



teozofija v sloveniji



Alexis Dolgorukii

A METAPHYSICS: "THE PROBLEM"

Republished from the website www-parascience.org

alexis dolgorukii © 1998

Prispevki k raziskovanju zgodovine Teozofskega gibanja - v izvorniku

PART I

"Metaphysics is a great light ... and like all great lights ... it attracts a lot of bugs!"; so, said the late great Sufi teacher, Murshid Samuel L. Lewis, and no truer words were ever spoken. It is equally true whether it is applied to metaphysics *per se*, or to Sufism itself, or to Theosophy, or to Occultism, and that is the clear fact that the "bugs" are: "THE PROBLEM."

The objective of finding and implementing a solution to that problem must be contemplated by any serious and stable student of the subject, by anyone who believes that it is important that the light of metaphysics not be hidden under a bushel of both fantasy and in all too frequent cases, actual insanity.

The light that is metaphysics, and by that I mean the abstract perceptions that are included in the overall study of speculative metaphysics, is literally the most important factor in the evolution of human consciousness, and that is why "The Problem" is a dire problem indeed.

Far too much that calls itself "Metaphysics" is nonsense. But then what IS "Metaphysics *per se*"?

I am going to quote from my definition in my Introductory Essay on Speculative Metaphysics.

"Metaphysics, and I want to make clear immediately that the word is NOT a euphemism for Religion, is the intellectual and speculative synthesis of several philosophical disciplines; and, in our time period: of some scientific disciplines as well, and they are distinctly hard' sciences too!"

"Metaphysics" is the methodology which intelligent human beings utilize to answer all their most basic questions regarding the "Nature of The Human Condition," their individual relationship to that condition, the place or context into which the Human Condition "fits" in the universe which is slowly being revealed to us in response to diligent scientific effort, and most important of all, to enable human beings to understand "What it all means." In other words, metaphysics is a methodology to try to answer humankind's most urgent existential questions.

There is a justly celebrated definition of "metaphysics" expressed by Francis Herbert Bradley (1846 -1924) who was an influential British Philosopher of his time associated with the Absolute Idealist Movement. In 1893 he defined "Metaphysics" as: "Metaphysics is an attempt to comprehend the universe not simply piecemeal or by fragments, but some how as a whole."

Another famous definition is that of William James who said: "Metaphysics is nothing but an attempt to think things out clearly to their ultimate significance, to find their substantial essence in the scheme of reality and, thereby, to unify all truth and reach that highest of all generalizations which constitutes philosophy."

In our times, serious metaphysical speculation includes the following concepts: substance, essence, accident, form, matter, actuality, and potentiality, To this must be added speculations on the perception of "beginnings" and "endings," life and death. Speaking more academically, the disciplines covered by the term "Metaphysics" include, Cosmology, Theology, Ontology, Epistemology, and Eschatology. But I find the simpler terms easier to deal with as they don't scare anyone off. Also, and this is only in our times, we cannot intelligently discuss these subjects without adding the input of scientific disciplines such as Quantum Theory and Scientific Cosmology which deal with precisely the same speculations from the scientific point-of-view.

For instance: Werner Heisenberg's "Uncertainty Principle" is clearly metaphysical in implication while totally scientific in nature. We also, of necessity, must include the very copious "hard" information coming to us through the Hubble Telescope and other astronomical-cosmological devices.

The term "metaphysics" is a gift to us from Aristotle, but his "metaphysics" (and his "physics" too) were limited to the parameters in which his tremendous and fertile intelligence was confined. Most of his speculations, both physical and nonphysical were based upon his tremendous powers of observation and synthesis, much of those were related to extrapolations derived from his extensive botanical and zoological work. We are infinitely luckier than he, for we have the most advanced efforts of our modern quantum theorists, scientific cosmologists aided by their "super-computers" to help us in our speculations in our effort to understand "The Nature of the Human Condition" and its relationship of the whole of which it is a part.

Now to the extent that anything which calls itself "metaphysical" differs from that definition it is NOT speculative metaphysical philosophy but fantasy and delusion!

So then, what I am saying is that metaphysics is a branch of philosophy. What is "philosophy" then? It's a common word, but listening to people use it glibly makes me wonder if they really know what the word means to say.

The late Manly P. Hall defined it this way: "Philosophy is the science of estimating values. The superiority of any state or substance over another is determined by philosophy. By assigning a position of primary importance to what remains when all that is secondary has been removed, Philosophy thus becomes the true index of priority or emphasis in the realm of Speculative thought. The mission of Philosophy *a priori*, is to establish the relation of manifested things, to their invisible ultimate cause in nature."

That though, while Mr. Hall appears to be speaking of all speculative philosophy, might also serve as a really excellent definition of "metaphysical philosophy."

The best definition of Philosophy that I have ever seen is Will Durant's:

"Science seems always to advance, while philosophy seems always to lose ground. Yet this is only because philosophy accepts the hard and hazardous task of dealing with problems not yet open to the methods of science - problems like good and evil, beauty and ugliness, order and freedom, life and

death; so soon as a field of inquiry yields knowledge susceptible of exact formulation it is called science. Every science begins as philosophy and ends as art; it arises in hypothesis and flows into achievement. Philosophy is a hypothetical interpretation of the unknowable (as in metaphysics), or of the inexactly known (as in ethics or political philosophy); it is the front trench in the siege of truth.

Science is the captured territory; and behind it are those secured regions in which knowledge and art build our imperfect and marvelous world. Philosophy seems to stand still, perplexed; but only because she leaves the fruits of her victories to her daughters the sciences, and herself passes on, divinely discontent, to the uncertain and unexplored.

Specifically; philosophy means and includes five fields of study and discourse: logic, esthetics, politics, and metaphysics.

