



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

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 revels 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.

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.
