proper given, and upon the meaning of these terms, as defined, do we base this argument.

Definition of Law: Law is the Inevitable, the Constant, the mathematics of combination or environment, the necessity for specialization—a thing unthinkable save that **It is**.

Definition of the Laws: The laws are tendencies ; they are that quality or state tending toward some purpose as accomplishing a result. They are the specializations of the Law. The Law is one pole of being, the laws are the opposite pole.

Many laws that control certain phenomena are known to science, but no one of these laws control all the phenomena which we define as life.

These laws of science are the countless tendencies which result from the necessity for specialization inherent in Law itself. They are the mathematical principles in the combinations that make the environments of life.

We trust that this will make plain the distinction between Law, as we define it, and the laws which are observed in the myriad phenomena of life.

Definition of Life: Life is variety, motion, manifestation, specialization in its various forms, resulting in combinations or environment; it is the end, purpose, and result of the laws; the experience of the Will.

Having stated our definitions of Law, laws, and life, it is next in order to state the hypothesis upon which we base this argument.

The Hypothesis: We postulate immortal Units of Force, each having the power to generate a constant but limited amount of energy, and no two alike in quantity. Upon this force generation in the Unit, necessitated by Law, do we base life. Life results from the inter-dealing and inter-playing of these Units among themselves eternally, sometimes potential, again kinetic, each limited in the amount of force generated, but unlimited in variety of motion, manifestation or specialization.

A principle that is assumed to be the base of any science or philosophy can never be established by that science or philosophy, yet all reasoning and conclusions must of necessity rest upon some assumed postulate; hence if our hypothesis can be shown to account reasonably for the various expressions, manifestations, and specializations, which we term life, it is but logical to conclude that it is the true hypothesis, at least until it shall be proven false by some system more comprehensive in its capacity to reveal unknown facts and to account for those already known.

A short analysis of the hypothesis, at this point, may aid the reader to a better understanding and a clearer comprehension of its scope. We will consider it briefly.

Units of Force may be thought of as original centers of force; parts possessing all the qualities of the whole, yet remaining parts only. As there can be no generalization without specialization, no unity without variety, it follows, from this axiom, that to have a whole there must be

parts, at least two, and given two, **ex necessitate** there are innumerables, or infinity in variety.

We predicate of the Unit of Force the power to generate a constant but limited amount of energy. It is apparent that the power to generate force is something different from the force generated. The energy produced can be considered only as a result of the exercise of this power in the Unit. We cannot conceive of a power generating itself, as something cannot come from no-thing.

Generation, according to the hypothesis, means calling into activity that which existed potentially in the Unit of Force. "We can comprehend a power producing the phenomena called force. Manifest force is the result of the activity of this power in the Unit. The power is a cause, and as no other cause is given in the hypothesis, it must be the original or primal cause.

We also posit of the Unit that it is sometimes active and sometimes potential. It logically follows that this power in the Unit can act or not act as it chooses. There being no other element in the hypothesis to influence this power in its action, it must be primal or original. Not being compelled by causes outside itself, it must be free and sovereign. As the Unit is limited in its power of generation, it is limited in quantity, but being free to act or not to act, as it chooses, it is unlimited in quality or variety.

The hypothesis further predicates life as the result of the interplaying and interdealing of these Units of Force among themselves eternally, each limited in the amount of energy that it may generate, but as no two Units are alike in quantity, without limitation in variety of individual action, motion, expression, manifestation or specialization; thus arises the ceaseless variety known as the phenomena of life.

We define Law as being constant. It cannot then be considered as having a limit in the sense of not being continuous. Hence life must be unlimited and eternal; and for the reason that the Unit is limited in the quantity of its power, life is limited in the sense of individualized, specialized action.

As this argument is based on the hypothesis, and the meaning of Law, laws, and life, as we have defined them, we shall not discuss the various

psychological, theological, and metaphysical questions that may arise. We attempt to account for the phenomena of life upon a hypothetical premise, and not upon any theory or dogma not contained in the hypothesis.

The hypothesis is our concept of the foundation of all life, and must contain the elements necessary to account for the various manifestations of the entire universe, otherwise it cannot contain the true and fundamental principle of life.

Knowledge, to be satisfactory, must meet the demands of reason. The more abstract any system of knowledge becomes, the narrower the field it appropriates to itself. The more comprehensive knowledge becomes, the more nearly it approaches philosophy.

We conceive philosophy to be an attempt to know the universe as a whole, though there can be no such thing as the finality of universal philosophy. There is no fundamental difference between science and philosophy; the difference is one of degree.

In presenting this argument in support of our hypothesis, it is with the assent that our definition of life be accepted as the true one. Those who interpret manifested life to mean something else than variety, motion, manifestation, or specialization, will find nothing within these pages to aid them in the solution of the basic and fundamental principle underlying the countless phenomena that go to make up that which we have defined as life. This assertion applies with equal force to the definitions of Law and the laws.

One thing further we wish to make clear at this point; it is this: Philosophy considered universally can never be synthetic. Universal philosophy in its finality is changeless Law, which is an equalization between synthesis and analysis, two parts of one; that is, when the tearing down and the building up balance, there is neither. Consequently the finality of universal philosophy is not synthetic; therefore it is absolute. It is principle, Law; it can neither be tom down nor built upon. It cannot be synthetic, for synthesis implies change as well as analysis.

As synthesis implies change, a thing that is synthetic is not final. If, however, we posit that some particular philosophy is synthetic, we may reach the finality or Law in regard to this particular philosophy. In such

case the finality in the universal sense is held in abeyance to the law of some combination of particulars. The synthesis in this case would not lie in any change of this particular law, but rather in adding to our stock of knowledge more laws, a building up, as it were, of our structure of particulars toward a unit, a more synthetic or analytic wholeness.

It follows from this, that synthesis is possible so long as universal philosophy is not acquired. A particular finality of knowledge is not universality of knowledge. Synthetic philosophy being an accumulation of particular laws, is therefore possible.

Deductive philosophy descends from completeness or absoluteness, and in its premise is not synthetic. Inductive philosophy ascends from incompleteness or particulars, and in its premise is synthetic.

From the point of the final solution of things, universal philosophy is not synthetic, hence not analytic; but from the point of induction, where the solution is still unsettled and hypothetical, philosophy is synthetic.

To state the whole question in the form of a syllogism, we would say:

The finality of philosophy is changeless Law.

Synthesis implies change.

Therefore a synthesis is not a finality or Law.

Synthesis is possible so long as universal knowledge is not acquired.

A particular finality of knowledge is not a universality of knowledge.

Therefore a synthetic philosophy in its accumulation of particulars or finalities is possible.

With this view of philosophy, and the fact of the law of synthesis, and our hypothesis, and the use of the terms Law, laws, and life, according to our understanding as defined by us, we will proceed with the argument.

UNITY POLARIZED

We assume that no one will attempt to contradict the statement that there can be no specialization without generalization, no unity without variety. To express the same truth differently, we say, Unity is polarized. A whole in the sense of unity must contain parts, at least two, and given two necessitates innumerables; hence to deny quality in specialization is to declare the annihilation of the very generalization itself. The nature of two, generalization and specialization, necessitates infinite variety. And as generalization and specialization do exist, generalization conceived as unity, wholeness, must be polarized.

The universe, considered as a whole, to will the first time must be two. Unity polarized, otherwise the conception of expression in things by Thing-in-itself would be impossible. And as something never came from no-thing, Thing-in-itself must always have been polarized, been things also.

This reasoning applies as well to matter as to mind. Things considered as things are eternal if only in idea. Matter is but a phase, a bagatelle, a focus, and things in idea necessitate time and space, orderly sequence, locality in the abstract at least if not in concrete form; therefore we have immortality of things co-existent with Thing-in-itself.

Having reached the conclusion that all things are the result of a polarized Unity, are parts of Thing-in-itself, we further conclude that the Unit of our hypothesis is the whole in quality and a part only in quantity.

We cannot conceive of the parts that comprise the whole of a thing, possessing fewer qualities than the whole of which they are the parts. For the purpose of illustration, take the Unit of Force to stand for man; man would be the whole in quality and a part only in quantity; and this is our contention.

Man's consciousness arises from the fact of the potentiality, in himself, of the thing of which he is conscious. Subject, self, becomes conscious of object by reason of the potentiality of object in subject. Subject could not be conscious of object, would have nothing in itself to respond to object,

were it not for this fact. As consciousness cannot result from no-thing, it must result from something; this something is the potentiality of object in subject, otherwise manifestation in things by Thing-in-itself, man, would be impossible. To say to the contrary would be to assert that consciousness of object might arise from no-thing, a statement which would be opposed by both reason and science.

Subject becomes object to other selves that possess the same universal qualities. Subject and object are alike conscious of all things outside themselves, and in turn become object to them, by reason of the potentiality of object in subject.

Consciousness of a thing and knowledge concerning it are two distinct things. While it is true that we can know nothing of a thing without being conscious of it, by the very law of opposites, we may be conscious of a thing and have no knowledge concerning it, no concept of its qualities. This is self-evident and needs no illustration. It is for this reason that the Unit of Force is conscious of qualities which in their finality can never be known. Were it not for the fact that the Unit of Force possesses these qualities in potentiality, it could have no consciousness of them. We do not say that all Units of Force manifest consciousness in a perceptible degree; we maintain only that they possess it in potentiality. Consciousness of a quality depends on the activity of the Unit along the line of the particular quality of which it is conscious.

Let us further consider these Units of Force: We postulate immortal Units of Force, with power to generate a constant but limited amount of energy, and no two alike in quantity. This power to evolve energy implies the power to involve; one depends on the other. A constant evolving of energy would _be equivalent to a static condition, annihilation, which is inconceivable; it is also contradicted by science. The power to evolve must be a polarized power, capable of producing opposite qualities, as the manifestations produced by evolving and involving are opposite in character. Hence the Unit is polarized, and as evolving implies specialization and involving generalization, it must contain the qualities of specialization and generalization. As specialization implies quality, and as the Unit of Force has the power to generate a constant but limited amount of energy, it follows that in quality, variety, the Unit must be unlimited. Further, as generalization is the opposite of specialization,

and as specialization implies quality, it follows that generalization in its finality, unity, can manifest no qualities. And hence a quality may exist in potentiality, with no apparent manifestation.

