

7 PHILOSOPHY

7.1 INTRODUCTION

¹Only objective consciousness can explore objective reality by studying the matter and motion aspects. Subjective consciousness explores the consciousness aspect. Therefore, both objective and subjective consciousness are necessary to the work of ascertaining facts and putting facts into their correct contexts, ordered into a system easy to survey.

²Mankind is trying to explore existence on its own. That attempt is abortive, which is best seen in the fact that mankind at its present stage of development can be objectively conscious only of about one per cent of the matter aspect of existence: the lower three physical molecular kinds (49:5-7). It is true that so-called clairvoyance, which has been acquired by some exceptional people, affords objective consciousness of twelve molecular kinds in all, six physical and six emotional. It should be noted in this, however, that exact observation is impossible for emotional objective consciousness. Exact observation requires causal objective consciousness.

³Philosophy is an attempt at exploring reality by the means of subjective consciousness only. The absurdity of such an enterprise is best seen in the fact that each individual's subjective perception of existence is individual. A common and, therefore, universally valid perception is obtained only by means of objective consciousness. This is the standpoint of common sense, and you would think that there should be no reason to doubt this, mankind's combined objective perception of objective reality. The existence of philosophy is the proof, however, how easily this common sense suffers itself to be misled. And the ground for this is that objective sense is restricted to so few physical molecular kinds. If we could objectively perceive the whole of material reality, we should also be able to explore it. The fifth natural kingdom has such an immense superiority in knowledge because a 45-self can objectively perceive 35 (5x7) different kinds of matter, and because the 45-selves are in communication with still higher natural kingdoms and can receive the requisite facts from them. In contrast, mankind banished those who were able to give it the knowledge of reality.

⁴Hobbes' definition of philosophy as the scientific endeavour to deduce effects from causes and causes from effects is better suited as a definition of esoterics. Science can ascertain effects, but causes remain unknown if they exist in the superphysical, as is always the case where processes of nature are concerned. Philosophy is the attempts made by ignorance at speculating on those causes that are unexplorable even by philosophy. Only causal objective consciousness can ascertain the causes of events in the worlds of man (47-49), can ascertain the past in planetary but of course not in cosmic respect.

⁵All there is of common sense and reality content in philosophy and history originally came from the planetary hierarchy. What we know of physical reality is the result of scientific research. Human speculation has always misled people. These are esoteric axioms that will be recognized as truths some time in the future. Only ascertained facts should be considered as tenable. Human "wisdom" is vanity.

⁶No two philosophers have had the same conception of existence, reality, and life. They never will. They cannot. Otherwise they would not be philosophers, but just echoes.

⁷In three different ways mankind has tried to orient itself, on its own, in an existence that is incomprehensible to it: through religion, philosophy, and science. And all three have failed. The learned have in all times been the greatest obstacles to consciousness development. Without knowledge of reality they have proclaimed what they believed they knew and in so doing they have misled mankind.

⁸The real significance ("value") of philosophy was that it taught people how to think clearly and exactly through definition of terms to the extent that this was possible. This is done more extensively in esoterics, when it has been given the requisite terminology and so has its terms

defined, a condition that did not obtain in theosophy, as is to be regretted.

⁹The benefit philosophy has provided by teaching people how to think has not outbalanced the harm it has done by its erroneous systems which have dogmatized various fictions. Only a system that agrees with reality makes it possible to think both clearly and correctly.

¹⁰Trying to “understand what the old philosophers actually meant” is a very common mistake, perhaps the one most commonly made in philosophy. We cannot do so simply because we cannot penetrate into the world of their thought. Those 46-selves who made such attempts were surprised at the limitation, even stupidity, in several respects beside a few ideas glimpsed. The world of thought we live in is so unlike the one of a few hundred years ago that it can be said to be totally different.

¹¹It is by no means uncommon to hear acute “thinkers”, who have studied summarizing presentations of the amazing figments and logical somersaults of the great philosophers, declaring categorically, “they cannot have meant it in that way, of course, but in this way”. Those people should be advised not to read later interpretations but to study the old philosophers’ own writings instead, and when doing so ask themselves whether those philosophers would have expressed themselves as they did, if they had meant something else.

¹²The great philosophers were few. The many interpreters were legion; wiseacres who could not conceal their vanity and presumption.

¹³If anyone possessed of common sense wants to have a correct idea of what philosophy is, the best manner of doing so is to study a philosophical dictionary to which philosophers themselves have contributed their articles; not a history of philosophy where everything is arranged so that errors are glossed over. Then it will be seen that every thinker holds a view unlike those of all the others. Is not this sufficiently telling? Not only do they all hold different views, but everyone criticizes the views of the others. No single view stands up to criticism.

¹⁴Whenever disputes arise about different views on reality, this shows that none of them possesses real knowledge, for that must always prevail, in contrast to political views where that one conquers which can seize power through some sort of coup.

7.2 Philosophy Must Be Critique

¹Philosophy could be called the discipline teaching us how to think. People cannot think, although of course they imagine they can. Thinking is not very easy, however. Rather it is something that remains to be learnt by mankind. Innate “superstition” saying that all are equals in all respects makes “everyone the master of his wisdom”. That wisdom is as might be expected.

²If the history of philosophy has not taught us anything else, it has (or should have) taught us how difficult it is to think right. It has taught the esoterician that man is unable to think in agreement with reality. You can do so only after you have received the definitive facts and put them into their right contexts. For it is the facts that make right concepts possible. Without facts our concepts are nothing but fictions.

³The principal task of philosophy as a discipline is to afford mankind right concepts. As a physical being in the physical world man has innate physical objective consciousness. He cannot obtain knowledge on his own about superphysical reality, since he lacks the corresponding objective consciousness. For objective consciousness makes it possible to explore material reality, which is the only reality common to all, the only universally valid reality.

⁴As consciousness alone, the world of consciousness remains mere subjective. It is the reality of matter that makes objectivity possible. The ability of consciousness to perceive material reality is called objective consciousness. This ability develops during the individual’s consciousness development through all the four natural kingdoms. The fact that philosophers

have thought themselves able to determine how this ability has developed merely demonstrates their unabashed, quite unwarranted belief in their ability to judge everything. This subjectivism is the real ground for all the errors of thought. This uncritical presumption lies at the bottom of the fact that mankind deals with emotional illusions and mental fictions at ninety nine per cent. Ever since our childhood we are inoculated with these superstitions and then we assume that they are right concepts.

⁵It is in the light of these realizations that philosophy ought to see its two proper objectives: to sum up the results of research into reality and to subject all theories to critique, to try to determine which ideas are tenable concepts and demonstrate what is untenable in the attempts made at explaining reality.

⁶When doing this, philosophers should not, like semanticists do, start from the dogmatic assumption that our entire mode of perception is wrong, for our objective perception of physical material reality is universally valid. It is valid in the animal kingdom, too. And to the extent that this perception has been afforded exact concepts, these are absolute. Denying this is only asserting subjectivistic madness of a new kind, and that is certainly not the task of philosophy. On the contrary, its task is the elimination of all the ideologies of ignorance.

⁷All philosophical systems are fiction systems. They are a school for logical thinking, since they afford opportunities to analyse the errors of the philosophers. Philosophy must be critique; it must not be an account of the views of life-ignorance.

⁸British statesman Balfour showed in his work, *The Foundations of Belief*, that scientific thinking ultimately rests on theoretical beliefs. It is the task of philosophy to elucidate those beliefs.

⁹The principal object of critique is to reveal defects, next to call the attention of the uncritical to these defects, next to help those who are unable to see the defects comprehend what is wrong about them. Those who dislike critique should refrain from thinking at all and should, as most people do in our times, accept everything, even the craziest views. As soon as the philosopher ceases to be a critic he has become a subjectivist with a personal view and can never claim to be accepted by independent thinkers. Critique may be subjective, too, of course. However, if it is subjective, it is unwarranted, since critique, to fulfil a rational function, should be universally valid and be based on objective facts in all essentials.

7.3 *The Real Aim of Philosophical Training*

¹The aim of teaching philosophy in schools should be to train individuals to be independent and critical thinkers. As it is now, there is a huge risk that the individual has not learnt to see the limit of his capacity to judge and assess. Scarcely anyone knows that limit. This appears in the opinions of most people, and that is a sad result of philosophical training, which should have taught people the elements. People blurt out opinions without knowing what they are talking about, without knowledge of facts, without understanding whether sufficient facts are available, whether alleged facts are facts. They have not learnt even that much. Giving opinions without prior examination is rather considered a sign of education. Besides, this is universally seen, from small children to professors. All are omniscient. The tendency appears ineradicable.

²It should not be the aim of philosophical training to cram students full with the more or less abortive speculations of the philosophers. What is the use in life of knowing about the erroneous views held by various people?

³Instead, the professor when examining his students should require that they give an account of the contradictions to be found in the systems of the philosophers. When they give such an account and refute the fictions, only then will they have begun to grasp what philosophy is: imaginative speculations. Refutation is the important thing. Philosophy must be critique, aid to realization as to the nature of the errors in thinking, for this is the only way in

which you learn how to think. Since all speculation is fictionalism, all philosophical systems are erroneous. This is what the philosophers must learn to see.

⁴The great merit of the Uppsala philosophers was that, when being taught by them, one was forced to see the errors in philosophy. This put an end to uncritical parrotry and faith in the absolute validity of hypotheses and opinions, which must be conjectures and assumptions, since mankind does not yet possess the knowledge of reality.

⁵We need not help people at higher stages with critique. They can perform that work of destruction themselves as soon as they have received the right knowledge. But they should be able to understand that not everyone can see the deficiencies of the fictional systems and the methods used in them, but that those things need to be pointed out, and this is true of mass fictions in particular, since they are otherwise very hard to get at. A quaint argumentation for the truth of a religion is invoking the number of its adherents. As if not the view of one single human being could be more correct than that held by countless billions of people. Truth is not a matter of quantity but of quality. Philosophy is critique, and truth is what remains when critique has said its last word, and then philosophy has rendered itself superfluous as well.

⁶It is gratifying to read (in January 1964) that professors at institutes of technology take an interest in humanism, the history of ideas, analysis of arguments, and techniques of investigation. It looks as if the teaching of philosophy could finally become training in common sense. Perhaps they may even be taught logic by refuting the views of the philosophers (not merely reporting those views) in all respects (starting points, contradictions, absurd consequences), by exercising critique only. Because philosophy is critique and should never be anything else. It is not the aim of philosophy to “find the truth”. It can never do so. The truth, the knowledge of reality, to the extent that it cannot be found through physical research, is given us by the planetary hierarchy. What is beyond that remains fictionalism.

7.4 Critique

¹There are those who consider all critique to be negativism and who demand that you should “understand everything”. But if we are to have something better, we must see the defects of what is. Critique often contains a comparison between something considered better and something considered worse. The critic starts from something positive to him, although this need not always be apparent. This is the motive of the critic who is able to understand. Thus there must be critique until the ideal is attained. It is regrettably true that there are those who ask for the impossible, not understanding what is possible for the time being. The ideal is the final goal and all of us have a long way to go there.

²Impersonal critique only desires to point out errors in the system and demonstrate what they are due to. The understanding of these mistakes makes it possible either to remedy the deficiencies or to construct a better system. All our concepts need constant improvement just as our systems constant reconstruction on account of new facts being added. Critique clarifies what in our concepts and systems needs to be changed.

³“You should not be negative, but positive” has become a slogan. Like all such slogans it has been accepted by parroting, thoughtless public opinion.

⁴Experience shows that presenting the knowledge of reality and life, merely being positive, is not enough. Saying how things are is not enough. You must also say how they are not. Telling the truth is not enough. You must also fight lies. You must demonstrate the errors, mistaken views, distortions there are in the ruling faiths. How else would people see the errors? See that it is necessary to rethink? If the false theories and ways of looking at things were not criticized, they would go on living for ever, since general ignorance would never realize their falsity. If you do not see what is deficient in the false teachings, then you will remain in them and reject new teachings as superstition or not consider them at all.

⁵We are supposed to be “gentle” in matters of life view and let people live in their illusions

and fictions! Out of consideration for people's feelings we should conceal the truth! This sentimental attitude is an extraordinary means of aiding the black lodge.

⁶Telling it how it is really should be enough. Those who are in a position to realize it to be true get what they want. The others, who are content with their systems, remain uninfluenced. There is also a category of seekers, however, who do not dare to trust their own judgement but are irresolute. And this is the category of people you help with your critique.

⁷It is the first and foremost task of the philosopher to criticize, since most things are wrong and the purge is necessary to provide space for the right things. If the fictions had been seen through, the history of philosophy would be critique only, since nothing in philosophy has proved tenable, human speculation can never be correct.

⁸Distinguish criticism (desire to blame) from assessment and necessary analysis made in order to understand better. Analysis clarifies the individual's level of development, active or still latent qualities and abilities. Analysis of lives, circumstances, or people should be made with respect to the impersonal matters at hand only and not from a personal viewpoint.

⁹Critique should always be impersonal. It should not be aimed at a certain person, but at the spirit represented by that person. If this is construed as personal critique, then the one feeling hurt has misunderstood the matter. The person is always taboo. Everyone has a right to his own view, however false it is. But if the view is false, you should point this out to set the matter straight to other people who could not realize this unless someone told them. Otherwise critique would be impossible and all views would be equally justified. It should be emphasized that where knowledge is concerned it is not a matter of persuading anyone.

