

# 1 LAURENCY

## *1.1 Introduction*

<sup>1</sup>One thing you learn when conversing with so-called educated people is that most of them do not know what esoterics is and that those who believe they know have got it all wrong. Newspapers are the authorities of most people, not only in political matters, but in everything else too. Even what they believe they know of esoterics is what they have got from some paper or journal, from a writer who in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred does not know what he is speaking about. Where esoterics is concerned they need not know more than what enables them to concoct any kind of rubbish. Since people swallow everything – unless it diverges from the dogmas (political, social, cultural, etc.) they have already learnt –, it is easiest for the journalist to search in his collection of clippings and crib some old article whose author once did the same.

<sup>2</sup>That is why most educated people know what humbug everything esoteric is. Therefore they need not investigate the matter. They know because everybody knows. But then their knowledge is as might be expected. The public does not see that knowledge of that kind is useless. What the public knows is not worth knowing. Anyone who is content with newspapers is content with what people believe they know, one thing today and its opposite tomorrow. How many of them reflect upon what has been held to be true in politics, religion, philosophy, science during just one hundred years and what has been changed on a daily basis? Can they draw any conclusions from such a reflection?

<sup>3</sup>When shall we have historians who make a study of what has been called truth the last two thousand years? It would be interesting to have an account of all the different views held on most questions that are in human brains today. All those who are able to think for themselves at all hold diverging opinions on almost everything. Is not the question that Sokrates asked on the worth of people's learning (the agreement of their learning with reality) as valid today as it was in his times? The answer to that question shows a man's insight into life and his understanding of life.

<sup>4</sup>The answer given by esoterics is that man is unable to know anything worth knowing by himself. Those who believe differently are the victims of their own ignorance. Then they might fantasize about their "cosmic consciousness", which can never reach beyond emotionality, since no human being can acquire a higher kind of objective consciousness. The emotional world is the world of illusions, and they are illusions because they can never be seen through.

<sup>5</sup>In all times, there have been those who were in possession of the knowledge of reality and life, initiates of secret knowledge orders. Those orders were instituted because all those possessing a greater knowledge than the rulers had to pay for it with their lives. A religion torturing and burning those who had their own views; a political system killing all who objected to its policies; a mankind intolerant of dissident views, being too primitive to rightly perceive the knowledge, and always abusing power; if you have all this there is only one way: to reserve the knowledge for the élite who had worked themselves up to the level where they could comprehend and understand, who demanded clarity, who saw through the absurdity of what was generally proclaimed, who realized the necessity of being silent of what they had been taught.

<sup>6</sup>If philosophers, in their ignorant faith in their own vagaries, did not constantly lead mankind astray with their fantasies, they could have taught us, at least as a basic dogma, that we cannot know anything of what is outside the range of scientific research – physical experience. Then we had acquired common sense and gained a solid ground on which to stand.

## 1.2 About Myself

<sup>1</sup>This present incarnation is my seventh as an esoteric philosopher. I am a very old esoterician, and therefore I possessed latent knowledge that could be resuscitated through esoteric study in this incarnation. Being an old Pythagorean, I possessed hylozoics latently. However, on account of the psychologically barbarous manner in which esoterics was presented from the beginning (it went on just as it had begun), it took an absurdly long time before I succeeded in remembering the hylozoic knowledge anew and reaching clarity. Some ten years wasted.

<sup>2</sup>Since I had a latent knowledge of Pythagorean hylozoics, I could treat of it, formulate it mentally into an absolute system of thought. When attempts were made at reducing my judgement to a minimum, the common resort was to call me “erudite”. By that I was dismissed as a “compiler”, etc. There are many people who are a lot more erudite than I am, even in esoteric literature, but who have not understood *The Philosopher’s Stone (PhS)*. And this is so because they did not possess the esoteric mental system latently. However “erudite” you are, it will be of no avail to you, unless you have latent knowledge.

<sup>3</sup>You will often hear people declaring that if they only had got an “education”, they could have reached any position. It is the superstition of life ignorance to believe that education can work “miracles”.

<sup>4</sup>“I could also have written such a book as *PhS*, if only I had got an education.” You might wonder why the millions of educated people did not do it.

<sup>5</sup>I have met “uneducated” people who, using their own power of reflection, had arrived at a life view that was in accord with esoterics in important respects. The simple explanation for this was that they possessed it all latently and managed to actualize their latency themselves, by observation and elaboration.

<sup>6</sup>It has also been seen that education and academic training have stifled what was latent so thoroughly that the result was a learned misfit in life, a person with a totally twisted conception of reality.

<sup>7</sup>It has been my endeavour to formulate a world view that could be accepted as a working hypothesis by scientists and philosophers, when they have realized the irremediable disorientation of the prevalent ideologies. Then they will need a philosophy based on facts and a mental system affording them a vision of reality and liberating them from the ruling illusions and fictions. When they have finally reached the insight that hylozoics is the only right conception of reality, they will be on the right track at last. It has been my endeavour and mission in life to clarify how hylozoics is superior as a working hypothesis.

<sup>8</sup>It has been my wish to give people a world view and a life view that accords with reality and can be comprehended even by a very mediocre mind; a working hypothesis that they could agree on and, if accepted, would make the individual, even without his knowing it, an aspirant to discipleship. That would put an end to the division and multitude of occult sects.

<sup>9</sup>I willingly concede that I am a non-entity, which is what I have appeared as well to most people. The esoterician does not compare himself with those on lower levels but with those on higher levels. The result is true, not false, humility. I am fully aware of the fact that I do not understand those who are on higher levels, unless they lower themselves to my level.

<sup>10</sup>Having experienced how the first two parts of Laurency’s work were given a systematic silence treatment (no newspaper bothered even to report their publication, let alone review them), the present writer finds it suitable to join in with Schopenhauer: “Not to my compatriots, not to my contemporaries, to mankind I leave my work, now completed, being convinced that it will not be without significance to it.”

<sup>11</sup>At all times, religion has always idiotized and brutalized mankind (from human sacrifice to torture and burning at the stake) with its fanaticism bordering on insanity. Even today it has a monstrous power of “castrating reason”, as Nietzsche’s terrible formulation goes. If I am

allowed to choose a family for my next incarnation, I shall definitely prefer to be born into an atheist one. Generally, they are the only families to demonstrate tolerance. And then I shall be spared all those senseless fictions that the Christian dogmas are. The fact that such dogmas are still being proclaimed is the best proof of the low level of mankind's reason.

<sup>12</sup>Of course, I should like to be born into an esoteric environment, to spare my reason the impregnation with irrational illusions and the work for years later in life to free itself from those idiotizing emotional molecules embedded in the emotional envelope. One should not expect such a great "luck", however.

### 1.3 My Path of Development

<sup>1</sup>My path of development can be described as follows. At Uppsala University I was given a thorough training in philosophy by Hedvall (theoretical philosophy) and Hägerström (practical philosophy).

<sup>2</sup>My own studies of the collected works of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel led me to the same view on the achievements of those romanticists as I found later in Schopenhauer, who was far superior to them in both realism and logical acuity. There are those who are annoyed at Schopenhauer's pungent criticism of those "philosophasters". Posterity will acknowledge the justness of his criticism, however. It might be of some interest to learn what 45-self K.H. thought on the matter.

<sup>3</sup>Philosopher Fechner had an opportunity of meeting that most recent incarnation of Pythagoras. And when Fechner asked him which philosophy best agreed with reality, the reply he received was: that of Schopenhauer. Every esoterician will certainly concur in that judgement.

<sup>4</sup>My study of the writings of Vivekananda led me to take an interest in the yoga philosophy. Finally I found Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled*. When studying the writings of Blavatsky, I remembered the esoteric knowledge anew. Loose facts that had not been put into their contexts aroused memories, it is true, but did not afford any clarity, since I was not a causal self but a mental self. Therefore, my need of a mental system formulated methodically and systematically remained. This led me to continue my thorough study of theosophy whose foremost representative was Leadbeater, the only one to clarify the basic concepts of theosophy. Only Leadbeater's works made it possible for me to formulate an esoteric mental system in *PhS* and, later, Pythagorean hylozoics in *The Knowledge of Reality (KofR)*.

<sup>5</sup>However, not even Leadbeater's presentation was entirely satisfactory. I filled the gaps in 1925 by studying *A Treatise on Cosmic Fire* by 45-self D.K. But even before then I had formulated the basic outline with the three aspects.

<sup>6</sup>Biologist Ernst Haeckel was the first writer to arouse my interest in hylozoics, in his popular book *Lebenswunder*. In the final chapter he mentioned the allusion F. A. Lange made in his *History of Materialism*, first edition, to this the most ancient Greek world view, misinterpreted, of course, for want of facts. In any case, Haeckel had understood that the three aspects of existence are matter, motion, and consciousness, which he expressed in his way as "matter, force, and psychom". Haeckel's idle speculations on other issues did not interest me.

<sup>7</sup>This idea sparked my ardour of investigation and resulted in the presentation of hylozoics to be found in *PhS*. It was only in 1952 (three years after the publication of *PhS*) that I had a confirmation that this was the basic view of the planetary hierarchy on existence, in three publicized letters from 44-self H. (fifth department) and 45-self D.K. (second department).

<sup>8</sup>My study of esoteric literature was pursued in 1917–1925 and was resumed in 1952. My collection of esoteric books was donated in 1929 to the Stockholm City Library (at its opening), which scattered it.

<sup>9</sup>I read practically everything in the "cultural sphere", and I was amazingly lucky to meet, in Sweden and abroad, the foremost representatives of culture and to learn from them. I was a

good listener and questioner, which was appreciated, and I absorbed like a sponge whatever they could give me. Being infinitely grateful for all I have received, I now see in retrospect the marvellous guidance I received through the labyrinth of life.

<sup>10</sup>Already at Stockholm University College and at Uppsala University I saw through the life-value of academic learning and smiled at the pride those memory robots took in their erudition. I am sorry to say that I had to obtain certificates of my studies to be employed and have an income. If I had possessed a private capital, I would never have cared for their diplomas. Afterwards I have always regretted the necessity of taking exams. The life-value of such things as of all kinds of Christmas tree decorations on the chests of the learned is not highly esteemed by esotericians. It is classed among the illusions that mankind lives by.

<sup>11</sup>I am telling this about my work to spare possible biographers the trouble of constructing hypotheses on my esoteric education and on the history of the genesis of the books. It was all very simple. The work consisted in collecting facts and axioms and in systematizing them. With patience and persistence, every discursive intellect can do such work. The difficulties presented were: purging the texts of misleading terms, misinterpreted symbols and all manner of fictions that had slipped into the texts when their authors had added their own suppositions; taking facts out of wrong contexts and putting them into the right ones; and affording the system the simplest possible exact formulation.

<sup>12</sup>If the foundation has once been laid by the formulation of an exact mental system, this makes it immensely easier for a student to assimilate new facts and axioms. Then facts and axioms automatically fall into their right contexts. It is the same with esoterics as with other disciplines. The solid foundation is the first and foremost thing. Hylozoics alone affords that foundation. This will be no building erected on the sand.

<sup>13</sup>Before you can help other people to reach clarity, you must have worked out a mental system yourself. The self's demand for clarity for its own part in its mental consciousness can still be classed among purely egoistic work. No merit accrues from it, nor from your desire to share with others the insight you have won. Probably all researchers want to do so and do not praise themselves for it.

<sup>14</sup>I have in past incarnations been busy formulating mental systems. It is my highest desire to enable people to have a clear and exact conception of the three aspects of existence, the most basic facts about the cosmos, evolution, the meaning and goal of existence. I shall go on doing this work in future incarnations to the service of those who need such systems, until all mankind has accepted hylozoics as a working hypothesis.

#### *1.4 The Anonymity of Laurency*

<sup>1</sup>Why I write anonymously.

<sup>2</sup>Firstly, because I have a right to do so, then all professors of literature, etc., may assert the opposite. I understand them. What would they else do for a living? I want to be left alone and be spared their curiosity and meddlesomeness. My private life is mine alone and is no concern of others. I willingly give whatever understanding and knowledge I may have to share. But I want to set the limits myself. Besides, Schopenhauer is right: What a writer can give is to be found in his works. Whatever you may learn about the person is not by far as fruitful for you.

<sup>3</sup>Secondly, because I want to be the only writer in my family.

<sup>4</sup>Thirdly, because I have not permitted myself to bring forward my own assumptions or suppositions. Facts and ideas in my writings are not my own. The formulation alone is my own, as far as I know. Therefore, I do not call it my work.

<sup>5</sup>Fourthly, because what I write is not dictated by my so-called personality – something that I do not care to explain further, since it is my private secret, which I have a right to keep.

<sup>6</sup>There are more reasons. But these will suffice. Once and for all: the writer has an absolute right to be anonymous. Besides, an esoteric writer always is.

<sup>7</sup>It was not out of a desire to mystify people that a distinction was made between Laurency and the editor. Anyone who has the corresponding experience knows why. It is very deplorable that some people, who had been given confidence in this matter, did not respect the anonymity. They should have known better. It will of course occasion fantastic interpretations, like everything people cannot understand but believe they can explain. The usual presumption.

<sup>8</sup>Who Laurency actually is will never be revealed. To ask who held the pen is like asking what typewriter was used for typing the manuscript. Both photography and biography lie. But the lie is the most interesting thing. Apparently the truth is not what people desire. They want to satisfy their hyena instinct. Laurency will remain anonymous, so the irremediably naïve curiosity about the transient personality will always have a disorienting effect. The writer was a tool, nothing more. And also the tool will remain an insoluble enigma. Moreover, all biographies are evidence of injudiciousness, trespasses on forbidden grounds. Everybody has a right to have his private life of consciousness in peace from curiosity. Anyone who arrogates to self-knowledge makes a cardinal error. Yet no man has known himself. "No mortal has raised my veil." And that is good. That knowledge would only be abused, as all knowledge, abused to poison existence. The self is unassailable. What the self was as a man it will see in the essential (46) world of the fifth natural kingdom. What the self has been in the universe it will see in the highest divine kingdom (1–7). Only then will the self know what it is. Obey what love advises us: leave the man alone. That is what wisdom advises us, too.

### *1.5 To the Question of a Writer's Right to Anonymity*

<sup>1</sup>Newspapers debate every now and then the question whether a writer has a right to anonymity. Therefore, it should be said that a writer has an absolute right to remain anonymous, unless when exercising this right he commits some crime such as libel, etc. As long as mankind is at the stage of hatred with its vindictiveness and desire for persecution, anonymity is although a very weak protection, yet a protection of those who attack lawlessness and injustice in society. Much time and energy are wasted on chatter about freedom. Freedom is largely an illusion, which is clear not least from the fact that this question of anonymity even needs to be discussed. The writer also has a right to keep to himself his motives for anonymity. Generally he has several such motives.