Polarization, then, is an attribute of the Unit of Force, which it expresses only in activity, when the Unit is kinetic. It is the manifested quality of the Unit, hence all expression, motion, specializations are coexistent with the Unit and therefore immortal. Things become Thing, in the sense of absolute unity, and are no longer things.

We can have no comprehension of things except through time and space. Time being the principle of sequence, comprehended in consciousness, belongs only to specialization; for there is no time in unity, because no sequence. Space being the principle of simultaneous existences, comprehended in consciousness, belongs only to specialization; for there can be no space in absolute unity, as things in that aspect are Thing and not coexistent.

Thus the Unit of Force of our hypothesis, considered in this argument as man, contains potentially all qualities in itself, but being limited in the amount of force it can generate, is part only in quantity. And thus some Units of Force may, during the period from the beginning of a Grand Cycle to its close, pass through all stages of manifested life from the amoeba to the archangel.

We do not postulate of the Unit of Force that it is always active to the limit of its power, but that it possesses the power to generate energy. Its activity or potentiality depends upon its Will; it has the power to act or not to act as it chooses.

Upon these immortal Units of Force, each limited in quantity, and no two alike in amount of energy, some active, others potential, interdealing and interplaying among themselves eternally, do we base immorttal life.

There is no action, expression, manifestation or specialization in all the countless forms of variety, that cannot be accounted for upon our hypothesis. In making this statement we do not say that we have discovered and understand all the causes that govern such manifestations or specializations, but as yet science has discovered and demonstrated no law that is not based on or may not be accounted for by our hypothesis.

Rhythm depends upon this law of polarity. It is the essence of rhythm rather than rhythm the essence of it. This, however, will further appear in the chapter on the Law of Rhythm.

FORCE IS CONSCIOUS

Force is conscious when incoherent, unsatisfied, pliable and elastic. We have shown that the amount of force in the universe has always been and must forever remain the same. For the reason which we then gave, all things also must have always been that now are or ever can be either potentially or in activity. Something can not come from no-thing, hence the converse is true, that something can never be lost or become no-thing. All things are potential in the bosom of the eternal; they are called out through desire, which is one definition of Will.

While things remain Thing or Unity, we are not conscious of them. This is so because we are conscious only through change; consciousness is the establishment of relations that arise through variety, manifestation, motion or any other form of change. Change is compelled by Law, which we define as the necessity to specialize.

When change takes place consciousness is a result. The All-consciousness of today is vastly different from the All-consciousness of a century past. The All-consciousness of tomorrow will be the All-consciousness of today plus the consciousness of tomorrow, and so on from the beginning of the present Grand Cycle to its close.

Force in potentiality is mind asleep; force in activity is mind awake. The power in the Unit of Force to evolve energy, is the power to produce change or manifestation. Just in proportion as this power is exercised does the Unit become conscious and acquire knowledge based on this consciousness, developed through change or experience, up to its limit. The individual limit is not in variety, but in specialized action. Units of Force being immortal and having the power to generate constant energy, cause expression, motion, manifestation, life eternal, an endless chain of being without break or separation.

The foundation of evolution is based on the experiences of these Units of Force, acquired through activity, or what we define as life. If it were possible that the experiences thus acquired could be lost or annihilated, evolution would cease in exact relation to the experience lost. That consciousness is possible only through change, we believe to be the

consensus of modern thought by those who have given the subject the greatest attention.

Change therefore becomes the source of consciousness. Change is a cause and consciousness a result. It follows from this that ceaseless change is the only condition under which continuous consciousness could exist. Change must be both internal and external. Primitive consciousness arises from the simplest order of change; complex consciousness arises from the multiplicity of experiences. Just in proportion as our experiences increase does our consciousness become more diversified and complex.

Mind in the broadest and most comprehensive meaning, is the sum of the individual's conscious experiences, the organized whole of our thoughts and feelings, the totality of our mental processes, the unity of our perceptions, a series of consciousnesses more or less sharply differentiated, the whole developed through ceaseless myriads of manifestations which we know as life.

That force is conscious is capable of absolute and mathematical demonstration, a demonstration that amounts to a certainty, basing consciousness on change or variety. Primitive consciousness, it is true, is but the beginning of organized thought and feeling, the first of our mental processes, the corner stone of the mental structure reared in this Grand Cycle.

To illustrate:

First. Equal force in all directions at the same time; phenomena, no motion or all motion.

Second. Equal force in two directions at the same time; phenomena, motion in a direction between the two forces, or if equal force be exerted in two exactly opposite directions, phenomena, no motion if toward each other, but with resultant, dynamic, explosive tension, which will seek the lines of least resistance, in directions nearest the right angle. .

Third. Equal force in all directions but one; phenomena, motion away from the point of that direction, or more clearly, motion in the direction from which no force emanates.

Fourth. All force in one direction; phenomena, exactly opposite to that of the last proposition, and yet, as we are dealing with spheres, it is the exact equivalent of the phenomena of the last proposition.

Let us apply these propositions to consciousness, which we may do with perfect assurance that they will fit, and then consider this: Consciousness of a quality named, hardness and softness, for instance; hardness you can easily perceive is not a true quality; it is a name for a departure from an arbitrarily fixed yet nevertheless variable point in one direction; softness is a departure from the same point in the opposite direction.

The zero point of the thermometer of quality depends upon the present application of the object to which it is directed in measurement.

Consciousness of quality is a question of successive presentations of the quality, in relation to that arbitrary point; therefore consciousness of quality depends upon environment and force exerted in that environment, in less than all directions. Consciousness of quantity must depend upon consciousness of quality, as you have it given above.

All physical force is from without, hence from circumference to center; hence proposition No. 3 would result in a vortex sphere and not a vortex ring. The earth was a vortex sphere with its forward motion, during its formation, and the invisible maintainer of its physical adherence is a vortex sphere of magnetism.

Now, as what you can postulate of matter you cannot of mind, you will suggest that the opposite should be true of mind and consciousness, and we must not shrink from the result; for if our premise be correct, this is exactly the situation. Inasmuch as this energy is mind itself, we cannot postulate the propositions as applied to matter. They may be applied to the dynamic, activity of mind, but with directly opposite phenomena.

We have been considering force from circumference to center, or from the matter pole; and it is evident that all such energy, except at the point from which none comes, is "massed" at the •center, and is ' 'capable,' ' in other words, dynamic. From this center, which is the mind pole, force operates from within out, or from center to circumference; hence proposition No. 3 would result in a movement from center to circumference, in all directions but one, and that one would be the direction from which the sphere enters itself. Hence mind and matter are

one, but opposite, and hence also the Unit of Force swings its consciousness from the center.

Always as we approach the mind pole, we find matter unsettled and “dissatisfied,” owing to contesting forces, some from within and some from without, as in protoplasm; and also always as we approach the matter pole, we find matter settled and “satisfied,” while yet the dynamic of dissatisfaction is ever about it. The matter pole is always on the verge of at once departing to the other, and the mind pole, while on the verge of drawing the other back, is ceaselessly hurling it forth again.

Bear in mind that in all units of force there must be one direction from which force does not operate or there could be no motion; there is motion, therefore this condition exists; and remember also that the direction from which no force operates is the very direction in which the mind pole finds its opportunity. Hence matter is always falling into the vortex of mind, to be hurled out in another direction.

The line along which force does not travel from circumference to center and along which force does travel from center to circumference, is the fulcrum platform for creative energy. And in the multiplicity of material objects this is an ever-shifting line, and is the point of contact with the fourth dimension.

Energy is conscious. When incoherent, unsatisfied, unequated, pliable and elastic, matter follows the trend of energy. When coherent, satisfied, equated, hard and brittle, matter takes upon itself a synthetic motion equal to the energy which created it, which energy, however, still keeps up its original motion as a necessary preservative. Energy is creative; it is the soul of things.

THE LAW OF RHYTHM

It should be understood that we are considering the phenomena of life as manifested in the present Grand Cycle. What the forms of life may have been in previous cycles or what future cycles may have in store, we can only conjecture. Basing the conclusion on the constancy of Law as we know it in the present Cycle, we are justified in the belief that life has always been and must forever remain the same, that is, exist in accordance with the present Law. However that may be, we are here only attempting to assign a hypothesis of life from which all observed phenomena may be regarded as flowing logically and scientifically.

Polarity is the essence of rhythm, and not rhythm the essence of polarity. It is inherent in the Unit of Force. It is the fundamental principle that lies back of all the forms of life. It is that which causes action and reaction or rhythm. It is the result of the Law, the mathematics of combination and environment, hence constant and changeless.

We shall continue the argument in support of the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites as set forth in the previous chapter. We claim nothing new for what is given here, except the hypothesis upon which we base our solution of conscious existence. This is different from any other that has come within our knowledge, hence the incentive for continuing the argument as far as the limit of this work will permit.

It is evident that from the point of unity or oneness there can be no motion, therefore no rhythm, therefore no specialization. Consciousness being the establishment of relations, things in unity or oneness cannot be comprehended in consciousness.

We postulate Units of Force with power to generate or produce force. When energy is produced motion appears, always rhythmic in its action, producing effects which are opposite in quality—the result of action and reaction, which is always equal in amount of force displayed and opposite in characteristics. Action and reaction are a pair of opposites possessing the basic qualities of all pairs of opposites.

At this point specialization begins in its simplest and most homogeneous form. It is the point where the Units begin to interplay and interdeal among themselves. Life becomes more complex and heterogeneous as the activities of the Units increase in force, consequently in vibration, producing countless forms of manifestation, resulting in the endless chain of life.

As all motion is rhythmic, and as each individual Unit is limited in the amount of energy it can generate, there arises rhythm within rhythm, cycle within cycle, wheel within wheel, producing innumerable forms of expression, variety, life; Changeless Unity has become changeable by reason of polarity. As the activities of the Units increase in strength and velocity, the rhythmic cycles multiply in the same ratio, and sweep along from low to high tide, each cause producing its own effect, and the rhythms diverging in countless ways.