¹⁰According to the Law, the individual proclaiming an "idea" (true or false) is responsible for its consequences. If the idea is false, it is his "reaping" to see to it that it is annihilated. And then people twaddle that you should criticize, that you should be "positive"! As if the false ideas should not be annihilated! They are the things that blind people and prevent them from seeing that what is true is reasonable. You must learn to see the necessity of pointing out what is false to make people reflect, show them how and why it is false. Too many new and true things have passed unnoticed because those proclaiming them did not see the necessity of critique. It is another matter that you need not criticize things which most people realize to be false. In such cases telling the truth is enough. Critique is necessary, since most things said are lies and lies must be exposed.

¹¹Being severe in matters of truth has nothing to do with incivility or brutality. The reader in possession of understanding realizes that the esoterician's critique does not aim at "crushing" anyone, even though he intentionally uses strong words to cause his readers to reflect. Being meek and mild in such respects is cowardly and irresponsible. If there is the least prospect of comprehension in his readers (for stupidity there is no remedy), he will pursue the matter with strength until even the one-track mind grasps it, until the dogmatist has his dogmas exploded.

¹²The critique directed at the representatives of theology, philosophy, and science, literary critics of all sorts, has the same objective. If these authorities of public opinion had some idea of their responsibility, they would understand that the aim of critique is to make them realize this. You do not mislead people with impunity, even if you do so in good faith. The distress of mankind would not be so horrendous, if those responsible for it were aware of their responsibility. Being ignorant of the law of cause and effect also in mental and emotional respect, they consider themselves entitled to say whatever suits them, which is a grave error. That "law of everything's vexatiousness" they curse is bad reaping out of bad sowing.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

7.5 Introduction

¹Everything said in the history of philosophy about what was taught in the esoteric knowledge orders demonstrates how efficiently the esoteric knowledge was kept secret during the ages. It is about time the writers of history purged everything said about “what the Pythagoreans taught”, etc.

²Scholarly authorities, who discuss the “speculation of the Greeks”, should be informed of the fact that the “Greeks” means the initiates, the only ones possessed of knowledge and understanding, and that they never “speculated”. They had learnt the difference between knowledge and speculation and that speculation is a mark of ignorance.

³In textbooks of philosophy you may still read about the moral taints and defects imputed to the philosophers by tradition. The philosophers of whom the textbook authors approved they presented as well-mannered, and those whom they disliked they pilloried as warning examples how those must fare who held such perverse views. Honest philosophers who dared to oppose this bad practice were content to emphasize that the only right posthumous reputation of a philosopher was his work and that his manner of living was of no interest.

⁴There are no manuscripts extant from philosophical authors before Roman times. Since we know that copiers took the liberty to change and “improve” what they did not understand or thought could be said better, we have every reason to take a very skeptical position to claims made as to what the “ancients” really thought. This is particularly true of the “pre-Sokratean” philosophers and of Aristoteles. It is known with certainty that Eusebios revised the original writings of the gnostic authors to fashion the gospels such as they exist in the New Testament. It will be the business of future esoteric writers (causal and essential selves) to present the originals, if they consider it worth the effort, which is doubtful. The knowledge we nowadays receive from the planetary hierarchy renders such work unnecessary. We receive directly what we need to know. Historical learning has therefore lost its importance. The past was different and if we need to know anything about it we shall receive that knowledge.

⁵The study of the history of philosophy should have made them realize the immense limitation of human reason as to the apprehension of reality ideas. What have philosophers succeeded in doing during the 2500 years they have been active? Anyone who, after familiarizing himself with the products of the philosophers, studies esoterics and does not realize that no human brain can “invent” all these totally new facts that are in mutual agreement suits well to be a professor of philosophy. He is no mental self, however.

7.6 Pythagoras

¹Pythagoras was the first one to formulate a mental system corresponding to the first self’s capacity for right conception of reality, and he realized that the Greeks were particularly suited for this. He was the founder of the Western view of existence starting from the matter aspect as the condition of scientific research. This project got off the right track as the sophists launched their subjectivism and Aristoteles tried to construct a “realistic” fiction system, which was bound to prove untenable sooner or later. Subsequent philosophers started from either of those two “tendencies”, constructing new fiction systems, which all together make up the content of the history of philosophy. Only in our times did they see that this starting point was untenable and did the speculators try to find other expedients without realizing that all such attempts by human reason are hopeless enterprises.

²When writers of books on the history of philosophy cannot explain how a philosopher arrived at his view, they resort to the expedient of having him gather his knowledge from someone else, often one so far back in time that no one cares to ask about the source of authority. They make him travel about to finally end up in some centre of learning of which

they know nothing more. The esoterician can inform them in the matter. If it really was about the knowledge of reality, that learning was gathered in a secret knowledge order. Where 46-selves were concerned, there was no need for this, since such a self is always in contact with the planetary hierarchy. Pythagoras did not receive his knowledge in Egypt. But 46-selves travel about, they too. It was his intention to study the different methods applied in teaching the superphysical knowledge and to try to find the most suitable one.

³Even if unessential it is nevertheless interesting from a psychological point of view to note that philosophers in their accounts treat of Platon and Pythagoras in the order here mentioned. However, Platon received his knowledge from Pythagoras who lived 400 years before. Ignorance or sloppiness?

7.7 Demokritos

¹Francis Bacon rightly considered Demokritos to be the only one of the ancient philosophers possessed of common sense. Bacon passed over Pythagoras and Platon because their teachings had never been understood correctly and such as those teachings were presented in the history of philosophy they were without reality. Bacon made an exception for Demokritos in this respect because Demokritos gave mankind the atomic theory (albeit veiled) as a lasting result. That was the only thing left standing of the speculations of philosophy up to his time.

7.8 Platon

¹Platon's writings have not been correctly translated. The various translations of Platon published hitherto demonstrate how little translators understood the reality Platon had in mind when writing. They read into the text the little they understood of that reality, and the result was as might be expected. The same difficulty presents itself in reading all esoteric writers. They are themselves painfully aware of how little they can be understood by literalists.

²Therefore, only a causal self can translate Platon right. It makes no difference however proficient in Greek or familiar with philosophy you are. Not even being an esoterician is enough, if you are only a mental self. You must be able to be present and to follow Platon's thoughts when writing, you must have access to his intuitions. The mental content being downscaled does not come out from his written words the right import of which must be the guesswork of modern philologists. They infer the meaning of words from their use in other Greek literature. This amounts to two sources of errors. Platon often made words mean something different. The children of a later age do not understand exactly what the Greeks meant to say, since their intellectual life was quite different from ours.

³Consequently, it can never be a matter of literal translation, but it must be an interpretation. If exoterists are to grasp it right and not bring forward new misconceptions, the translator must also add a commentary to further explain the meaning.

7.9 Aristoteles

¹The fact that Aristoteles was an initiate is clear from his three absolutes: the absolute subject (consciousness), the absolute object (matter), and the absolute purpose (movement as possessed of finality). Trinity was well masked, which was necessary, since the explanation of that symbol was esoteric. Strange to say, Hegel was the first to discover these three absolutes in Aristoteles. However, Hegel did not comprehend that it was about three realities, as his abuse of these concepts demonstrates. Just like the theologians, the philosophers have failed in their attempts at interpreting the symbols of the initiates. The real knowledge is certainly to be found only in the world view and life view of the fifth natural kingdom.

²They have asserted that Aristoteles did not use the term "metaphysics", but that his treatise on superphysical reality was given that name because of its place after physics. But he did not include it in his physics, and it dealt with superphysics. Anti-metaphysicians will have to

produce better arguments. At all events, Aristoteles' metaphysics was an attempt at stopping the sophists' analyses, dissolving all concepts, by offering the normal individual a system intended to satisfy his need of an explanation of existence, the unexplored. Aristoteles failed, of course. But his attempt became the model that subsequent philosophers tried to emulate. They all believed themselves able to do it better. None of them realized that it was a hopeless enterprise.

7.10 Bacon

¹Why has nobody wondered how Bacon dared to attack the scholastic Aristotelian system, which was as sacred as the Bible and the theological dogmatic system, and also did so with impunity? For what reason was he so well protected by Queen Elizabeth that no one dared to accuse him of this horrendous crime which would have cost anyone else his life without fail? Esoteric history may give information on this. Historians should be the first to say something, however, each one producing his guesswork. Many doctors could be created in the process.

7.11 Kant

¹To the esoterician it is obvious that Kant also was a dogmatist and a skeptic (least of all a critic), for he denied knowledge of the "thing in itself" (the matter aspect). His religion within the limits of human knowledge is a manifestation of traditional religiousness as a "substitute" for the lost knowledge of "god", a psychological need. His analyses are an irremediable confusion which no one has managed to disentangle.

²It is often seen that people untutored in philosophy place Kant on the same footing as Platon. In so doing they demonstrate that they have understood neither Platon nor Kant. Platon is an esoterician also when writing exoterically. Kant is a physicalist, which many people seem to have difficulty in realizing. Kant was totally unable to understand Platon. An irremediable lack of clarity about these things still seems to be prevalent among philosophers.

³It is about time that Kant was reduced to his right proportions in the history of philosophy.

⁴Kant's many fundamental errors include two misconceptions: of freedom and of moral principle. No abstract principle can determine what is just and unjust. Only the knowledge of the laws of life affords the requisite insight. And freedom is the condition of right action.

⁵Only primitiveness may try to afford divine sanction to what are basically social laws (legal regulations), necessary to the continuance of society and communal life without friction. In doing so they have appealed to men's fear of divine judgement, not understanding the law of sowing and reaping, an impersonal law of life.

⁶Identifying, as Kant does, "free" will with human morality reveals ignorance of life and psychological blindness. After "thou shalt" of Mosaic law had lost its authority, Kant wanted to construct a tenable authority (the command of duty). The basic error was that man, at his present stage of development, is unable to decide for himself what is just and unjust and must keep to a codex of social laws and generally accepted conventions. When, some time in the future, he has acquired knowledge of the laws of life, he will know what is just and unjust, but that presupposes a knowledge of reality which he does not have yet.

⁷Kant's erroneous assertion that objective material objects cannot make impression on consciousness is refuted by the esoteric fact that all matters and material forms radiate some kind of material energy, due to the unceasing rapid turnover of primordial atoms in all kinds of atoms. The expression "esoteric" in this connection means that physical disciplines are unable to ascertain these facts.

⁸Anyone who studies Kant's philosophy, using his common sense uncorrupted by philosophy, must constantly ask himself how Kant succeeded in having thinking people accept his arbitrary assertions, how it was possible that his pseudo-demonstrations were received so uncritically. How does Kant know that "wir haben es nur mit Erscheinungen zu

tun”, that our “theoretical reason” cannot penetrate beyond the “space and time of the sensuous world”, that space and time are limited to the visible world, that laws of cause and effect are valid only within the visible world (that the visible world is the only one world we can explore), that our traditional forms of intuition and forms of thought are the conditions of our experience? Nothing but arbitrary assertions which have gone down quite easily with the entire philosophical posterity. Esoterically, all Kant’s inventions are positively false.

⁹If Kant had been able to express himself rationally, then instead of constructing antinomies in reason he had simply explained that unsolvable contradictions in the basic hypotheses of philosophy indicate the limits of human knowledge, that man can never solve the problems of existence. Esoterics makes clear that it is impossible. Only the individuals of the fifth natural kingdom command the subjective and objective consciousness required for this. No human being would have been able to give mankind Pythagorean hylozoics (KofR 1.4–1.41), this wondrously simple description of reality. Philosophy has never been able to present a description at all (except what it borrowed from the esoteric knowledge orders). Science can describe the physical world only, and will never be able to pass beyond it. Having those limits, it will not solve the problem of the meaning of life. When philosophers chatter about the “value” of life, they demonstrate that they confuse the concepts of value and purpose.

7.12 Goethe

¹Schopenhauer reports from a conversation with Goethe that the latter said that “reading a page of Kant’s philosophy is like entering a bright and well-lighted room,” this Goethe who, frankly speaking, detested both Kant’s manner of writing and his complicated scholasticism, and only in Spinoza found something that agreed with his own ideas. With all deference to Schopenhauer’s otherwise uncommon honesty one cannot help getting the impression that in this case he was the victim of a self-made illusion.

²An indication of Goethe’s esoteric knowledge is to be found in his aphorism, “Ins Innre der Natur dringt kein erschaffner Geist”, a statement that must be misunderstood by all non-esotericians. The triads are creations that are supplied to the monad for its evolution. And the monad in the first triad is quite unable to “penetrate into the interior of nature”. Only the second self is able to do so.

7.13 Schiller

¹Schiller had attained the stage of humanity, thus had acquired common sense and so was in a position to discover reality ideas. Schiller was superior to Kant in his conception of reality and life (had perspective consciousness), which is evidenced by the fact that he clearly realized that Kant was in error both where his “categorical imperative” and his “moral law” were concerned. Schiller realized clearly that these conceptions of Kant amounted to an intrusion into man’s divine right to freedom. All commands and commandments imply abolishment of the law of freedom, violation of “immanent divinity”. Schiller was right when asserting against Kant that morality is freedom and not constraint or command, and that one should not, as Kant, separate morality and nature; that freedom is not (as Kant says) an “intelligible”, transcendent, abstract, “moral” form, but a potential faculty in the individual, a faculty that he should develop methodically. Where there is constraint, outer (the prohibitions of gods or human beings) or inner (“moral” constraint), freedom is absent, the possibility of free choice is absent.