<sup>2</sup>May the writer Laurency appear for the sake of the cause. He can say that almost none of the facts and ideas to be found in the works he publishes are his own. Only the formulation is his own. The content alone is important, however, and that is not his own. It did not become him to strut in borrowed plumes. Moreover, at the time of his appearance, everything esoteric was surrounded by the usual air of ignorant ridicule, which could reflect upon people close and dear to him who were active in social and scientific work. In addition there was in Laurency himself a need to assert the right to freedom. Someone had to lead the way. All meaningless, social constraint is obnoxious to him. As hampered as the individuals increasingly are in the present society, any possibility of upholding the individual's right must be utilized. This will not be needed, when some time in the future we may experience a truly free society. I avail myself of this opportunity to protest against the fact that libraries possessing my books have revealed my anonymity. I consider this a violation of my right. The doctors of literature who pry into all private matters violate the sanctity of private life.

<sup>3</sup>We are all found somewhere on the seemingly endless ladder of the evolution of life. That much is certain that no biography has ever been able to indicate the developmental level of any human being. All biographies are constructions. We actually know nothing worth knowing of other people. The interest displayed in individual incarnations, in the temporary envelopes of the monad, has always appeared to me to belong at the hyena stage, and the professors of literature have seemed to me as intellectual body-snatchers. Prying into the private lives of other people fosters the gossip and slander instinct. Those who have left the

physical world live in the emotional or mental world and can always perceive the emotional or mental vibrations of other people. Leave them alone, and do not disturb them with the vibrations of ignorance, incompetence, incomprehension, not to say those of the repulsive instinct of hatred. When people have acquired a knowledge of reality, they are so busy minding their own business that they do not interfere in the affairs of other people, since any interference could only harm them. In the present condition, everybody counteracts the consciousness development of everybody else.

### 1.6 *The Works of Laurency*

<sup>1</sup>It has been seen that extremely few people have realized the importance of *PhS* and *KofR*, realized that they contain the cultural ideas of mankind in a concentrated form. They read and declare, “well said”, but do not understand that these books are unique in their kind, are without parallel in world literature. Even “prophets of culture” have to be told it to grasp it.

<sup>2</sup>The ideas and facts presented by Laurency are not new. But they have been put into such contexts that the reader may understand their real importance. With some justice this can be called “ploughing virgin soil”.

<sup>3</sup>This is not written as self-praise. It is written to make people better comprehend and understand the books. Strange as it may seem, appreciation is a condition of fostering that interest which makes for a profitable reading. As readers do not realize the value of valuable books without having this pointed out to them, it is necessary to do so.

<sup>4</sup>Of course, Laurency does not claim priority for any of his ideas. Many people think them simultaneously, and who was the first to formulate them is unimportant. What is important, however, is that they become the property of mankind. Only the formulation of ideas is the individual’s own work. There is no other right of priority; this being said in case someone were obliged to uphold some right for this very cause.

<sup>5</sup>Some judges of *The Philosopher’s Stone* have stated that the author is “well-read”, so intimating that Laurency would be a compiler of the works of others. It certainly would be asking too much to demand that judges were able to judge whatever they judge. Such a thing probably does not happen once in a thousand times. Where the works of Laurency are concerned, the fact is that the editor, thanks to his philosophical, scientific, literary, and also esoteric training could be chosen as a tool for working out, under guidance, that system of thought which Pythagoras considered desirable for the current century (1950–2000). Perhaps mankind could use the works of Laurency to gain clarity also in the next century or millennium, and if so, nothing would delight the writer more.

### 1.7 *The Purpose of the Works of Laurency*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency’s presentation of hylozoics starts from the basic concepts of natural research. The intention is to enable the student to have a logical conception of reality and life. Esoteric symbols have been consistently eliminated. On the other hand, only esoteric facts have been used, so that the presentation in no respect wars against the basic esoteric conception of existence. The endeavour has been to simplify the general picture given of the universe and consciousness development.

<sup>2</sup>Laurency has afforded esoterics the epistemological groundwork on which to stand, something that it has not had until now, a serious shortcoming in the eyes of the intelligentsia trained in philosophy and science. This shortcoming of course is due to the fact that nobody has previously understood the necessity for this and nobody has been able to make that groundwork. If it had been there from the start, then we would have been spared all those occult sects without number which (often intentionally) have had a misleading effect, and it would not have been possible for critics to ridicule the true knowledge.

<sup>3</sup>Another purpose of the works of Laurency is to help develop mental consciousness. Mental development is best promoted by the efforts the individual makes at reflection. People are largely mentally inactive, since they are contented with what others have said and with parroting it without thinking for themselves. There will be no mental development with that attitude.

<sup>4</sup>As for the world view, Laurency's mission was to make a brief account of the atomic structure of the cosmos and to clarify the trinity (matter, motion, and consciousness) of existence. These are two basic facts that are necessary to the knowledge of reality. They have not been clarified before. As for life view, Laurency was to assert that existence absolutely conforms to law.

<sup>5</sup>Also many other facts had to be emphasized: such as that the meaning of existence is the consciousness development of the primordial atoms (monads) through the six natural kingdoms and six divine kingdoms of evolution; the existence of the planetary hierarchy, the planetary government, the solar systemic government, etc. The presentation of these facts clears away a great number of misconceptions and superstitions, and establishes common sense in its rights, eliminates theological and philosophical speculation, and makes hylozoics appear in its wonderful simplicity and self-evidence.

<sup>6</sup>Laurency has regarded it as his mission to formulate the Pythagorean mental system (using concepts taken from modern natural science and modern esoteric psychology) in such a way that it may serve as an acceptable working hypothesis for philosophers and scientists when, some time in the future, they realize that all the imaginative speculations of their ignorance have failed. That is a thing which neither theosophists nor anthroposophists, yogis, or other occultists have accomplished. The greatest possible exactitude in the description of the processes of matter and energy has been strived at as a necessary basis of the conception of reality.

<sup>7</sup>All knowledge rests upon facts. Not all facts are of equal importance, however. There are inessential, essential, and fundamental facts. It is easy for the scientific disciplines to drown in torrents of facts. In school, teachers shower inessential facts upon their pupils, so that the latter will have no grasp of the general subject and they often will lose their interest in it. There are specialist teachers who consider all inessential facts essential. What the school needs are surveys that afford perspectives. The facts that afford surveys are essential facts. Even a specialist sorts out established facts that he considers inessential. The facts to be found in encyclopedias are, they too, extracted from a multitude of facts, are a distilled product. The facts of encyclopedias should not burden the pupils' memories. It is sufficient that they know where to find them, if they will ever need them.

<sup>8</sup>Laurency is no teacher, has never wanted to be a teacher. Possibly it might be said that he is an expert on (published) esoteric facts from the planetary hierarchy and wanted to put them into a mental system, so as to present them in a manner comprehensible to the intelligentsia trained in philosophy and science, usable as a working hypothesis. He did not count on understanding on the part of contemporary philosophers and scientists, nor on the part of the occult sects. The system should be available, however, when some time in the future seekers will care for a tenable working hypothesis. He dares to assert its superiority to the systems ruling in philosophy, science, theosophy, anthroposophy, rosicrucianism, and yoga philosophy. This system could not have been formed without the facts 45-self had publicized in the years 1919–1949. The system does not make D.K.'s work superfluous but, on the contrary, constitutes an introduction to this work difficult to understand for the "uninitiated".

<sup>9</sup>Being fully aware of what problems face the person who, having no knowledge of esoterics, desires to try to comprehend reality, the present writer with these comments has tried to smooth the path to understanding in various respects.

<sup>10</sup>It is to be hoped that somebody (one fully capable for it) makes an exact account of the fortunes this knowledge has undergone ever since it first appeared in 1875. Such an able man

must not be a member of any one of the many occult sects that have contributed to disorientation in this area of esoteric knowledge. This is a remark which should not need to be made, but which unfortunately has proved necessary. All too many people suffer from that presumption and impudence which are easily stimulated by an inborn tendency to imaginative construction and romance and to which the field of esoterics appears to give unlimited possibilities. Except some few facts (common to most of them), the individual's imagination seems to have been given free reins. All attempts at mixing up the ephemeral hypotheses of natural research and of experimental and introspective psychology with esoterics are utterly misleading. Such attempts only result in an unremediable quasi-knowledge. Esoterics has no points in common with exoteric research. The two must be kept absolutely apart until research has discovered and then fully explored the physical etheric world. What is said here cannot be emphasized too much.

### *1.8 The Works of Laurency Are an Introduction to Esoterics*

<sup>1</sup>*PhS* and *KofR* as well as all the other esoteric works of Laurency may be regarded as an introduction to true esoterics, the works dictated to Alice A. Bailey by the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, 45-self D.K., and published in her name. The works of D.K. are intended principally for disciples of the planetary hierarchy, which clearly implies that such people have equipped themselves with prior knowledge and that his writings cannot be understood by the "uninitiated".

<sup>2</sup>As new as it all must appear to those who desire to acquire knowledge of reality, a world view and life view so totally different from the ruling ideologies in theology, philosophy, and science, a basic mental system of the basic facts of existence is needed. Without the solid basis the student will have no real clarity. Immense domains of knowledge await their elucidation.

<sup>3</sup>Regrettably it has been seen that readers of D.K.'s works have thrown unreliable statements on their contents around them. The history of esoterics ever since the esoteric knowledge was permitted for publication demonstrates how much faith people have in their judgment of things they are in no position to judge. They have not learnt how to distinguish facts from fictions, how to tell their own ingenious fancies from true intuition. You may very well advise them not to give themselves out as prophets until they have become disciples of the planetary hierarchy and so have joined a group having a common consciousness. Until they have done so they should refrain from making their own interpretations, they should restrict themselves to working on the facts they have received from the planetary hierarchy. The condition of doing such work is mastery of the hylozoic mental system.

### *1.9 Laurency's Criticism*

<sup>1</sup>By his criticism of philosophy, anthroposophy, and yoga in *KofR*, Laurency wanted to demonstrate their insufficiency as world views and life views. This criticism aims at what is basic and essential. A detailed scrutiny was by no means intended.

<sup>2</sup>In *KofR* the writer levelled strong criticism at the various occult societies that have appeared after the year 1875. Some people have opined that these societies with their teachings satisfy the need of more rational explanations better than the religious, philosophical, and scientific ideologies. However, those more recent societies and their ideologies are marred by the same fundamental defects as the older ones. They distinguish themselves by sectarianism. They base their teaching on paper popes whose inerrancy they have patented. They preach dogmas, doctrines that must not be doubted, which become as many stones in the way of further development. They debar one another, are mutually exclusive and not inclusive. All of this proves that they are faith-based societies and have never understood the true knowledge of reality. Faith, belief is not understanding. And the understanding they lack is the very understanding of essentials.



<sup>3</sup>All manner of occultists – spiritists, anthroposophists, “rosicrucians, etc. – not to mention missionizing yogis, buddhists, zen buddhists, have already managed to instil so many misleading views into the minds of seekers that the rectification of all misconceptions appears a Sisyphean labour.

<sup>4</sup>You can just advise students to examine all systems, compare them, and see which one affords the simplest, most rational, most general explanations of previously inexplicable things.

<sup>5</sup>In *KofR* 1.1.31 it is said: “The judgment of Western psychology is preferably left to the understanding reader of all the following.” This evinces no sanguine overestimation, but just the desire to be excused from dealing the crushing blow.

### *1.10 Laurency Fights Dogmatic Thinking*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency has a great reverence and respect for science, for the great ones who have advanced science, for all the others who have seen the limits of science in all respects. Regrettably, dogmatic thinking dominates, and therein is the basic flaw.

<sup>2</sup>It is necessary to fight all the tendencies to dogmatic thinking to be seen in all spheres of life and even in the scientific disciplines.

<sup>3</sup>In all systems of thought (theological, philosophical, scientific), dogmatic thinking is the most serious hindrance to further development. The intelligentsia are still at a level where every acute intellect believes itself able to judge the unexplored and calls each revolutionary discovery a hoax. There is something irremediably idiotic in the attempt at judging the unknown. It is understandable that the masses do so in almost all respects. When those who have a university education do so, however, it is a disastrous proof of injudiciousness.

<sup>4</sup>At the universities they imbibe the fictions about reality and life that dominate academic opinion. That opinion does not like such works as *PhS* and *KofR*. The university people are so blinded by their ideologies that they are unable to use their common sense.

<sup>5</sup>The wise man still agrees with Sokrates: “I know so little that it is almost nothing by comparison with all that I need to know.” In the days of Sokrates the “initiates” knew much more than present-day scientists do. So there is no reason to smile superciliously at their knowledge. The historical ignorance of our times is immense, however. What historians know are “old wives’ tales, cock and bull stories, and narratives for youth of riper years”. The past exists in the planetary memory. And only the one who is able to read it can describe what has been in a realistic manner. What is to be found in what Steiner called the “akashic records”, in the emotional world, is what people at all times believed on most things. In that world, too, the Muse of History can be likened to a story-teller who has shot a film.

<sup>6</sup>Those who dislike Laurency’s tone about the “learned” should consider the following.

<sup>7</sup>The learned know only what they have read and heard. They know nothing about superphysical, reality which makes up ninety-nine per cent of all reality. They mock and ridicule everything they have not been taught. Before the unlearned they behave as though they knew everything and could judge everything. In their almost total ignorance of life they show off in their conceited self-glory as though they were real authorities. In so doing they become hindrances to people seeking knowledge, and they become the enemies of truth. They need a good dressing-down.

<sup>8</sup>When these exceedingly learned ones have comprehended, realized, and understood that our cosmos can be likened to:

- a bubble in primordial matter,
- a solid, compact globe,
- an organism the cells of which are atoms,
- a living being,

then they have started to grasp something of reality.

### *1.11 Laurency Does Not Speculate*

<sup>1</sup>Every statement on the superphysical to be found in Laurency is based on esoteric facts and ideas from the planetary hierarchy. The writer has not permitted himself to put forth his own opinions, assumptions, suppositions, conjectures, theories, or hypotheses. If there are errors in what he says, they are due to the so-called human factor.

<sup>2</sup>The books consists for the most part of facts made public by the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, 45-self D.K. All of these ideas and facts are the ancient heritage of mankind. Only the combination of these facts into a unitary system is the present writer's work. Even the preliminary outlines of the system existed before.

<sup>3</sup>Laurency's books are works on "popular esoterics" that use a terminology comprehensible to Western readers. They are not at all intended for experts on esoterics, but only for those who have always remained seekers after the knowledge of reality (the "lost word of the master" or the "philosopher's stone") and have not been able to content themselves with the ideologies (of idios logos = one's own doctrine, not an ideology using reality ideas) ruling in theology, philosophy, and science.