Rhythmic action produces the different properties of the elements of which matter is composed: Let us consider briefly the mystery known as substance. In the light of modern science, what is it? Substance in its finality can never be known. One of the basic principles of the Law of Opposites is, that what you can posit of one pole of a thing you cannot of the other. But what does science teach us of the properties of the elements?

There are more than seventy so called elements that compose matter. The various properties of each element science admits to be but the "periodic function of its atomic weight". This is the great Periodic Law of Chemistry, amounting almost to proof positive of the qualitative unity of matter. Since the discovery of this law in 1869, several new elements have been brought to light, each of which, as soon as its atomic weight was discovered, took the place assigned it by the Law of Periodicity, years before its existence was known.

What great truth is it that this law of modern chemistry teaches? If the properties of the elements constituting what we now know as matter, are but the "periodic functions of their atomic weights" the logical conclusion is, that should this rhythmic function cease throughout the universe, all qualitative distinctions of the various elements that compose matter would disappear, therefore matter would be dissolved into the ultimate, final, and primary condition. There is no escaping the

further conclusion, that if the properties of the elements, therefore the properties of matter, be the result of rhythmic motion, the qualitative difference that distinguishes one phase of matter from another, as gold from silver, iron from lead, etc., is nothing else than a combination, the result of rhythmic law, the fundamental principle of which is polarity, inherent in the Unit of Force. Further, as the various properties of matter are the results of force in manifestation, or to express it more accurately, we would say, the manifestations of force; we connect cause and effect, and declare matter and force to be opposite expressions of the same thing.

We have said that force is conscious when incoherent, pliable and elastic. It will be quickly assumed that our contention is, that mind and matter are but opposite expressions of one and the same thing, which is correct.

We have further shown that matter takes upon itself a synthetic motion equal to the energy of the motion which produced it; which energy still keeps up the original motion as a necessary preservative. This is only a more comprehensive statement of the Law of Chemistry, that the *i* 4 properties of the elements are the periodic functions of their atomic weight." Here again we find science resting its latest conclusions upon a basis not unlike our own in so far as it goes. We go farther, and predicate a hypothesis upon which this and all other observed phenomena may be accounted for without doing injustice to either logic or science.

To conform to the Law of Opposites, if force is conscious at one pole of expression, it must be unconscious at the other. Thus mind and matter are opposite expressions of the same thing. In absolute unity there can be no force, therefore no rhythm, no matter, no mind, no consciousness in manifestation.

The Doctrine of the Law of Opposites is based on the fundamental principles of the qualitative difference in things. It teaches duality based on polarity, and accounts for the universality of rhythm by the principle of polarity. Qualitative difference or opposite characteristics of the same thing, are the result of action and reaction or rhythm.

For a simple application of the Law of Opposites consider this: When health is ebbing or reacting, disease is always active, and vice versa. All pairs of opposites can be tested by this Law. When this principle cannot

be applied it is because the attempt is made to apply it to things that are not opposite in quality, therefore not different manifestations of the same thing. Manifestation of the opposite characteristics of a thing is caused by action and reaction or rhythm. When this law acts all things manifest qualitative differences, that is qualities that are opposite in the complete sense of the word.

As the law of action and reaction is universal, it must be conceded that the Law of Opposites is equally so. But what of the facts? Does experience bear this out! Let us quote Herbert Spencer: "Nations rise and fall with unvarying regularity, carrying in their racial cycle the rhythmic rise and decline of religions and customs never again to be adopted as a whole by other races to follow. Species in animal life appear and flourish for a time, then decline and finally disappear."

The same law holds good in the growth, fruition and decay of plant life, which reappears from its own seed another year. This is life coming and going; it meets us on every side. The rhythm of an individual human life, with its tragedies of birth and death, testify to the same universal truth. The very round of our daily duties and pleasures is in obedience to the same law that holds the planets in their spaces. The astronomer bases his calculations of the movements of the heavenly bodies upon this Law of Periodicity, and he has never been deceived. Thus we might enumerate every conceivable phase of life as the result of this law, which is inherent in the Unit of Force of our hypothesis.

In the lower orders of life rhythm is very simple, scarcely more than primitive, but as we ascend the scale it increases in complexity and grandeur. As rhythmic action multiplies, changes become rapid, manifestations recur with increasing variations, cycles become intermingled with cycles; and we, with our usual observation, recognize only those demonstrations that appeal to us most forcibly at the time.

Wherever we discover force—and it is omnipresent—there we find rhythm. There is no absolutely static condition in nature; a perfect equilibrium is never reached; either one pole or the other forever predominates in manifestation. Should we approach an approximately static condition, consciousness would cease, and all things would sleep in fathomless Unity.

The Law of Rhythm is apparent in the realm of mind. It is admitted that thinking is the result of the establishment of relations—a necessary sequence. The maintenance of consciousness in any one state to the entire exclusion of all other states, would amount to a cessation of all thought. We know that emotions swing from one pole to the other; love changes to hate, sorrow to joy, hope to fear, a good deed is often followed by an evil one, intellectual activity reacts to a sluggish mental state, a long period of silence demands expression in words.

However we turn we find that every form and fact of life is but the expression of this Law. It is the Law of effects that must necessarily result from causes, varying in their ratio of vibration from the highest to the lowest. According to the quickness or slowness of the motion is the person or thing said to be in the high or low tide of its rhythm. Force is constant. Rhythm is ceaseless. There is no absolute equilibrium anywhere; all is motion, specialization, life. The swing of a Grand Cycle is from Unity to the many and back again. The many compose the One; they are co-existent; neither could be without the other. Dualism is the half of its eternal mate, monism; they cannot be separated in fact or in consciousness.

As the chain of causes and effects can never be broken, nothing is ever lost; hence, according to our hypothesis, the individual chain of causes and effects must be connected eternally with its original source—the Unit of Force, and in Unity forever remain an undivided whole. While this is true, as the weaker and shorter cycles are swallowed up and lost in the stronger and longer ones, approximate equilibrium or an apparently static condition must be reached after aeons of time. The Law of Rhythm compels a return from the active and dynamic state to a potential one, from a conscious to an unconscious condition, and in due time the same Law brings us again around to a kinetic manifesting consciousness. This conclusion is logical, it is scientific and cannot be avoided. The element of rest equals that of unrest. All manifestation, every form of life seeks rest after action, true to the Law of Rhythm, which is the relationship it bears to the opposite pole of itself.

When an approximately static condition is reached, change apparently ceases, consciousness is lost, life, as we know it, is blotted out, the Great Cycle sleeps in the arms of the Law, to remain thus, until the outward

swing of this Law begins again. All things being equal, like causes produce like results, change appears, action and reaction produce their qualitative differences, the many emerge from the One, and the Unit of Force after its sleep takes up its individual chain of experience, and continues its own life as in the dewy morn of a new day.

This conclusion follows logically from the hypothesis, and in no whit runs counter to science, but is in fact supported by science, still more it rests upon science.

As the Unit of Force is a part of the universal Whole, and stands for the individual man, man is the whole in quality and a part in quantity.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAW OF OPPOSITES

The Doctrine of The Law of Opposites is based on the fact that polarity is inherent in the Unit of Force. The argument by which we attempt to account for the endless and variable manifestations of life, finds a sure foundation in the Principle of Polarity. It seems proper at the beginning of this discussion to consider this Principle in its application to man, as it is the ground upon which we rest the assertion that man is the whole in quality and a part in quantity.

We maintain that a consciousness of the Absolute or Infinite could not precede the self-evident principle or quality upon which consciousness is based. Self-consciousness can never get ahead of self, nor can it be a thing apart from self. The principle upon which the consciousness of a thing is based, lies in the subject so declaring. We cannot assert consciousness of a principle, quality or thing that is not within and a part of us. It is there either in an active or a potential state. Consciousness of a quality establishes its presence, not necessarily its activity. Activity of a principle or quality serves to animate the consciousness, and make it more clear and active. This does not alter the fact that the principle or quality was there before it became active, thus producing consciousness.

If we are prepared to assert consciousness of an Absolute Being, it must rest upon the principle of absoluteness in self. If we affirm that the Absolute Being is constant, changeless, and eternal, the opposite of what we know as matter in the sense that matter is transitory and variable, and possesses characteristics unlike those which we define as life, being opposite in all respects, it is for the same reason based on a like principle, the potentiality of the same in self; for all negative conceptions are deduced from affirmatives.

Consciousness being the establishment of relations, we can only know through change, hence our definition of life. Life is self, subject, manifesting. It is the Unit in activity; the manifested pole of self, which in unity is one and in activity many, co-existent with the immortal Unit.

No one can deny this principle unless he be prepared to maintain that man possesses no consciousness of the Absolute and Eternal.

The fact that man is conscious of all objects proves his universality; it shows that he has within himself the potentiality of all things. Man becomes conscious of object as soon as he sees it; he may not understand what it is; understanding is not consciousness. Self, subject, recognizes object by reason of its oneness with it. By object we mean all things outside of self-other selves, things and phenomena.

Blindfold a man and take him to a new environment, one that he has never before seen, a strange room or a landscape, remove the bandage from his eyes, and he immediately becomes conscious of his surroundings. He knows the things about him, though they are entirely new to him.

Consciousness results from the adjustment of subject to object. It is instantaneous; there is no logic or reason, in fact no effort. Consciousness knows nothing of time save that which it takes for the eye to receive the light. Man recognizes, that is all.

If a man does not instantly adjust to the other half of himself, object, he is either insane or unconscious. Consciousness has nothing to do with liking or disliking; to know does not mean to love or hate. Man does not necessarily fall in with what he sees; he may not like or be drawn to it. This is a different question. Man does not like all moods of himself. You may be introduced to a den of thieves; you will adjust to them as the sunbeam to the pit. The thief in you is asleep, but it awakes from potentiality through environment.

If man were less than the whole in quality, he could not adjust to all environment in consciousness. Individual man is potentially universal. Man's constancy consists in quality, his inconstancy in variety or manifestation, the opposite pole of quality.

Thus we are forced to the conclusion, that man can only find God, the Absolute, Changeless, Perfect and Eternal, in Ego which is the whole in quality and a part in quantity. The reasons for this conclusion are, to us, axiomatic and self-evident.