1. LOGIC is the study of ideal method in thought and research.
2. ESTHETICS is the study of ideal forms or beauty; it is the philosophy of art.
3. ETHICS is the study of ideal conduct.
4. POLITICS is the study of ideal social organization.
5. METAPHYSICS (which gets into so much trouble because it is not, like the other forms of philosophy, an attempt to co-ordinate the real in the light of the ideal) is the study of the “ultimate reality” of all things; of the real and final nature of “matter” (Ontology), of “mind” (Philosophical Psychology); and of the interrelation of “mind” and “matter” in the processes of perception and knowledge (Epistemology).”

Now as I see it, Dr. Durant has left out one of the most important disciplines in metaphysical speculations and that is the study of “ends and beginnings” or “Life and Death” (Eschatology).

But this, I believe, makes it clear that “Metaphysics”, for all of its special nature, is still a Speculative Philosophical Discipline and nothing else. Now it is also clear to me that anything which is “speculative” implies and requires the use of intellect to make the speculations. In this regard I have to say that it is a lack of clear definitions that makes up an important aspect of “THE PROBLEM.”

Metaphysics is not “channeling,” it is not “Occultism,” it is not “Magic” or “Magick” - those things are belief systems, those things are religions, or at least they act LIKE religions in that they are irrational, and precisely because they are both irrational and anti-rational they are intrinsically oppressive of their “believers.”

The possession of intelligence and the ability to reason are one of the most important factors in sentience.

But it is precisely those utterly irrational things that have become confused in the public mind with the careful and rational approach to philosophy that is speculative metaphysics. This is a tragedy!

There is an important corollary to what I’ve just said, and intrinsic to that corollary there is an extremely insidious trend in the entire metaphysical Community. It is particularly active and most obvious in the “Occult” and “New Age” community.

But, as I have indicated elsewhere, this trend is, while not nearly as obvious, certainly more pernicious in the Academic and Scholarly Communities themselves. This “trend” is an outgrowth of the Decon-

structionist-Relativist Movements, and it is one of the most destructive and harmful movements ever to confront Human progress.

Metaphysics, if it matches the two quoted definitions given above, and it does, and if it is truly a speculative investigation as to existential realities, and it is; in that case it is primarily an intelligence-based process, rational and intellectual in nature. As I see it this is true even though metaphysics speculates on abstractions. But precisely because its focus is abstract, it requires the highest and most acute intellectual perception to deal with it.

Now, given that the foregoing is true, and I firmly believe it is, the insidious trend is the constant and powerful denigration of intellect and intellectuality in the communities in question. The “New Age” and “Occult” communities, and almost every other group dedicated to what might be called “the pursuit of metaphysics,” ridicules and berates, in the strongest terms, anyone and anything which they deem intelligence based. These people preach an emotion-based approach to metaphysics, which they do not see as speculative at all. And that is a colossal error. This utterly fanatic anti-rationality is the principal cause of “The Problem.”

It may seem incongruous to connect Deconstructionism-Relativism with an anti-intellectual movement because this movement presents itself as an entirely advanced intellectuality, but that is a complete fabrication. All of Heidegger and Derrida’s pseudo-philosophical premises are, at their intrinsic level of meaning, totally anti-rational and anti-intelligence. “Intellectual” is what they pretend to be, but it is an “Alice in Wonderland” intellectuality in which reality and facts are “stood on their heads” in favor of consciously and willfully pernicious nonsense. Deconstructionism-Relativism is actually societal nihilism.

“The Problem” has its roots in two separate but inter-connected things. One is an almost complete misunderstanding of the nature and reality of what were called “The Mystery Schools” in the Classical World. The other are the various permutations of Manicheanism which was itself a misperception of Gnosticism which was itself a misunderstanding of the Mysteries of the Greco-Roman World.

This misunderstanding was unfortunately combined with an equal misunderstanding of the Chaldean Mysteries of Babylon.

ALL OF MODERN OCCULTISM AND MAGICK PROCEEDS FROM THIS BASIC SOURCE.

It’s all horrendously dualistic. Though to be truthful, I’d have to say that “dualistic” doesn't barely describe the infinite multiplicity of their fantasies.

Perhaps, I’d best define the meaning of what I said above. All of it! What were “The Mystery Schools”? I ask this question because I think I’ve already made it obvious that I consider the almost total misunderstanding of the reality behind this oh-so-misleading nomenclature is the basic cause of most of the problem.

One of the biggest problems we face in dealing with a rational discussion of the so-called “Mystery Schools” is lack of hard data regarding them. While certain hard facts do exist, they are entirely overwhelmed and engulfed by clouds of fantasy. A really large amount of what people believe about the “Mysteries” comes from what is called “channeling” or “revelation” and this is entirely invalid as history. It is enjoyable and amusing as fiction, but it is dangerous when taken as fact.

The thing that makes all “channeling” or “revelation” invalid is the simple fact that such data can neither be proved nor disproved, therefore it is irrelevant. It’s just that simple.

Rational beings cannot and must not base their belief systems or world views on irrational data.

So then, what do we actually “know” about “Mystery Schools”? Well, the Druids had centers for the study of the “mysteries” at Glaeston (Glastonbury) and Karnac in Brittany. These two are known to all. There were other centers in Ireland, Northern Spain (Galicia), Wales, Scotland, Germany, Scandinavia, and at a few centers in the Slavic Lands. Where ever the Celtic peoples were found, so too were the Druids and the Druidic “Mysteries”.

In the Classical milieu (*i.e.* The Mediterranean Basin) the Mystery Centers were: Eleusis in Greece, Delphi in Greece, Samothrace in Greece, Dordona in Ionia, Sais and Heliopolis in Egypt, and prior to the advent of Zoroastrianism, the Mazdazdians had a center in Babylon. After the advent of Zoroastrianism that school was moved to Shiraz, in Persia, where it eventually became associated with the Sufi order.

How did these Mystery Schools differ from the Cult Temples?

Well, primarily it was a matter of direction, purpose served, and orientation. The Cult Temples were places of worship, the Mystery Temples were the providers of various degrees of knowledge. What kind of knowledge? This is important to our discussion because it is from the public perception of the nature of the knowledge so carefully dispensed by the mystery Priesthoods, and the almost total lack of either knowledge of, or comprehension of, HOW they dispensed that knowledge and to whom, that the myth of “occultism” arises. What happened is that the Mysteries became “magical” which is exactly what they weren’t.