### *1.12 Laurency Continues the Work of Sinnett and Leadbeater*

<sup>1</sup>Sinnett, Leadbeater, and Laurency are the only Western-oriented writers on esoterics. They have expounded esoterics starting from the matter aspect and so have made it the most easily accessible to uninitiated Occidentals. Sinnett was restricted to the use of Sanskrit terms for realities publicly unknown before then. Leadbeater faithfully followed the terminology, regrettably abortive, established by Besant.

<sup>2</sup>It was the task of Laurency to continue the work begun by Sinnett and Leadbeater, to give Westerners an objective description of reality, a presentation rid of the immense burden of views handed down since thousands of years with all the various symbolic languages (which are always misleading) and also rid of oriental subjectivism, which makes people go astray in the emotional world.

<sup>3</sup>Laurency decided to find occidental words for the three aspects, for the kinds of matter, the kinds of envelopes, the worlds, etc., and to introduce mathematical designations, so that a unitary universal terminological system could replace the general confusion and, above all, so that exactness in every detail was facilitated.

<sup>4</sup>If ever it will be possible to formulate esoterics in a scientific fashion, then mathematical terminology will be a necessary condition and Pythagorean hylozoics will be the only tenable basis. Indian subjectivism with its symbolism can never become Western science. Those who have become enamoured with it may very well keep it. Those who desire the highest degree of clarity and exactitude, however, go over to Pythagoras. It is high time that an exact, logical mental system superseded the vagueness the mystics need for their imaginative excesses. Many people who have studied hylozoics are amazed how immensely simply all of it can be described and how easily the complicated, unclear, misleading presentations can be swept aside with a sense of relief.

### *1.13 Laurency Starts from the Matter Aspect*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency starts in his world view from the three aspects of existence (matter, motion, and consciousness) but makes the matter aspect the basis of conception. Everything consists of primordial atoms, and this is the fundamental fact. It is quite another issue that the matter aspect seemingly loses in importance with each higher atomic kind, whereas the motion aspect (the "will aspect") and the consciousness aspect gain in importance. What takes priority is making existence comprehensible to mankind, and then the matter aspect is the most suitable one without comparison. The matter aspect also has the advantage that it precludes that mass of quasi-knowledge which has idiotized so many occultists of all sorts.

<sup>2</sup>The planetary hierarchy of course views reality from the motion and consciousness aspects. The planetary hierarchy regards the whole of existence as a work of gods who live in the 21 higher atomic worlds. For human beings, however, it is important to eliminate the idea of divine arbitrariness introduced by all religions into people's view of life, and instead introduce the idea of law as rendering arbitrariness of any kind impossible. In that respect, the law of freedom is the fundamental law that grants all beings (monads) the right to freedom within the limits of the equal right of all.

<sup>3</sup>Laurency has wanted to particularly emphasize that it is justified and desirable to start from matter, the law, evolution from the mineral kingdom through all the higher natural kingdoms, and individual freedom. The fundamental principles must be upheld and must not be forgotten when contemplating existence, its meaning and goal. And they are all too easily forgotten in the religious and scientific views.

<sup>4</sup>The main thing is that the student is clear about the fact that all matter is at the same time consciousness and energy, that all consciousness is at the same time matter and energy.

<sup>5</sup>Matter, that inevitable basis and support, must be emphasized, and the error of earlier presentations lies in not having done so. The student will comprehend with an incomparably greater exactness and clarity, if it all is presented to him starting from molecular kinds, worlds, envelopes, etc. Mystics are bored with this exactitude, but then they can always resort to their literature, which allows their imagination to expand into infinitude.

#### 1.14 For Whom Laurency Writes

<sup>1</sup>In his writings, Laurency addresses several different categories: people at the stage of culture who possess the esoteric knowledge latently but who have not had the opportunity of contacting it to be roused to remember it anew, the intelligentsia at the stage of civilization who are seeking after a rational explanation of the meaning of life, Western philosophers and scientists. The esoteric common material and hylozoics form different parts of his work which will probably interest the different categories of readers to different degrees. The esoteric common material should not be confused with Pythagorean hylozoics as treated in *KofR*.

<sup>2</sup>The whole of *PhS* was written for those who possessed esoteric knowledge latently in their subconscious but who had never reached clarity because of their lack of facts. (Thus this category does not include those more advanced esoteric students who have remembered their latent knowledge anew and who are already well oriented.)

<sup>3</sup>Thus *PhS* is for esotericians, and this is particularly so where the second section, "The Esoteric World View", and the third section, "Esoteric Life View", are concerned. However, also many people at the stage of culture (the stage of the mystic) may profit from reading the first and third sections of *PhS*. In contrast, the second section is not written for those who have no prior esoteric knowledge.

<sup>4</sup>The second section of *PhS* contains both Pythagorean hylozoics and the teaching common to all esoteric knowledge orders. This section of *PhS* was written also with a view to those theosophists who possessed esoteric knowledge to demonstrate to them the defects of the theosophical presentation. They were in a position to realize at once that hylozoic agrees with reality. It was seen that extremely few theosophists were able to assimilate the esoteric world view contained in *PhS*. The great majority of them were hindered by their fictions, with which they were contented, from examining the world view of hylozoics and ascertaining its incomparable superiority as an explanation of reality. Even theosophical leaders declared themselves unable even to review the book.

<sup>5</sup>Therefore, *KofR* was written as a more popular account of the three aspects of existence and consciousness development through the different natural kingdoms. The presentation of hylozoics in *KofR* is primarily intended for those who possess latent knowledge but have not had the opportunity to contact it anew in their new incarnations. Thus *KofR* is for beginners in

esoterics and not for “doctors” of esoterics. The purpose of the book is to afford a lucid, simple mental system to those who did not gain clarity from the theosophical pioneers, the rosicrucians, anthroposophists, or yoga philosophers. In addition, *KofR* is intended for the intelligentsia at the stage of civilization who are familiar with the philosophical and scientific outlook. The book wants to give this intelligentsia a rational and tenable view of reality and in so doing liberate them from the ruling ideologies. It is important that intellectuals learn to see that those ideologies are fictitious and untenable. It must be possible to bring home to them the fact that theology and philosophy have failed completely.

<sup>6</sup>If these intellectuals realize that the exoteric systems of thought are fictitious, they will have the opportunity to study hylozoics and examine its reality content. Hylozoics is still a working hypothesis which is unknown to them and which, at any event, would do them no harm if they familiarized themselves with it. Those who have already got stuck in the current ideologies and are content with them do not need esoterics. Laurency hopes, however, that many intellectuals will not be satisfied with what is presented in exoteric literature and therefore will be interested in the mental material he offers them.

<sup>7</sup>Laurency desires to give philosophers and scientists a tenable world view instead of the hypothetical constructions that have been dominant, a common basis of knowledge for all thinking people, and to demonstrate the ambiguities of philosophy, theosophy, anthroposophy, and yoga philosophy. A world view deals with the make-up of existence. In its capacity of world view it has nothing to do with life view and the human needs to be satisfied with it. The world view offers nothing for emotion, which seems to be what most people desire. Only a tenable world view can afford the firm foundation on which the life view along with the conception of right must be based, if it is not to rest upon the sand.

<sup>8</sup>What is said here thus concerns the world view of Pythagorean hylozoics. In contrast, esoterics, the world view and life view, is only for “old initiates” who possess the knowledge latently. Only those who have reached the stage of perspective thinking and realize the immense limitation of human knowledge and capacity for judgment can understand esoterics.

<sup>9</sup>There is no point in appealing to people’s common sense, since this is still absent and is acquired only with perspective consciousness. Esoterics will be accepted by so-called educated people only when so many mentally superior people agree about it that academical opinion will no longer dare to make disparaging statements. What Schopenhauer said of “university philosophy” is valid in many respects today as well and will probably always be valid where “academical opinion” is concerned. It is just a parrot and can do no better.

<sup>10</sup>Laurency desires to emphasize with all the necessary vigour that he does not give himself out to be an authority, and that those who proclaim him as such must do so on their own responsibility. He puts forth what he has been able to accept himself, and then everyone must choose the system of thought that best agrees with his power of comprehension. Such individual examination and choice is not only our right according to the law of freedom, but also our most reasonable option, incomparably better than mere acceptance on faith. It is better for our development not to believe anything at all. All kinds of belief, acceptance on the authority of other people, without comprehension or understanding, have a paralysing effect on your power of judgment. Blind faith will idiotize you.

<sup>11</sup>Laurency’s personal relationship to the planetary hierarchy does not concern anyone. He has never claimed any kind of relationship to it whatsoever. His work stands or falls on its tenability, the hylozoic mental system and its agreement with reality.

<sup>12</sup>Laurency’s books are only for those who must have clarity, no matter what. Others do not take the pains to examine how hylozoics explains everything in the only rational manner, how it affords a certainty in judgment that nothing else is able to.

<sup>13</sup>You rarely come across a theosophist or anthroposophist who is still a seeker. Most of them cling to dogmas and “swear by the teacher’s words” without understanding, without

even comprehending. In contrast, among spiritualists I have encountered many seekers receptive to common sense hylozoics and willing to learn knowledge, not just dogmas.

<sup>14</sup>The works of Laurency are for the first self, not for the second self (or causal self). They are for those who seek to acquire a mental system, a concrete conceptual system liberated from any kind of symbolism. Symbolic systems do not help the individual to acquire intuition but rather counteract this endeavour. This mental work represents a necessary transitional stage. Unless he has led a purely mental life for one incarnation or more, the individual will not be able to acquire perspective (47:5) and system (47:4) thinking, necessary conditions of a later acquisition of causal consciousness and causal objective consciousness in particular.

<sup>15</sup>This concrete mental consciousness is the special faculty of the fifth department, and so those who have the fifth department in their mental envelopes have particular, natural prospects of success in such things in the simplest way.

### *1.15 Laurency Writes for Objectivists*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency writes for objectivists, those who have already acquired a scientific outlook, and who find it easier to understand the matter aspect of existence. Laurency's pioneers in this respect are Sinnett and Leadbeater. Subjectivists, who want to look at everything from the angle of the consciousness aspect, prefer such writers as Besant and Bailey.

<sup>2</sup>This means that Laurency writes for those who are pursuing the 1–3–5–7 path, not for those who are walking the 2–4–6 path, basing their views on the consciousness aspect. The extravert disciples, walking the objective path (departments 1, 3, 5, 7) find it easier to view things from the angle of the matter aspect. The introverts, walking the subjective path (departments 2, 4, 6), prefer the consciousness aspect. When still in their "training process", either of these two different types finds it hard to appreciate the merits of the other one.

<sup>3</sup>If I shall not have the opportunity to work out the third part of hylozoics, then I hope that the redactor of the existing materials will "keep the style", objectivism, and will not distort it into subjectivism. Soon enough there will be writers who subjectivize everything.

### *1.16 Laurency Does Not Write for the Esoteric Élite*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency does not write for the esoteric élite. It is by no means his intention to give instructions to disciples of the planetary hierarchy or to such esotericians as already possess the hylozoic groundwork. They have mastered mental consciousness and seek to acquire the intuition of causal consciousness. They have their schools, which mostly deal with the consciousness aspect of existence, an aspect that is very well provided for. They have a rich literature at their disposal, incomprehensible to the "uninitiated".

<sup>2</sup>However, even such old esotericians might need a preparatory course for their new brains. After that they may continue their search, eventually becoming experts on esoterics, if they want to.

<sup>3</sup>It has been seen that people who believed they were esotericians did not only lack the groundwork but also were unable to see the necessity for it and to grasp the fundamentals of hylozoics.

### *1.17 Laurency's Terminology*

<sup>1</sup>It has been Laurency's endeavour to definitively eliminate all symbols and vague terms, and to introduce instead a simple, easy-to-grasp, economical terminology. Since Pythagorean hylozoics makes it possible to divide the different kinds of matter and worlds mathematically, Laurency had recourse to that expedient. It is quite sufficient to use only mathematical terms for such things as are beyond human comprehension. Using such terms you make it clear to students that "this passes your comprehension". There is no point in inventing lots of strange (usually misleading) words for those incomprehensible things. The mathematical method

reduces terminology to a minimum, and is the only truly international terminology. Where it is not used, chaos will ensue sooner or later. Mathematical terms make an exactitude possible that cannot be obtained otherwise.

<sup>2</sup>It should be obvious why in Western works on esoterics Western terms should be exclusively used, and not Sanskrit ones. Laurency has in certain contexts included Sanskrit terms (within brackets) in order to explain the terms used in old esoterics (the works of Blavatsky, Besant, and Bailey) in some important cases. It should be considered whether these, too, should be dropped in new editions. One more reason for the dropping of Sanskrit terms is that they are generally misunderstood by uninitiated Hindus (yogis, etc.) who have not been initiated into esoterics. The fact that they have been used at all demonstrates that the earlier writers were not in a position to develop a suitable terminology. Besant's attempts at using terms that have become idiotized irremediably should have a deterring effect in that respect. The entire theosophical terminology ever since the days of Blavatsky gives the impression of helplessness.

### *1.18 Laurency Writes about the Reality of the First Self*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency takes no particular interest in superhuman worlds. Hylozoics, the Pythagorean mental system, certainly affords a summary sketch of the entire cosmos according to the planetary hierarchy's view on existence. But it does so exclusively because the knowledge of the worlds of man presented would otherwise be without the necessary foundation.

<sup>2</sup>It is thus quite intentionally that Laurency all but exclusively treats of the first self (the monad in the first triad), its worlds, envelopes, and kinds of consciousness. The important thing is to set mankind free from its current ideologies which disorient it, and then you must start from, and as far as possible keep within, the worlds of man. Those who have attained the stage of culture, or the stage of the mystic, and begin to take an interest in their "higher self" are in a better position to orient themselves on their own.

<sup>3</sup>What Laurency considers the most important at the present time is to give the thinking people among the exoterists knowledge of the meaning and goal of life, in the form of a mental system comprehensible and acceptable to them, to give the intelligentsia at the stage of civilization a vision of existence, and a non-contradictory, irrefutable system of thought that is in agreement with reality in the worlds of man (47–49) and so is able to orient people in this reality. This is a groundwork on which to go on building for those who want to orient themselves in the worlds of the fifth natural kingdom (45–47).

<sup>4</sup>Man's goal in the human kingdom is to acquire consciousness in his proper human envelope, the causal envelope. When he has succeeded in this, and become a causal self, then it is about time to take some interest in how the members of the fifth natural kingdom view the pertaining worlds. There is no point in wasting your time on matters that in any case are incomprehensible to man. Only misunderstandings may come out of such things.