It is not our purpose in this brief work to build a system of philosophy, but to lay the foundation upon which a system may be built in future, should our foundation justify such a course, after critical examination and scientific tests. For this reason we present the subject of Opposites

from the position of our hypothesis, as we conceive it, together with the definitions we have already given of Law, laws and life, avoiding, as far as possible, all discussions of the subject in the light of other theories.

We are keenly alive to the fact that this Doctrine of Opposites is not new. It has been presented in various forms, and from different standpoints, in profound discussion aided by learning and meditation, by both ancient and modern scholars; yet we have never known it to have been considered from the standpoint of our hypothesis. And while we may not add anything new to the argument for the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites, we have this to our claim, that the discussion is based on a new hypothesis, one that enables us to marshal the facts and phenomena of life from a scientific standpoint, or at least from a postulate which science up to the present time has no right to deny or reject. Indeed, modern science has done much to aid in the solution of this all-absorbing problem.

For centuries monism and dualism have occupied the minds of great thinkers. At times the belief in monism seemed to predominate, again dualism had the ascendancy. Evolution compels us to change our view point constantly; and the question has swung from one pole to the other, demonstrating in this respect, at least, duality in thought upon the subject. Among those who have maintained either doctrine of monism or dualism, there has been no unanimity as to the reasons upon which they based their theories.

Let us consider whether there be an irreconcilable difference between monism and dualism: Monism does not deny the qualitative difference in the emotions, sensations, affections, and volitions when aroused and active. That experience teaches qualitative difference, is admitted by the advocates of both doctrines. The monist points to the fact that these differences shade into each other and become unified. But how, we ask, can the recognition of this fact disprove the fact of difference? The potentiality of the two poles of being is the blending of these essential differences. One pole is always more intense than the other in manifestation. According to this we assert of a thing or quality, that it is either hot or cold, as one or the other of the two poles is active. The unification of heat and cold does not change the essential difference

between heat and cold; we know them by their qualitative difference, whenever we comprehend them in consciousness at all.

It is an axiom of science that there can be no static condition in nature. It is the universality of this law that maintains the qualitative difference in the two poles of expression. If it were otherwise there would be no orderly sequence. We may change the two poles, reverse them, causing one to disappear and the other to appear, yet the parallelism of the essential difference remains true to itself. We may reverse the poles of a magnet, so that the positive becomes the negative and the negative becomes the positive, but their qualitative difference remains the same and they parallel each other through all changes. In unity the qualities do not lose their identity, but become simply potential and impossible of observation. In manifestation or life only does polarity disclose its identity.

Both monists and dualists admit that in manifestation nature is dual. Should we define monism as the fundamental oneness of things, and dualism as the fundamental plurality of things, they would not oppose each other. Monism does not deny qualitative difference, but asserts unity of all. Dualism maintains that there are two ultimate substances in nature, and that they never blend or resolve into, or can be explained by each other. Monism declares difference in a qualitative sense, while dualism contends for a two-fold nature—being and operation in the absolute sense; that psychical and physical existences are wholly diverse in their nature.

It is axiomatic that there can be no generalization without specialization, no unity without variety, hence monism depends upon specialization or the many for its fundamental oneness, and yet it is compelled to admit the qualitative difference in specialization, because specialization implies qualities." Dualism maintains that there are two kinds of substances in nature, and that neither can be resolved or blended into each, other, even in operation or manifestation. The monist contends that to conceive of a thing as a whole or a unity, we must at the same time think of it as having parts, at least two, and given two necessitates in-numerables.

The theory of our hypothesis is in harmony with the doctrine of monism, a fundamental oneness of things, a single ultimate substance.

There has always been the same amount of force in the universe as there is at the present time, either potential or active. To contend that there was a time when the amount of force was less than now, would be to assert that something came from no-thing, which is unthinkable and impossible. To maintain that the amount of force in the universe will ever be less than at the present time, is equally incomprehensible and unscientific; for if something cannot come from no-thing, it is evident that something cannot return to no-thing; it is also opposed to the axiom that nothing can ever be lost. The assertion that the amount of force now in the universe has always been and must forever remain the same, is founded on both reason and science.

We posit of the Unit of Force the power to generate a constant but limited amount of energy. This is more consistent with law and phenomena than to posit a single, unlimited, unpolarized Unit.

A single, unpolarized Unit would be the whole in quantity and quality; the whole in quantity must of necessity include the whole in quality; hence no individuality, no variety, no specialization, no consciousness. Polarization of Unity is variety, the many in One.

As the whole cannot be conceived in consciousness without at the same time considering it as having parts, at least two, no hypothesis could be successfully maintained that did not include the many.

Life results from the bombarding of these Units among themselves. A single unpolarized Unit would be both subject and object, hence potential and unconscious, and there could be no such phenomena as we define as life. A hypothesis based on a single Unit would not be true to life, as we conceive it. The true hypothesis must be based on Units of Force, that cause manifestation, variety, specialization. Life results from the One manifesting in the many.

To generate a constant amount of energy is to produce or reproduce a constant amount of force. Generation is the calling out of potentiality into activity; in other words, the power of manifestation. It is evolving, which implies its opposite, involving. Force is set in motion by the power inherent in the Unit to generate. The amount of energy each Unit can generate depends upon its limitation.

Force is constant: We mean by this, that there is so much energy, motion or exchange possible in a given time between a given number of Units of Force. This does not mean that the Units always act to their limit, or that they are potential, but that they have the possibility either resisted or expressed of so much force in a given time. This results in action and reaction being equal and opposite. By this we mean that each Unit involves exactly the same amount of energy that it evolves. These dual functions produce opposite results; they increase vibration from low to high, and decrease from high to low. Whether force is becoming more intense and less potential, or less intense and more potential, is determined by its manifestations, its qualitative differences, which are always opposite.

The qualitative difference in things is brought out as the result of Law. We define Law to be the necessity for specialization, the mathematics of combination of environment.

Pairs of opposites can be comprehended in consciousness only through their manifestations. To illustrate: Evil and good exactly balance in the universe; that is, from the point of unity or wholeness there is no evil and no good. The Unit of Force cannot specialize from Unity; one pole of expression is uppermost and then the other, hence either good or evil is evident; they cannot both be in evidence at the same moment. From the point of the universal, whatever is is right, not good, but from the point of special conception whatever is, is very likely wrong.

Action and reaction are equal in the amount of force displayed and in characteristics or qualitative difference. Action and reaction then are a pair of opposites. What is true of this pair of opposites should be true of all pairs. Science assures us that action and reaction are equal in the amount of force displayed, that all force put forth in action must return in reaction. Thus the results of action and reaction parallel each other in two ways, they are equal in amount and opposite in character. To state the same thing differently we would say, that what you can posit of one pole of expression you cannot of the other, and that when one pole of expression is kinetic the other is potential. To illustrate: Heat and cold are a pair of opposites; when heat is present, cold is absent or potential. Good and evil are a pair of opposites; when evil is active, good is dormant. It is impossible to be sick and well at the same moment of

time; sickness and health may shade into each other to such an extent that it becomes difficult to tell which predominates, but no matter how close the union, the qualitative difference between health and disease remains true, and sooner or later manifests, by the Law of Polarity, as there can be no static condition in nature.

From the point of oneness or absolute Unity, the pairs of opposites approximately balance, therefore in unity there is no love or hate, no sickness or health, for it is not possible to express both the positive and negative poles of any one thing at the same moment. The positive and negative poles of things that are not the same in unity may have simultaneous expression. For instance, one may love, be good, healthy and homely at the same time, but he cannot express any of these qualities and at the same moment of time express the opposite quality.

In the Unit of Force quantity has no relation to quality: quality does not depend upon the amount of force that the Unit can generate. Only in manifestation does the Unit appear to be much or little. No matter how infinitesimal this power in the Unit may be, as a part of the universal whole, the Unit contains all the qualities of that of which it is a part. In this respect we might illustrate by the magnet: Break in two a bar magnet; both parts become magnets with poles at the ends; this may be repeated indefinitely. The same principle applies to the Unit of Force. The quantity does not affect the Quality; the smallest Unit in quantity has in it all there is in quality.

By this Principle of Polarity inherent in the Unit of Force, life is a chain of endless combinations and specializations, a gathering of experiences into each individual temple; it is the basic and fundamental principle of evolution as taught by science. The Unit of Force is the Unknowable of science. All that we can ever know of it is through its manifestations. Knowledge is limited to the understanding of its activities. Its manifestations are the many of dualism, and in unity they compose the One of monism.

The power in the Unit to generate force, predicated in the hypothesis, is none other than Will; a subject that we will treat at the close of this work.

Phenomena from the great Unknowable appear and disappear at the dictation of Will; this endless chain of appearances, necessitating

combination and environment, we know as life. We collect data from the many manifestations, and through generalization discover new laws, but throughout aeons of time, all we can know of the Ultimate of ultimates is what the pairs of opposites teach, as they continue to parallel each other, in countless manifestations, no two the same in quantity but showing a persistency of force, a never-changing purpose, a unity in variety, a One Thing in the many.

THE LAW OF ETHICS

We ask ourself the questions, why should I be good, why ethical, why moral? We seek to know, to realize, to understand. We are no longer content to follow blindly. We want to know why we are expected to act in a certain way in one environment and in a different way in another. It is this that leads us to search for the law that is at the foundation of the various duties and obligations known as moral or ethical. If there be such law, and its existence will not be denied, there is cause or necessity for its being; and if we discover this law it will answer all questions arising within the domain of ethics.

Cause and effect correspond and are one in unity, but in variety or activity they become the opposite expressions of the law that lies back of them. It therefore becomes us first to consider the nature of those conditions known as ethical or moral, and then to ascertain the law that necessitates their existence. And if the principle for which we contend does not answer all questions pertaining to ethics or morals, it is not the true principle or law.

There are many definitions of ethics, some are complicated and difficult to understand. We define morality to be the idea of self in relation to other selves. It is that which is necessary to harmony in combination.

Laws inherent in combinations appear in the form of ethical formulas, maxims, and even axioms. Bear in mind that the law is inherent.