I think it should be pretty clear that what were called “Cult Temples” were the ancient equivalent of our modern Churches. They served the cults or myths of the Gods and Goddesses, they were centers of worship and veneration of those “Divinities,” and they were the only providers of social services in that period. They were the Religious Institutions or Churches of their time and place.

So then, I ask once again: what were the “Mysteries” if they were, in fact, other than “occultism” has made them seem?

The Priests and Priestesses who served in the Mystery Temples were selected through a process that was elitist and exclusionary in the extreme. The candidates were chosen from among those who presented themselves at the Temples with the desire to become “Mystae” or “initiates” in the “wisdom” (knowledge) preserved and passed-on by the Priests of those temples. Some of the wisest and greatest of the Human Race served in these temples, and some individuals, like Plato and his grandfather Solon were initiates into most of the different “mysteries” available in their period.

These Priests were not “magicians,” they were scholars, they were the anthropologists, and the scientific cosmologists and particle physicists of their times, they were also the only historians of their times! The “mysteries” they guarded and dispensed so carefully were simply the comprehension of the nature of the human condition, the nature of the greater reality outside of the human condition, and the nature of the inter-relationships between the two.

IT WAS THEIR METHODOLOGY WHICH LED TO THE PROBLEMS THAT EXIST TODAY REGARDING “OCCULTISM.”

The knowledge and understanding they possessed were not then, and are not now, attainable by the ordinary person. In reaction to that fact, the “Mystery Temples” dispensed their knowledge in carefully “graded” doses, and the entire content of their data-base was kept rigidly secret from all but the highest level of their Priest-Initiates. Why? Well because knowledge of things one is incapable of comprehending is dangerous and more so to the person who gains that which is utterly beyond them, than to anyone else. “A Little knowledge is a dangerous thing” and, by extension, “a lot of knowledge is an extremely dangerous thing.”

Especially to those who are incapable of comprehending what they are taught. And so, the content of their instructions was held rigidly secret. Both by those who taught it, and by those who received it. That is the only reason why they were called the “Mysteries,” it was because they were hidden or secret.

Their teachings were, in fact, available on a very low level to all who applied to the Temples of the Mysteries for “Initiation,” in the form of dramatic presentations which demonstrated symbolically, certain truths or facts about the human condition. By people’s reactions to those demonstrations, the Priests knew who might be appropriate for further instruction.

The Mystae were first and foremost scholars. Their knowledge and wisdom were the only source of “power” they possessed and that is equally true of their successors to this day. They are not magicians, they are not alchemists, they are simply knowledgeable!

Now popular metaphysics-occultism arose out of total mis-perceptions of the “Mysteries” which as time passed gave rise to “Manicheism” and “Gnosticism,” in passing I really have to note that far too much of mainstream Judeo-Christian-Islamic Theology arose from the same misunderstandings. Now all of these belief structures, the Judeo-Christian-Islamic “Triad,” Manicheism, and Gnosticism were more intimately connected with the Pre-Zoroastrian Mazdazdian belief structure than they were or are with the Mysteries, but as time passed the Mysteries became blended with the Dualists and today are almost entirely inseparable from them.

The Mazdazdian original was the basis for all dualism, it’s emphasis on the “war between light and darkness” or “good and evil” have disfigured all metaphysical thinking in a religious context since. Manicheism, Gnosticism, and the Judeo-Christian-Islamic Triad are all simply minor variations on the Mazdazdian Dualistic theme. It is entirely wrong and so are they.

How does all this history pertain to what I call “The Problem”? Well, it is because if you review what has long gone on in the community which claims to be Metaphysical and if you extend that review to the current state of affairs in the so-called metaphysical community it will be very clear to you that the basic reason metaphysics is in such a parlous state is the total misconception of what the study of metaphysics implies and entails, and the fact that many of the individuals I define as “bugs” are entirely tainted with not simply misperception of WHAT it is that metaphysical philosophy is, but a totally irrational and unbalanced view of themselves and their connection to metaphysics.

To any reasonably sane person who is intrigued by the fascinating speculations which are part and parcel of the study of metaphysical philosophy it is a source of great sadness and frustration to know full well that to the great majority of people on this planet, the study of metaphysics is entirely identified with “channeling,” “terrestrial communications,” “angelic communications,” even “Dolphin Communications,” to which is added idiocy like “ascended Masters,” “initiates,” and clap trap like the “Golden Dawn,” “OTO,” and all of Aleister Crowley’s Thelemic “fun and games.”

Now, the fact of the matter is that none of these bits of nonsense have any connection with the serious study of Metaphysical Philosophy whatsoever. But most people believe they do, and that perception is far stronger than reality.

So then, that is the problem. If you consider yourself to be a serious student of metaphysical philosophy, as I do, then it is not simply “The Problem” no it is OUR PROBLEM.

What, in the name of sense and sensibility, do we do about it?

PART II

“What, in the name of sense and sensibility, do we do about it?”

That’s how the previous “installment” of this essay ended. So let’s start by really taking a look at what we’re forced to deal with.

In this part of my exposition on the problem facing those of us who would seriously attempt to make sense out of metaphysics, I am going to be dealing with a demonstration of the kind of egregious road-blocks that almost completely prevent our being taken seriously by people who are both intelligent and completely sane.

In the first part of this exposition, I outlined the problem, in this part of my essay I am going to demonstrate that I am not “making it all up” by showing to you all the face the so-called Metaphysical-Occult Community presents to the world.

Here in Northern California, there is a “throw away” magazine called COSMIC LIN that is given away gratis at many Natural Foods Stores, Bookshops, and shops catering to the New Age Community. Its name is certainly evidentiary of the kind of infantile pretentiousness so very common to this community. Each issue is a complete compendium of the kind of nonsense I call “the problem.”