<sup>5</sup>Another matter that Laurency considers to be of equal importance is the elimination of the entire old symbolism, positively misleading, inherited from the knowledge orders, which are nowadays superfluous. This is a symbolism that has been the basis of the illusions and fictions prevailing in religion and even in philosophy. It is necessary to replace these misinterpreted symbols with exact concepts and to introduce a mathematical terminology as far as possible instead of new, unnecessary terms, which will always be distorted.

### *1.19 Laurency and D.K.*

<sup>1</sup>During 30 years, 45-self D.K. (also known as Kleinias) dictated to disciple Alice A. Bailey a total of 18 books, which were published by the Lucis Trust. He intimates that these books are written primarily for causal selves. Unfortunately, the facts and ideas given out in them have fallen into the hands of uninitiated people who believe they are esotericians and who

have of course misunderstood and distorted them with effects for themselves that are deplorable. To believe you understand is not the same as to understand. Laurency has made a very extensive use of these communications by D.K., scaling them down into a mental system, so that they can be understood by the intelligentsia trained in esoterics. This should be pointed out lest in the future ever-alert critics should insinuate that Laurency wants to strut in borrowed plumes. However, a benevolent comparison made by true experts on the matter will easily demonstrate the extent of such borrowings.

<sup>2</sup>Most of the facts to be found in D.K.'s works that Laurency has been able to use for his possible readers he has incorporated into his works as well. The remaining facts, however, are not for the uninitiated. Quite on purpose Laurency has refrained from advertising D.K.'s works. This is because of deterring experiences he had of how immature readers of those books misunderstood most of what is said in them. As usual everyone believes himself able to understand what he perhaps comprehends, an infallible evidence of self-overestimation and absence of self-criticism, of naïvety as to one's own ignorance. All of the readers did not merely misconstrue what they read, but also lost their heads, talking as if they were in possession of some higher power of judgment. They became cracked, to put it bluntly.

<sup>3</sup>It is a typical trait in people that as soon as they learn something about higher stages, they at once believe they are at the highest one. And when they learn about "supermen", they believe they are such ones. You have a disheartening impression of impudence in readers when they frankly declare that they understand everything and imagine that they are able to determine the developmental level of other people, the latter being impossible without causal objective consciousness (which is capable of ascertaining previous incarnations, the departments of the envelopes, activated consciousness in different molecular kinds, qualities acquired, etc.) The idiotizing illusion of equality asserts itself in all spheres.

<sup>4</sup>The advice to be given to those who begin studying D.K.'s writings is that they should read them in a group and discuss thoroughly what they read so as to avoid many errors. Those who do not have esoteric knowledge are without the most elementary preconditions of understanding the works of D.K. Those who have not already acquired "esoteric common sense" are not ripe for the study of those writings. In any case they are not suitable to the "uninitiated". There is much in his writings that can be understood by causal selves only. D.K. says himself of his books that they cannot be understood by the present generation. This has also been demonstrated in a deterring manner.

### *1.20 The Philosopher's Stone*

<sup>1</sup>Truth is knowledge of reality. There is no other "word of god" than a book dealing with the knowledge of reality. In *PhS*, Laurency put down the summary of the knowledge that had been made available at the time of the writing of the book.

<sup>2</sup>"Divine knowledge" is essentiality. Like all other consciousness, this essential consciousness (46) has two tendencies: "wisdom and love", knowledge of reality (insight and understanding) and a serving attitude to everything in life. The condition of this is, first and foremost, total self-forgetfulness. Essential and still higher kinds of knowledge are knowledge of the Law, also comprising the ability to apply the law faultlessly as far as this knowledge goes. To individuals in higher kingdoms, knowledge and ability are one and the same thing.

<sup>3</sup>*PhS* is a book of combined aphorisms. Those who have read it just once or twice do not know what is in it. The only person to have realized this was one who said, "you are never done with such a book, you will go on reading it for the rest of your life." Every time they read it, they make new discoveries, see things they did not see before. A doctor of philosophy read the book at a stretch in 36 hours. But when the writer one week later tried to have him say what he found in it, he replied, "it contained very much". Thus a mere general impression of thousands of facts new to him. Its content wasted.

<sup>4</sup>The first section of *PhS* was written as a general orientation for perplexed intellectuals. It was intended to provide the common sense view of the issues treated therein. To realize the justification of this view, it is required to have reached the stage of culture and to have acquired common sense as of that stage. The problems have been treated within the framework of immanence philosophy, in a way that comes rather close to the agnostic standpoint, thus without superphysical interference and without esoteric knowledge.

<sup>5</sup>The subsection on philosophy contained in this section is the summary of the results arrived at by philosophy on its own without esoterics.

<sup>6</sup>The second section of *PhS* was a brief summary intended for those who had studied Blavatsky, Sinnett, and Leadbeater. Blavatsky made an account of the symbols used in the various orders of knowledge. Sinnett and Leadbeater made the best use of the facts available at the time. The esoteric world view presented in *PhS* (the second section) was never intended as an introduction to esoterics. It was too compressed to be read and understood by the “uninitiated”. A short text, “The Three Questions of the Sphinx”, was written to give a brief summary of the world view contained in the *PhS*, but was seen to be too little of an explanation.

<sup>7</sup>The second section was intended only for those who were once initiates of some esoteric knowledge order and so possessed the knowledge latently. Many such people had ended up in the Theosophical Society but were dissatisfied with the presentation of esoterics given there. This section was not written for the majority of theosophists (the “uninitiated”), since they never understood the problems, which is clear from their cult of authority and their ever-recurring question, “who said that?” Anyone who cannot see for himself whether alleged facts are facts is not ripe for esoterics.

<sup>8</sup>The esoteric world view of *PhS* starts from the idea that if existence can be comprehended at all, then it must be possible to logically demonstrate that the knowledge of it is the only possible explanation, the only correct system of thought. Hylozoics is the absolute system of thought and is in exact agreement with the fundamental facts and factors of existence.

<sup>9</sup>The second and third parts of the *PhS* were intended for people at the stage of humanity, those who had covered the stage of the mystic. Anyone who puts these two esoteric sections of *PhS* on a par with philosophy or human speculation has understood nothing of their essential message. *PhS* rests upon facts about reality, facts that ordinary people are in no position to ascertain or verify.

<sup>10</sup>*PhS* was written for the élite. Many people disliked that expression. What was meant, however, was just to wake those up who were members of the élite without knowing it. The proof that they were was their understanding of the first and third sections of the *PhS*.

<sup>11</sup>*PhS* is not my work, even though I was the instrument holding the pen that wrote it, and was made to rewrite every page until the content was approved as being correctly perceived. The formulation is mine excepting the quotations. I did not permit myself to bring forward even one assumption or conjecture, even one supposition. I did not write anything that I did not accept as tenable myself. Moreover, no single fact, no single idea is my own. Almost all of them existed before in the esoteric literature, even though expressed differently. The presentation and the compilation are my own. It was my endeavour to weed out all the symbols and old, worn-out, misleading terminology. Hylozoics stands out clearly.

<sup>12</sup>*PhS* contains four revolutionary new teachings that were never given out even in the esoteric knowledge orders.

<sup>13</sup>The first one is the solution of the mystery of “trinity”, the three equivalent aspects of existence, the basic idea of the absolute knowledge system, the foundation of the philosophy and science of the future.

<sup>14</sup>The second one is the assertion that matter (the atoms) is the carrier of consciousness, that the meaning of existence is consciousness development, that this consists in the monad’s



continuous self-activation of consciousness in ever higher kinds of molecules and atoms, that these molecular and atomic kinds indicate the limits of the different kinds of consciousness, that not having this understanding the self, or monad, will drown in the ocean of consciousness there is between worlds 48 and 46, as raja yogis do.

<sup>15</sup>The third one is the objective criteria of the different stages of development indicated.

<sup>16</sup>The fourth one is the formulation of the “laws of life”, particularly emphasizing those which are essential to our times as introducing the Aquarian epoch, the epoch of law.

<sup>17</sup>Anyone who cannot by himself see this is not in a position to comprehend esoterics. He should study occult symbolism instead, and go on devoting himself to his cherished imaginings.

<sup>18</sup>The writings of Alice A. Bailey with quotations from the *Old Commentary* mark the final parting from the Oriental mode of presentation.

<sup>19</sup>Before there can be any talk of purposeful life, mankind must have acquired knowledge of reality, of the meaning and goal of life, of the manner in which to reach the goal. Only then can we begin arranging our lives in a rational way. Before that, everything will be done at random.

### 1.21 The Knowledge of Reality

<sup>1</sup>*KofR* is meant to be a philosophical and scientific basis for a correct conception of reality. It has no higher pretensions than that. The greater is the need of Pythagoras’ simple hylozoic mental system with its teaching on the monads and their evolution through material envelopes, on the three aspects of reality, on evolution through twelve natural kingdoms, six in the planetary and solar systems, six in ever higher cosmic worlds. This wondrously clear system of thought can never be superseded by a better one for a mankind that has not acquired causal consciousness. Future mental systems will contain innumerable new facts. But all of them must be based on the Pythagorean system, which is the fundamental system of all reality systems.

<sup>2</sup>The first two sections of *KofR*, “The Problems of Reality, Part One” and “The Problems of Reality, Part Two”, could be regarded as the basic world view of the science of the future. This can and should supplant philosophical speculation.

<sup>3</sup>The section on the History of the Knowledge contains a badly needed critique of the conception of reality held by the theosophical sects, a conception that on account of the lack of facts has been incomplete and largely misleading.

<sup>4</sup>The section on the History of European Philosophy is the definitive refutation of all philosophical speculation.

<sup>5</sup>Steiner’s anthroposophy is a consistent falsification of esoterics. This can only be explained by the fact that Steiner was a victim of the black lodge, shrouded in a thought form made by it.

<sup>6</sup>The yoga philosophy has been refuted epistemologically. Its world view will in due time be supplanted by hylozoics. Its methods are unsuited to Westerners. It will be up to the latter, in the future, to keep whatever is useful in raja, bhakti (for mystics), and karma yoga. Hatha and gnana yoga can be discarded without further ado.

<sup>7</sup>I have analysed philosophy, anthroposophy, and yoga, and all but destroyed them, not for criticism’s own sake, but to set at least Westerners free from disorienting ideologies, since they have a destructive effect and are hindrances to the true knowledge.

<sup>8</sup>My essays on philosophy, anthroposophy, and yoga should have sufficiently explained and vindicated the saying of the Buddha to the effect that human reason cannot solve the problems of reality and life. Henceforth no one should need to overestimate the capacity of the academic intelligentsia.

<sup>9</sup>Perhaps *KofR* should have been called *The Problems of Reality*, and the two sections of it now carrying this heading should have been called “The Knowledge of Reality”, for that is precisely what they contain. The other essays treat of historical matters. However, there is a lot to be said for the title eventually given to the whole book.

<sup>10</sup>The writing-style of *KofR* leaves much to be desired. The writer paid attention only to the content of facts and did not consider the disinclination of critics to look beyond formulation, their lack of understanding of what is new to them and so inconceivable.

<sup>11</sup>We shall probably have to abandon the hope of *KofR* serving to rouse philosophers and scientists to reconsider the knowledge basis on which they have erected their world view and life view. Apparently, dogmatic thought has not yet been dealt the blow that will bring its construction down. The courage of stepping forward to proclaim their inmost conviction is absent in the majority of those who have in private accepted hylozoics as a working hypothesis. Strange to say, they do not seem to realize their responsibility, the fact that by their cowardice they hinder the voice of truth from making itself heard, that they are stones in the road. What right do they have to future claims: to be born into a nation of culture, a family of culture, to be given an efficient organism and brain, opportunities of study?

### 1.22 *The Knowledge of Life Series*

<sup>1</sup>In the fourth part of his work, the five volumes of the *Knowledge of Life* series, Laurency has accounted for esoteric facts from the symbolic literature extant and in so doing has rendered these symbols in comprehensible language in accord with the basic mathematical terminology he used in his previous books. In everything having reference to esoterics, he has as usual avoided personal assumptions and suppositions.

<sup>2</sup>In this fourth part, Laurency has in addition written on many things that have little or no bearing on esoterics. Readers will probably realize that underlying these exoteric essays is a view on cultural and other human phenomena that was acquired through esoteric study. In these essays, Laurency expresses views on so-called everyday matters as well. These views often greatly diverge from those of public opinion. They raise no claim to be considered “infallible”. But they may perhaps afford ideas for debate, ideas for individual reflection in readers, and in so doing expand their perspectives in some respect. For that is necessary to counteract mental stagnation, dogmatism, thoughtless parroting, and endless repetition of “ideas” the individual once acquired.

<sup>3</sup>If you possess esoteric facts and axioms, then you think in these respects as a causal self does. The pertaining vibrations raise your mental capacity, so that you will easily acquire perspective consciousness and even system thinking will be possible for you within domains of reality familiar to you. Circumstantial discursive thinking and narrowing principle thinking will in many cases be superseded by an overruling perception that untrained people often have difficulty in describing exactly. Also, you will soon realize that discussions are meaningless, when there is no common platform for a starting-point. There will only be misunderstandings. It is also unavoidable that those who by acquiring the esoteric knowledge have entered the world of reality (liberated from illusoriness and fictitiousness) often put another sense than the conventional one in what they say. This, too, results in misunderstandings.

### 1.23 *The Purpose of the Section on Philosophy in KofR*

<sup>1</sup>In “An Esoterician’s View of the History of European Philosophy”, the opinions of philosophers have been compared with the description of reality by Pythagorean hylozoics. Thus this section is not at all intended as a history of philosophy in the ordinary sense.

<sup>2</sup>The purpose of the essays on philosophy in *KofR* and *PhS* was to set people free from the belief that philosophers are able to solve the problems of existence, just as the purpose of the essay on history in *PhS* was to set them free from the belief that history is reliable. The purpose thus was to spare the intelligentsia the trouble of studying philosophy and history at all.

<sup>3</sup>This purpose has been misunderstood. People who have no training in philosophy have thought that they should study some “real” history of philosophy to understand Laurency’s essays better. Some people have regarded these essays as “introductions” to philosophy and have begun studying philosophy to find out whether Laurency is right! Then there is a risk that their confusion of ideas will be even more serious than ever before, because the view taken by the esoterician is not that of the exoterist. The two cannot be united. The exoteric basic concepts are subjectivist constructions that make it more difficult to form a correct conception of reality. They must be eliminated, thus not be acquired.

<sup>4</sup>All of this has been stated very clearly, but it appears that they have to be pointed out anew. People nowadays read so inattentively that they forget what they have read and criticize from what they have been able to grasp from their reading, which generally is different from what says in the text.