²It is interesting to study Schiller’s attitude to religion. He clearly states that he does not accept any of the religious ideologies. His grounds are that none of them comes up to his demands for a true religiousness, the freedom from any feeling of constraint, fear, submission. Only that individual is religious in whom reason is sovereign and who is thereby in harmony with existence, which thus must be assumed to be rational.

³The superiority of Protestantism to Catholicism was due to the fact that the former granted the individual greater freedom by placing him (without the mediation of the church) in a personal relationship with omnipotence. However, not even Protestantism granted man the divine freedom which life affords and to which he has a right as a responsible individual.

7.14 Schopenhauer

¹It is a sign of a real lack of judgement in a professor when he asserts that Schopenhauer makes a “spiritual or supersensuous factor intervene in the mechanism of natural laws”. He thinks that Schopenhauer is guilty of an egregious error holding the view “that the unconscious will of nature, thus a psychic concept or a manifestation of soul, makes the celestial bodies ... able to wield an attractive influence on each other”. The will a psychic concept! No one who says so has understood this matter in the slightest. Good Lord, deliver us from our professors of philosophy! They should consider what Schopenhauer wrote about them. But instead they took their horrible revenge on the greatest philosophical genius of modern times.

7.15 Kierkegaard

¹From time to time Søren Kierkegaard becomes fashionable. According to his view, “subjectivism is the truth”. But he realized where that doctrine would carry us, so he wanted to replace the concept of reality with the idea of goodness. Brandes demonstrated that Kierkegaard’s subjectivism was a restatement of belief and went on to say that there is no opposition between what is ideally true in itself and what must ideally be true to me. Besides, Kierkegaard has refuted and condemned himself by approving of persecution of dissidents, torture, and burning of heretics. Where was his idea of goodness then? His defence of the individual’s right to hold his own opinion is only defence of his own right. He permitted no one else to hold an opinion that deviated from his own, the view which he considered the only true one for the time being, so that tolerance was only for himself. Small wonder then that he stood out as an example to be emulated. A very agreeable teaching for all people with dictatorial tendencies. Arbitrariness made a system.

7.16 Tegnér

¹It was a pity that Tegnér was not made a professor of philosophy instead of a bishop. In this obvious manner, he solved the two main problems of epistemology:

²“Transcendence is impossible based on the resources available to science. Science cannot mean anything else than a system of knowledge.”

³“The external world (the object) with its relation to the internal world (the idea) is given to me. The need for a speculative explanation of this relation began with the Greeks among the sophists. Among us it comes with the college years and seems to be one of the academic prerogatives.”

⁴Lower reason complicates, higher reason simplifies everything. Common sense finds the simple solution of unsolvable pseudo-problems. This is called genius.

7.17 Whitman

¹Walt Whitman was a man of extensive reading; he had studied Emerson, Mulford, Thoreau, Blavatsky (*Isis Unveiled*), and many other authors. He rehashed everything he picked up and reproduced ideas in his own poetical symbolism. This is what his readers and admirers have never grasped but they believed that everything he wrote was his own ideas and original. Only the form was original in everything he said. The very form, however, seems to be the essential thing to many people interested in literature. The reality content of

the ideas presented seems to be irrelevant to them. He was a typical mystic, who just like many poets detested mental clarity and exact concepts.

7.18 Fechner

¹Of all philosophers, the one who tried to formulate the theory of psycho-physical parallelism in the most thorough manner is Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801–1887). He started as a physician, then devoted himself to the study of physics and chemistry. He lectured as a reader in 1824 at the University of Leipzig on experimental physics, became a professor of physics in 1834.

²Strangely enough, Fechner's work is little known. It is an epoch-making, monumental lifetime achievement. In 1848 he published *Nanna*, a book on the psychology of plants. This was followed in 1851 by *Zend-Avesta* (in three parts); in 1855 by a work on atomic theory, a book that was overlooked but nonetheless was ground-breaking; in 1860 by a work on psycho-physics (in two parts, 917 pages in all, republished by Wilhelm Wundt in 1889), and a number of lesser works. In all these works Fechner treated of the various theories of interaction between "body and soul".

³We should be grateful that such an able man dedicated his life to the attempt at solving the pertaining problems. His work demonstrates very clearly that it is impossible for a man to think in agreement with reality without esoterics. Fechner's work remains insufficient without esoterics. He did not reach beyond demonstrations of probability based on the principle of analogy (congruence, correspondence). He applied the principle of analogy brilliantly, however, and could launch the hypothesis of the existence of mineral souls, plant souls, animal souls, human souls, and "star souls".

⁴Curiously enough, Lange in his *History of Materialism* never mentioned Fechner's atomic theory, which was the most important contribution without comparison, perhaps because he was unable to grasp it, which was a pity because if he had included it, this would have afforded his history a more solid foundation.

⁵The basic error of the theory of psycho-physical parallelism is that it leaves out energy; that it starts from the erroneous assumption that matter and consciousness have separate causal chains that nowhere interlock. According to esoterics, all events are the results of interaction between the three aspects of existence, although man cannot realize it, since he cannot ascertain the consciousness and energy aspects of the atoms (the 49 successively higher atomic kinds). When the great cosmic process of manifestation and, with it, evolution has reached its goal, everything will work according to law, that is to say: with absolute finality.

7.19 Caspari

¹Natural philosopher Otto Caspari is one of the philosophers they have passed over with silence, just like Fechner. Fechner made propaganda for the theory of psycho-physical parallelism for which Wundt later got the credit. Fechner was ignored for he was "unscientific" enough to speak of "mineral souls, plant souls, animal souls, human souls, and star souls". That was an idea that passed the power of understanding of professional philosophers. Caspari shared the same destiny, since he, too, launched an esoteric (Platonic) idea. He subscribed to Haeckel's basic idea of a common family tree of all organisms. He also considered that finality in nature could be explained only by assuming that atoms must possess the potentiality of consciousness, that the matter aspect of existence was a mechanism regulated by natural necessity, but that this mechanism, in its turn, was the result of energies directed consciously. But since that idea could not be fit into the speculative systems of the ruling ignorance, it could not be correct. Better then to pass it by without mention of it. That is an attitude which cannot be too severely excoriated.

7.20 Spencer

¹It is typical of the ignorance and inability of historians of philosophy to assess philosophers that Auguste Comte with his agnostic system is valued higher than Herbert Spencer, who launched two revolutionary ideas.

²The one idea was that of evolution. Biologists have given prominence only to Darwin, who presented facts about the origin of species. Before Darwin, however, Spencer explained in a splendid way the universality of the law of evolution, its validity in all spheres of life. Only after this did the intelligentsia begin to doubt the view maintained by theologians that the established society was in accord with the will of god and that every change was an evil, a work of antichrist. Still they have not realized that the meaning of life is consciousness development and that its causes as well as effects imply change. Greek esoterician Herakleitos intimated this fact in a symbolic fashion, so he has been considered the discoverer of this ancient reality idea.

³The other idea which achieved a breakthrough thanks to Spencer was the idea of relativity, to which Einstein later claimed the right of priority. The following statement by Spencer contains many things which we find again in Einstein's presentation.

⁴“Here, for instance, is a ship which, for simplicity's sake, we will suppose to be anchored at the equator with her head to the West. When the captain walks from stem to stern, in what direction does he move? East is the obvious answer – an answer which for the moment may pass without criticism. But now the anchor is heaved, and the vessel sails to the West with a velocity equal to that at which the captain walks. In what direction does he now move when he goes from stem to stern? You cannot say East, for the vessel is carrying him as fast towards the West as he walks to the East; and you cannot say West, for the converse reason. In respect to surrounding space he is stationary; though to all on board the ship he seems to be moving. But now are we quite sure of this conclusion? – Is he really stationary? When we take into account the Earth's motion round its axis, we find that instead of being stationary, he is travelling at the rate of 1000 miles per hour to the East; so that neither the perception of one who looks at him, nor the inference of one who allows for the ship's motion, is anything like the truth. Nor indeed, on further consideration, shall we find this revised conclusion to be much better. For we have forgotten to allow for the Earth's motion in its orbit. This being some 68,000 miles per hour, it follows that, assuming the time to be midday, he is moving, not at the rate of 1000 miles per hour to the East, but at the rate of 67,000 miles per hour to the West. Nay, not even now have we discovered the true rate and the true direction of his movement. With the Earth's progress in its orbit, we have to join that of the whole Solar system towards the constellation Hercules; and when we do this, we perceive that he is moving neither East nor West, but in a line inclined to the plane of the Ecliptic, and at a velocity greater or less (according to the time of the year) than that above named. To which let us add, that were the dynamic arrangements of our sidereal system fully known to us, we should probably discover the direction and rate of his actual movement to differ considerably even from these.

⁵“How illusive are our ideas of Motion, is thus made sufficiently manifest. That which seems moving proves to be stationary; that which seems stationary proves to be moving; while that which we conclude to be going rapidly in one direction, turns out to be going much more rapidly in the opposite direction. And so we are taught that what we are conscious of is not the real motion of any object, either in its rate or direction; but merely its motion as measured from an assigned position – either the position we ourselves occupy or some other. Yet in this very process of concluding that the motions we perceive are not the real motions, we tacitly assume that there are real motions. In revising our successive judgments concerning a body's course or velocity, we take for granted that there is an actual course or an actual velocity – we take for granted that there are fixed points in space with respect to which all

motions are absolute; and we find it impossible to rid ourselves of this idea. Nevertheless, absolute motion cannot even be imagined, much less known. Motion as taking place apart from those limitations of space which we habitually associate with it, is totally unthinkable. For motion is change of place; but in unlimited space, change of place is inconceivable, because place itself is inconceivable. Place can be conceived only by reference to other places; and in the absence of objects dispersed through space, a place could be conceived only in relation to the limits of space; whence it follows that in unlimited space, place cannot be conceived – all places must be equidistant from boundaries that do not exist. Thus, while we are obliged to think that there is an absolute motion, we find absolute motion incomprehensible.”

⁶Why did not Spencer gain recognition for his revolutionary ideas?

7.21 Haeckel

¹Surely it was pitiable and a proof of fossilized thinking to reject Haeckel’s “history of creation” because it displayed gaps in its demonstration for biological evolution. Where are not gaps to be seen? The basic fact of evolution was the essential thing, or was it not?

7.22 Wikner

¹How far Pontus Wikner could carry his understanding is best seen in what he says of philosopher Boström in Uppsala, notorious for his scandalous insults and lampoons.

²“Here we have a sublime naivety, a childlike faith, in the most beautiful sense, in the omnipotence of truth... This directness now pointed out left its impress not only on his own speculation but also on his discourse in speech and writing, nay even on his manner of treating people. In respect to the last mentioned trait, a remark should be made of his inclination to judge the intellectual powers of people by their attitude of approval or disapproval of his own system. Since his kindly disposition in most cases prevented him from ascribing bad motives to his opponent, it was quite clear to him that the latter was of feeble intellect, otherwise he would of course be able to see what Boström saw with the eye of a child, so to speak, and what consequently a child should be able to grasp. It was equally natural to Boström that, when thus considering someone stupid, he should not conceal this truth, important to that person, and he then enounced it...”

³Alas, if one could always expect to meet with understanding as benevolent as that of Wikner!

7.23 Russell

¹Bertrand Russell is a typical example of how one may become totally disoriented in the theory of knowledge and yet have a clear grasp of the problems of life view. He occupied himself for so long with the pseudo-problems of philosophy that he never realized that they were fictions, but ended up in the skepticism, subjectivism, and individualism of Hume, in the philosophy of sophist Protagoras. The philosophical, political, social, etc. problems demonstrate the primitivity of the human intellect. From where comes this reliance on the lowest mental activity, this tendency to judge everything of which they have no idea, this belief in illusions and fictions of all kinds, this faith in their own vagaries and imaginings?

²Russell’s life view is without any foundation in his world view and so “is in the air”. His instinct of life (the sum of the worked-up experiences of all incarnations) could assert itself without a firm basis in world view. This phenomenon is repeatedly seen in the lives of saints through the ages. The lived right and believed wrong, which shows that level of development and theoretical speculation can be without points of contact in individual cases. Generally, however, this is untenable. Life view must have a firm basis in world view.

³The individual has taken a big step forward when he starts thinking for himself and not just

parrots other people. But he takes the decisive step when he asks himself: what facts do I have for this assumption?

⁴There are in Russell's writings many dogmatic assertions that lack support in reality. So he asserts that:

- 1) there is no law of cosmic progress,
- 2) the theory of evolution cannot provide an enduring foundation for an optimistic philosophy,
- 3) Hume has refuted the concept of substance,
- 4) we shall never know whether there exists a superphysical reality,
- 5) it will be possible to fully explain the properties of organic tissues with chemical and physical concepts,
- 6) there is no other will than concepts,
- 7) the concepts of matter and motion are erroneous,
- 8) psychology must refrain from the concepts of perception and consciousness,
- 9) we assume the object to possess existence because also other people experience it,
- 10) nobody has been able to explain the occurrence of genius.

⁵Based on the knowledge available to exoterists their concept analysis must end in the dissolution of all concepts, so that they finally dare not utter a word, for everything is false. The Greek sophists of necessity arrived at the same result.