“Channeled articles,” and various health-oriented rip-offs. One of the most common of all notes in this kind of thing is the outrageous charges these so-called practitioners make for their very highly questionable services.

I have chosen a two-page advertisement to show you exactly what I mean. This is, without a doubt one of the most outrageously offensive things I have ever seen. It is an insult to the intelligence of anyone who reads it. Those who “buy” what it has to “sell” probably are either in need of psychiatric care or extremely ignorant. It did not “scan” too clearly, but I really wanted everyone to see it.

Now this advertisement, purporting to be for a “Wesak Festival” is a terribly pernicious thing. I don’t regard it as wildly dangerous because it is far too ridiculous to be taken seriously except in a small coterie of people to whom reason and rationality are entirely irrelevant. What is “Wesak”? Well, in the part of the world that is Buddhist, it is a festival celebrated on the full moon day of the Indian month of Vaisakh which is called Wesak in Sri Lanka. It purports to be the simultaneous anniversary of ALL the major events of Gautama Siddhartha’s life, i.e., his birth, his attainment of Buddhahood, and his death. Now of course this is no more true than is the belief that Gautama was born of a virgin named “Maya”

or “illusion,” all of that is just religious mythology.

Nonetheless this is a festival celebrated by all the multitude of Buddhist the world over. BUT the people who placed this ad are not Buddhists, they are Occultists, and New Age Occultists at that. They are indulging themselves in an illusion which was, as my research indicates, first created by Charles Webster Leadbeater, the famous second-generation Theosophical leader. His other claim to fame is that he was a life-long molester of little boys. I mention that because it gives us an indication, and a very clear one, of the nature of his ethics. The nature of a person's ethics gives us an indication of the clarity and depth of their intelligence. A truly intelligent person could never be comfortable in the act of using their position to get another person to do things they normally would not do. This is especially true as regards the sexual abuse of very young children.

There's an old saying in Latin "Ex Nihilo nihil fit," which means: "Out of Nothing, nothing comes." Well, I'd like to propose a matching saying: "Out of Something negative, nothing positive ever comes." Charles W. Leadbeater was a totally bad man, nothing that came out of him is good. Now the fact that his "badness" may have been, and most probably was, the product of insanity doesn't lessen the harm he did in any way. Insanity may explain Leadbeater's behavior but it doesn't mitigate it.

I am bringing the subject of Bishop Leadbeater up because a really goodly percentage of what is horrid about modern pseudo-metaphysics can be lain right at the feet of the Bishop's Throne. I am talking about a problem which deeply effects, in a totally negative fashion, the practice and study of Metaphysics, and Bishop Leadbeater is the cause of most of that problem. Now, Leadbeater was followed by others who were perhaps just as wrong but hardly as negative.

These folks were entirely influenced by the Bishop's silly and harmful metaphysical fairy tales, and made up some of their own. They are Alice Bailey, Gottfried de Purucker, and latterly Elisabeth Clair Prophet. The man who is responsible for this advertisement quite clearly comes out of this tradition.

I have a question, Joshua David Stone calls himself a "Dr.," but I must ask what kind of Dr. is he, and where did he get the degree that is supposed to accompany such a use. Unfortunately for all of us, we must be suspicious when someone claims the right to use a title that should be hard-earned but in all too many cases, especially in the new-age/occult/metaphysical community, these degrees, while technically legal (perhaps) are not ethically valid. One can buy a perfectly legal PhD from "The Universal Life Church," it is legal but Meaningless. This is true too of many other Diploma Mills which disfigure the face of the New Age Community. Joshua David Stone calls himself "Doctor" but I personally feel I need some proof that it is a valid Doctoral Degree and not merely a legal one. It could also be simply a self-awarded title, there are far too many of those in the New Age Community, I have encountered so-called Reiki Masters who call themselves Doctor. The problem I have with Joshua Stone's use of the title Dr. both for himself and his associate Mikio Sankey is that to all too many people the term Dr. implies an individual worthy of respect, one whose word can be relied upon, one who knows what he's talking about, ergo seeing these two "Dr." involved, people will give more attention to what they are saying than what they are saying deserves. In other words, their "titles" lend verisimilitude to their words.

Now let's look at those words.

At the top of the flyer, we have a row of "esoteric symbols" meaning in aggregate absolutely nothing. Below those symbols we find the title: "THE MELCHISEDEK SYNTHESIS LIGHT ACADEMY" - what a lot of pretentious twaddle that is! The occult community has always used the name Melchisedek

to gull the gullible and impress the ignorant. Melchisedek is an entirely mythical and probably fictional personage. In the great body of fiction created over the years by Occultism, he is considered a very great magician and teacher of magicians. Aside from the presence of this name in the identification of their group, the other words add up to nothing! Absolutely nothing! Each word, including the name, means something when standing alone, but put them together and they add up to pretentious twaddle.

Now, the flyer itself starts with these words: "The 1997 Wesak Celebration in Mt. Shasta was a tremendous success. It was a magical event with over 1200 high level disciples, initiates, and ascended beings."

What an unconscionable ploy that is to appeal to the egos and insecurities of the ineffectual people who tend to go to events of this type. He is saying clearly that everyone who attended this meeting was either a "high level disciple," or an "initiate," or an "ascended being." How utterly absurd. It would be funny were it not so very pathetic.

I would also like to know what Joshua Stone means by saying "IN" Mt. Shasta. On it, or near it, or at it, would make sense, but "In" it? Did they hold their convocation in a cave? I am not aware of the existence of such a space within this dormant volcano. But the choice of Mt. Shasta is evidentiary. Many people in the New Age Community firmly believe that the mountain is now the site of the Headquarters of the "Great white Brotherhood" and that, in addition, it is a "Space Base" where flying saucers land and are based.

The entire concept of "high level disciples," "initiates," and "ascended beings" is invalid, it is anti-rational twaddle, and it's all based on lies.