<sup>5</sup>Alas, how mistaken Laurency was! He was stupid enough to believe that he had deterred people from having anything to do with these imaginative speculations likely to disorganize reason. Anyone who has immersed himself in this fictionalism may count himself fortunate if subsequently he is able to reacquire his common sense. Not many people succeed in doing so. It is by no means strange that any absurdities whatever can be put into people’s heads. Their instinct of reality has been idiotized systematically by the black lodge during more than fifty thousand years. Their defenceless in epistemological respect is demonstrated by history and by the history of philosophy in particular.

<sup>6</sup>Besides, the history of philosophy is still unwritten. Such a history would consist of four parts: a factual account of the systems put forth by the philosophers, a criticism of the theses those systems start from, a demonstration of the inner contradictions of the systems, a demonstration of the absurdity of their consequences. This was the method of treatment that Hedvall, Hägerström, and Phalén applied in their oral teaching. In this it was demonstrated that no system was tenable. However, none of those teachers realized that a tenable system of thought would be possible in the future. They kept to what existed, the system such as it was put forth, independent of its other temporal conditions. Of course, they considered it illegitimate to criticize one system from another one. That will not be possible until the absolute knowledge system has been constructed – that system which will agree with reality in the worlds of man. Systems for still higher worlds would be incomprehensible to mental-causal consciousness.

#### 1.24 *The System of Hylozoics*

<sup>1</sup>It needs to be pointed out, because misunderstandings on that matter have been voiced, that Laurency’s presentation of the “meaning and goal of existence” is not spiritism or spiritualism, as they want to call it, not theosophy, not anthroposophy, but hylozoics, or spiritual materialism. I leave it to esotericians of the future to determine which of these various schools is in possession of most esoteric facts. A hylozoician is a person who was once initiated into the secret doctrine of the Pythagoreans. In addition anyone may consider himself an hylozoician who understands that hylozoics is the only correct explanation of existence. Hylozoics means spiritual materialism implying that matter is always the carrier of consciousness in the entire cosmos, that self-consciousness is the self and that the self is “spirit”.

<sup>2</sup>In fact, the hylozoic mental system is the simplest conceivable of all systems, so simple that philosophers make short work of it and dismiss it with a shrug. Any young school child could learn it by heart in a week's time. That is the very drawback, for "it mustn't be that simple". Then it is quite another matter to understand its agreement with reality. No ordinary professor is able to do so, because he is chock-full of balderdash that prevents his thinking reality.

<sup>3</sup>"The simpler a hypothesis is, the truer, the more correct is it; the more difficult is it to find it, the more difficult to be accepted by the learned." It was the formulation of this principle that made Henri Poincaré the greatest man in celestial mechanics of his times.

<sup>4</sup>Hylozoics makes it possible to judge the value in a life sense, if any, of the literature and cultural products of the exoterists, something which the exoterists themselves demonstrably are unable to do.

<sup>5</sup>Give me something more rational than the esoteric mental system, something that explains more, better, more simply – and I will accept that instead.

### *1.25 Hylozoics Is Its Own Logical Demonstration*

<sup>1</sup>Many esotericians have expressed the view that it is not possible to logically convince people that esoterics is correct, that this is possible only by experimental means (magic). That view is based on the fact that all philosophers have failed, since they must fail using their too few facts as the basis of their explanations and also since the esotericians themselves did not possess all the requisite facts and also were unable to make philosophical constructions.

<sup>2</sup>Laurency thinks that the mental system he has put forth must have a logically convincing effect. The hylozoic system of Pythagoras, such as it is presented in "The Problems of Reality, Part One", is an irrefutable system of thought which no philosopher has been able to devise. It contains all the facts necessary to the comprehension of existence. In this system all the facts of future research will find their given places. It explains all previously inexplicable basic phenomena of life and the meaning of existence in the only rational way. From this it follows that the hylozoic system is and remains the only tenable working hypothesis.

<sup>3</sup>In addition to the five proofs of the correctness of esoterics presented in *KofR* there is yet another proof. That is the two works of Laurency, *PhS* and *KofR*, which could never have been written without the esoteric basis. Esoterics affords the key to what is exoteric in the two books. The Uppsala philosophy (Hedvall), appearing occasionally, afforded the writer (except the very logical training) the idea in Hedvall's proposition and his refutation of the pseudo-proofs of Hume. The rest is criticism of philosophy, anthroposophy, and yoga on the basis of esoterics.

<sup>4</sup>It is only a matter of time when hylozoics will be accepted by the thinking portion of mankind as the only tenable working hypothesis. Once mankind has seen that the meaning of life is consciousness development and that this goes on through a series of ever higher natural kingdoms in a series of ever higher material worlds, mankind will have been liberated from its worst illusions and fictions. Then mankind will see that the consciousness aspect is the most important of the three aspects of life. Those who are not very keen on exploring the matter aspect will then turn their attention to the life view and try to acquire the art of living in order to use its qualities and abilities to reach ever higher kinds of consciousness, become ever more skilful at living the life according to the laws of life. What Laurency wants to inculcate on his readers is that the life view must rest upon the rock, upon a groundwork that is unassailable, upon the true knowledge of reality, upon the hylozoic world view. Without it, the life view will never have that certainty it must have for people to strive after self-realization, for them to see that it is necessary to apply the knowledge of the laws of life.

### 1.26 *Hylozoics Is No Human Creation*

<sup>1</sup>On his own initiative and in spite of being warned of it, an acquaintance of Laurency sent a copy of the pamphlet *The Three Questions of the Sphinx* to Sven Stolpe, Ph.D., requesting his statement on it. The reply he got was to the effect that the pamphlet obviously was the work of some “rural prophet”. Stolpe went on to say that “this chap is manifestly cracked”.

<sup>2</sup>Well, if it were a matter of speculation by some philosophical visionary, a work of man, then this statement could have been correct. Stolpe could not easily have seen, however, that no human being could make such a construction. Nor does he know that there is a fifth kingdom in nature, and that individuals of that kingdom can communicate esoteric facts to a seeker who has not been able to accept the hypotheses of any religion, philosophy, or science.

<sup>3</sup>It should be obvious to a first-class intellect that has studied the philosophical systems that by comparison with the esoteric world view of *PhS* they are exceedingly threadbare attempts at speculation. That is as far as the intellect may reach on its own without facts. To those who have mastered the hylozoic mental system it should be as obvious that no human intellect is able to “concoct” a system which is non-contradictory, irrefutable, which explains existence and thousands of previously inexplicable phenomena in a rational manner and so demonstrates that it agrees with reality. All superphysical facts are a gift from the planetary hierarchy. The hylozoic system will gradually be complemented with new facts. Already thousands of such facts have been publicized which could not be used for *PhS*, which had to be limited to the basics, since those must be first mastered by students, and without such a mastery the additional facts cannot be comprehended by them. There are already many things said that only causal selves are able to understand. It is typical of human conceit that most readers of that additional information believed they comprehended what only causal selves can grasp. Probably they did not understand even *PhS*.

### 1.27 *How Laurency's Works Were Written*

<sup>1</sup>Laurency's works were written by using the ideas that were gradually received from the subconscious, the results of ideas brought there from the waking consciousness, which is constantly occupied with the problems of reality and life. The perspectives were constantly widened and the syntheses renewed so that the ideas written down gradually had their value enhanced. This had to be considered when editing the texts. Not all formulations were equally successful.

<sup>2</sup>Understanding readers of *PhS* and *KofR* probably realize that the writing of *PhS* presupposed the knowledge presented in *KofR*, but that *PhS* is the basic work and *KofR* is little more than a popularizing commentary on *PhS*, that without *PhS* there would have been no *KofR*.

<sup>3</sup>The conditions of writing the works of Laurency were more than sixty years of life experience and forty years of esoteric study. Laurency spent seventeen years writing *PhS* and ten years writing *KofR*.

### 1.28 *On How PhS Was Written*

<sup>1</sup>The first draft of the second section of *PhS* was written at midsummer 1931; in the following year, 1932, the first version of what would become the third section, “the laws of life”. The first section, “Exoteric World View and Life View”, was elaborated in 1936. During seventeen years in all, all three sections were revised until, in the autumn of 1948, they had received an acceptable form.

<sup>2</sup>My readers might find it interesting to learn something of how *PhS* was printed. At that time (in 1949), *Sydsvenska Dagbladet* possessed a publishing house which printed doctoral dissertations and similar things. In February 1949 I requested them to furnish a quotation for the printing of 1000 copies. The manager of the printing division, who thought it was a

scientific work, expressed his desire to print my manuscript and to have it distributed by the publishing house. He decided the format, type, and quality of the paper. I gratefully agreed. As the manuscript was being set up and it became known what kind of book it was, the publishing house realized that they made a mistake by agreeing to print it. Unfortunately it was too late, and the contract had to be fulfilled. They refused to distribute the book, however, and sent the printed edition to me. This they did in spite of the fact that the publisher's commitment was indicated on the title page: "Distributed by, etc." Afterwards I heard people voicing their astonishment that such a publisher desired to print the book. This was in January, in the year of grace 1950.

<sup>3</sup>The publisher's newspaper refused to review the book. That was the case, too, with all the other daily papers. A city architect and freemason tried in vain to persuade a newspaper editor in Gothenburg. Another editor of the same city confided to the architect that "there's something strange about that book. It's sort of forbidden even to talk about it." He went on to say that the author's true name was Hansson. Some experience of how easily journalists pounce on false statements to spread them far and wide made me receive that report with the laughter of recognition. The creation of a legend was in full swing and there was no point in trying to effect a correction.

<sup>4</sup>On January 2, 1950, the first copies were available in the bookshops of Malmö. A financier had offered to defray the cost of printing, but was later unable to fulfil this commitment. This financier had decided the title, the picture to be put on the cover, and the price of the book. The price was so low that each copy sold through a bookshop entailed a direct loss of two crowns.

<sup>5</sup>When writing *PhS*, it never occurred to me that I should write a sequel. At the time, I wanted to share my knowledge and experience of life with seekers, who would perhaps take pleasure in them. Otherwise I would have planned it all differently. There were numerous errors to be corrected in the presentations of the current theosophical and occult sects.

### *1.29 How KofR Was Written*

<sup>1</sup>On a bright day of the spring of 1958 I was visited in my home by Mr Gösta Nyblom, a publisher from Uppsala. He had been given a manuscript to read, "The Meaning and Goal of Existence", been informed of who was the author of it, and wanted to publish it. However, he wanted some more to fill a volume. He received "An Esoterician's View on the History of European Philosophy". He disappeared and then I heard nothing more of him.

<sup>2</sup>It probably needs to be pointed out that *KofR* by no means implies any "development" in any sense with regard to *PhS*. *KofR* was written because exceedingly few people were able to comprehend the esoteric world view of *PhS* (second section). It also appeared that this section of *PhS* made great demands even on those who were familiar with the theosophical formulation.

<sup>3</sup>Therefore, it was necessary to simplify the presentation, and the Pythagorean mental system was best suited to that purpose. Some new esoteric facts (publicized through the secretary of the planetary hierarchy, D.K.) were used to give further emphasis to the three aspects of reality. A brief account of the fortunes of the esoteric knowledge put theosophy into its correct perspective. To this were added succinct critiques of the fictions of philosophy, anthroposophy, and yoga for the benefit of those who were at the risk of going astray in those labyrinths.

<sup>4</sup>Likewise the planned third work is intended to popularize the knowledge even further. It might be expected that this will be interpreted as demonstrating a weakening of the writer's reasoning power. The doctors of literature certainly have to give proof of their acuity and profundity.

<sup>5</sup>It was expected that both *PhS* and *KofR* were to meet with resistance. Rather, the writer was very joyed and surprised at the tokens of recognitions shown to him by seekers who had finally reached clarity. Esotericians easily understand that they were few in numbers.

### 1.30 Readers of Laurency

<sup>1</sup>Sometimes people might tell you that esoterics is too difficult to comprehend. If they do not comprehend it at once, it is “too difficult”. You may wonder if they mean that they can learn only what they already know, if they consider themselves incapable of learning anything new on their own, or if you must like a school mistress teach them how to read or like a teacher tell them what it says in the book so that they may be let off thinking for themselves. Any school child of normal intelligence preparing for high school should be able to comprehend all Laurency’s books. Moreover, the more times you read those books, the more you will understand. If everything were well-known, then no books would be needed. Telling people what they already know is certainly part of the art of rhetoric where formulation is the important thing. A writer who wants something different, however, says as Goethe did: “I do not write to please you; you should learn something.” And learning requires work.

<sup>2</sup>Many people who read the first section (exoteric part) of *PhS* say they find its message “obvious”, so obvious that “this need not even be said”. Then they should ask themselves whether this was as evident and obvious before they read it or if that understanding came afterwards. That section was written precisely for those who find it obvious. If it is not obvious they will reject it, for that is the attitude people take to everything they do not understand and have not experienced. Many people who found that section obvious were very uncertain whether they could be right against the great masses who think differently. If the book afforded them certainty, self-reliance, confidence in their own perception, then it has fulfilled an important function.

<sup>3</sup>You might think that at least those interested in esoterics had learnt how to read what it says in a text. It has been seen, however, that they see only what they knew before, not what refutes their erroneous “esoteric” views.

<sup>4</sup>Laurency desires such readers as are not already crammed with occult ideas and facts, but such as are able to read his works with unmuddled brains (without a previous occult study). It has been seen that those who understood him the best were always the people to whom all this was new in this incarnation.

### 1.31 Statements by Readers on *PhS* and *KofR*

<sup>1</sup>An esoterician expressed the view that Laurency’s work, *The Philosopher’s Stone*, was only the writer’s striving to reach clarity for himself. This might be correct. Anyone who writes for himself, however, gives his best to others as well. Without some knowledge of your own you have nothing to give to others. It is also conceivable, however, that the work of Laurency might be the attempt of Augoeides to use the possibility of a conception of reality, which the man he is supervising has gained in this particular incarnation, in his endeavour to concretize a vision of the worlds that are accessible to him only through that man. If so, I hope that Augoeides is contented with his work.

<sup>2</sup>Another critic of *PhS* said that the first section of the book is contradicted by the second section. He did not realize that the first section is a presentation of the understanding mankind has arrived at on its own, and the second section is an attempt at explaining how reality appears to individuals of the stage of ideality. Such critics demonstrate their own stage of development and the limits to their understanding.

<sup>3</sup>An engineer said about *PhS* when he saw the cover: “The book has no author’s name. You don’t know what to believe. It surely is some pseudo stuff.” Other people sneered at the mere sight of the cover and declined offers to receive the book as a free gift. Of such people I said:

“Their instinct was true. The book was not for them. For Laurency’s books are for those who know what they are speaking about.”

<sup>4</sup>Many people do not know what they say. Other people say what they do not know. Some people do not say what they know.