⁶Writer T. S. Eliot, whom Russell himself declared to be one of the few to have understood his "symbolic logic", gave his final verdict: "It [symbolic logic] did not seem to have anything to do with reality." Indeed, it does not.

7.24 Hans Larsson

¹In his essay on Kant (*Ideer och makter*, page 91), Hans Larsson attempts the task, impossible for exoterists, of explaining what Platon meant by "remembrance" or what Kant called "apriority" in our perception of reality (for example, space, time, causality, etc.). Hans Larsson considers that the "discovery of 'innate ideas' compels Platon to assume a non-sensuous world of ideas." This was no discovery by Platon, and nothing compelled him to assume anything. The knowledge of the causal world was imparted in the secret knowledge orders, and they were tens of thousands of years old. Platon had to mask his knowledge. And an esoterician has no difficulty in perceiving where the dividing line goes in the intimations made. All "intellectual discoveries" made before and after Platon are facts received by mankind from the planetary hierarchy. One by one the esoteric ideas have been allowed for general knowledge. It was of course inevitable that these pearls were given preposterous settings.

²The problem of the Platonic ideas occupied Hans Larsson all his life. He did not arrive at the clarity he sought. But often he almost stumbled on the solution. There are perhaps many people who like him thought that "we have those ideas above us as lodestars and within us as incentives", but few there are who could go on to say, as Hans Larsson did, "and they shine through all of nature around us".

³Another problem that occupied Hans Larsson all his life was the problem of morality. This problem was Fichte's moral law, or the requirement of duty, which Kant made a categorical requirement that must not even be explained. "Absolute oughtness", thought Larsson, should coincide with the realization and demonstration of "existence and oughtness". Fichte made Kant's practical requirement a theoretical requirement of consequence. Fichte considers the necessity of consequence to be the nature of consciousness. Oughtness ends in a fact, in a statement that such is our being. Unfortunately, we never find the last link of the theoretical consequence. And no one is able to name the last motive in the chain of practical requirement.

⁴This is a pseudo-problem, like most philosophical problems. There is no absolute

oughtness. According to the law of freedom, we have a right to judge for ourselves what we consider appropriate (if we do not cross the limit of the equal right of all). But after that comes the question of the meaning and goal of life, of the conditions of reaching that goal.

⁵In his many writings, Hans Larsson makes excellent analyses of a multitude of ideas in order to clarify their idea content, which is usually distorted by ignorance and injudiciousness. What could be objected to his analyses is his invoking various philosophical authorities to support the correctness of his presentation of the content of the ideas. Such a procedure is perhaps natural for a professor of philosophy. But the impression this makes on a humanist who has grasped the very idea and realized its validity is rather the opposite of the intended one. Because the idea needs no authority, for it carries its own weight as evidence. If you begin invoking authorities, it will all be a matter of faith instead of the self-evident realization of common sense.

⁶Many examples of Hans Larsson's clear thinking could be cited. Here is just one: "The fact that it [czarism] was devoid of power was precisely because it was devoid of ideas, for in the last analysis all power is anchored in convictions and ideas – there is no absolute guarantee of power." His five proofs why "revolutions are dangers to culture" should be cited in all schoolbooks. Such analyses are among what must never be lost in the literature of culture, and what must never be forgotten.

⁷Hans Larsson's striving as a philosopher was the quest for the synthesis. His inmost belief was that the basic instinct of philosophers aimed at a common goal they had all sensed, even if the paths leading to it seemed quite different. This idea of convergence he called his "idée fixe".

⁸If all philosophers at bottom had the same conception, this would imply that they had all solved the problem of knowledge in the same wrong way, that all their imaginative speculations were similar. When the problem of knowledge is once solved, as it is in hylozoics, all the fantasists have really been hylozoicians. That is a thought quite worthy of a philosopher who can afterwards explain what they all tried to say: "what they thought right, although it was wrong". One wonders whether there really is anything so preposterous that philosophers cannot work it out.

⁹Esoterics offers other explanations. The knowledge of reality was once the common heritage of mankind and should therefore exist latently in the subconscious of the intelligentsia at least and should be an instinctive groping, so to speak, for this common knowledge. To what extent such attempts were encouraged by initiates in the ancient knowledge orders can be determined only after a comprehensive search in the "archives" of the planetary memory. The fact that such philosophers, who had once been initiates, should manifest a common tendency, even enounce the same basic ideas, appears as obvious as the fact that "men of sense are really but of one religion."

¹⁰In these times, when powers are at work to distort all ideas, it might be interesting to learn what Hans Larsson means by an "idealist". In a theoretical sense it is a person who believes that there is a spiritual and more real world behind the "sensuous world" (physical world). In a practical sense it is a "person cultivating ideal needs, what is good, true, beautiful, divine." In an aesthetic sense it is one who "wants to give us reality in a beautified form".

7.25 Hedenius

¹Hedenius' dependence on authorities is clear from many places in his works. Nor does his opinion of the spiritists rest on independent examination. Logical analysis can establish what is unambiguous or ambiguous, non-contradictory or contradictory. But it cannot decide whether what is unambiguous agrees with reality, only whether it agrees with the hypotheses of science.

²The fact that Hedenius' book *Tro och vetande* ("Belief and Knowledge") aroused such controversy shows that emotional thinking still dominates theologians. Hedenius' book is a

treatise on elementary logic. Logically, the debate was about the validity of the law of opposites, an incontestable law. Logic cannot be logically refuted with logic. There are limits to logic, however. Logic cannot solve any problems of reality. Hedenius must start from the present standpoint of science, the only possible standpoint for exoterists.

7.26 Ahlberg

¹The rector of Brunnsvik County College, Dr. Alf Ahlberg, was by many people considered the foremost representative of culture in Sweden after Professor Hans Larsson of Lund University. He was engaged by the *Svenska Dagbladet* to review books on philosophy and the philosophy of religion. Being a pupil of Hans Larsson and chiefly walking in his footsteps, he may be regarded as the type of thinker who has an all-round orientation in culture and philosophy.

²Alf Ahlberg was the perfect summarizer of other people's views. He could enter other people's ways of thinking so well that he was for the time being convinced that they were right. To begin with he was a "Christian" (in the manner of Viktor Rydberg, the influence of his father), then he became a Kantian (the influence of Hans Larsson), subsequently an adherent of the philosophy of value (Rickert and others), then a pragmatist (current trend), lastly a positivist (in the manner of Protagoras, also a current trend).

³Alf Ahlberg was an excellent translator and reviewer. He could account for other people's views in a clear and succinct manner. Having that ability you can become a Ph.D. with the highest grade. He was free from dogmatic thinking in so far as he did not get stuck in any philosophical system. His own works revealed his ability of identification with the currently dominant ideology. But he never arrived at a personal view, a view of his own. He always depended on the authority of others.

⁴Alf Ahlberg called himself a seeker. His seeking remained within the framework of philosophical subjectivism, however, which is clear from the following statement of his: "Not even our 'ordinary reality' is, indeed, any reproduction (sic) of an objective reality independent of ourselves (sic), but is a product of the historically conditioned symbols (sic) in which we have formed it." Such a loose conception of reality makes it possible to regard imaginary hypotheses of all sorts as noteworthy contributions to the knowledge of those "frames of reference" which according to modern psychology are among the factors that determine our conception of reality. Thus, knowledge is not objective and universally valid but remains subjective and individual. We understand that Ahlberg once complained that it was impossible to find a firm ground and unbearable to feel like walking on a bottomless quagmire. Such a view could be left aside without further ado, if it were not so typical of our times and characteristic of cultured people with a philosophical and scientific orientation. In any case, such a person's instinct of reality has been irremediably idiotized for that incarnation.

⁵Ahlbergs quotes and approves of Freud's statement, "It evidences a poor faith in science if you do not believe it capable of taking up and studying what must be true in the assertions of occultism." This just demonstrates that they do not have the faintest idea of what "occultism" (more correctly: esoterics) is: the teaching of the existence of a long series of superphysical material worlds with everything pertaining to this, the teaching of the existence of a series of ever higher natural kingdoms with individuals who in ages long past were human beings but who, thanks to their intensive cultivation of the consciousness aspect and devoted service of evolution, have been able to find their places in the collective consciousness of higher worlds. And science would be able to judge this!! Neither religion, nor philosophy, nor science will ever be able to do so. Nor has any "occultist" asked for that. But they are right to request that esoterics is not rejected without examination. They demand that the five proofs that esoterics agrees with reality are tested in a factual manner, which has never been done. Esoterics claims

to be the only tenable working hypothesis of all attempts made to explain the world. That much can be ascertained also by a scientist, if he is sufficiently logical.

⁶A copy of *Kunskapen om verkligheten* [*The Knowledge of Reality*] by Laurency was sent to Ahlberg in 1961. He refrained from reviewing that book, however, just like all the others who received a copy of it. But it may be noted that the concealed critique of his own accounts to be found in that book at least had some effect. This appears in later editions of his own books, in how he later treated of Kant and Spencer and in other parts. Interested readers could compare his manner of presenting the history of philosophy before and after 1961. He also began to study the yoga philosophy in the books available in the library of the Sigtuna Foundation, apparently with a negative result. Besides, after the age of 63 years the attempt at mastering a previously unknown subject is a vain undertaking.

⁷It can be ascertained, however, that certain esoteric ideas penetrated his mind and subsequently through him reached the general public. It is interesting to observe how certain esoteric ideas slip into philosophical views in a manner unnoticeable to outsiders. Philosophers make those ideas their own without acknowledging from where they took them. They do not dare reveal their source out of fear of making complete fools of themselves.

⁸Dr. Alf Ahlberg could be called the philosophical job-hopper. He accepted one by one the philosophical views that dominated for the time being, not having an independent foundation for the positions he took. He summarized with great skill the systems of other thinkers, but could not determine for himself their reality content. That is, to be sure, all you need to be an expert on the history of philosophy. In his heart of hearts, he will remain uncertain until some time in a future incarnation he will meet hylozoics then ruling.

THE UPPSALA PHILOSOPHY

7.27 The Character of the Uppsala Philosophy

¹It was characteristic of the Uppsala philosophers, Hedvall, Hägerström, and Phalén, that they did not take any interest in the opinions held by the philosophers on world view and life view. They regarded philosophy as a logical method of examining the reality content of prevalent conceptions and concepts, thus examination and definition of concepts. It was natural that the logical method was extended to include the examination of logical contradictions of the philosophical systems. The tasks of philosophy were limited to immanent critique of systems, their erroneous bases, inner contradictions, and absurd consequences.

²A number of realizations were at the bottom of this attitude: philosophy is little more than arbitrary speculation; knowledge is a result of never-ending research; our knowledge of reality is too deficient for us to be able to formulate a system of thought that is logically without inner contradictions and factually in agreement with reality; consequently, knowledge consists in a continuous series of knowledge systems which can never be more than temporary and the deficiencies of which must be discovered and elucidated to counteract the tendency to dogmatism.

³The fact that logical systems appeared to the Uppsala philosophers as unattainable ideals thus did not imply that they criticized the idea of system as such. They were also aware of the fact that analysis of concepts must remain a never-ending critique of concepts. To them, philosophy could as philosophy never be anything but critique and critique of systems in particular.

⁴A universally valid world view must be based on the definitive (non-hypothetical) results achieved by scientific research in the matter, consciousness, and energy aspects of reality. This is the common basis. The results the human élite arrive at in their research, incomprehensible to the masses, constitute a superstructure which at best can be accepted as a

working hypothesis, individually or collectively.

⁵The Uppsala philosophers could demonstrate that the problems of the philosophers were pseudo-problems, that you cannot ask right until you know the right answers, that all philosophy produced up to then was misleading imaginative speculation.

⁶The contribution of the Uppsala philosophers was of fundamental importance, necessary to demonstrate that subjectivism is untenable, that subjectivism which had been an absolute ruler in both the West and India. Their successors seem not to have grasped that their critical contribution revolutionized the entire philosophical way of looking at things. The esoterician can realize that the critique levelled by the Uppsala philosophers brought about a further development of the human intellect.

7.28 *Hägerström, Hedvall, and Phalén*

¹Uppsala Philosopher Axel Hägerström never realized that man is incapable of constructing a tenable philosophical system. He ascertained the fact that all philosophers had failed. He concocted his own system, however, which no one else could comprehend. One is reminded of the old story about the philosopher who stated: “Formerly, god and I were the only ones to grasp this, but now it is only god.”

²In contrast, Karl Hedvall was fully aware that philosophy could never be anything but critique. And in his philosophical seminars he ground all philosophical systems and speculations to pieces. It is a pity that these discussions were never recorded. A terrible waste of the logical achievements of a critique genius. Unfortunately, he was self-critical to such a great extent that he only managed to publish his critiques of Hume and Fichte. These two works, however, demonstrate how philosophy should be done.

³Adolf Phalén was trained by both Hägerström and Hedvall. His early works are philosophical masterpieces. But he did not understand how necessary it is to relax and let strained brain cells in particular recover. At the end of his life he lost his capacity for logical achievement.

7.29 *How the Uppsala Philosophers Viewed Reality*

¹Uppsala philosophers Hedvall, Hägerström, and Phalén largely shared the same view of reality. They were physicalists or, more correctly, anti-metaphysicians. They disapproved of the term “agnostic”, since man does not have the logical right to assume the existence of anything “unknowable”.