There's something else at work here too. It's something I believe is more than a little ugly. You will notice that Joshua Stone bills himself and the presenter of all this. What do you think he's trying to tell us about himself? After all, being the person who makes all this "glory" possible puts him into a position in which he is inferring that he is at least such an individual himself, if not one even more important. You know, he's charging 300.00 per person to attend this group ego trip and that makes simple profit not an unimportant motivation ($1,200 \times 300.00 = 360,000.00$). That's a lot of motivation! However, I do believe that Joshua Stone is in this as much, if not more so, for ego gratification as he is for the extensive profit. What he, in common with all the other people like him, has failed to understand is the simple fact that if what he was doing was anything even remotely real there would be no charges whatsoever accruing to attendance.

The second paragraph reads as follows: "At the 1997 Wesak Celebration there were not only 1200 high level initiates from around the globe in attendance, there were also 55,000 inner plane Planetary and Cosmic Ascended Masters and Angelic Beings. The Masters told me also that there were another 100,000 inner plane Masters and Angels who tapped in at different times throughout the weekend."

Now, this is an example of the "Metaphysical Problem" in its worst possible aspect. This is obviously either insanity or a scam or, and personally, I think this the most likely answer; it is a combination of both. What is being "sold" here is a fantasy, and the fantasy is this: If you can afford to waste \$300.00 on this weekend, you belong in the illustrious company which Joshua Stone is claiming will be present. The important reality with which we all must deal is this: "High level Initiates" and "Inner plane Masters and Angelic Beings" are, for all we know entirely fantasy or fictional things. There is no pragmatic proof that such things are real, nor can there be! But what an ego-trip this stuff is!

In the course of the last thirty years, I have been doing research into the metaphysical community and, in the course of that research, I have, unfortunately attended “meetings” of this kind. The best I can say for them is that they are silly, and that the people who attend them are, for the most part losers.

Most of these so called “High Level Initiates” are simply disaffected housewives who are adding glamour to their lives by fantasizing status. Surprisingly enough, there are rarely many males at these events.

In the course of that same thirty years of research I have learned a great deal more than I really wanted to, about these mystical magical mythical and totally fictional creatures they talk about, and because of that I am almost totally bemused by the really contextually ignorant way Joshua Stone uses the names of these fairy tale figures. Couldn't he have done some research to at least get his lies straight?

In the last paragraph of the first page, and in the opening paragraph of the first page there is a listing of the illustrious sponsors of this event ... this is all totally twaddle! Many of the individuals enumerated are fictional, others are taken in the wrong definition of the words, and some are merely synonyms for one another.

This could never have been produced by anyone who seriously studied either religion, or occultism, or even basic history for that matter.

We are told that “The Cosmic Masters,” Melchisedek, Mahatma, Metatron, the Divine Mother, and the Arch Angel Michael among others, are personally sponsoring and “over lighting” this event. Oh????

“Cosmic Master,” what sort of nonsense is this? By itself “Master” is bad enough, but “Cosmic Master,” what a lot of childish braggadocio. The reality behind the name Melchisedek we have already discussed. When he says “The Mahatma” his ignorance or stupidity is revealed. Mahatma means “Great Soul” in Sanskrit, and the Theosophists used the term Mahatma in connection with their putative “Masters” but here was never any singular person called “The Mahatma” except for Mohandas K. Gandhi who was a politician who lived in our century.

The Indian people have a much less glamorized view of the meaning of Mahatma than theosophists and occultists do. But clearly by saying that “The Mahatma” is a “sponsor” of this event Joshua Stone reveals his ignorance. Now there is a fantasy individual in the occult hierarchy called the Mahachohan, but Joshua Stone clearly doesn't know that.

Now we come to “Metatron” this is an archangel invented by the Kabbalists to be their “special angel.” Neither the Roman Catholic nor any other “angelology” contains any reference to this “arch-angel.” Of course, the existence of “angels” is highly debatable. Then he goes on to brag of the participation of “The Divine Mother” as well as The Virgin Mary, Isis and Vesta ... but if he knew anything at all of the histories behind those names he'd have realized that for most folks and most theologians The Divine Mother and the Virgin Mary are identical, and for those who really study the history of religion these female principle figures are of the same identity. They do this a lot. They go fishing for “Divine Names” and print out synonyms as separate names. This is true of Maitreya, Sananda, and Christ, they are all the same fictional figure but these are different names given them in different times and different places, I am very surprised that Jizo Botatsu isn't listed as a patronizing deity (That's the Japanese version of Jesus Christ). Then of course there's Djwahl Khul who was Alice Bailey's pet spook, and poor St. Germain, who I will bet is seen as a Saint named Germain rather than as a actual historical

figure called by his pseudonym; the Count de Saint Germain. And then there's an amazing identity the "Akasha-Angel Being" which is something I can't even try to identify. "Akasha" is the Sanskrit word for the energy field which is the reality of all things, but what the "Akasha-Angel Being" might be I have no idea, I guess it's some "Channels" pet spook. And then there's my own particular favorite: Commander Ashtar-Athena who seems to be a sort of compendium of the Goddess Athena, the Goddess Ishtar (who is completely different than Athena) and a Spaceship pilot or commander.

Can you see how insane this all is?

This is a really devastating part of the problem. Is it not easy to see how those of us who are seriously trying to make sense out of metaphysics are damaged and shamed by this kind of lunatic nonsense.

PART III

Once many years ago, when I was both a member of the Theosophical society, and an active officer in it, I was introduced on a radio program as "a member of the Metaphysical Establishment." And as I assume that to many people the Theosophical Society is a principal part of the so-called Metaphysical Establishment, then it follows that the Theosophical Society bears a large part of the burden for "The Problem."

In fact, while hardly the basic cause of the problem, for that cause is the basic mental instability of the kind of people who are sometimes drawn into the peripheral fascination with metaphysics as fantasy, none the less the Theosophical Society is the source of most of the present-day fantasies that are almost the entirety of "The Problem."