The ideal to be ethical must be a social ideal. This makes for human morality, and suggests the Law of Relationship, as existing between ourself and other selves, as the true principle of ethics. Let us see if this is borne out by facts, and if it be possible to establish our claim not alone by the Principle of Relationship but by antithesis or nonrelationship.

The different social organizations have each their own system of ethics upon the observance of which depends their welfare. The ethics of an organization involves its very life principle, and must be observed or death of the organization is the result. There are neighborhood ethics, municipal, racial, tribal, and many others. Even a band of outlaws have

their code of ethics. The ethics of each body deals entirely with its members in their relation to each other and to the organization to which they belong. This is especially the case in all secret orders. A person not a member of such an order is not expected to conduct himself in accordance with its rules. In most orders the obligations of the members to each other and to the organization to which they belong, are kept secret and could not be followed by persons not members; yet should a member of such an organization violate one of its rules, he would be considered not ethical or immoral to the extent of the violation of his obligations, created by his relation to other members and to the organization as a whole. The ethical standard of an organization being a nucleus, each member is expected to develop his individual morality, as nearly as possible in accordance with the consensus of opinion of the whole.

We are not seeking the law that applies to a particular community, but a law that will apply to every kind of organization. Let us take for illustration the act of lying. Is there in community an intrinsic law forbidding lying?

In every organization there are certain conditions necessary to its holding together; one of these conditions (intrinsic to combination) is, that the word of each man shall be as good as his bond; otherwise no possible business or association in harmony for any length of time can be maintained. The rule that applies to lying, applies to stealing, adultery, murder, and all the cardinal sins. Society in harmony hinges upon ethics. There is no namby-pamby gush, no religious sentiment bound up in this law. It is the hard matter of fact necessity of a combination of people into a society or state. A band of thieves must have its code of ethics, and its members must be true to the organization and to each other in order to work successfully together.

A race may be ethical so far as its own people are concerned and commit all manner of crimes against other races. Just as soon however as commercial relations arise between races, a code of ethics comes to the front as a flag of truce. Why? Because of the intrinsic law which makes commerce impossible without absolute confidence in the mercantile honor of the countries concerned.

Ethics apply to small things as well as great. The law knows no distinction. Measured by its standard there is no small and no great. A man may be religious and not ethical, or he may be ethical and not religious. The moral man has been described as one who is centered in the sphere of common duties. This is based on the Law of Relationship. A man belonging to the navy has ethical duties to perform that he would not have save for his relation to that body.

If ethics be what we claim for it, that is a science, it can make no absolute formula to suit all cases. This we find to be the fact. It is so by reason of the multiplicity of relations each person bears to others; for morality is action conducive to social welfare. Standards of morality are not fixed; opinion changes, and what at one time is considered moral may at another be considered immoral. As environment creates certain necessities, it has much to do with ethical standards. One race or nation may consider certain conduct immoral that another race would consider not only moral but obligatory, for example: The Thibetan woman who marries knows that she is to be wife not only to the husband, but to all of his brothers as well. Non-conformance to this custom in Thibet would be immoral, and as good ground for punishment as compliance with such conduct in the American wife. Offensive as this may seem to those not accustomed to think of morality as the standard of social necessities, varying in different peoples according to environment, it is nevertheless true to environment in the high and almost barren plauteau regions of Thibet, where combined effort is necessary for the maintenance of the family.

Again, if a citizen of one country travel in a foreign country under the protection of his own, he may with propriety conduct himself in accordance with the customs of his country; but should he become a citizen of the adopted country, he would be expected to conform to the customs of this country. To act otherwise would not be ethical. As before stated, the fundamental law of ethics is the Law of Relationship inherent in society.

Let us consider this Law in its application to some of the accepted axioms of morality: "Thou shalt not steal" why? Is it not on account of our relations with others? Does it not tend to chaos and inharmony? Is it not destructive to society? And is not ethics the necessity to make harmony

in combination? Is there any other reason for this command? One cannot steal from himself; it is only against another that he can commit the crime of theft, and from him only by reason of his relationship to him. Formerly according to the law in the United States, it was not possible for the husband to steal from the wife, owing to the peculiar relation existing between them. This law is still in existence in some countries. It considers the two one, and the husband the one.

As with stealing so it is with lying. The ten commandments are based on the idea of self in relation to other selves. Christ makes a striking application of this law; he puts the ten commandments into one when he says: Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you. This obligation would be meaningless if there was but one man on the earth, or if any number of people but so far separated as to have no possible association or relationship to each other, it would still be without meaning. It is only in our relation to others that morality or ethics can be conceived.

This is forcibly illustrated in primitive conditions. Ethics first appeared in the family. It had its beginning in the endeavor to protect and care for the family as such. Later tribal laws and customs came into existence, as the result of the efforts of the tribes to protect themselves in their dealings with other tribes; they were the necessary means for protection in traffic and in war.

Without some kind of relationship between ourself and others there can be no moral or ethical duties. It is true then that morality is based on relationship. Therefore the Law of Relationship is the foundation of all morals.

Let us consider another view of this question.. It is agreed that a person cannot steal from himself. Some persons are able to enter things—rocks, plants, animals, even persons—to become the thing or person for the time, getting its feelings and emotions. This is possible where great sympathy for the person or thing exists or where the condition is taken on for a purpose. It is accomplished by an agreement of the affections between ourself and the object, and a complete surrender of self for the time. Now as a man cannot steal from himself, by reason of non-relativity, he cannot steal from the object possessed by him for they two are one for the moment.

We have reached the conclusion that we cannot steal from ourselves, and if by law or through sympathy or an agreement of the affections, we can become another person for the time, that is, lose consciousness of self in becoming conscious of the feelings and emotions of another self, it must follow that while we are in that condition, no matter how acquired, we cannot steal from that person; and because we are that person for the time, we cannot relate to him. While we are in the condition that we cannot relate to another person we can have no moral or ethical obligations toward that person. This is self evident. Thus by the opposite of the Law of Relativity, or non-relationship we are able to prove the law that lies at the foundation of ethics or morals.

There remains one other aspect of this subject that we wish to consider at the present time. It is this: Is a person ever justified in stealing, lying or violating other ethical duties that exist by reason of his relationship to his fellows? Is it ever right to lie or steal? To the first we answer, yes; to the second, no. Take for example the case of physician and patient. The patients condition is such that should the physician tell the truth concerning it, his recovery would be doubtful; but should the physician deceive him by leading him to believe that there was no danger of death, that recovery was assured, serious results could be averted. In this case two evils are encountered, and the physician chooses the lesser. To deceive the patient is a lesser evil than to let him die. But the lie is no less a lie with all its evil results, nevertheless the physician is justified; and while he will have to pay the penalty of lying, the penalty is less than it would have been had he told the truth thereby causing death. This may seem hard, but justice is based on the law of action and reaction which are equal. In this case the penalty is the reaction. The evil of lying per se is as great in self defense as under any other circumstance. The law of the lie exists, and its results continue alike in both cases, but the evil of death being the greater evil of the two, law brings up against law, and one deflects the other but does not change it. It is so with all evils. You may steal bread to save your own life or the life of another. The principle back of the theft does not change because a life is saved. Principles are changeless. Stealing for any purpose is theft, but to save a life is the greater duty under the above circumstances. The person who steals the bread is justified, but this does not make the theft any the less wrong. One meets fire with fire, principle with principle, law with law.

So we cannot commit an immoral act against another except as we in some manner relate to that person. It follows then, that if all relations between ourself and others were removed, morality and immorality would not exist. Hence the basic law of ethics or morality is the Law of Relationship.

CRIMINOLOGY

In the discussion of this subject we shall confine the argument to the application of the Law of Opposites.

We discovered the basic law of ethics to be that of relativity. Morality is based on the strict observance of the law of relativity. Criminology, by the Law of Opposites, must be based on the non-observance of this same law. To state it otherwise we would say, there is a law, the harmonious observance of which is ethics or morality. We name this law the principle of relationship, the violation of which is crime. Violation of this law produces opposite results from its observance, and tends to chaos, as does the violation of all law.

The science of Criminology is scarcely more than a quarter of a century old. It includes among its representatives some of the brightest minds of the past two decades, yet there is such difference of opinion as to the causes of crime, that those who have given this subject the greatest attention are divided into several classes. They are also divided in opinion as to the best method of treatment of criminals.

If we can discover the cause of crime, some enlightenment on the best method of treatment should appear.

Criminologists may be classed under two heads: First, those who believe that criminals are born such, that they are peculiarly wicked by nature. This position implies that criminals are different in quality, have different possibilities from other individuals.

Second: Those who maintain that crime is the outgrowth of causes outside the individual, such as social organization, education, environment.

The quality of crime is certainly inherent in the individual or it could not be called out by circumstances. It is a part of him or it could not be his crime. The opinion held by the second class destroys all individual responsibility, and gives to object qualities not in subject. As we define object to be all outside of self, from our standpoint it is absurd.

These views are exactly opposite. One accredits crime to a quality inherent in the individual, while the other makes crime a result of causes entirely outside the individual but in his personal environment. If we should stop here the first view would show a result without a cause, in this, that individuals possess unlike qualities either active or potential. This is contrary to our hypothesis. We predicate like quality in all Units of Force. We do not say that all qualities are alike active at the same time in all persons, but that all possess the same qualities either active or potential. This will hardly be denied in the light of modern science. The quantity of power in each individual differs, but the quality, never. Constancy is found in quality, inconstancy in variety or quantity.

It seems plain from this reasoning that the qualities that make up morality and crime are but opposite expressions of one and the same thing, inherent in every individual, and more or less active in all persons.

Crime is called into activity by environment. A child born criminal must have had somewhere in his past existence, an environment conducive to the development of the criminal qualities in his nature. As like causes under like conditions produce like effects, unlike causes produce unlike results. The same law accounts for all tendencies so well developed in many youths. Environment is as much a cause as anything with as lasting result.

If it be true that cause and effect cannot be separated, the two are one, and travel together. While it is true that we can not always see the cause, yet the recognition of effect pre-supposes the presence of cause.