²They moreover thought that a philosophical system must be unassailable. If its basic premises were false, if it displayed inner contradictions, if its consequences were absurd, the entire system had to be rejected. They did not consider the question whether a human intellect was able to construct a tenable system. In any case, they thought, such an exact system was impossible before research had said its last word.

³The epistemological problem (the problem of the possibility of knowledge) was a logical problem. Any confusion with psychological attempts at explanation was to be rejected. Logic and psychology were strictly separated. They condemned in the most severe manner the confusion wrought by historians of philosophy in this respect. The history of philosophy was logic, not psychology, nor a mixture of both.

⁴According to the Uppsala philosophers it was wrong to use the terms “inner” and “outer” for logical conceptions of reality. The concepts of inner and outer were psychological ideas and belonged to subjectivism, which was psychological, not logical epistemology.

⁵An esoteric philosopher may add the following comments to this. The psychological explanation of how we can perceive an object does not belong to epistemology, which must be exclusively logical. The very issue is whether a statement is logically correct. The two quite different problems must not be confused. The Boströmian problem, “whether objects

exist inside us our outside us”, is in any case not a logical problem. To common sense the very question is idiotic. Physiological and psychological processes of the sense organs are not crucial in the matter of correct perception of material reality by objective consciousness. The perception by objective consciousness is direct and unmediated in all the worlds of existence, once the faculty of objective consciousness has been acquired.

⁶“Three men are looking at an elephant, and all three have different perceptions of the size of the elephant. Consequently they really see three different elephants.” This is what sophist Protagoras could have said, because he could not see the error of his subjectivism. The logical absurdity consists in making three elephants out of a single one. It is a matter of one and the same elephant, which is a single one. Subjective perception is one thing, reality another. Have the three men indicate the size of the elephants in centimetres. Then make an objective measurement in centimetres. This will show that there is one elephant and three different erroneous measures. The madness of subjectivism must entail as a logical consequence that a person who sees doubly (suffers from a vision impairment) is right if asserting that there are two elephants. The fact that such “problems” can even be posed demonstrates how subjectivism can confuse people’s ideas, how they confuse psychology with logic.

7.30 *How the Uppsala Philosophers Taught Their Students*

¹Such as philosophy traditionally was taught, professors accounted for the views of the philosophers, and then they tested their students to see whether the latter had “done their homework”. This the Uppsala philosophers called the study of the history of philosophy as history, and that was no good. They shook the entire instruction of philosophy up from the stagnation that had befallen it. Their students had to comprehend the philosophical problems, not just be able to account for the more or less unsuccessful attempts by the philosophers at solving those problems, but also be able to demonstrate logically the errors of thinking in the thinkers, what was logically untenable in their reasoning. It was all about demonstrating the errors in their premises, the inner contradictions of their systems, and the absurdity of the consequences of those systems.

²Two examples of the examination for the bachelor’s degree in philosophy are given in what follows. During an examination in practical philosophy, which took one hour and a half, only two questions were put to one candidate by Hägerström. The first question was: “Account for the concept of justice in Greek philosophy. Begin with Sokrates.” The second question was: “Account for the basic ideas of Kant’s ethics.” An examination by Hedvall in theoretical philosophy lasted two hours and a half. The only question put to the candidate was: “Account for the contradictions in Schopenhauer’s philosophy.” Eight principal ones were found. Some readers of this might amuse themselves by finding them as well. This is how students should be taught and trained at an academy. The question is how many professors are up to it.

³The history of philosophy thus was made philosophy and not history. What is the use of the philosophers’ views, if you do not comprehend the errors there are in the? It was seen that the philosophical problems arose because the questions were put wrong and so were pseudo-problems.

⁴The esoterician realizes that all the problems of philosophy must be pseudo-problems, not only the problems presented up to now, but also those waiting in the future. Such as the questions are put they contain premises that do not exist in reality. Trying to answer them is like trying to answer senseless questions of children. Because you cannot ask right about reality until you possess knowledge of reality, until you can answer right. And esoterics makes it clear that no individual of the fourth natural kingdom can acquire that knowledge. The Buddha said this as early as 600 years BCE.

⁵Anyone who under Hedvall’s guidance has experienced the analysis of Kant has in that

study learnt to see how incredibly blind the philosophers were. It is a great pity that this oral teaching was never taken down in shorthand and published. An immense waste with a mental acumen that was unique in its kind. It was never displayed to full advantage except at the oral teaching of appreciative and therefore stimulating students. Something similar may certainly be said of the majority of great writers. The flashes of genius they fired in their circle of friends have now been lost to mankind. Not all of them had, like Goethe, an Eckermann present.

7.31 The Limitation of the Uppsala Philosophy

¹The Uppsala philosophers never realized that man is quite unable to solve the problems of existence. They started from the given reality and considered that the correct system of thought had to be a system of immanence, that everything had to be explained with the resources available to “common sense” (or, more correctly: physical objective sense). As they saw it, man did not have a logical right to state anything beyond the reach of general human, universally valid experience. In addition to other tasks, philosophy was scientific critique which refused to accept scientific hypotheses as views outside exact knowledge. Thus it was all a logic of facticity, and philosophy must not be made something else.

²The Uppsala philosophers, Hedvall, Hägerström, and Phalén, were much blamed for their logical analysis destroying all philosophical systems. The ordinary term of abuse was “logicomania”. Philosophy is logical analysis and aims at demonstrating logical fallacies. Therefore, it can only be negative. To be positive it must be in agreement with reality, and this requires esoteric knowledge. Many philosophical systems contain some reality ideas, but that is quite another thing. The system is untenable, and will remain so, until it is made up of nothing but reality ideas in their right contexts.

³Uppsala philosopher Phalén’s assertion that analysis and synthesis is the same thing is an error. Certainly both processes are mental but have widely different results. Admitted that analysis is in many cases the prerequisite of synthesis, but mere analysis yields no synthesis, which as a rule is an idea received.

⁴The Uppsala philosophers realized that research is not in a position to provide materials for a tenable world view. They did not realize that mankind is unable to judge whether such a world view is possible at all. This means, in other words, that at the present stage of mankind’s development, philosophers are incapable of determining whether such a phenomenon as hylozoics is in agreement with reality. They are unable to assess the reality content of hylozoics. Hylozoics remains a working hypothesis. But the philosophers, if they live up to their name (which seems nowadays to be the case more and more seldom), are in a position to realize that the five proofs of probability for the agreement of hylozoics with reality are unique in the history of philosophy and even otherwise have an overwhelming probability for them.

⁵Amazingly, they never realized that knowledge of reality requires facts, and that you must possess objective consciousness to ascertain facts, and that the philosophers did not possess superphysical objective consciousness. That settles the matter. Philosophy has never been anything but the fancies and guesswork of imagination. We can receive knowledge of superphysical worlds only from individuals who have passed to those worlds inaccessible to man. The philosophers are not in a position to judge anything but physical reality. They do not have the logical right to make statements on the esoteric knowledge of reality. They are not in a position to criticize it.

PHILOSOPHY IS IGNORANCE OF LIFE

7.32 Philosophy Is Speculation

¹As has been extensively elucidated in KofR, the entire history of philosophy is the history of errors. Ignorance of life wants to explain existence of which it can know nothing, and begins speculating, and the sum of these abortive conjectures is called the history of philosophy. Philosophy can never be anything else, will always be speculation, acute and profound vagaries and imaginings, logically proved with available material.

²It is another matter that such imaginative constructions may be artworks of logical fictions. Many people are fascinated by such things. They have no points in common with the knowledge of reality. Knowledge consists of a material of facts gathered methodically (not randomly) and systematically elaborated.

³Philosophers have not even been able to agree on the basic reality concepts, which demonstrates that their conception of reality has been subjectivistic and usually individualistic as well.

⁴Historian of philosophy G. Aspelin has said, to the great delight of theologians, that “Medieval scholasticism is the foremost creation of European intelligence” and has compared it in this respect with the “mathematics of the Greeks”. Scholasticism could produce systems of thought which in their logical formulation are fully comparable with the philosophical systems of the modern era. Without facts of reality, however, even the most logical system remains a system of fictions. It is ancient philosophical superstition that when you can construct a system that really does not display contradictions, then you have solved the riddle of the universe. But knowledge is no purely logical product but a system of ascertained facts (subjective as well as objective ones). Only a causal self can ascertain real facts in the emotional and mental worlds of man.

⁵Kant and Fichte laid down, quite arbitrarily, categorical demands for both knowledge and actions, understanding neither reality nor life. They had no idea of what law of life means. Laws of life indicate the condition of consciousness development. They are no demands. The law says that anyone who wants to reach the goal of life must want to use the right means of doing so. All law is based on freedom.

⁶An illustrative example of the absurdity of philosopher Fichte’s assertion, “The I sets against itself a not-I”, was Fichte himself by the following: “I create God every day.” This is what may happen if you live in mere abstractions. You never know what madness you end up with.

⁷All philosophy must sooner or later, like semantics in the West and Zen Buddhism in the East, end up in absurdities. That they have arisen or reappeared in our age of transition is one of the almost countless proofs of the inability of human reason to explore or understand reality.

⁸Just as in the matter of the problems of exoteric philosophy all speculative minds construct their own fiction systems, so in the future they will go on making imaginative constructions of occult facts. Mental activity does not rest and always seeks something to occupy itself with, tries to solve everything that has in it something of insoluble problem. And precisely because human conceit is incurable, the mania for speculation rages on as before: passing fancies are taken as reality ideas, freaks as inspirations. Conceit is unflagging in finding defence of ongoing speculation. Warnings are of no avail. It really appears as if the first self could not learn to see its own limitation.

⁹Reality has three aspects. And anyone who wants to get to know reality should obtain knowledge of all three. At all times the big mistake of philosophers was that they began speculating before they knew what they were talking about. Then it must be subjectivism (individual imaginative speculation). Theology cannot be discussed in this connection, for

theologians do not know but what others have said and what historians believe to be reports of past events.

¹⁰A certain philosopher talks about the “unitary and meaningful evolution of scientific thought from the times of Pythagoras and Demokritos all the way to modern field theoretical thought.” This is no evolution at all but a quite unnecessary circular movement that will end where it once started: with Pythagoras.

7.33 *Philosophy Is Fictionalism*

¹“Our fictions blind us to our own ignorance.” But not only to our almost total ignorance of any other reality than the physical. Every fiction makes us blind to that reality of which the fiction purports to give us knowledge. Fiction is pseudo-knowledge, a notion that does not correspond to reality. If somebody believes he has a correct view of something, it is almost impossible to make that person realize that it is incorrect. Experience appears to show us that only such intellectuals as have become skeptics since they have realized that the prevalent ideologies are untenable are in a position to see that hylozoics is superior as a working hypothesis.

²The foremost scholastic philosophers were every bit as acute and profound as all the other great philosophers. This is the best proof that such faculties are mental constructors and do not entail the possibility to know anything of reality and life. Philosophers are fictionalists, let them then be however great geniuses. Expressed esoterically: the monad in the lowest triad can by itself know nothing of higher existence. Children play with wooden construction blocks, philosophers with mental construction blocks. When will mankind be set free from fictionalism?

³Why is it that new fictions are so covetously accepted? A false prophet gains countless followers. But the one rational explanation is passed over with silence, is rejected without examination. What would people do with “more light” when they do not see even the light there is?

⁴The philosophers seem to have accepted Herbart’s assertions that “objects with qualities is an untenable concept”, that “the concept of change is untenable”, that “the concept of self-consciousness is untenable”. All of this abortive criticism is about refuting untenable definitions, not the real things. All these assertions of Herbart are punches in the air. But this is, assuredly, the case with almost everything in philosophy.

⁵Only on the concept of self-consciousness a few words might be said, since that concept cannot be explained without esoterics. The existence of the self appears in the possibility of attention, by the fact that the self can observe and study the different kinds of consciousness of its envelopes.

7.34 *Philosophy Is Physicalism*

¹Philosophy must keep within the limits of human reason, and then it cannot, as Buddha made clear, solve the problems of reality, let it then construct how many imaginative systems it likes. In its ignorance of the existence of a fifth natural kingdom, which can acquire knowledge of reality, it refuses to examine the system of knowledge given us by the planetary hierarchy. For it is difficult to assume that a reliable study of hylozoics and a subsequent check of it would not lead to the acknowledgement of hylozoics as the only tenable working hypothesis, which gives a unique, rational explanation of previously inexplicable things and events and which to a great extent enables deduction from the system, conclusions that prove to agree with reality.

²It appears as if philosophers, theologians, and scientists by and large refuse to concern themselves with anything but what is physical, believing that everything said about the superphysical is mere constructions by ignorance. Apparently esoterics cannot expect

recognition from the “learned”. They remain physicalists. On the other hand, a considerable percentage of them can accept the fiction that the external world is an “illusion”. Such a notion they can swallow.

³If it all depended on the “learned world”, the planetary hierarchy would have no chance of reappearing, for the condition of this is that they are “called” to do so. Enforcement of recognition would be a violation of the Law. Present-day people live in a chaos. Must it go so far that this chaos brings mankind to the brink of ruin, before they catch at the salvation offered to it, like a last straw, if they want to receive it?