<sup>5</sup>As Schopenhauer says: All wise men of all ages said the same things, and all mankind did the opposite.

<sup>6</sup>The chief librarian of Dickson’s Public Library in Gothenburg refused a free copy of *KofR*. He had “had a philosopher in whose opinion he had complete trust” read the book. That is an infallible method of exonerating yourself from responsibility, so that you have said nothing. Then the chief librarian of Stockholm Public Library was more honest, for he frankly declared, “we will not accept that book (*PhS*)”.

<sup>7</sup>“*PhS* and *KofR* are the only books worth reading.” (The leader of a spiritualist group)

### 1.32 *Opinions of Readers on the History of Philosophy in KofR*

<sup>1</sup>Curiously enough there are readers of *KofR* who pass over the philosophical section, since they “do not understand philosophy”. An esoterician must learn how to understand it, however. And precisely as much of it as is contained in that section. The section also contains many esoteric facts and many facts of world history, the history of culture, and the history of religion. So it should be read.

<sup>2</sup>One of my readers thought, after reading the manuscript of *An Esoterician’s View of the History of European Philosophy*, that this work should have been published first of all, before *PhS*, etc. But before you can demonstrate where the philosophers erred in their thinking you must have explained the make-up of reality. Otherwise your argument is without a foundation, the mental system in agreement with reality.

<sup>3</sup>A university graduate who had majored in philosophy put on a supercilious smile when I told him that I had treated of the history of philosophy. He probably could not even have dreamt of such a treatment.

<sup>4</sup>Critics will say, of course, that my treatment of the romanticists (Kant, etc.) is unfair. Thinkers of the future must judge that matter. Schopenhauer’s critique of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel holds good.

<sup>5</sup>Kant’s terms, “phenomenon” (*Erscheinung*) and “noumenon” (*Ding an sich*), are highly ambiguous. “*Erscheinung*” (appearance) must not be translated by the realistic “*företeelse*” of the Swedish language. The ambiguity and vagueness of these terms of Kant are obvious.

### 1.33 “Nothing for Emotion”

<sup>1</sup>Some people have said, “There is nothing for emotion in Laurency.” That is correct. Emotion is no source of information, and the knowledge of reality should be knowledge and not emotion. Everything in mystic literature that is part of emotion or, more properly, sentimentality, has been avoided. Also everything has been excluded that concerns the desire of curiosity for all manner of sensations, magical phenomena, the personalities of causal selves and higher selves. These selves have requested that their private lives be left in peace from the thoughts of the uninitiated in their work for mankind. They always help when they are allowed to do so according to the Law. However, they never do so in response to requests for help. They know everything about all who need help and have a right to be helped.

<sup>2</sup>Mystics and emotionalists of all sorts who “need something for emotion” will seek in vain for such a thing in the works of Laurency. The whole of mystic literature, from medieval times and on, is at their disposal. The mystics, saints, sufis, yogis of all ages have indicated the path to the stage of the saint. You reach this by striving for all the means and modes of expression of attraction.



<sup>3</sup>Laurency writes for mentalists who want to have facts put into their right contexts in order to have clarity and exactness.

<sup>4</sup>His works are intended primarily for people of the third and fifth departments. Those who belong to the second, fourth, and sixth departments have almost all the other esoteric literature at their command.

<sup>5</sup>*PhS* does not appeal to emotion, does not encourage a rapid spiritual career. Such an exhortation must come from within and must be entirely different from good resolutions, immature enterprisingness, the faith of ignorance in its own skill, misjudgement of one's own capacity. The laws of life indicate the conditions, the path to be walked. Anyone able to do it will do it.

<sup>6</sup>*PhS* is for those at the stage of humanity who no longer need emotionality as their driving force, but who strive to acquire common sense, the highest kind of reason at the present stage of mankind's development.

### *1.34 Apparent Contradictions*

<sup>1</sup>Many readers think they have found contradictions in *PhS* by Laurency, and to would-be wisdom there are surely thousands of them. However, all cases I have heard of were due to the fact that readers started from their own assumptions and their own capacity for judgment. If you want to demonstrate true contradictions, you must not get stuck on occasional formulations that may not be fortunate. However, if you judge *PhS* on the basis of the two systems represented by that work, you may perhaps understand what is meant in each particular case.

<sup>2</sup>*PhS* consists of two mental systems, the one for exoterists, and the other for those who have remained seekers after the knowledge of reality and have left the emotional stage of the mystic behind them. The esoteric world view requires from the reader the ability to combine facts about the matter and consciousness aspects, so that he realizes their interconnectedness, since they are inseparable.

<sup>3</sup>It may be necessary to give different explanations of the same thing depending on the different capacities for comprehension there are in different questioners or on the different situations in which the question was asked. If malevolence compiles these explanations, it may use them to demonstrate the unreliability of the responding person.

<sup>4</sup>Consequently, there are plenty of contradictions in the writings of Laurency. It is to be expected that critics will make much of them. These would-be critics never comprehend the justification of apparent contradictions. They should be informed, however, that these apparent contradictions were fully conscious and intentional. Readers who hunt for such things can safely omit reading the books.

<sup>5</sup>A few examples of apparent contradictions. It says in *PhS*, in one place, that the philosophers have not comprehended the problems of reality; and in another place, that philosophers in all ages have comprehended everything. In one place it says that life is suffering; in another, that life is not suffering. There are more when it comes to philosophy.

### *1.35 "Schoolmasterly"*

<sup>1</sup>You might think that Laurency seems schoolmasterly in his circumstantial account of the facts and concepts of esoterics. If so, it just demonstrates that you do not have a psychological and pedagogical experience, and also that you are ignorant of the irremediable confusion that holds sway in the occult sects, since the writers have been unable to present their teachings in a detailed and exact manner. Having once benefited from what Laurency offered them, and having reached the clarity made possible only by the exact presentation, superior critics take delight in giving the teacher a patronizing pat on the back. When they no longer need it for their own further development, they consider it to be far below their own level. And of course

they must shake off the oppressive feeling of having received knowledge, of gratitude for what the teacher gave them. This painful feeling often is the psychological cause of a behaviour of former pupils that is otherwise incomprehensible. Apparently they have no sense of the comical feature of their attitude.

### *1.36 They Have Taken Offense At...*

<sup>1</sup>They have criticized the statement made in *PhS* to the effect that this book was written for the élite, saying that members of the true élite often do not know that they belong to it. Well, perhaps there are élites of different kinds: the football élite, for example. However, *PhS* is intended for the esoteric knowledge élite. Or expressed differently: anyone who understands *PhS* is a member of the élite whether that person knows it or not. Anyone who cannot even comprehend it is not a member of that élite which *PhS* desires to reach.

<sup>2</sup>They have taken offence at a statement to the effect that the church, which for about 1500 years was the enemy of freedom, would be one again, if it were to regain its old power (*PhS* 3.12.8). They have thought that this would be impossible. Then they have not understood what is implied by the stages of development. Everything is possible in a mankind that has scarcely left the stage of barbarism.

<sup>3</sup>They have taken offence at statements such as: “Injustice in any respect whatsoever is absolutely out of the question.” “No evil can befall anyone who has not a bad sowing to reap.” “If an individual is to remain unhelped, then people will be incapable of helping him, no matter how they try.” It is fully understandable that many readers have reacted. Also, appearances are against the facts. The seeming injustices of life have too shocking an effect. The law of reaping can be understood only if reincarnation is considered. Then a 45-self says: “Our greatest trouble is to teach pupils not to be befooled by appearances.” The law of reaping is called a “terrible law” that can intervene in the least expected ways in all situations of life. The sowing must be reaped unto the last grain (sowing in thoughts, words, and deeds). Then it may take however many incarnations. One comfort is that a bad sowing need not be paid off by suffering but can be paid off by good deeds and various sacrifices such as living for another person, sacrificing oneself for another, etc.

<sup>4</sup>Readers of *KofR* have asked how the planetary government could condemn almost all mankind to death by drowning at the submersion of Atlantis. You are amazed at such questions, irremediably naïve. After all, these readers have studied the Law and should understand that nobody will ever be entitled to complain of injustices. We have, all of us, during tens of thousands of incarnations at the stages of barbarism and civilization, committed so many misdeeds in so many respects that whatever happens to is only a small “instalment”. Still at the stage of ideality the individual has so much to redress that he is eager to “save” thousands of lives, afford them the knowledge, etc. that makes it possible for them to be spared a wasted incarnation.

<sup>5</sup>Also readers are quick to give their opinions on the basis of too few facts. They do not know that when the decision to submerge the continent had been made, “all the good people” were warned, were asked to emigrate and go to upland regions, and also were assisted in this.

### *1.37 Judgment Is Lacking*

<sup>1</sup>It is characteristic of people at the present general stage of development that they have a tendency to pass judgments at once, without prior examination. How many of them sneered at the picture on the cover of *De vises sten* by Laurency, dismissing the book as “religious pseudo-teaching”! They did not even study the picture, for then they would have seen that it conveyed the idea of initiation. They did not even grasp that. But they knew it was rubbish all the same.

<sup>2</sup>Presumption and impudence are two traits characteristic of nearly all intellectually superior people. Out of some one hundred such people I have met, only two had gained the Sokratean realization so that they understood the boundless insignificance of human genius. In that respect esotericians are no exceptions. Three highly intellectual people, whom I taught, upon learning the elements of esoterics became full of self-importance, started fantasizing about their intuitions and proclaiming “facts” out of their own heads, claiming to be in contact with the planetary hierarchy, etc. The others swallowed everything without discrimination, being incapable of putting new facts into their correct contexts. Only one person learnt how to master the system in the one right way, profound acquisition through years of dedicated study. Strange to say, the spiritualists I have got to know were considerably more “awake spiritually” than the theosophists, and realized at once that hylozoics is superior as a working hypothesis. They found fault with the statement in *KofR* 3.1.32 about the attitude of spiritualists to Blavatsky. If this has changed since the 1880-ties, it is gratifying indeed. However, Conan Doyle still condemned H.P.B outright.

<sup>3</sup>The only truly rational people are those who see their own incompetence. The others believe themselves capable of everything.

<sup>4</sup>There are highly developed people who (according to the Law) are equipped with envelopes of incarnation that make them unfit for life, and are put in situations they cannot control. That is not an occasion for self-pity. It is an occasion for experience and self-knowledge.

### *1.38 Readers of Laurency Have Not Understood*

<sup>1</sup>I have not yet met any people who were able to judge *PhS* by Laurency. It is typical of the judgment of readers that you have to point out to them what the book contains, that its contents are largely esoteric axioms, reality ideas, and no speculations by the writer. They have not even realized that the first section is the summary of mankind’s experience, showing how far mankind has come, how much the intelligentsia is able to understand.

<sup>2</sup>After the writer pointed out in *PhS* that history is a collection of legends and the muse of history is a story-teller, people must study history to be convinced that this is true.

<sup>3</sup>After the writer made clear in *KofR* that philosophy is an imaginative speculation by life ignorance, people feel they must study philosophy to comprehend *KofR* better.

<sup>4</sup>Are readers able to read or do they not understand what they read, however simple the presentation?

<sup>5</sup>Once in a while I am surprised as well as joyed by proofs of understanding, such as when a reader told me, “you get perspectives you never thought were possible, you get a breathtaking insight into things you used to pass over without thinking in everyday life.”

<sup>6</sup>Only a few of those who have read Laurency’s books have understood their contents. But how could they do so, since this requires latent knowledge? I hope that some esoterician will care to incarnate here, so that stupidization will not increase even more. For without esoterics people will be more and more disoriented in their search.

<sup>7</sup>I have almost daily evidence that readers of Laurency’s writings have not grasped what it says in them, that they cannot even read what is explicitly stated. You get the impression that they believe they comprehend what they read without further ado, which is their first mistake. You cannot do so until you have mastered the system. Comprehension goes from universals to particulars, and it is only from the whole that you may have a correct grasp of the details. Their second mistake is that they do not stop at every sentence, trying to fit it into its right context, which is not automatically clear from its occasional context. They read carelessly and forget what they have read. Not one of the readers of Laurency who have asked about the pertaining problems has comprehended, for they have asked about things that are already answered.

<sup>8</sup>In that respect the believers of the various occult sects are no exceptions. Whatever contradicts the view they have got appears erroneous to them. I have not yet found in any of those societies anyone who understood what they read, let alone what they taught. You may observe that they are believers who never understood what they accepted.

<sup>9</sup>Esoterics eliminates all kinds of belief, which is always an error, even in such matters where it could be right. There are no authorities in esoterics. Anyone who needs such things is not ripe for esoterics. What you have not understood and realized to be right you have misunderstood. Where occultists of all sorts are concerned, it may be established that very few of them possess the faculties they believe they possess. It always holds good that many believe they are called, but few are chosen. Otherwise there would not be so many different sects.

<sup>10</sup>This has been said before but must be said over and over again. You may wonder why so many people grapple problems they cannot possibly comprehend. Esoterics is for those who have reached the mental stage and become mental selves (47:5), and they are still very rare.

<sup>11</sup>What most people need is an orientation in the physical world, so that they are able to lead purposeful lives having a right attitude to their fellow human beings. In so doing they will have abundant opportunities to develop a capacity for thinking as well as the qualities of emotional attraction, to acquire a right attitude to life, and to benefit from the period of rest between incarnations. Superphysical problems are not for those who are unable to grasp them. Generally speaking, the occupation with those problems has had an inhibiting effect on consciousness development, since it has fostered credulity, that serious hindrance to the development of common sense.

<sup>12</sup>The more you see of all those different occult teachings, the more convinced you are that they have not been of use to those who have accepted those teachings on good faith, not being able to judge their reality content. All such things counteract the development of common sense, which is the highest authority and the only basis for the further development of mental consciousness, which is an unconscious process that is easily distorted through erroneous methods of meditation.

<sup>13</sup>The religions have largely been the curse of mankind, have fostered hatred and superstition and made life a hell in the physical and emotional worlds. Doubt is better than belief, being a skeptic is better than being a dogmatic, for this gives thought the opportunity to emancipate itself from all the systems that become hindrances to further mental development. The religions have not helped people to lead more rational lives, which surely was their intention.

<sup>14</sup>Among the greatest human beings can be numbered such noble humanists who lived to serve mankind, development, and unity without religion, philosophy, or any other kind of superstition. Such a brightly shining figure in the darkness of mankind was the German poet Schiller, to mention just one of them.