Another reason for our position is found in the fact that criminals strengthen their environment. A criminal seeks such environment as is best adapted to the carrying out of his criminal tendencies. If this is not easily found he creates it, realizing from past experiences that favorable conditions are necessary to carry out the best in him along that particular line of activity. Man and his environment are one, each is half of the other, inseparable as are the two poles of the magnet.

The whole truth from our standpoint is this: Criminals who come into life such, have had their evil tendencies developed in some past environment. Criminals not born such, have had their evil tendencies awakened through environment in the present existence.

We put criminals in two separate classes. First, those who are actuated from intellectual motives, and second, those who are wholly under the sway of their emotions.

The intellectual criminal is cold, keen, cruel, diabolic. He loves the mental excitement that comes from pitting himself against existing social order. He schemes and executes in defiance of law and its officers. His kindly emotions are dormant. His intellect is awakened to the limit. He enjoys the danger, the risk, the excitement of crime. He cannot endure the common place. There is no monotony for him.

Emotional criminals are imbecile babes who abuse and injure themselves, revelling in beastliness, without¹ intellect, their whole attention turned toward themselves. They care not to go out of self except for mere sustenance of the body. They live in selfish gratifications. This class of criminals are exactly opposite in character to the first named, with less force and power. One is intellectual; his motive is from mind. The other is actuated by passion in its lowest form. These two classes express the two sides of crime. There is as marked difference between them as between good and evil. This is a striking example of the fact that opposite qualities roused produce opposite results. Yet the predominating quality in each is in some slight degree manifested in the other. This is so by the Law of Rhythm, according to which no quality can maintain a static condition.

It now remains for us to consider whether the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites furnishes a guide for the treatment of the two classes of criminals we have described. It is manifest that what would be beneficial to the first class would not be so to the second. This is self-evident, when we remember that like causes produce like effects under like conditions, and that unlike causes produce unlike results. The results desired are opposite in character, hence opposite treatment is necessary.

Every phase and condition of life has its opposite. This is the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites. And just in proportion as the opposite phases balance in the individual, is he normal or "well balanced".

The opposite quality from the predominating one in each class of criminal, should be roused and made active, that he may become normal. By so doing the energy now all sent in one direction, would be

part sent in the opposite direction, in the one case producing a less active intellect and more emotion, in the other producing more intellect and less emotion.

This is the treatment prescribed by the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites. The practice is not easy in all cases, when first attempted, but it is well to persist in this direction. Perfection of character according to this principle makes the perfect man.

Let us apply this doctrine to the emotional criminal. What have we to accomplish here? We answer, to save the man from himself, from his own self-destruction. His treatment should be such as will rouse his interest in things outside himself. A detail of any plan is not the purpose of this work; the sole object being to present the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites in its application to the subject under consideration.

As for the intellectual criminal, it is evident that the treatment suggested for the emotional criminal would not in the least avail. The object to be accomplished in this case is to rouse the kindly feelings in the individual. He is cold, cruel; he injures for pure love of it. The excitement of crime is a tonic to him. The sympathies of such a one should be stirred to action. He must be made to feel what his victims suffer, that it become possible for him to have sympathy for them. It is the lack of responsive emotions that enables him to be what he is. One of large sympathies suffers when he sees another suffer. Likewise suffering enables one to sympathize with another who is alike afflicted. The law of affinity, that like principles work together, is accepted in science. In this case it is necessary to rouse the sympathies of the individual before it is possible for him to feel with his victim. When he has been made to suffer, as he has caused others to suffer, his sympathies for the injured will be roused. He will feel as they feel, sorrow as they sorrow. As cold departs when heat is present, so will the cold element in his nature give place to kindly emotions which are warm. His activities along the line in which he formerly delighted will be changed. He will become a normal, well balanced individual. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" may sound harsh to the mind of the Twentieth Century, but the Mosaic law was fraught with sound philosophy in this regard.

We have presented this from the standpoint of our philosophy or that of our hypothesis, which we contend is the only premise from which a

comprehensive and intelligent consideration of ethics and crime can be presented. We have shown that all qualities are alike in all individuals; that good and evil, as all other qualities, are called out through social structure, education, and environment, and developed in some previous condition in the individual called criminal from birth.

We, have shown that there are two classes of criminals; one an individual wholly without feeling, the result of excessive mental activities; the other a being of no intellect, the product of the emotions; each class showing opposite qualities of the same thing. As the two classes of criminals are the product of causes diametrically opposite, it is plain that they require treatment of a different nature, such as will rouse the qualities dormant in each.

Ethics or morality is based on the law of relativity. Crime is its opposite, and has its foundation in the failure to observe this law. In Unity there can be neither morality nor crime; because, in unity there could be no relativity, hence no nonrelativity.

The Doctrine of the Law of Opposites solves this problem of Morality and Crime, and prescribes a remedy for the latter. We have written this chapter merely to show the application of the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites to one of the greatest problems in life. It will be found infallible.

MIND AND MATTER

To make a more concrete representation of the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites, we will illustrate by one of the great pairs of opposites—Mind and Matter. We use the word mind in its broadest and most comprehensive meaning, to express the invisible as opposed to the visible, although in the ordinary acceptance of the word it is looked upon as intellect. Mind as we use the term includes the feelings, emotions, volitions, and mental experiences of the individual.

There are certain tests or principles that, when applied, enable us to discover and determine the various pairs of opposites, one of which is this, that what you can posit of one pole of expression you cannot of the other. This is a universal test.

All pairs of opposites are one and inseparable in regard to individuality, but two in qualitative difference or characteristics. They are rhythmic in expression, the result of action and reaction, and present diametrically Opposite sides of the same thing. One of a pair of opposites does not create „ the other, but accompanies it always and follows rhythmically (barring interference of Will) in expression. Disease cannot be said to be the result of health, nor evil to be the child of good. The two aspects of any one thing can never be present at the same moment of time, but follow each other according to an innate principle.

Opposites attract and seem to unify. The point of apparent unification is that point where approximately no force is exerted in either direction. Though they seem to blend, they do not. This is the paradox of the opposites.

Qualitative difference as it appears in the opposite poles of expression, must always have existed. There was never a time when evil was not, nor a time when good had a beginning. To say otherwise would be to argue that something came from no-thing, which would be an absurdity. For the same reason evil will always be. We do not say that evil will always exist in expression, but that the principle of evil must forever remain a fact. It must be so or good could not remain a fact. Hence qualitative difference in things is coexistent with Thing-in-itself out of which it

came. The cause of the manifestation being Law or the necessity to specialize.

In Matter all things are one; in mind are individuals or many. Our bodies are not our own; we devour each other, are passing through each other. All Matter is a continual shift of the one thing. For example: Draw a circle and place within it a number of dots. The circle will represent matter, the dots will represent mind. Thus in variety (mind) is unity, or in unity (matter) is variety. The variety in matter consists in density and location. Mind on the contrary finds its variety in its manifested energy, and its stability in its individuality. Yet Mind and Matter are the inseparable poles of the same thing. Mind has its stability in its individuality, its change in its manifested energy. Matter has its stability in its unity, and its variety in location and density. The stability of anything is its invisible constancy. All things are both visible and invisible. Invisibly matter is unity, visibly matter is variety. Invisibly mind is variety, visibly mind is unity or one. The invisible of anything is the opposite of the visible. Thus what you can posit of one of the Pairs of Opposites, you cannot of the other.

Like forces work together along the same lines. Applied to mind, this principle produces grand results. Mind exercised upon mind, produces grandly in matter. Mind exercised upon the objective produces mildly in matter. He who lives in things is a baby compared with one who lives in mind. I do not mean that his body is weak; he may be an elephant, a giant; I simply mean that he expresses comparatively nothing. On the contrary when force is sent from mind to mind, when invisible reveals in invisible rather than in things, the material expression is something lofty and telling. Mind rejects its opposite pole; it never becomes one with matter, but mind coalesces with mind, producing great results in matter.

Mind is the positive and matter the negative form of vibration. Mind being positive does in exactly the reverse way from matter. Mind is projectile in power, dynamic in force, unconfined and transcendent of space and time, it is a unit and indivisible. Matter on the contrary depends upon time and space. It is inert, plastic and divisible. Mind molds and matter receives the impressions. Matter is an expression of mind reversed. It takes impressions as a camera takes pictures, in a reversed manner.

Cause is mind, expression is matter; abstract is mind, concrete is matter; the general is mind, the special is matter. All that you can posit of mind you cannot of matter and vice versa. When invisible mind brings forth visible matter, it does nothing more than to condense an already existing thing, so the senses cognize that which existed before but could not be seen. Matter is the definite form of the indefinite. Matter defines, because in becoming visible it binds itself, consequently it is diametrically opposed to mind in substance.

From the point of unity, mind and matter exactly balance in the universe. One accompanies the other always, as effect follows cause. Only in its cruder manifestations does effect appear to follow cause, so with Mind and Matter.

In this and the two preceding chapters we have given enough to illustrate the Doctrine of the Law of Opposites as taught in this work. We will now consider immortality from the standpoint of our hypothesis.

IMMORTALITY INDIVIDUAL AND UNIVERSAL

Questions are constantly arising that the human intellect is called upon to solve, we might add compelled by an ever ceaseless law to struggle with always. And none is more vital or of more far reaching importance to man than the mortality or immortality of the soul.

Attempts are made by schools of theology to decide this question for us, basing their authority solely on the Bible as the inspired word of God. Closing the door to all reasoning on the subject, ignoring all argument based on reason and maintained by logic, they simply assume the truth of the subject. Now as we can find no two persons who exactly agree in their interpretation as to the true meaning of the Bible, it is safe to say that either this authority is not infallible or the individuals relying upon it do not understand its true meaning. We must admit one of these conclusions, unless we agree that immortality means something different to different individuals.

If our philosophy be what we claim for it, it must furnish a solution of this as well as all other questions pertaining to human life and welfare. The magnitude of the question or its importance must not deter us. These are lost sight of in the argument, and our whole energy concentrated upon the problem and the principles upon which the solution rests. In the application of principles there is no small and no great, one problem is of as much importance as another.

In order to clearly understand our presentation of this subject it is necessary first to understand what we mean by immortality. We define life as variety, motion, manifestation, specialization. What then is immortality but an endless continuation of these conditions. If our definition of life be correct, our conception of immortality must also be true. According to our understanding of life and immortality we will present this argument.