I have long ago discussed the aspects of the activities of the Theosophical Societies that have caused so much of "The Problem" to the entire field of Metaphysical Study. Now I want to spend some time discussing how "The Problem" effects The Theosophical Society itself. Because in the last 24 years during which time I have been involved with The Theosophical Society and with Theosophists in general (you will notice that I have used the capitalized version in each instance as these remarks in no way apply to theosophy and theosophists (small "t") ... that's another "kettle of fish" altogether) I have come to be unavoidably aware that: due in all probability to the intrinsic nature of the Religious Institution that The Theosophical Society has become, with its emphasis on such tremendously elitist concepts as "initiates," "disciplehood," "Karma," "higher learning," and of course "The Great White Brotherhood," an almost entirely negative influence on the world.

The entirely unavoidable implication of all this "flapdoodle" is a situation that clearly insinuates that the kind of people who become Theosophists are "advanced," and so by implication "superior." The unfortunate result of this is that instead of "making the world a better place for all people to live in" the Theosophical Society (and its ancillary groups) tends to make "bad" people far worse, and "good" people far less good than they might otherwise have been. As a result, it has made, and is still making, the world a much less good place to live in. There is absolutely nothing that hurts a dedication to the concept of "Universal Brotherhood" than a smug sense of superiority, the self-satisfied notion that: "I know something you don't know" that so typifies the majority of Theosophists.

The Theosophical Society also attracts, as its history quite liberally illustrates, more than its share of mentally unstable people. Nowhere is the more clearly demonstrated than in some of its more famous

leaders. Charles Webster Leadbeater was not simply a notorious pedophile, but he was also as totally insane; when “insane” is taken to mean self-deluded to the point of a total divorce from reality, as anyone has ever been.

I have before me a copy of the Official Magazine of the Theosophical society in America ... QUEST MAGAZINE (winter 1997 issue). It is a very clear example of how the Theosophical Society has been effected by the “Problem” of which it is one of the most intrinsic causes. There are three major articles named on the cover. One of them is entitled: “Princess Diana as Divine Mother,” another is entitled: “UFOs and the meaning of life” and the third is “Divine Humans, a Human Jesus.” These three articles, while ostensibly terribly intellectual and “advanced,” are nevertheless basically the same old religious “putch,” something theosophy was originally supposed to combat. On the whole however, the magazine is simply an expensively produced version of the magazine I talked about in the previous part of this over-all essay.

“Quest Magazine” and the cheaply produced “Cosmic Link” are siblings. That this is true tragic.

Let’s start by looking at the advertisements appearing in “Quest Magazine.” While they are glossier and slicker, and probably very much more expensive, they are never the less of the same quality and character as those which appear in “Cosmic Link.” Though “Quest” lacks the large number of advertisements by people claiming to be channels and psychics, the organizations represented are very little different. It certainly seems to me that Madame Blavatsky would have taken extreme umbrage at the character of this magazine, and rightfully so when it is compared with her own magazines “Lucifer” and later, “The Theosophist.” Neither of these magazines accepted advertising during H.P.B.’s tenure as editor and publisher. “Lucifer” of course, did not survive its author, “The Theosophist,” like the Theosophical Society itself, unfortunately survived minus its integrity and class.

Like this “Journal of Science and Spirit,” during Blavatsky’s life time, those magazines maintained their absolute integrity by not doing so. The minute a magazine sells advertising it compromises its integrity. The nature of the advertising it does accept compromises its “class.”

Why not look at some examples?

Well, for starters there’s an advertisement for AMORC, or “The Rosicrucians” right on the inner cover, which is the most obvious of all ad placements, and the most expensive after the rear cover. I have a question, the cover price of “Quest” is \$4.95, which is a lot to pay for such an “in-house” journal. The theosophical Society, whose organ it claims to be is a not-for-profit foundation, and furthermore The Kern Foundation, which supports Quest Publications and presumably could easily support, and may very well support the magazine, is extremely well endowed. Why compromise the integrity of the magazine with advertising at all? One could very well have asked: “What would H.P.B. have thought of AMORC?”

The over-all tenor of the advertising is relentlessly “New Age,” admittedly that “New Age” was clearly ushered in by the Theosophical Society. But when one is dealing with the Theosophical Society one has to consider it’s “Three Objects” (For a really extensive or “in-depth” discussion of those “Three Objects” please turn to my essay WHAT IS THEOSOPHY? under the topic heading DOLGORUKII ON BLAVATSKY in this Journal) and most of the advertising can only be connected with those objectives in a tenuous fashion.

The objectives of the Theosophical Society deal with study and research and experiment to find that "Truth" which is "higher than religion." More important than that, the Theosophical society was dedicated by its "First Object" to the inculcation of universal amity. This is hardly obtained through the kind of elitism currently so typical of the Society. Most of the groups advertising claim to have a "lock-grip" on a specific truth and many of them are purely religions.

But there are other things advertised too. How does the half page advertisement (page 11) for the works of someone who calls himself "The Master Charles" fit into the three objectives. What do you think Blavatsky would have to say about a person with the temerity to call himself "The Master Charles"? In the context of theosophy that word has a very specific meaning, even though I now think the whole "Master" concept to be nonsensical, I have to ask how the Theosophical Society could be so indiscriminate as to permit someone to advertise himself as "A Master"? The answer to that question is that since the demise of H.P.B. and probably before that time as well, the Theosophical Society has exercised no discrimination at all and prostituted itself to anything that came down the road. It doesn't really matter what this "American Mystic" has to say, he disqualifies himself by calling himself "The Master Charles" which makes him just another snake oil salesman. What's his ad doing in Quest?

On page 22 of the same issue we find an ad for a group that calls itself "The Association For Spirit Releasement Therapies;" their propaganda states that they do research into what they call "Spirit Releasement Therapy (depossession)" which is simply another way to say exorcism, but as I see it this is hardly a "Third Object Function." The third Object concerns itself with the investigation, in general terms, of the possibility that such a thing as "spirit possession" may exist. These people have no questions at all, only answers. Exorcism is a function of religion. Religion is an entirely negative thing. Other topics of interest to this group are: "UFOs and Mental Health," "Past Life Therapy," "Spiritual Protection For The Spiritual Explorer," "Remote Viewing," "Healing the Souls of Children," "The Anomalous Sensitive Person," "NDE" and more. What a Smorgasbrod!