7.35 Philosophy Has Idiotized Reason

¹During the 2500 years they have speculated on things of which they know nothing, philosophers have displayed an amazing lack of common sense and judgement. The great thinkers formulate their own way of thinking, make their own, completely fictitious world of imagination, and then live in it. Schopenhauer thought that those who studied Hegel got their brains totally disorganized so that they could never more think a rational thought. This is true not only of Hegelians, but also of Berkeleyans, Kantians, etc. They learn to think as the models they have studied, and in so doing they are trapped in the pertaining fictitiousness, in the set lines of thought.

²Fictionalism may be however acute and profound, may agree with traditional views however much, yet it remains fictionalism, speculations that can never afford us knowledge of reality. It may be regarded as mental gymnastics, and undeniably it develops the lower two kinds of mental activity, inference thinking and principle thinking. At the same time, however, it is harmful by destroying the very instinct of reason and so makes it harder for man to acquire common sense. When, some time in the future, men will have acquired common sense, they will also discover how philosophy idiotized that faculty.

³Theologians think that those who were born and died before Christianity are lost for eternity. Philosophers think that those thinkers who lived before the birth of European philosophy understood nothing. Whence comes this tendency to deny common sense and believe blindly that the vagaries of one’s own life ignorance are the only truths?

⁴There is no absurdity that philosophers have not been able to accept through the ages. The same is true, of course, of mankind in its entirety. Philosophical subjectivism, which can even deny the existence of the external world and of matter, shows how long way even philosophers have to go before they have acquired common sense. Students of philosophy are told to enter deeply into the history of philosophy so as to learn how they should think to think right, for surely the great thinkers ought to comprehend it all better than other poor creatures. And a great brainwashing takes place that disorganizes reason once and for all. Subsequently they believe whatever Hume or Kant or Fichte or Hegel or someone else has seen fit to concoct. And then they swear allegiance to the word of their master.

⁵So it was quite right and proper that they thought Kant understood what he said. He thus asserted that it is the spirit of man that makes nature a cosmos. Therefore, without the reason which the philosophers had discovered cosmos would be nothing but chaos. According to common sense, which the philosophers have always rejected, reality is precisely such as we perceive it by our sense (objective consciousness). Slowly and through a long series of painful psychological experiences the child comes to realize that the external world is uncompromising and hard reality. Only long afterwards does reflection learn how to think logically.

⁶Once disorganized by philosophers, thinking can by the aid of logic demonstrate the truth of any absurdity. How far they have strayed from reality is clear from their talk about the “gulf between idea and reality”. If they meant the gulf between the “ideas” of philosophers and reality, it would no doubt be true. There is no connection between them. Between reality

idea (causal idea) and reality, however, there is no gulf, for the reality idea is the exact perception of reality. That idea is part of the world of intuition, the world of Platonic ideas, which is quite beyond the grasp of philosophers. How far from reality philosophers have strayed is clear from their assertion that the idea belongs to the realm of art, thus the world of imagination.

⁷In all ages philosophers were ignorant of the three aspects of reality, of man's different material envelopes with their respective kinds of consciousness, of the different stages of human consciousness development. They speculate without knowledge of the facts that are necessary to comprehend reality.

⁸The complete failure of Kant's conception of reality (and the same could almost be said of the other philosophers) also includes his abortive concepts of freedom and of will. According to esoterics, the will is determined by motives, and the strongest motive wins. Man's freedom consists in the fact that it is possible for him, by methodical work, to make any motive whatever the strongest. Usually motives are determined by subconscious complexes, prevalent manners, customs, taboos, habits, and illusions and fictions of all kinds.

⁹Philosophy does not show us how to think. It is one big example of how we should not think. It demonstrates how impossible it is for mankind to solve the problems of existence without esoteric facts about superphysical reality.

THE END OF PHILOSOPHY

7.36 *The Failure of Philosophy*

¹The philosophers have during a few hundred years wrestled with the same problems as occupied the sophists. What Locke, Hume, and Kant taught, the sophists taught as well. The same problems as engrossed the sophists turn up again in Rousseau and Nietzsche. Just as in ancient Greece the sophists used their concept analysis to dissolve all concepts until nothing to think with was left, so modern philosophers, too, have arrived at the "nothingness of thought". The sophists went so far that they did not dare utter a word, because all statements were false. This is where they are heading today, too. The philosophers do everything in their might to deprive mankind of the wee bit of common sense they have acquired with so much toil. Philosophy, being speculation without facts, has reached the limit of its *raison d'être*. It has not moved from the spot during 2500 years.

²A professor of philosophy proved not to have understood the old logical expression, "universally valid and necessary", but declared that "necessary" was meaningless. Just as after Aristoteles enlightenment rose as judgement sank, the same is the case during the 20th century. In technology the world has made giant strides, but in culture it has declined at the same rate. According to the old logical definition, "necessary" is what follows from a given ground. According to Schopenhauer there is in this respect a fourfold necessity: physical (cause and effect), logical (ground and consequence), mathematical (axiom), and ethical (motive).

³A thick volume written by the famous professor of philosophy at Chicago University, George H. Mead, is typical of the prevalent complete disorientation in reality and life. His work was given the apposite title, *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. This tells it all, the philosophers' imaginative speculations on existence and abortive conjectures about matter, consciousness, motion, and this in all respects. The esotericians observes that practically nothing said by all the philosophers mentioned agrees with reality. Philosophy has degenerated into conventional thinking, attempts at systematization of ephemeral hypotheses of science, which are regarded as "possibly" correct, are considered as provisionally valid (a standpoint taken also by Henri Poincaré). This amounts to recognition of the fact that philosophy and science are unable to solve the problems of existence. Buddha announced this

to the world over 2500 years ago. But he was no scientist, you see.

⁴It is somewhat amazing that the “Greek spirit” with its striving to achieve an objective way of looking at things, that Greek heritage which characterizes what we mean by Western, scientific outlook on existence, has in philosophy degenerated into that epistemological subjectivism which we took over from Greek sophists and which has been finally refuted only in our times.

⁵Both Hans Larsson and Alf Ahlberg turned to religion, became believers in their old days. Apparently they realized that philosophy is unable to solve the problems of existence. And since they had not found, or could not understand, a perfectly satisfactory system of knowledge, it only remained for them to revert to their childhood faith. That seems to be the fate of most philosophers, if they are granted to live long enough. The failure of philosophy.

⁶Bacon’s observation, “in the schools of philosophers, the adepts learn to believe”, has always been valid. They never understood the problems they tried to solve. They were in all times the victims of their vagaries, and their echoes accepted their fictions. It is vouchsafed the present age, however, to evince the unconditional surrender of reason to the worst aberration of them all: semantics. Another example is that muddlehead, Marx, whose imaginative speculation has turned the heads of Russian and Chinese philosophers of a low intellectual standard. How far is mankind still from the acquisition of common sense, from the ability to determine the truth or falsity of its vagaries, from the ability to solve the problems of philosophy!

7.37 The Breakup of Philosophy

¹It is high time philosophy were replaced with the history of ideas, the effort at collecting the ideas of mankind, so that human beings are spared the toil of rediscovering these previously conceived summaries of forgotten experience.

²The history of ideas is or should be the collected experience of mankind, also historic experience. And history should be divided into special sections: military history, history of diplomacy, history of civilization, history of culture, etc. If someone then would collect the rest into a history of anecdotes, history of perversion of life, history of crazy notions, then even that history could be made instructive.

³What will then remain for philosophers is to discover more and more logical errors in the older systems, sum up the results of research into systems of survey and orientation, refute the new speculations of concept analysts, and change the name “history of philosophy” into “history of errors in thinking”.

⁴It will probably be long before all misleading philosophical terms have been purged. There is nothing corresponding to that term used by philosophers, “mind”, as if this were some independent thing, perhaps even some sort of “immaterial substance”. Consciousness is a quality of matter.

7.38 A New Age Has Begun

¹The systems of illusions and fictions accepted by mankind prove not to agree with reality. Research has exploded the fundamental hypotheses on which science has built its theories. New areas have been discovered in which ordinary scientific disciplines are not applicable. Rock-firm belief in the power of science to determine “what conflicts with the laws of nature” has proved to be just a presumption of ignorance.

²A new age has begun. The dogmas of theology, philosophy, and science have proved untenable and have lost their power, their ability to afford people certainty.

³Instead of discouraging us this should inspire us with confidence, for it indicates that mankind will finally be able to attain a level of development consistent with reason. What immense progress is contained in the very ability to demonstrate the illusoriness and fictitiousness of what previously was the basis of the world view and life view ruling.

⁴A negative result is a result of immense value. It makes it clear that alleged knowledge was not knowledge. It shows that the skeptics of all ages had a more correct instinct of life, since they refused to accept that which to the learned was unshaken certainty, that instinct telling them “it cannot be like that”. Sokrates, who has been made the emblem of wisdom, was a skeptic in regard to all pretended solutions of the problem of reality. They have been proved right, those skeptics. In fact they confirm what Buddha categorically asserted, that human reason cannot solve that problem. It is a big step forward that research has been able to demonstrate that all explanations advanced up to now are untenable, even if it cannot be said that this is reason’s declaration of independence.

⁵What was the basis of the certainty of the skeptics: “it cannot be like that”? Somewhere in the long chain of assumptions and demonstrations there was an absurdity, something that did not make sense to them, even if they could not explain the reasons why. Surmise or divination is still part of the unconscious, is something that is pressing, trying to grope its way out into waking consciousness. Instinct, too, is part of the unconscious, although it comes from the fund of latent experience. And we all share in the collective consciousness, the basis of that omniscience which we shall conquer when we have once acquired the ability to find whatever we want to know in the world of Platonic ideas.

⁶It was their need of certainty that made the philosophers construct their systems, which they believed to be tenable, something firm to keep to. Having this belief they started from the assumption that a non-contradictory system of thought must agree with reality and that the very quality of non-contradictoriness was the criterion of truth. Without knowledge of reality, however, there can be no system which does not, sooner or later, display both contradictions and absurdities. There were also philosophers who more than surmised that a system in complete agreement with reality must be a matter for the future. They thought that they should have to be content if the system could afford them certainty, could claim to be the best possible one. (Many philosophers long held the Aristotelian system to be such a one.) It must have been a similar train of thought that made a philosopher “not care for the truth” (the perfect system), if only he had clarity” (a system of concepts that were firm enough for him).

PHILOSOPHICAL PSEUDO-PROBLEMS

7.39 Introduction

¹Most so-called problems are pseudo-problems and not real problems. The solution of a pseudo-problem brings about new pseudo-problems, until imagination is a helpless prisoner of its own constructions and finally it only remains to break it up and begin anew with other starting positions (which is happening in so-called modern philosophy) with the same inevitable results. The entire history of philosophy is a drastic example of that process. You cannot pose a problem of epistemology right until you know the answer. And then the solution of it is so directly obvious that you do not understand how you could make a problem out of it.

7.40 Semantics

¹The latest aberration in philosophy is so-called semantics, the study of meaning. Semantics seems to have effected a paralysis of the faculty of thinking in most philosophers of our times, as they have been led astray by the general failure of philosophy.

²The task of concept analysis is to analyse concepts to make them unambiguous, to eliminate the ambiguity which concepts have taken on during the ages. The limitation of concept analysis is given by this. However much you analyse concepts, you cannot extract more from them than what was once put into them. Thus by analysing concepts you do not obtain any knowledge of reality, but knowledge is something quite different, is arrived at in

other ways (by objectively ascertaining facts). These realizations are actually evident to common sense.

³When semanticists want to construct a new way of looking at reality using their concept analysis, they have fallen victim to a new kind of belief. Their new way of looking at things must carry them away from reality and make them unable to have a correct perception of reality. Not understanding what common sense actually is, should be ideally, they have completely denied it.

⁴Perhaps the very term, “concept analysis”, has added to confusion. The ancients used a less misleading term, “concept definition”.

⁵Semantics will soon bring us back to that age following the sophists when they did not utter a word, since everything could be proved false, when they finally only dared “moving a finger”. Semantics is quite simply a relapse into that dissolution of all reality concepts which sophistry wrought, an example that “everything returns” like in a circle. It must do so, since people lack knowledge of reality and speculation can never find something finally firm. It makes one wonder whether the ancient sophists have reincarnated.

⁶It would be interesting to know how the “philosophers” of semantics think (if they think at all) how research is to be conducted after they have deprived the researchers of the fundamental reality concepts (originally those of hylozoics) on which all natural science is based.

⁷Semantics is bereft of reason to such an extent that it has great prospects of becoming the fashionable philosophy.

7.41 Pragmatism

¹The many “epidemics of the intellect” of our times include so-called pragmatism. Finally they became so disoriented in their thinking that they could not keep the concepts apart, could not tell the difference even of truth and arbitrariness. Truth was thought to be anything but truth. Truth was made now usefulness, now value, etc. They had picked up the fashionable word, “pragmatism”. The simplest recourse was to call new schools of thought “pragmatism”. That term became a valuable portmanteau. Into this common receptacle went even the notion saying that hypothesis was truth. Well, neither philosophers nor scientists draw much nearer to the truth or the right perception of reality on their own.

²Therefore, several kinds of pragmatism must be distinguished. American psychologist William James is a representative of one kind. James accepted as truth whatever he deemed viable, an opinion that remains more or less arbitrary.