The generally accepted idea of immortality is the continuance in some permanent state or condition. According to our philosophy this is not possible owing to the law of rhythm which governs all forms of life. Perfection is possible only in the climax of a rhythm. As no static

condition exists in nature, a climax is no sooner reached than (barring the interference of the Will) its opposite appears. The climax of any condition is the beginning of its opposite. Consider the rose:

It grows to perfection as a flower, when—behold the mystery—the reverse condition appears, and it starts on its way to perfection in another direction—the production of a perfect seed. Energy being constant, from the death of the seed a new flower is born.

Completion of a rhythm is the only possible perfection. A perfect plant or animal is the one that perfectly fulfills its mission in nature whatever that may be. Not every climax is a perfect product along its particular line. Also ideals differ as individuals differ. If all men were agreed in ideals, there would be but one man, because all would occupy the same point in space and time. A man's ideal is himself. Though ideals change, the principle of perfection does not, and perfection is a fact, else we could have no knowledge of imperfection. We can have no knowledge, of a condition save by contrast with its opposite.

Let us consider the subject of immortality from a scientific standpoint, and see if known principles and axioms of science do not furnish proof of individual immortality.

Science posits that nothing is ever lost: It is self-evident that generalization without individuals to unify is impossible. We cannot conceive of generalization without at the same time being conscious of the things generalized. This will not be denied. Then we cannot lose individuality without losing generalization. In unity there is no generalization and no specialization—an approximately static condition is reached, as nearly static as the law of rhythm will permit. This axiom of science, that nothing is lost, is a statement of a generalization of individual things, covering ages of experience by innumerable scientists. This axiom is evident for another reason: If something cannot come from no-thing, something can never become no-thing, therefore can never be lost.

Force is constant. Action and reaction are equal in force and opposite in direction. This could not be so if force moved always in one direction. Evolution implies involution, specialization implies generalization, in obedience to the law of the constancy of force. Generalization is cause,

specialization is effect or vice versa. Cause and effect are one and indivisible. That which cannot be divided is the true unit. Individuality cannot be divided, and as nothing is ever lost the individual is intact.

The very nature of generalization and specialization necessitates infinity in number, and as cause and effect can never be separated, the individuals unified in generalization can never be lost, hence they are immortal.

Another principle of science that gives support to this argument is this: Energy in one form may be transformed into energy of any other form. Energy never continues in any one form, and it has become an accepted fact in science, that from a definite amount of force in one form definite amounts in other forms result. Hence among the several forms in which force appears the quantitative relations are fixed. This law of the Transformation of energy, according to which each force manifestation either directly or indirectly is changed into other forms in the physical world, operates with equal exactness between the mental forms of force. All forms of force whether heat, light, electricity, magnetism or chemical attraction are transformable into each other, also into those forms of force known as sensation, emotion, thoughts, and are again retransformable into their original forms.

Now generalization cannot be conceived in consciousness without specialization because they are the two poles of the same thing; one follows the other as cause and effect. In another sense they do not follow each other, for by the law of rhythm, when the limit of energy is reached in specialization the reaction—generalization—appears. In fact generalization and specialization are continually going on, but one or the other predominates.

Science admits cause and effect to be the opposite expressions of one and the same thing, that one cannot be without the other, that they can never be divorced. If this be true, then cause and effect are the two sides of a one thing, for things that are inseparable must belong to the same thing. As every cause has its effect, so is every effect fathered by its own cause. Hence every phenomenon is composed of two parts—that which we cognize with our physical senses, and that which causes the phenomenon and cannot be so cognized, but may be comprehended in consciousness, for consciousness and knowledge are different.

Science further teaches that the elements of the physical body can never be destroyed; that they can be changed and modified but never lost. If body is result, the half of that which is known as cause, or vice versa, we care not which, and if cause and effect can never be separated, one half cannot be lost while the other remains. The thing itself must be or neither half can exist. We cannot conceive of a thing without the co-existence of its parts. To annihilate a part is to lose the thing as a whole. The question may be asked how we connect this argument with a conscious immortality of the soul. We answer, by memory, which is the synthetic consciousness of the individual's experiences, and which become his distinctive feature or marking, separating him from all other individuals.

By recalling experiences they become familiar memories, and by constant practicing they become automatic, as in the case of the pianist, they grow into the being. The sum total of our individuality at the present moment, is the sum of our past experiences strung on the cord of memory. It is in this way that memory becomes the synthetic consciousness of our past experiences—it registers itself into the being, making of each an individual unlike all the rest.

Memory being the photograph of the individual's past experiences in cause and effect, all memories are everlastingly part and parcel of him, his chain of causes and effects and his alone.

Now if force is constant, if action and reaction are equal and opposite, if nothing is ever lost, if there is no hiatus in nature anywhere, if cause and effect cannot be divorced, and if memory is the synthetic consciousness of the individual's experiences which separates him from all the rest, how can the individual, invisible coil of being be divided, lost, or destroyed. If these laws and axioms of science do not prove the endless existence of the soul in continued possession of a distinct individuality and consciousness, of what value are they in any branch of science or elsewhere?

We have shown that universal immortality, in the sense that all things are immortal, is a fact. We postulate immortal Units of Force with power to generate a constant but limited amount of energy, no two alike in quantity. A true unit cannot be added to or taken from. If it were possible to add to it, the quantity added could be subtracted, hence if it could be

added to, it would not be a true unit. Thus our Unit of Force is simple. We postulate nothing of it except the power to generate energy and that nothing can be added or taken away. The Unit of Force is the pure Ego, of which we can know nothing except that which we predicate of the Unit of Force. That which results from the activities of the pure Ego we call the alter ego. In the alter ego is stored the experiences of the pure Ego. Tlia experiences of pure Ego constitute the alter ego, which pure Ego trails behind it like the tail of a comet, sometimes bright, again dim, according to the activity or potentiality of the Unit. Alter ego is inseparable from pure Ego, as is cause from effect; they are a pair of opposites, the result of the Unit's polarization. Pure Ego is conscious of its mate in which is stored all experiences through which it has passed. Self-consciousness belong to pure Ego; the alter ego is that of which the pure Ego is conscious. As cause and effect are but halves of the same thing, and one cannot be lost or destroyed while the other remains, we posit the immortal Unit as cause, the alter ego as result. And as the Unit has the power to generate force constantly, it can readily be seen that the chain or alter ego is never broken, and that each event is welded to all the others. Further this constancy of force generation makes a break in the individual Unit impossible.

Consciousness is the result of change or friction. It is evident then that while there is no change or friction there can be no consciousness. Where the activities are slight, no self-consciousness is possible. It does not follow, however, that there is a total absence of consciousness where there is but a limited amount of energy generated. Consciousness exists, but it is not self-consciousness. It is what may be called a universal consciousness, a sub-consciousness, the other pole of self-consciousness.

Sub-consciousness is concomitant of two causes: First, where there is but slight activity in the Unit of Force, and second, where the Unit of Force is so limited in power to generate energy, that it cannot, when in the low tide of its rhythm, produce sufficient motion to raise its consciousness to what we term self-consciousness. To illustrate: Suppose a Unit of Force with power to generate what we may call one horse power, while another has power to generate two, six or even ten horse power. It is evident that the Unit with the greatest generative power will produce the greatest amount of friction, hence the greater degree of consciousness.

The difference between sub-consciousness and self-consciousness arises in the manner we have indicated; in quality they are one, they differ only in degree. The less complex activities result in sub-consciousness, while the more heterogeneous activities of the Unit produce self-consciousness. There must be a point then where sub-consciousness passes into self-consciousness, and at this point the individual responsibility of the Unit of Force begins; it is the point where individuality emerges from universality.

Let us carry the illustration further, and imagine a Unit of Force so limited in its power to generate energy that it represents but a small fraction of one horse power, and its activity at high tide not powerful enough to raise it to self-consciousness, but must forever remain in the condition of sub-consciousness or universal consciousness. For such a Unit there would be no responsibility, no individuality, no good, no evil, no heaven, no hell, yet the quality of this Unit is like that of all units; its limitation is in its power to generate energy—its quantity.

While this is the true condition, we cannot say what Units of Force are so limited, on account of the law of rhythm. A Unit of Force may be subconscious at the low tide and self-conscious at the high tide of its rhythm. All matter is energized by these Units of Force, but the activity of the rock is so slight that it has not self-consciousness, neither has the sand on the beach.

Comparing the amount of matter that is energized by Units of Force that have sufficient energy to vibrate self-consciously, with the vast amount of substance that is not self-conscious, we find that sub-conscious matter exceeds a thousand fold that which is self-conscious; that only a small per cent of the Units of Force have sufficient energy to become self-conscious.

All Units of Force are individualized and are either conscious or subconscious. Everything possesses consciousness in this sense.

Psychometry is based on this principle. The psychometrist forces or blends his energy with the sub-consciousness of the rock or whatever the object may be, getting its past life and history, by taking it into his self-consciousness and passing judgment upon it. Individuality then shades into non-individuality, self-consciousness into unconsciousness.

All Units of Force are polarized. Some never attain individual immortality, according to our understanding of the term. They never reach individual responsibility on account of their limited power but go to make up universal immortality.

All Units are in constellations. Our thoughts group in constellations; an event occurs, it at once calls up others akin to it. An idea seizes us, it may be of beauty, love or hate, similar ideas out of the past immediately show themselves, the most intense thought becoming the center around which the others cluster. Thoughts are eternal; they are welded together by that inseparable nexus—the Will—the cause of their existence. The synthetic consciousness of thoughts we name memory, the vividness of which depends upon the intensity of the Unit of Force.

Individual immortality then is a fact, for all' those Units of Force that have sufficient power to raise sub-consciousness into self-consciousness, thus producing responsibility and individual immortality.

THE WILL

Thus far we have considered man as a Unit of Force, a dynamic center of energy controlled mathematically by law, with no power on his part to in any way modify it. He has figured as a result, a being whose chain of causes and effects are welded together by the Law of Polarity, a mere product of polarized force, an automaton, without power of choice, an absolute necessity, an inevitable thing lacking all responsibility for good and evil, a mathematical certainty at all times.