Now this is an ad you'd surely expect to see in "Cosmic Link" but in Quest? There are many other ads, some for organizations and books that are patently respectable but hardly in place in the Organ of an organization of the character of the Theosophical Society. There are two other small advertisements I'd like to mention though, they are: (on page 31) an ad for "The Builders of The Adytum" which is an organization primarily devoted to teaching the Tarot and which fits into the category of "Popular Occultism" as do the "Rosicrucians."

The other, (on page 49) is for an organization which calls itself "Prosveta USA" and which promotes the "over 50 volumes" of the work of one Omraam Mikhael Aivanov (these by the way are unique spellings) and these are 50 volumes of Leadbeaterish "Occultism." It too has no place in a Theosophical Journal, after all the Theosophical Society is stuck with Leadbeater, why bother with his copycats?

Now let's get to the content of the magazine itself.

What's wrong with those three cited "cover" articles appearing in Quest? The answer is LOTS!

I want to start by saying that I should be VERY hard put to adjudicate which of the three articles is the most dichotomous with what Theosophy is supposed to be about. But they all three have one thing in common, they are dreadfully pretentious and smug. But then I should hardly be astonished by that, the entire Society is pretentious and smug, so why should its magazine be any different?

I am going to start by discussing the article which first drew my attention to this issue of quest Magazine. "PRINCESS DIANA AS DIVINE MOTHER." The first thing I have to say about this article is that to me, it is entirely unseemly, and in fact entirely unethical, to join the stampede to exploit a personal tragedy of this kind. Diana Spencer-Windsor, Princess of Wales was a beautiful woman, and a far better than ordinary Mother, who made the mistake of marrying onto a family in which the humanity, the essential humanness, of individuals has been entirely snuffed out. This has produced an "animatronic Royal Family." Elisabeth II of England is a cold and distant person whose feelings have been entirely stifled in the pursuit of an entirely imaginary fantasy of "Duty" and "Position." Diana Spencer was a vibrant, intelligent, and strongly independent woman who simply could not fit into this stifling Royal "Mold" and who was driven out of it as a result. The reaction to her death has been astonishing, but cruel to her two sons.

This article is a perfect example of what I mean. The author, Nancy Hiscoe Clark, is an ordained Unity minister who leads workshops in the Goddess heritage and serves as an adjunct faculty member in the Unity School of Christianity. Let me say this about Unity. Unity, it seems to me, is a half-hearted religion for people who are uncomfortable with, and doubtful of, Christianity but are not sufficiently bold to leave it altogether. To someone like a Southern Baptist or Roman Catholic I'd assume that Unity would be considered a total heresy. If the Southern Baptists don't consider the Mormons to be "Christian" at all, what must they think of Unity?

Ms. Clark is herself, a contradiction in terms. She is a so-called Christian Minister who leads workshops in the Goddess heritage. But there is no Goddess heritage in Christianity, especially in Protestant Christianity! Admittedly one could easily equate the "Maryolotry" in Roman Catholicism with Goddess worship but we know that the more extreme. Protestants regard Roman Catholicism as "an abomination unto God." So, what we have here is that Ms. Clark is really a minister in the "Church of What's Happening Now." Goddess worship is an important if fantastic aspect of the woman's movement, it's not Christian at all, but it is popular at the moment. So, I guess it's no surprise that a person like Ms. Clark would choose to exploit the Death of Diana.

Now, while the second objective of The Theosophical Society is the study and comparison of religions and philosophies, this was intended to be a comparative and evaluative study. It was not intended as an incentive to advocacy of religious views, popular or otherwise. Make no mistake, this article is advocacy, a particularly pernicious kind because it is so subtle. But with no doubt at all it is advocacy of the religious views of Ms. Clark. I am afraid I have to say that, as I see it, it is also almost totally hypocritical. Ms. Clark makes it seem that no one, perhaps even Diana's sons, mourned her as deeply and sincerely as Ms. Clark.

This article is a perfect example of everything that is wrong with The Theosophical Society. It is stylish, sophomoric, and simplistically superficial. And it is, Oh, so terribly sincere! In it, after linking poor Diana with every currently stylish Goddess cliché, she goes so far as to compare poor Prince William of England with Jesus. Good heavens, does she hate the poor young man. What a terrible burden to lay upon such young shoulders as a comparison with Christianity's entirely fictional martyred God!

She says, and I quote exactly: "England and the whole world are looking to her son William who will some day be anointed to reign as heir to the royal throne as the hope of new life and resurrection of all Britain and its monarchy. How very like the Great Mother and her son of old."

This is pure unadulterated babble! It is hyperbole to an unimaginable degree.

While I think it safe to assume that most English people, and many people elsewhere at least those who are aware of the boy's mother tragic death, feel great pity for Henry and William "The Whole World" is not "looking to William" and to say that it is can only be described as pure idiocy. The author moreover, reveals a great depth of ignorance when she says that William "will someday be anointed as heir to the Royal Throne" he is currently Prince Royal of England, and is the second in line, after his Father to the Crown of England. The anointing process, when, and IF (and it's a very BIG "if") William chooses to become King upon his Father's death, will anoint him KING of England, not "heir to the royal throne," he's that now.

Secondly, I'd really like to know what this poor misguided creature means when she says: "the hope of new life and resurrection of Britain and its monarchy." History cannot be gainsaid, the British Monarchy is simply a tourist attraction and a figure head, it has no connection at all with the future of the British Nation, only a connection with its past. If we are to judge by current political trends, Great Britain has no future at all. Not with Scotland, Wales, and even Cornwall, home to determined Independence movements. No nation has ever deserved dissolution more. The British Empire did untold and untellable harm to the world. Britain isn't, and never was, "The Hope of The World." England and the English aren't looking to "New life and resurrection" but simply to life itself in comfort and security something to which all people are entitled by birth. This by the way is something that the British Empire denied many in its realm.