³A good representative of another kind of pragmatism is French mathematician Henri Poincaré. To him as a scientist the scientific hypotheses, “on the present standpoint of science”, implied the highest point of knowledge and comprehension. He started from the scientific hypotheses, not because they were true, but because we had explored reality as far as the hypothesis reached and were reduced to using it as a means, a temporary one to be sure, but the only practical one. Consequently, we had to make our thinking start from those hypotheses and treat them as truth, being unconcerned about the unexplored reality of which we knew nothing.

⁴A closely related standpoint was taken by Spaniard Ortega y Gasset, who thought that “all knowledge is knowledge from a definite point of view”, that the “persistent error that has hitherto been made is the supposition that reality possesses in itself, independently of the point of view from which it is observed, a physiognomy of its own.” He considered that there could be a justification for philosophical systems as attempts at orientation, but that the “world defined by the philosophies we have been examining was not really the world, but simply the horizon of the philosophers responsible.” And so he formulated his own system starting from the ephemeral hypotheses of science.

⁵A fourth school of this kind of practical auxiliary philosophy is the “philosophy of as if” of German philosopher Vaihinger. Being aware that we do not have knowledge of reality, we use our concepts as if they agreed with reality, because we have no other recourse. Or in another formulation: For want of facts about reality we must consciously be content with erroneous fictions as if they were true. We start from these as auxiliary hypotheses, being aware that reality perhaps is something different.

⁶The people who make up the so-called modern intelligentsia could be regarded as pragmatists, which they seldom realize. They accept the ideologies ruling in religion, philosophy, or science, being ignorant of the fact that those views are fictions, and live on them as if they were the true knowledge. And that is pragmatism: the current hypotheses are the truth. But all exoteric speculation is fictionalism. When will mankind arrive at that realization?

⁷In addition there is of course a popular pragmatism in keeping with that political demagoguery which nowadays rules nations. According to this, truth is everything that they have made people believe in one respect or other. Just claim something that agrees with people’s egoism or prejudice or interests in general, and it will be true. It is dinned into people by assiduous propaganda. Then you can lie however much; the more brazenly the better.

⁸The Uppsala philosophers held these views to be logically untenable, and rightly. Logic cannot accept more or less arbitrary assumptions as realities. Only that is truth which is logically inevitable and universally valid and so absolute.

⁹From this it follows that truth can never be anything but that definitive system which is the final goal of research, since the conception of reality advocated by science constantly changes as research progresses. From this it follows in turn that philosophy cannot be anything but a continuing critique of the systems that replace each other in an unsurveyable succession. It is the task of philosophy to demonstrate the shortcomings of all systems.

¹⁰These observations irritate, of course, all those who have an emotional or mental need of keeping to something absolutely firm. If so, the only advice to be given them is to examine hylozoics.

7.42 “*Everyone Is Right from His Viewpoint*”

¹The slogan, “everyone is right from his viewpoint”, is exceedingly typical of our democratic times with their confusion of ideas. Everyone having a right to his own view apparently is the same as the views of all people being equally right. However, everyone having a right to his own view does not imply that everyone’s view is correct, agrees with reality. Nor does it imply that all comprehend and understand equally much. This was the opinion held by the Greek sophists, since they lacked knowledge of reality and life.

²Those facts about physical reality which science has established definitively can be said to be universally valid. That is not true of the scientific hypotheses, however. Most academics start from the temporary dogmatic systems they learnt when they received their university education, and regard them as universally valid. This is a mistake, for they remain temporary, even if they are accepted by all contemporary people.

³Where psychological (emotional-mental) phenomena are concerned, it may be safely assumed that no human opinions can be correct. In any case, criteria of objective truth are absent. Such criteria are obtained only as objective causal consciousness is acquired. Infallible ideas of consciousness in the worlds of man are possible only to essential (46) consciousness (in the fifth natural kingdom).

⁴The esoterician maintains that there is only one universally valid knowledge, and that is the mental knowledge system of the Pythagoreans, hylozoics. Since science is unable to verify this at its present stage of development, however, hylozoics remains a working hypothesis, although the only one tenable in the long run.

7.43 COMMON SENSE

¹Common sense is the ability to think in accord with reality. Common sense is what accords with the collected, universally valid experience of all mankind, not with the conceptual world of the various nations, cultural epochs, religions.

²There is much talk of common sense, it being apparently presumed that everyone has common sense. This may be said, if by common sense is meant everyone's highest possible sense, or rather reason. But in that case we have a whole series of ever higher kinds of reason, each kind representing the highest reason on a certain level of development. For there is a huge difference between common sense at the stage of civilization and at the stage of humanity, at the stage of culture and at the stage of ideality.

³Also, the conception of common sense can be quite different on different levels of knowledge. What seems to be common sense to the esoterician can seem incomprehensible to the exoterist. It is a matter of different systems.

⁴Thus everyone has his own definition of common sense according to this level of development and level of knowledge. Probably most people assign whatever they find self-evident to common sense, and this because they immediately grasp the matter, since it follows logically from their conscious or unconscious system of thought. This is often the direct opposite of common sense, which for an esoterician is what agrees with reality. A scientist at the beginning of the 20th century would have regarded the belief in the rationalistic and mechanistic world view ruling at that time as a proof of common sense. The question remains whether the modern system of scientific hypothesis will prove more tenable than, for example, the hypothesis developed by Ernst Haeckel in his book *Welträthsel*. Since they do not want to receive the gift of the planetary hierarchy, they will have to crawl along at a snail's pace through the multitude of hypothesis systems formulated and discarded, being equally certain with each new system that they have solved the problem of reality.

⁵When you have once received the facts, it is all self-evident according to your common sense. You can turn it the other way round: if it is self-evident according to common sense, it agrees with reality. But then it must be the common sense of the highest mental consciousness and it must be in possession of all the facts relevant to the matter.

⁶Common sense is the opposite of emotional thinking. Scarcely one per cent of intellectuals are free from emotional influence when making their statements. Just by contradicting them in discussions you can provoke them to make almost any absurd statement. Such people should not speak of common sense, although they preferably do so.

⁷Common sense refuses to accept anything that appears absurd to the individual. The humanist's common sense refuses to accept religious, philosophical, scientific, sociological absurdities.

⁸“Whatever conflicts with common sense cannot agree with the teaching of the Buddha.” All the dogmas of Christian theology are irrational, nay even worse, they are inhuman. They are all fictions of ignorance.

⁹Wisdom is the application of the knowledge of reality and life by common sense. Common sense is a necessary prerequisite of wisdom. Common sense is the teaching of the Buddha (not Buddhism) and the wisdom religion. Common sense liberates us from theology and philosophy, which are constructions of the ignorance of reality and life.

¹⁰Common sense is supreme reason, the simplest of all simple things, too simple for sophisticated mankind. Kant is the greatest philosopher, for he possessed the ability to make what was actually self-evident so profound that it became incomprehensible even to himself. Mankind has drowned itself in the illusions of emotionality and the fictions of mentality. Illusions are the products of self-interest, egoism, and selfishness. Fictions are the constructions of philosophy and the hypotheses and theories of science. Instead of ascertaining facts to find laws (constant relations) they persist in making everything something it is not, for it “cannot be

that simple". It is precisely that simple, however. The simpler, the truer, the nearer to reality. According to the planetary hierarchy, the knowledge of reality, the knowledge of the Law, of right action, of right application of the Law is of all knowledge the easiest to grasp but also the most difficult, because man gets entangled in his fictions.

¹¹In all times philosophers have disdained common sense, which can be said to express the universally valid perception of reality in the consciousness development of the fourth natural kingdom. Then the results were the most perverse in respect of reality. Objective, material reality was conceived as something subjective and arbitrary. In contrast, emotional subjective valuation of human action was deemed objective.

¹²In his life view (although not in his world view) Bertrand Russell had common sense to an unusually high degree and did what he could to develop it in other people. Generally, anti-metaphysicians are the ones to develop common sense. Metaphysicians lose their common sense in their speculations on things of which they can know nothing. It is important that people are taught everything that concerns physical life and only that; are taught to think in such a manner as if there were no other worlds. Only then will they be able to lead rational lives in the physical world. Common sense is the prerequisite of applying the rule, in all worlds, of letting this be this and not anything else. Common sense sets people free from ideologies of all kinds. The only truths people need to know beyond those of physical reality is that the self is immortal, that there are higher worlds, that the meaning of life is consciousness development in ever higher natural kingdoms, that everything is Law, and that in addition common sense is the most important faculty.

¹³There are no sharply defined "norms" in esoterics. Therefore, common sense is a necessary faculty in regard to esoteric conditions. And common sense includes the attitude of not assuming, supposing, speculating, but of keeping to real facts or, in their absence, of refraining from conclusions and only allowing for "possibilities" and thus not probabilities. "Certainties are always erroneous without the necessary facts, and they are absent more frequently than people want to admit, for they eagerly want to believe that they know. And that is what the esoterician must not do, if he does not want to deceive himself and in so doing re-enter the world of fictions, which is the case with most occultists. Esoteric facts are received from the planetary hierarchy only, not through people who believe themselves called to receive such facts. Those facts are always to be had in the esoteric literature from the planetary hierarchy. Regrettably, we must expect the appearance of falsified such literature, and that is why common sense is required. D.K. inculcates on us not to accept anything that does not make sense in all respects; he says that doubt is better than belief, and that we should defer our acceptance if we do not understand that it must be as it is said. For the first self there is no higher authority than what is logically cogent. Everything else is uncertain. The Buddha, too, inculcated this on his esoteric disciples. This is a hard saying but must be said. Not all those who believe themselves called are fitted to be esotericians.

¹⁴Strictly speaking, only causal consciousness implies common sense. The esoterician understands what Buddha meant when he made it clear to his disciples that the first step on the path to higher kingdoms is the development of common sense. The prerequisite of this is the refusal to accept anything as true or real that conflicts with our experience, that implies something that is absurd, illogical, objectively or psychologically irrational. A matter-of-fact analysis of the ideologies (theological, philosophical, scientific) accepted by mankind makes it clear that they are all untenable. Everything that must be blindly accepted as "transcending" human reason (as it does at that stage) are creeds belonging at the emotional stage.

POWER OF JUDGEMENT

7.44 *Injudiciousness*

¹Anyone who does not possess knowledge of facts, axioms, and principles within each particular field of knowledge has fictions. This is particularly true of the problems of world view and life view. All believe themselves able to solve these problems. They do so in the only manner possible for them: they become uncritical and believers.

²People are in such hurry to give their opinions on everything that they cannot wait until they have found out what it is about. They use the superficial orientation they had in school as if they believed themselves all-knowing. This indicates a fundamental defect of the methods used in education, which should at the very outset have made people realize their almost total ignorance of life.

³Man's faith in his own power of judgement is the primary cause of most people's mistakes in life, of the illusoriness and fictitiousness ruling. The next cause is the faith in other people's power of judgement.

⁴The spontaneous tendency to give opinions is self-deceptive in more than one respect. If someone people know fails in something, they will say: "Well, I always thought he would do such a thing." If after some time the same individual surprises his old fault-finders by succeeding in some particularly difficult enterprise, they will say: "Well, I knew he would be successful. I always said so."

⁵It is typical of the injudicious that they believe they comprehend without knowing the facts. It is quite sufficient for them to hear something mentioned to "know" at once what this is, to relate this new thing, which is actually unknown to them, to something they already know. And so misconception is the certain outcome. One example. A certain Orientalist heard the term "planetary hierarchy", a term he had never heard before. The concept to which he referred the term could not be the esoterician's reality concept of the planetary hierarchy, for he did not care to find that out, but his concept was a supposition of a group of yogis. Supposition thus resulted in a typical fiction (conception without a correspondence in reality). In this way new facts gave occasion to the formation of new fictions, and the result was grotesque. This is what happens all the time when people believe they know, being unable to grasp that there can exist things which they do not know

⁶Many people do not realize what presumption (*hubris* of the Greeks) is. They feel very humble before the "mystery of life", so humble that they are on the verge of self-effacement. Deepest down, however, there is faith in their own power of apprehension and judgement, faith that has been developed in their intercourse with the less intellectualized. It is very commonly seen that hyperintellectuals, having realized their mental superiority to those around them, overestimate their own power of judgement and believe themselves able to judge everything, make statements on everything, not suspecting that their knowledge of reality and life is exceedingly limited. Being a "quality" of all philosophers it has contributed to their belief that the results which precisely they arrived at in their speculation agreed with reality. The individual finds it easy to imagine that he is a very important person. However, a clear realization of their own enormous limitation is a distinctive trait of all people at really higher stages.

7.45 *What Power of Judgement Is*

¹Power of judgement is partly the ability to separate facts from fictions; partly the ability to determine whether all the requisite facts are there or whether all the requisite principles have been considered; partly the ability to put facts into their right contexts or to synthesize many principles.

²Most errors of judgement arise because not all facts or principles have been considered.

The one committing such an error has concentrated on one principle, having no idea of how many more other principles are required. Injudiciousness believes that one principle will suffice and that this principle can be used indiscriminately.

³People pick up a fact and at once make statements starting from that fact, having no idea of how irrational this procedure is. Often a thousand facts combined are required for a passably reliable statement.

⁴The ignorant think that there is only one cause in the relation of cause and effect. Research discovers eventually that the “cause” is a whole complex of factors, discovers increasingly more factors.