### *1.39 Is Laurency Too Harsh?*

<sup>1</sup>Readers have taken offence at “unnecessarily harsh” statements in *PhS* and *KofR*. I am fully aware that “too harsh utterances irritate more than they give cause for reflection”. It has become ever more apparent, however, that formulations aimed at smoothing down do not make the necessary impression. Goodness is not smoothness. Goodness is harsh when it is apparent that only harshness is perceived as earnest. If such harshness is perceived as hatred (contempt, an overbearing manner), this gives evidence of the usual psychological infantilism. Most people are nowadays so destroyed by too much reading that they do not notice what is said if it is not made incisive. The use of exclamation marks or another printed style is not sufficient. *KofR* was written to give people knowledge and was dictated by goodwill. Anyone

who is not able to gather this from Laurency's books but remains a letter-slave may leave the books unread without loss.

<sup>2</sup>It would be all right, if you could just tell it as it is, "put forward the positive things", as benevolent, uncritical, niceness preaches. But how would people see the errors there are in older teachings, if it is not pointed out to them? Anyone who is told what is wrong finds it easier to see what is right. "Whoever knows evil knows good." Mere information will not suffice, however. You have to make people pay attention. And sometimes hammer blows are necessary to drive the nails of knowledge into the blockheads. It does the readers no harm if they get annoyed at harsh sayings. Then at least they have perceived that criticism is being levelled. If this makes them reflect upon what they read, then they have always gained something.

<sup>3</sup>Besides, experience shows that anyone who is able to understand is not put off by harsh sayings. Such a person understands very well their intention and good motivation. Scarcely any others than those with erroneous views will be irritated, and you cannot reach such people anyhow.

<sup>4</sup>Any kind of moving persuasion into "faith" is utterly alien to esotericians. Anyone who does not want to examine the reality content of what is said is no seeker. He is "saved" for this incarnation and will have to relearn in those to come. That is what I want to spare them.

<sup>5</sup>To cram into people absurdities of all sorts that make it impossible for them to acquire common sense – that it to idiotize people. And that is a thing that should not be glossed over with smoothness. Idiotizing is idiotizing, and that must be pointed out, a very serious matter.

<sup>6</sup>If blindness were not that total, resistance not that stubborn, self-conceit not that compact, attacks not that perfidious, then you would not need to resort to such forceful expressions as repel those who believe they gain something by being harmless to the point of tearfulness.

<sup>7</sup>You must cajole and wheedle people into accepting the truth (the knowledge of reality). You must not offend those who preach false ideologies, who are totally disoriented in reality, who are firm in their beliefs. You must not say it brutally as it is. There are a few people, however, who dare to break with conventions, who refuse to join in moral hypocrisy. They are pilloried as rude loudmouths whose words fall on deaf ears for a generation or two. But new times bring new readers who value honesty the most and rejoice at the fact that there were people once who dared to breach with heavy guns. Artillery may be needed when it comes to razing Chinese walls, or strong trumpet blasts, if we are to believe the Atlantean legend (which the Jews rehashed). Treating people with kid gloves you achieve very little. They will observe you, put you on the shelf, and forget you.

#### *1.40 On Studying Esoterics*

<sup>1</sup>I use to tell those who ask me questions that they must not "believe" what Laurency says but they should examine and compare all occult and esoteric systems. Doing so they develop the "esoteric instinct", which learns how to perceive what is correct and what cannot be correct. They acquire esoteric self-determination. That is a path all have to walk before they are ripe for discipleship.

<sup>2</sup>Even if by thorough study you are however much convinced that the hylozoic system agrees with reality, yet you must view it as a working hypothesis until you have become a causal self and are able to ascertain facts yourself. This principled attitude is necessary to avoid all manifestations of dogmatism, fanaticism, and intolerance. However much you deplore the almost total lack of broad-mindedness and perspectives in those ignorant of esoterics, deplore that you cannot help people in the only right way with their problems of life, you must nevertheless leave it to them to find the right way by themselves as long as they are stuck in some ideology, creed, or skepticism. This condition of theirs is evidence that they

have ceased being seekers and become believers, for every idiology is a belief system, must be one without knowledge of reality. Skepticism is belief, too.

<sup>3</sup>Since Laurency writes for exoterists and not for esotericians, there is much that he leaves unsaid. He does so intentionally, because it is important that the seeker masters the fundamental reality system first, before in his studies he enters into such details as presuppose a clear understanding of the basic mental system. When the seeker once has had a good foundation laid and has eliminated the present idiologies with their illusions and fictions, he will find by himself what more he needs.

<sup>4</sup>The lack of clarity in the thinking of many so-called esotericians is due to the fact that they start from an erroneous or incomplete fundamental system or that they have never mastered the system. The hylozoic system is the only one to afford both clarity and complete explanations.

<sup>5</sup>Without common sense, perspective consciousness, emancipation from the concepts and ideas of life-ignorance, especially from so-called semantics, which appears to paralyse thinking more and more, it is impossible to understand the Pythagorean mental system. It can be comprehended, it is true, but the absence of instinctive certainty that this is reality such as it can be conceived by man, precludes real understanding. Instinctive certainty is remembrance of latent knowledge. The understanding man was once an initiate of some one of the ancient knowledge orders.

<sup>6</sup>The right to give dismissive opinions on hylozoics is possessed only by the person who is able to demonstrate that it is untenable on grounds clarified in *KofR*.

<sup>7</sup>Again and again it must be pointed out to students of hylozoics that they do not master it until they prove to be able to explain otherwise inexplicable real things and events, and this to a great extent.

<sup>8</sup>Those who at once, from the beginning, voice objections (which they should be able to answer themselves, if they used a bit of their power of reflection) seem to think that they can ask rational questions without having mastered the system. Apparently they have not understood that they must abandon their old thinking and rethink it all from the bottom. This requires years of work.

#### *1.41 Excerpts from Replies to Letters*

<sup>1</sup>Your demonstration of how the sentence in question can be misinterpreted is enlightening. What do you say of this formulation: "Painful experiences of how rare is still the quality of tolerance will teach them soon enough to be careful not to express opinions so far from prevalent views.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps I am too mental and not sufficiently emotional to grasp what the esoteric knowledge of reality has to do with egoism and pride. Two twos are certainly four, even if Satan says so.

<sup>3</sup>I recall that a theosophist reproached me saying, "there is nothing for emotion" in *PhS*. I replied that emotion is no source of information and that quite intentionally everything had been avoided that could influence emotionality and so be persuasion into belief. Or what do you think about that religious lady who said that the teaching of the grace of salvation seemed more agreeable to her and so she preferred it to the law of sowing and reaping? Did she think that the laws of life accommodated themselves to her views?

<sup>4</sup>Anyone who tends to be offended at my formulations will have abundant opportunities in *PhS*. The talk of the élite, of different stages of development, of secret knowledge irritated many people. "But if so, it is their own fault."

<sup>5</sup>As for secret knowledge, new esoteric orders will soon be instituted in all parts of the world. Those of the fifth natural kingdom long to give us their view of reality and deplore that the knowledge is abused. Whatever they can give and mankind can comprehend they are

bound by the Law to communicate in such a manner that it does no harm. Not sharing the knowledge is abusing it, too.

<sup>6</sup>“Your assertion is one of those passing fancies of imagination and presumption which by no means are intuitions, but amount to abuse of facts gathered from literature.”

<sup>7</sup>Reply to a letter:

<sup>8</sup>If you think that disdain of philosophy, etc. is a proof of latent knowledge, then I understand that the world is thronged with esotericians. But those who received the highest degree in ancient times were extremely few. And they were the only ones to comprehend esoterics.

<sup>9</sup>Those who when hearing about reincarnation and the law of reaping do not see at once, as though it were a revelation, that these facts are facts, do not possess esoterics latently. However, they need not be esotericians merely because they see these facts, because they have been taught in India for more than 30,000 years.

<sup>10</sup>Those who hear about rebirth have already joined some esoteric sect (theosophical, anthroposophical, etc.). The fact that they swallow everything said there indicates belief and not comprehension. Very few have left the sect because they have seen through its errors.

<sup>11</sup>My history of philosophy only proves the philosophers wrong. It does not prove me right.

<sup>12</sup>Your uncertainty whether esoterics holds the solution to the problems of existence was abundantly clear from a conversation we had where you said that at least the first section of *PhS* was right. Have you forgotten that? This told me all I needed to know. At all events perhaps esoterics is not as simple as you now suddenly seem to think.

<sup>13</sup>I understand Goethe well when he says, “I willingly carried the teacher’s burden long yet, if only the disciple did not want to become a teacher at once.”

#### 1.42 Reading Laurency

<sup>1</sup>Each one of Laurency’s two works, *PhS* and *KofR*, is a coherent whole. If the reader has forgotten what was said before, he will misapprehend what is said later. If he has skipped a sentence, he runs the risk of missing something that is important for what follows.

<sup>2</sup>The books of Laurency are mosaics, collections of aphorisms, studded with facts and axioms. You do not read such books as people generally read. If you do, you could as well leave them unread, for then they are unread.

<sup>3</sup>People read Laurency’s books as though they were newspaper articles compiled in an hour or so.

<sup>4</sup>Are Waerland criticized my style saying that it hampered fluent reading. I replied to him that *PhS* should not be read in that manner. That book is made up of aphorisms you should dwell upon. My difficulty was in joining the aphorisms to make a continuous text.

<sup>5</sup>The beginner should not demand to comprehend Laurency’s books at his first reading. The best way is to read the whole book attentively and slowly many times over. At each new reading you comprehend more of it. You read it so many times that its content comes alive, so to speak. Then you can relegate to the subconscious to do the rest.

<sup>6</sup>As people have destroyed their comprehension by having read such amounts of balderdash, there is nothing anymore to make impression on them so as to stick fast in their memory. Readers of *PhS* have made that clear to me. Those whom I tested demonstrated that they could not account for the content of the book. Most of them do not even know what they have read. Only a few words or sentences have remained in their memory. That is how people read nowadays. The “art of reading”.

<sup>7</sup>What people see in *PhS* is what they recognize. The rest makes no impression on them. I have learnt this from conversations with intelligent people who have read the book. They have no idea of most things said in the book. I had to show them again and again that “this is said there”, which they disputed until I showed them the place and they had to acknowledge:

“I never saw that.” The many things which they read into the book and which are not to be found in it, but are misconceptions; these, too, are examples of how people read.

<sup>8</sup>My fully justified opinion is that anyone who has not read *PhS* twenty times, slowly and thoughtfully, has not read it at all. It is, as one reader rightly wrote, “a book that you never finish”. I can say the same thing for my own part.

<sup>9</sup>I have endeavoured to afford to people the gist of mankind’s experience of life. Early in my life I made it my motto: For every idea you receive from another, think one for yourself! As Georg Brandes said, everything you write should be “ideas to be debated”, to be analysed. Writing in such a manner you develop your ability of independent thought as well. Most people just parrot what they have heard and read.

#### *1.43 On Literary Work*

<sup>1</sup>In countless ways you must prevent it from being misapprehended. If there is any possibility of misunderstanding, it will no doubt be misunderstood. So it has always been, and so it will remain. What is really new seems to be incomprehensible. They do not realize that new things require a new basis, which is lacking for the time being. Platon is still not understood. An esoterician who is familiar with the works of doctors of literature is amazed at how little they have understood of Shakespeare, Goethe, Schiller, etc. Does not a writer of esoteric books run a much greater risk? The proofs given to him of misinterpretations by his readers force him to deal with things that are sheer trifles to experts. He had better explain his subject as though he were talking to small children.

<sup>2</sup>No one should write books until he is fifty years old. Only then will he have gathered a sufficient experience of life, so that he has something to offer.

<sup>3</sup>It is necessary to be alone to reach the height of achievement. I found myself that I was able to write something of lasting value only on the third day of solitude. I had to rewrite the other things.

<sup>4</sup>When studying the content of the various ideologies I have not cared to analyse the tenability of the arguments in detail, but have been content with noting them objectively and impersonally. Too many people trust their analytical capacity and do not notice that underlying motives contribute to distorting their analysis. Instead I left that matter to the unconscious, which was given the task of combination and elimination. One fine day the synthesis struck the waking consciousness. When re-examined critically it proved tenable. The shortcoming of this method is that when discussing the problems you cannot explain how you arrived at the solution. But what does it matter? You are none the sillier because of that.

<sup>5</sup>A writer who affords knowledge of reality and life is working with a view to mankind’s future and opens his arms to receive those who will understand him some time.

#### *1.44 On Books*

<sup>1</sup>It is particularly typical of the “cultural situation” today that all manner of trash literature gets published. Thanks to advertising, this literature can be printed in huge editions and be devoured by disoriented masses who believe they become more educated in the process.

<sup>2</sup>Books that can give occasion to some pondering, some individual reflection, find no publishers. Their authors, who perhaps have devoted entire lives to their works, have to print them at their own cost and give the edition away.

<sup>3</sup>Writing fiction literature – poetry, novels, and plays – is the simplest way of propagating ideas. Apparently, the public cannot assimilate ideas save in diluted doses. So it is by no means remarkable that Nietzsche could establish as a rule for writers to say in ten sentences what others say in a book, what others do not say in a book. This condition is what makes people unable to perceive what is to be gained from a book that affords ideas only. They are so used to scrambling through the pages that they never reflect upon what they are reading.



<sup>4</sup>Usually works of imaginative literature demonstrate that their authors are subjectivists who start from their arbitrary views of reality and life, having no idea of the true nature of reality. They propagate their own illusions when they are not content merely to inculcate the emotional illusions and mental fictions generally ruling. If such a writer has studied psychology, then he will advertise some one of the many psychological fancies to be found in academic psychology, that quaint discipline.

<sup>5</sup>Your own library should be a reference library containing only such books as you need to consult ever and again, books you never finish, but want to reread and learn something new from every time, something that you did not see before, that you forgot and needed to remember.

#### 1.45 On Pedagogy

<sup>1</sup>The “power of example” is one, but only one, psychological factor in education. An example has an effect on those who are on the same level of development but does not influence the others. This insight is lacking in most idealists who are ignorant of the law of consciousness development, ignorant of the stages of human development and their fundamental importance.

<sup>2</sup>Not the learning you pick up in schools and at universities is of value. It will soon enough be replaced with fresh fictions. What is of value is that training in logical, methodical, and systematic thinking which you may receive. Mere learning makes man a theoretical fossil in a certain field of knowledge. Right training educates the individual to become an independent thinker in some domain of life, having the ability to quickly assimilate the essentials (without the burden of details) of existing learning in the field he wishes to examine. There is always a noticeable shortcoming in all people who are so-called natural talents (autodidacts), if they have not been able to train themselves in so-called academic reasoning with the general education that they used to pick up automatically at the universities but is too often lacking in present-day university graduates with their narrow specialization.

<sup>3</sup>Squeezing the contents of some 300 volumes of esoteric literature into a few pages is probably deemed a “bold venture” by many people. So many things must be left out that most of the questions the ignorant ask themselves when reading remain unanswered. Strange to say the general attitude is that all questions that are not fully answered are counted as demerits of the system. There are sufficient facts in *PhS* and *KofR*, however, to answer the most basic and essential questions of the nature of reality and the meaning of life. Those who want to know more must go to the “sources”.