It's entirely futile, and very harmful to compare reality with fiction, and the "Great Mother and her son of old" is entirely fiction while Diana Spencer-Windsor and her sons are real, very real indeed, and they both, the living sons, and their dead Mother, do not deserve to be exploited. They have a right not to be so, a basic human right, a right which Ms. Clark denies them.

What a sad descent from "Lucifer" this magazine is.

The next article which drew my attention is: UFOS AND THE MEANING OF LIFE. The author of this article is an interesting person, but once again an advocate of a particular viewpoint, one which can almost be defined as religious. He is Ronald Story, and the short "blurb" on him that accompanies the article states that he is: "The editor of The Encyclopedia of UFOs (Doubleday) and author of other books on the subject, including Space Gods Revealed (Harper & Row) and UFOs and the Limits of Science (Morrow). The entry on "Unidentified Flying Objects in the 1988 edition of the World Book Encyclopedia carries his byline, as successor to the late J. Allen Hynek, who had written the article in previous editions. Story has been working on a new book, tentatively titled 'Beyond Eden: solving the Mystery of Alien Contact'. He has a degree in philosophy from the University of Arizona."

So then, that's a respected expert on UFOs. My question of course, has to be how respected is anyone connected with the field of UFOs? And if so, to whom?

And if not, to whom? This is a valid and important question. So too, is this one: What about UFOs?

The title of the article in question is: UFOS AND THE MEANING OF LIFE, but do UFOs have any relevance to the meaning of life? They only do so if one considers them to be entirely symbolic, a euphemism for one's attitude toward life itself.

I repeat: "What about UFOs?"

The answer is, that I don't really know, and I really believe no one else does either. The big problem, as I see it, is when people claim to a truly KNOW something about the subject, and far worse yet, make an article of faith out of what they believe.

UFOs are probably some kind of reality, the trouble is we don't know enough about them to decide what. We do know that there have been reports of such things, or reports which can be construed to describe such things, for millennia.

The trouble is that in the "construing" things get exaggerated and twisted to mean what the "construer" wants them to mean.

Logically speaking, the presence of other intelligences in the universe is of a high grade of probability, but until actual and undeniable contact is made, probability is all we can reasonably discuss. Many of the so-called reports are fraudulent, many are the result of mob hysteria, but not all. Some of the reports can only be described as probably accurate sightings of vehicles about which nothing is known and which appear not to be of terrestrial origins. That's it!

No reasonable person can view books like those of Messrs. von Daniken and Schreiber as anything but speculative fiction at best, and downright fiction at worst. They are far too reliant on here say and don't really provide any hard evidence.

Now, where I find the article in *Quest* to be of questionable value is that it is using a Jungian Psychological interpretation of something that at best is imperfectly known and understood. Jung, because of his background, and because I really believe he was an extreme neurotic, saw everything as symbolism. But we just don't know, and/or understand enough about this subject to run it through Carl Jung's neuroses.

This essay in *Quest* concerns itself entirely with the neurotic-psychotic aspects of the UFO controversy and not with the controversy itself. And that is what causes me to complain.

My problem is once again with the fact that this essay is predominantly a "very stylish" or "faddish" effort, it is also fair to say that "Jungian" ideas are also a fad which is passing from fancy. Now, while the "Three Objects" make almost any subject appropriate for discussion among Theosophists, this one requires quite a long stretch to make appropriate. It is clearly not something which fits into either the second or third object categories. It surely isn't concerned with the comparative and evaluative study of religions and philosophies which constitutes the "Second Object," nor does it relate to research into the latent and potential abilities present in Humans which constitutes the "Third Object." Now the "First Object," which of the three is considered by most Theosophists to be the most important, is the inculcation of "Universal Brotherhood" which is simply a stylistically "Victorian" way to say that the Society seeks to bring about a condition of world-wide peace, friendship, acceptance of multiversity and tolerance. Now that's a pretty broad area.

So, let's get down to my reasons for complaining. What's wrong with an essay on the subject: "UFOs and the meaning of life"? My complaint is that it's an irrelevant discussion of a meaningless topic. It is also a very careful and cowardly avoidance of the only meaningful question regarding UFOs and this is "Are they Real, or are they Fantasy." To pass them off glibly as part of the search for meaning in life, is to avoid both the topic of UFOs themselves, and to avoid the fact that "the search for meaning in life" is a function of neurosis. Life is its own meaning. Life itself, is its own perfect *raison d'être*.

People who need to search for a specific “meaning” in life, are really only saying that they inwardly believe they themselves are meaningless, and are actually seeking an excuse for their own existence. None is needed.

Why do I regard the publication of this article as unfortunate? I do so because it reduces the journal in which it appears to a condition of stylish meaninglessness.

Now we come to the last of the three articles I want to discuss: DIVINE HUMANS AND A HUMAN JESUS.

This article is by Reverend Harold D. Jester and he is a Christian Minister. Now that, in itself is not a problem, or needn't be. The Second Object of the Theosophical society is the evaluative comparison of religions and philosophies. But this article is mostly concerned with the promulgation of the Judeo-Christian religion in a psychological context. It does not evaluate the Christian Religion, it “pushes” it. The Theosophical Society, at least in Helena Blavatsky's eyes and mind, was intended to combat and ultimately destroy the Judeo-Christian Islamic paradigm.

The promulgation of various religious paradigms is one of the clearest indications of the fact that The Theosophical society has lost its way. This is not a new thing, it lost its way in about 1880. The Theosophical Society went from being a challenging iconoclastic gad fly to being the terribly unorthodox spokesperson for a terribly orthodox religion, and over time, that religion changed from its original format of a combination of Dualistic Brahmanism and even more dualistic Mahayana Buddhism to being a sort of “mish mash” of those religions and Christianity. In trying to be “all things to all people” it became nothing at all.