We now wish to consider man in the aspect of a being of free and sovereign Will, having the power to choose in an instant of time between the two poles of his being, to direct and control, to its limit, his Unit of Force, to attain and realize the fruits of his choice always within the limits of his force generation. This aspect of man makes of him a free agent, absolutely responsible for his thoughts and conduct—the maker of his own destiny, arbiter of his own fortune.

Considered as an attribute of man, we define Will as a free and sovereign power inherent in the Unit of Force. It is the power to choose, to wish or desire. Will pure and simple is force desiring. One may will at random for impossible as well as possible things; there is no limit to the power of Will to desire.

The power to choose implies things from which to choose. That which is chosen is something different from the power which selected it. That out of which Will makes its choice is environment. The word environment includes everything outside of pure Ego—all other Egos and everything apart from the particular Ego desiring. Pure Ego seeks the other half of itself—object—environment. Except in connection with environment Will could not be comprehended in consciousness. It is Ego seeking to wed outsiders, which apart from environment would be incomprehensible.

Force and Will, as we define them are not the same. Will is desire pure and simple, and in the abstract, unattended by any force. We may desire a thing without using the least energy to acquire the thing desired, we are conscious that we desire the thing, and at the same time, equally

conscious that we are using no force to realize the thing desired. It is true that the thing we most desire we often make no attempt to get for the reason that it is impossible to acquire it. Yet our longing for it shows our desire, which is Will, pure and simple. Thus we distinguish between Will and force, in the abstract.

Ego unites with environment through Will. To the extent that it succeeds in this does it build the alter ego, which we have described in a previous chapter. The alter ego may be added to indefinitely. In this respect it is the opposite of the pure Ego which is the true Unit and cannot be added to or subtracted from. Will selects the entire body of the alter ego, in this sense that it is the nexus which unites the experiences of the pure Ego—the Unit of Force—into a chain without beginning or end. The synthetic consciousness of which is memory.

It is self-evident that if man had not the power of free will, he would have no responsibility. The free and sovereign Will is the principle of individual responsibility.

The strength of a Will is its power to hold to a purpose; it is concentration. Stripped of all concrete considerations one will is as strong as another. Will is the sovereign of environment and need never be conquered by it. If Will were the slave of environment, it would not be free. The reason we do not attain the things we desire is either through lack of holding to the purpose or because of our limitation in energy, and not from failure of sovereignty of Will.

We have shown the impossibility of consciousness of a thing that we do not possess within ourselves. If we had not free and sovereign Will we could have no consciousness of being able to desire the impossible as well as the possible. The fact that we possess this power is proof of the freedom of the Will. It is as easy to desire the thing that is beyond our power of accomplishment as that which is most easily attained.

Though the power to Will is free our desires are often induced by environment, often yield to environment. All that we maintain is that we have the power to desire the opposite condition from the existing one, also the power to shape and control environment within the limit of our energy, which is sufficient to our desires if we apply it toward the accomplishment of our purpose.

Some theologians contend that results occur according to the will of a Being outside of man. If such were the fact, then He, and He alone, would be responsible for results. This doctrine robs man of all dignity and responsibility for his actions, and makes of him a creature at the caprice of something outside himself. To say the least it amounts to a travesty on justice.

There is one thought that we wish to keep constantly before the mind of the reader, it is this:

Man is the whole in quality and a part in quantity. This is a cardinal principle necessary to the understanding of these teachings and the phenomena of life. Therefore free Will as an attribute of God, does not argue for its non-existence in man. For the reason that God is either object to man (self) or He is self. If God is object, then self knows object only by the potentiality of object in self. If God is subject, and subject is the whole in quality, then subject (man) possesses free and sovereign Will. We are forced to this conclusion from whatever point we view the subject.

Man could have no conception of free Will if he did not possess this quality in himself. To possess the quality of free Will is to have free Will.

The power, in the abstract, to choose or desire is the primal quality of Will. It does not depend upon anything outside of the individual, nor does it result from an inner condition brought about by past experiences, it simply IS.

If there existed two motives for doing a thing or not doing it, and both motives had the same power to influence the Will, or if one had a thousand times more influence than the other, the Will might choose either motive, or it might choose to act in a way different from both. It is not possible to conceive of a condition or environment where the individual would not have the power to choose between that and another. We do not say that he would seek to change it, that he would use any effort to do so, we only contend that he has the power to desire to change. That he makes no effort is another question. The very denial of this power is in itself an act of free Will. He who denies the existence of a thing, knows that he can as easily affirm its existence as deny. The

question is not of the truth or falsity of the statement, but of the power to deny or affirm.

We cannot deny the existence of a thing that we have no knowledge of. We can have no knowledge of a thing save we possess it in ourselves, otherwise it would not be our knowledge. If you reply, that this power is given us by a Being outside ourselves, we tell you that you can know nothing from without save you have its co-respondent within, that the consciousness of a thing depends upon the potentiality of the thing within yourself. A person cannot deny the power of choosing, without, at the same time, being conscious that he is exercising this very power in making the denial. If man possesses the power not to choose he also has its compliment—the power to choose. This is so by the law of opposites. To affirm that man has a certain quality is an admission that he possesses the opposite one. One cannot be conceived in consciousness without the other.

When Will asserts its power it acts as a cause, and it is the First Cause from which results flow. We are now speaking of Will when it acts approximately without reference to environment, as a free and sovereign right. The act of choosing is done when the choice is made; the result may not be accomplished for a long time and it may never be. The carrying out of a desire is quite another matter.

It is the custom of Will to follow the course suggested by reason or habit as a result of past experiences. Causes external and internal exercise an influence upon the Will and just to the extent that it is influenced by causes external to itself, it ceases to exercise its sovereign right to command. Now the Will has the power to stop this mechanical process, and to set up new causes born of the Will itself as a first cause independent of all existing conditions. Man knows that he has the power to choose between the two poles of his being—the two phases of expression in any particular specialization, as between good and evil— in defiance of existing conditions, such as reason, emotion or environment external or internal, also to change his decision, though it should mean instant death. The consciousness of this power in man is evidence of its existence.

If man is the whole in quality and a part in quantity, there can be nothing in the universe outside of himself except quantity, and the whole must

include the quality known as free Will. The strength of our position lies in this: From the point of unity there is no cause except Will. If we attempt to trace causes we never can reach the end except at the point where existence began. Even so, there was a cause for the beginning, which would be the First Cause, and from which all other causes would follow. If on the contrary you trace back to no First Cause, Will being primal and sovereign, we have an absolutely free Will, in itself a cause, influenced perhaps by other Wills, but never forced, because of its precedence to environment.

Man either controls environment or environment controls man. One of these positions~'must be maintained. If man has not the power of choice, but is compelled by a power outside of himself to act in a particular way always, then whatever he may do, no matter how wicked, carries in it no responsibility for him. If the cause is outside of him, the effect is also there. Rob man of free Will and you take from him his only heritage that makes the man—the power of choice in his actions, and the responsibility that results from the same.

The philosophy of the man who believes in free Will must be directly opposed to that of the man who believes in the creation hypothesis. The man who believes in free Will recognizes no sovereignty, and practices to that end.

If the Unit of Force is but slightly active the quality predominating manifests but slightly. The Will however has the power to arrest either pole of being and compel the action of the opposite pole to the full limit of the power of the Unit of Force. This is forcibly illustrated in cases of sudden danger, where choice has to be made instantly. Will makes the choice and concentrates its force for the result. It makes no difference if the person is in a state of reaction and his energy apparently spent, the reverse condition takes place instantly at the command of the Will and may be continued till the result is accomplished. This is possible because the last effort of Will is always more powerful than the one that preceded it. A greater cause overcomes the effects of a lesser one or one whose effects are partly spent. The result of the first cause is not lost or destroyed, but it is deflected and proceeds along the line of least resistance.

If man had not freedom of Will he would swing up and down, in and out, mathematically true to the law of cause and effect or rhythm. This is not borne out by the facts of life. The individual may and does, to an extent, direct the events of his life. In a majority of cases, unconsciously, it is true, he makes a sort of automatic use of his Will, which if used consciously, would make of him the dictator who controls his life and destiny. The individual who feels himself at the mercy of forces outside himself, who has no realization of the kingly power, is a being of another sort. His life is spent in a weak submission to things as they are, whether or not they are to his liking or wellbeing. He is up or down according to the rhythm of events, a mere puppet of fate, happy and miserable by turns, and not in the least comprehending the reason why, nor dreaming that it is in his power (and nowhere else in the universe) to make results different by an exercise of his free and sovereign Will.

Thus Will may be considered as voluntary and involuntary. In the higher orders of life, it is voluntary, while in rocks and plants it is involuntary. When man acts in accordance with the conscious direction of the Will, his actions are voluntary, but when he is dominated solely by the rhythm of events, his actions are in accordance with natural law which in this case dominates the Will, and his doings are involuntary.

Force and Will in the abstract are not the same thing. When force is considered apart from the Will, it has not the characteristics of Will, but when it is directed by Will, it appears to be the same.

Attributes or qualities are called out of unity by Will. There is no cause that has not been fathered by Will. It follows then that all vibrations in the universe are caused by these Units of Force. Matter is kept in motion by them. All motion is based on this fact. In this sense all things have Will. Hence it is that results produced by causes outside of self, can be overcome by Will interference, and effects stopped so long as the Will is sufficiently concentrated. It is force matched with force.

Man is successful in the attainment of his desires just in proportion as the Will balances in concentration the causes that he desires to overcome. Observe we speak of concentration of Will, not of strength of Will. However, a man usually sends his energy in the direction of his desires. With the Will sufficiently concentrated, the rhythm of cause and effect is transcended, and results then occur according to the amount of

energy. In the application of this principle lies the key to attainment in all directions, and is the source of all power.

If upon investigation our hypothesis is shown capable of answering all questions relative to the countless manifestations of life, and if it accounts satisfactorily for known facts and reveals those before unknown, it is but logical to conclude that it is the true hypothesis and contains the fundamental principles upon which the varied forms of life find their changeless and everlasting foundation.