<sup>4</sup>Esoteric writers are always grateful for letters containing questions about things that the reader has not understood. This will help them in their work at making their presentations clearer, filling the gaps with necessary facts, etc. In esoterics, it is never easy to decide what should be included or excluded. This is so in particular where such concentrated summaries as *PhS* or *KofR* are concerned.

<sup>5</sup>If an esoterician must refuse to answer a question, this demonstrates that the questioner was either injudicious or inconsiderate.

<sup>6</sup>The teacher of esoterics has the recurrent experience that it does not suffice to give out facts and put them into their correct contexts. These new facts must be put forward again and again, elucidated from different angles, illustrated in various respects. The repetitions occurring are the results of experience had with readers who had obvious difficulties perceiving the new facts given if they were not repeated constantly. “*Repetitio est mater studiorum*”, as the Romans said.

<sup>7</sup>The occult sects also demonstrate how much has been misconceived of that which has been made exoteric. From now on, everything must be done to prevent such things.

<sup>8</sup>You must master the basic mental system before you can proceed any further. It takes a very long time to learn how to illustrate the tenability of the system by using it as a basis for explanation of those phenomena of life that are inexplicable without the system. Until the system has been universally accepted, the esoterician remains alone with his view and must learn how to be an exoterist among the “uninitiated”.

#### *1.46 Comments on Certain Terms, Etc.*

<sup>1</sup>It is to be noted that Laurency distinguishes between metaphysics and superphysics. Metaphysics is part of philosophy. It is a speculation of ignorance. Superphysics is the esoteric teaching on the superphysical worlds, the molecular worlds in the solar system and the atomic worlds in the cosmos.

<sup>2</sup>In the original Swedish edition of *PhS*, the cosmic atomic kinds and systemic molecular kinds were denoted differently. In the second Swedish edition, this unnecessary double method of notation was eliminated, and the 49 atomic kinds were made the basis of the description of the solar system as well.

<sup>3</sup>In *KofR* 1.28.5, will–desire is juxtaposed with will–motive, which caused one reader to make the remark that motives exist at the emotional stage as well. It is evident that you cannot express yourself clearly enough. Therefore, it is better to distinguish emotional and mental motives. Everything mental can be dragged down into emotionality, so that at the present stage of mankind’s development pure mentality scarcely makes up one per cent of the content of consciousness. It tells us quite a lot that Schopenhauer did not descry any difference between mentality and emotionality. Feeling is mentalized emotionality, and its truth value or reality value is determined by whatever desire finds desirable.

<sup>4</sup>The term “god” in Laurency is an abbreviation of the “deity, divinity”. The term “god” has always been abused and that is the reason why it should be struck from the vocabulary of esoteric literature. That term has been indissolubly connected with a concept of personality and so its idea has degenerated into the grossest superstition.

<sup>5</sup>In the analysis of Steiner’s philosophy of history made in *KofR*, it was said in the original Swedish edition (in paragraph 6.12.6) that Steiner’s data should be taken with a “good slice of healthy skepticism”. Typically, some readers thought that the writer had hylozoics in mind. If so, they did not understand much of the contents. If it is possible to misunderstand something said, then it will certainly be misunderstood. Anyone who is skeptical of hylozoics is too far away from reality.

<sup>6</sup>“He knows himself who is aware of his godhead.” This saying, frequently used by Laurency, has always been misunderstood. Some people have even believed that they knew themselves because they had been told that they are divine in essence. To be aware of one’s divinity, however, it is necessary to have acquired self-consciousness in one’s causal envelope. Only then will man know, since only then will he be able to gain all the knowledge there is in worlds 47–49 and of his envelopes of incarnation and their different kinds of consciousness. Then he will have “raised the veil of Isis”.

#### *1.47 Esoterics Has to Be Silenced*

<sup>1</sup>No newspaper has dared to review, or even mention, Laurency’s two books. What Blavatsky said of *The Secret Doctrine* is still true of hylozoics: “That scientist who dares to acknowledge that he has concerned himself with the work will make himself impossible.” What a grand testimony to the “freedom of research”! What is meant by freedom of thought and freedom of speech when those who realize the merits of a work do not dare to step forward and bear witness to it? One more confirmation of the fact that sincerity requires courage. What will future generations think of it? One thing is certain. There will be no material for boasting of the intellectual heroes of our times.

<sup>2</sup>I have donated books containing esoteric teachings to several public libraries. It is typical that these books were never even recorded in the card-catalogues of those libraries, but disappeared. It is unknown to me if they were just stowed away or if they were destroyed. A question: Do librarians have the right to withhold at will from the public the books that the library has received as gifts?

<sup>3</sup>Laurency has to be silenced, that is the obvious slogan. Many literary people have read Laurency, which is clear from the perfidious attacks that sometimes appear. One such doctor of literature made fun of the “sacred” numbers three and seven. Another one scoffed at the talk of the “élite”, asking where it was. A third one declared that nowadays there is no “authority”. A fourth one pointed out that the correct word-form was ideology, not idiology. Many more examples could be cited.

<sup>4</sup>Schopenhauer was surrounded by silence for about 30 years. Our descendants might amuse themselves by noting how long our contemporaries were successful in silencing Laurency’s work. It is the same old story, and mankind is always the same. Common sense and knowledge of reality are not in great favour. No, something for the imagination to revel in, that could be something. The crazier, the better.

<sup>5</sup>That “faith” of which Christos spoke was “trust in the Law”. Those who claim to have faith show nothing of that trust. Expressing their opinions is an easy matter for them, as they are surrounded by their protective guard of sympathizers. Voicing views that challenge public opinion is quite another matter, however. And that is what anyone must do who want to be a pioneer and to be received in the circle of heroes.

#### *1.48 Was Esoterics Published Too Early?*

<sup>1</sup>It is said in *KofR* 5.17.11 that esoterics was published too early. No wonder the majority of the planetary hierarchy in 1775 voted against the proposal to publish esoterics. The majority have been proved right in all respects. The verdict of the hierarchy in 1775 that the knowledge was to be rejected by the representatives of theology, philosophy, and science has been fully confirmed. Numerous occult sects have come into being led by people who largely are incapable of understanding esoterics, and who in the best and rarest of cases (Besant and Leadbeater) prevent the misconception of the knowledge given to mankind, as many distortions as there are sects.

<sup>2</sup>The minority hoped that sufficiently many people had latent knowledge of rebirth and the law of reaping to realize the truth of these ideas when renewing their familiarity with them. Therefore, the minority wanted to try new ways of fighting physicalism and to help those seekers who had refused to accept the ideologies ruling.

<sup>3</sup>Laurency is fully aware of the fact that both *PhS* and *KofR* are ahead of their times. The hylozoic mental system should nevertheless be available for those who have remained seekers and also for the masses of intellectual people who will start to look about for a tenable working hypothesis when they have realized that the ideologies ruling are untenable. Such people will probably increase in numbers during the next one hundred years.

#### *1.49 How Esoterics Should Have Been Published Initially*

<sup>1</sup>Exercising the right that everybody has to voice his own opinion, being fully aware of my own ignorance, being uninformed of all the factors that are available to 45-selves, with all respect for their wisdom, I have wondered what the state of things would have been, if from the very beginning (1875) the knowledge of reality had been clearly formulated in accord with Pythagorean hylozoics, like in *KofR* 1.4–1.41, for instance, and had not been presented as it was by writers without a philosophical and scientific training. Those who possessed the knowledge latently, and they are not a few, would then have realized its agreement with reality at once. Such as Blavatsky and Sinnett formulated it, they could not accept it without

having several initiations behind them. Attackers would not have had so many opportunities of distorting and ridiculing it. People who were interested in it would not have run so many risks of misunderstanding and misinterpreting it. The black lodge would not have had so many opportunities of casting suspicion on all esoterics as being a pseudo-teaching and humbug and of inculcating on public opinion this “axiom”, which deters most people from examining hylozoics such as it is presented in our times. Hylozoics would not have faced such a compact resistance. We should have been spared the struggle against that prejudice which rises like insurmountable mountains against those who seek and desire to know. It would have been easier when talking to people individually to spark their interest so as to make them examine the matter themselves.

#### *1.50 How Esoteric Knowledge Should Have Been Communicated*

<sup>1</sup>It is highly desirable that the planetary hierarchy do not communicate the esoteric knowledge through amanuenses such as Blavatsky and Alice A. Bailey, but directly through independent researchers, as was the case with C. W. Leadbeater. Such researchers should have a training in science and philosophy so that they could adapt their presentation to the faculties of comprehension and understanding there are in those who have a university education.

<sup>2</sup>It is also to be desired that the presentation be prefaced by exact definitions of the basic terms, so that possible errors in the earlier presentation of esoterics were clearly elucidated. Till now the definitions given have not been exact save in the works of Leadbeater. Nevertheless it is obvious that even his definitions need some further clarification, however superior they were to the previous ones.

<sup>3</sup>Neither the works of Blavatsky nor those of Bailey are suited as introductions to esoterics or for others than those who are already “initiates of the mysteries”. The terminology used is exceedingly unsatisfactory, and the definitions given are often misleading.

<sup>4</sup>A third thing to be desired is that the Sanskrit terms be replaced with Western ones, and that if the use of symbols is occasionally deemed necessary, then such symbols be given their exact interpretation. Orientals should not write for Western people.

<sup>5</sup>Of course what is said here is not intended as a criticism of the works of these initiates. They did as best they could using the resources available to them. Thousands of esoteric facts were made accessible thanks to them. It is not given to everybody, however, to be able to put those facts into their correct contexts in an exact knowledge system, which is necessary if they are to afford mental clarity and not to cause confusion and ideas and misconceptions. We should have learnt something from such failures as the theological and philosophical systems, and also the occult systems presented hitherto.

<sup>6</sup>It appears as though trained mentalists having envelopes of the third and fifth departments were the most suited to present esoterics.

#### *1.51 The Duty of Spreading Information of the Knowledge*

<sup>1</sup>What has surprised me is the fact that most readers of the works of Laurency who approve of their content and rejoice at it, who say they have got a new view of existence, do nothing to inform other people of the knowledge. A wee bit of reflection, a minimal understanding of the Law, should tell them that they have not been given the knowledge for nothing that they should keep it to themselves, that the planetary hierarchy has not taken all the pertaining measures merely to afford them a better sleep at night with a Laurency book under their pillow.

<sup>2</sup>Do they grudge other people to share the knowledge with them? Do they not dare to stand out among others as inwardly free, independent thinkers? The author certainly has not written for such people, but to give this knowledge to mankind. Do the readers not understand the

responsibility that goes with their not doing anything in return for the knowledge they have received? If so, they did not understand much of what they read. Do they not understand that in future incarnations they will be left out of it themselves? What right do they have to know anything beyond what is accepted by the public?

<sup>3</sup>“The children of this world are wiser than the children of light.” Hard to understand? What do they do who have gained esoteric knowledge to spread it to others? The children of this world boost their fictions in thousands of ways. What have the readers of *PhS* done to spread that book?

### *1.52 Conclusion*

<sup>1</sup>The disciple who incarnates to serve the hierarchy and mankind is always allowed to choose his own way in which to do it, as he desires and as suits his “temperament”, his qualities and abilities acquired, the best. No two disciples do it in the same way. And from now on no one will be allowed to invoke any authority. They will state the facts, presenting them in order, and then those who comprehend and those who understand must make the best of it. There must be no more of the cult of authority. H.P.B. made a truly serious mistake when she revealed the existence of her “masters”. She realized that she did so, too. Fortunately she did everything to liberate all outsiders, who could not serve the cause, from adoring her or having faith in her. I admire her the most for that very quality. She used a sledge-hammer against all dogmas, mostly the moral and religious ones. You could well choose the crown of thorns. But then you must take great care to ensure that no martyr’s crown, canonization, or hagiolatry will follow later. Tell them that they may very well cry out “crucify!” but omit the stupid nonsense of hosiannah and apotheosis, for it does not befit a mankind that is at the stage of hatred.

<sup>2</sup>I have no personal enemies but so many more enemies of truth. I shall always fight them with the weapons of truth. Anyone who fights lies of any kind must be prepared to become an outlaw among his fellow men. My attacks on religious, moral, political, cultural, scientific lies have brought me many enemies. Those are good signs.

### *Endnotes by the Translator*

1.14.13 “swear by the teacher’s words”. Horace: nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri.

1.15.3 “the third part of hylozoics”. This refers to what was later published as *The Way of Man*, which in the writer’s lifetime existed as a collection of 18 unedited manuscripts. Not even the title of the work was decided upon, but it was always referred to as the “third part”, or the “Problems of Reality, Part Three”.

1.22.1 ...“the five volumes of the Knowledge of Life series”. This formulation is mine, not Laurency’s. In the writer’s lifetime, this collection of essays was always referred to as the “fourth part”.

1.28.2 *Sydsvenska Dagbladet Snällposten*, or *Sydsvenskan* for short, is the leading daily of the city of Malmö and southernmost Sweden. It was founded in 1848.

1.28.4 “The price was so low that each copy sold through a bookshop entailed a direct loss of two crowns”. The price was fixed at 10 Swedish crowns (a little less than 2 U.S. dollars by the exchange rate at that time) the purchasing power of which was about twenty times greater than the same amount today.

1.29.4 The “planned third work” refers to what was later published as *The Way of Man*.

1.30.1 Goethe: ”Ich schreibe nicht euch zu gefallen, ihr sollt was lernen.” *Zahme Xenien*, erste Reihe, I.

1.34.5 The apparent contradictions in *PhS* cited by Laurency: “the philosophers have not comprehended the problems of reality” is to be found in 1.28.5; “philosophers in all ages have comprehended everything”, in 3.24.3; “life is suffering”, in 3.64.1 (in quotes in the text); “life is not suffering”, in 3.40.3.

1.36.2: “Injustice in any respect...”, in *PhS* 3.53.3; “No evil can befall...” and “If an individual...”, in *PhS* 3.57.1 “Our greatest trouble...” *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, third edition (1962), Letter No. 43, p. 257; the 45-self who said this was M.. Karma is called “this terrible Law” in *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, third edition (1962), Letter No. 62, p. 347.

1.51.3: “The children of this world are wiser than the children of light.” The Bible, Luke 16:8.

The above text constitutes the essay *Laurency* by Henry T. Laurency.

The essay is the first section of the book *Knowledge of Life Four* by Henry T. Laurency.  
Translated from the Swedish by Lars Adelskog.

Copyright © 2010 by the Henry T. Laurency Publishing Foundation. All rights reserved.  
Last corrections entered March 15th, 2020.