⁵How many facts or principles are required depends on how complicated the matter is. The problems of philosophy, for instance, require so many principles that mankind at its present stage of development is unable to grasp it. Then more than 99 per cent of the pertaining judgements and statements are erroneous.

⁶Power of judgement is confused with the faculty of logical inference thinking. The most stupid people can draw correct conclusions. People of the highest intelligence make appalling errors of judgement. The true power of judgement appears in the realization that our learning is fictitious and our knowledge insufficient.

⁷The total lack of judgement that characterizes public opinion appears in its ignorance of facts and principles. “Whenever a truth is embraced by a majority it thereby becomes a lie.” (Kierkegaard) Since ignorance cannot see that everything consists of relations, is dependent on conditions, states, and circumstances, that principles are valid for clear-cut cases that never occur in reality, that principles must be relativized, that a principle which is valid for a certain case must not be absolutized so as to be made valid for all seemingly similar cases.

⁸Learning and power of judgement are two different faculties. Learning presupposes the ability to grasp facts. Power of judgement is the ability to combine facts in the right way. People cannot do so. They can only repeat what others say. They do not even realize that anyone is right who has combined the facts right. They must first ask their professor whether it is combined right. Then they “believe”, believe they know.

⁹You are not stupid merely because you are ignorant, cannot comprehend what you never studied. You can call that person stupid who believes himself able to judge and make statements without knowing the facts. And that stupidity is seen in most conceited individuals

¹⁰People label all kinds of things to put them into the pigeonholes they believe to be the right ones, subsequently to dismiss them. They label other people, and then they are through with them. They do not grasp that all such activity demonstrates stereotyped thinking.

¹¹Correct judgements are rare and the power of judgement is a rare faculty. Many people never make the great differences between intelligence, power of judgement, and ability to apply clear to themselves. Power of judgement presupposes both intelligence and expertise, knowledge of facts and processing of these facts. It is, finally, the ability to apply that affords wisdom. People talk about theory and practice but often have superficial notions of both.

¹²All people make statements about everything. They are so clever. Wisdom, however, begins with the realization that one is an idiot: a new formulation of the Sokranean wisdom saying.

7.46 The Development of the Power of Judgement

¹The power of judgement is the result of strenuous mental work during many incarnations. The insight gained in life upon life enters into innate instinctive understanding. It is true that facts must be acquired by the brain anew, but the ability to put these into their correct contexts becomes increasingly automatic. Anyone who has refused to accept absurdities (refused to violate his instinct of life) finds it ever easier to acquire common sense (supreme reason).

²It is the general fund of principles clearly grasped and correctly synthesized that determines a person’s level of education. All education starts from and presupposes a certain

fund of principles. If this fund is insufficient, the person learning cannot follow what is taught and cannot synthesize the new principles that are imparted by the by. He must misunderstand them and apply them in a wrong way. General injudiciousness is the outcome of this condition.

³The more facts and principles we acquire the more correct our judgement is. Note this: the more correct, not infallible. We approach step by step the infallible judgement, which presupposes omniscience in the matter.

⁴Talk about education goes on in infinitum without people even having made the essential point clear to themselves: the aim of education. This is the development of the power of judgement. The majority of “educated” people have acquired learning of a great number of facts and principles. These are insufficient for a factually correct judgement, which presupposes expertise. They are sufficient, however, to that pseudo-knowledge and that sophistry which characterize the education of our times.

7.47 Absolutization and Relativization

¹We express ourselves in absolute judgements, or statements. A statement may be right in itself. When being applied, however, the statement is wrong, which is due to the fact that the realities to which the statement refers consist of relations. To be right the statement need to be relativized. The paradox is a typical example of relativization of two opposite, absolute statements. The more ignorant you are, the more often you make absolute statements. To simple minds, to the ignorance of life, everything is absolute. The more you understand, the more seldom you absolutize.

²The same is true of facts. Facts are absolute. Relativization appears as facts are put into their right contexts.

³It is the same with principles. The principle as a principle is absolute. It must, in order to be comprehended by the lowest intellect (47:7), be given an absolute formulation. It cannot be applied absolutely, however, but must be relativized by being modified in a synthesis with other principles. Common sense precisely consists in the ability of relativization by knowledge and application of all the principles that may appertain to the matter. Insight fits the principle into the context made up of all the principles discovered by experience. That is the way in which the principle gains its right significance and practical usefulness.

⁴To make correct statements you must have total knowledge of the matter in question. You practically never have, until you are sovereign and possess complete knowledge.

⁵An esoteric axiom says that partial knowledge is not knowledge. This is especially true of the knowledge of life. People absolutize all principles they pick up. You cannot judge by one principle only, if knowledge of several, of many, of a “thousand” principles is required for right judgement. To be able to learn you must learn one principle at a time. Ignorant people begin at once to judge by one single principle they have learnt. In most cases the result of this must be idiotic.

⁶Facts alone make up the basis of knowledge and, therefore, of judgement. Those cases are extremely rare where one fact is sufficient to judge something in life; so rare they are that you may safely disregard them. A completely new fact, added to all the other facts, at once changes the whole in some respect. We learn from life, and life causes those who reflect to re-think almost everything.

⁷At lower mental stage thinking moves from ground to consequence. This is “thread thinking”, thinking along one narrow thread at a time. But life can be compared to an immensely complex “fabric” having thousands of knots at every square centimetre. The intuition consists in the instantaneous perception of all those thousands of knots in their various connections, and in the increasingly rapid perception of all details.

7.48 Academic Education

¹Academic education is specialized training which often produces specialists with one-track minds. Whenever university graduates make statements outside their speciality they demonstrate their incompetence. Even within the specialty itself theoretical studies are seldom sufficient, and that is why many an experienced practitioner, who has had opportunities to pick up essential facts, often has a better judgement than the one lacking in experience.

²Sometimes we have had the opportunity of meeting doctors whom we once knew as students. And, amazingly, we got the impression that they have become stupidized, that they cannot any longer think with the same clarity and freedom as they used to. They have become dogmaticized, make use of academic clichés, have become fixed in set lines of thought. From having demonstrated quick perception, the ability to draw correct conclusions from new facts, they have become logically immobilized, intellectual bores, unable to think in other ways than the ones taught to them. They have acquired views which they keep to, which is always fatal, since views, like hypotheses and theories, are soon replaced by other ones. They do not like new ideas, new perspective on existence. Above all they dislike common sense. There must be some fundamental flaw in academic education. Instead of fostering live human beings, wide-awake to all the undiscovered sides of life, it churns out zombies.

7.49 The Dubbing of Geniuses

¹Only in rare exceptional cases are his contemporaries in a position to decide whether the individual is a genius. Many so-called geniuses hardly possess talent. These judges may consort with true geniuses for years and years without suspecting the genius. We demonstrate that we are reliable judges by refraining altogether from valuing and classing people. We cannot judge others, for we know too little.

²Goethe quite realized that Schopenhauer was a man of considerable intellectual capacity, but not that he was a genius. In contrast, Schopenhauer was fully aware of Goethe's greatness.

³An "axiom" of would-be-wisdom, which biographers seldom fail to enounce to reveal their lack of judgement, is that "geniuses generally show a notoriously bad judgement in their choice of company". Geniuses never have the opportunity of choosing the people they consort with. They must be happy if anyone cares about them at all. The people they associate with are mostly eccentrics of dubious reliability.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THINKING

7.50 Reasoning Power

¹Reasoning power, the ability to think, the use of one's mental consciousness must be acquired through methodical and systematic work.

²Ignorance is due to the absence of facts of reality but also to inability and reluctance to use the existing facts. Most people want to avoid thinking.

³At lower stages of development people are very reluctant to rethink. They want to keep to the fictions they have once acquired. Assimilating or elaborating a new mental system is too tiresome.

⁴Mental development consists in our acquisition of the ability to form concepts, to formulate ever greater abstractions, from concrete concepts (chair) to abstract concepts (furniture), subsequently to ever more comprehensive principle concepts, perspective concepts, system concepts, until we in using the intuition catch all relations in an intuition concept. Language does not yet have the words for the pertaining realities, which demonstrates mankind's ignorance of life, lack of experience of life.

⁵The concept retains what is common in a number of real physical things or events (for

example the concept of table retains tables of all kinds, of all shapes and colours). The principle is the corresponding summary of what is common to a group of similar concepts. The perspective is the summary of principles, and the system is the summary of perspectives. Acquiring the perspective we approach the ability to apprehend the causal idea with its reality content, like a photographing of reality surveyed where the least detail is distinctly observable with all its relations.

⁶The artist learns how to observe reality so accurately that he is able to represent its shapes and colours from imagination. This is the faculty of visualization, the first step in a method that brings about causal consciousness. As this faculty is being developed, that need of definitions which characterizes the concept fades away, and then you know because you see. When the individual has acquired the faculty of mental objective consciousness, vision becomes an automatic process, and then he sees whatever he wants to in the physical world independent of distance.

⁷On the other hand, clairvoyance (emotional objective consciousness) affords only most unreliable images, because they are constantly changing under the influence of your own and other people's emotional and mental consciousness. One might say that what you see is as unreliable as people's learning and power of judgement, the views of public opinion. It is in any case never exact, always in some respect "deformed", unclear, diffuse. Often a distorted image is obtained.

7.51 Different, Ever Higher Kinds of Thinking

¹The different kinds of consciousness of the mental molecular kinds will be elucidated by esotericians in the future. Until then we shall have to content ourselves with rather infantile divisions of the different modes of expression of mental consciousness.

²For the time being, the ability to think can be divided into six classes: 1) absence of pseudo-reason, 2) pseudo-reason, 3) ability to parrot, 4) ability to reformulate the ideas of other people (which is regarded as independent thought and is largely all you need to be appointed professor), 5) ability to think new ideas, 6) ability to foresee discoveries of new ideas and facts. An essential distinction must be made between ignorance of facts and inability to use facts.

7.52 Simplest Inference Thinking

¹Thinking on the lowest mental level can only move step by step with the simplest motion of identities from concept to concept. Each fact must be separated and absolutized, as if it were the only essential, the only existing thing, so that it can be apprehended and slowly impressed (the mental molecule forced into the brain-cell, where it sits in its isolation and is the one and only, absolute truth). However, the use of this procedure impedes the reasoning activity, and those who are able simultaneously to apprehend many facts requisite to the understanding of the matter are paralysed in the work of reflection that otherwise had been possible for them. When a concept, a fact is absolutized, it has lost its significance, which is clear only from its being put into a context with other facts.

7.53 Principle Thinking

¹Principle thinking, absolutizing everything and regarding logical necessity as the absolute, the basis of all thinking, has in all times resulted in absurdities. Throughout the history of philosophy it has led thinkers astray. Logical formalism must be given a subordinate position in thought. Probably it cannot be entirely disposed with until causal intuition supersedes "logic". It is a necessary intermediate stage mankind is at until it has learnt how to think, which it cannot yet do. The masses do not think at all. They parrot, and that is the function of the mental robot. Only when the individual is able to say, "this thought I have thought all by

myself”, will he be able to begin thinking.

7.54 *Would-Be Wisdom*

¹It is very common to hear people who are untrained in philosophy – and this means all who have not studied the works of the philosophers themselves, but only the history of philosophy – make statements about what the philosophers “actually meant”, what they should have said and done instead of what they said and did. Long afterwards they are very wise and masters of wisdom.

²Human wisdom is would-be wisdom. It is probably long yet before that insight has become general, before they have seen the general injudiciousness even of the so-called intelligentsia in everything outside a sphere of very limited experience. So-called education (general orientation in life) should have inculcated the understanding of our small prospects of judging and that every judgement (except trifles) requires a knowledge of facts and an expertise that are present only exceptionally. Actually only the expert can realize how much is required for a correct judgement within one’s own field. People should have been taught that much in school and at the university. Has anyone learnt it?

³The simplest truths, those ones closest at hand, the self-evident truths properly speaking, are the hardest ones to find. They still have not grasped that. You may hear from those who have been told that the trinity of matter, motion, and consciousness are the basic factors of existence: “But that is so self-evident it needn’t even be said!” A statement which demonstrates that the person making it has no idea of the great deficiencies of the intellect in its apprehension of reality. The esoterician is taught that all knowledge is self-evident, is the simplest of all simple things, but that it is quite impossible for our intellect to discover it without aid. This should give also the mystics food for thought, those who believe that the truth is inconceivable. It is quite the opposite. The truth is the most self-evident thing, and that is why it is out of reach of reason of lower kinds. And that is our salvation, because otherwise mankind at the stage of barbarism (children and bandits) would annihilate all life.

7.55 *Emotional Thinking*

¹Mankind is at the emotional stage. Few people have reached the mental stage proper, perspective consciousness (47:5). Even the intelligentsia when thinking deal with mentalized emotional forms. Their thinking is a kind of emotional thinking, what is called *kama–manas* in Sanskrit.

²Ideal is an emotional phenomenon, a down-scaling or emotionalization of a mental idea.

³Only an esoterician can comprehend that emotionality and mentality are part of the super-physical, of two superphysical worlds.

⁴Wishful thinking distorts reality.

⁵The desire to believe not only generates illusions and fictions but also brings about manifest reluctance to consider facts.

⁶The desire to understand, to be spared doubts, to escape unclearness, etc., often has the effect that we content ourselves with too simple explanations, too simple systems of thought. This is what makes cheap ideologies so easily accepted.

⁷The successes of political ideologies are due to the herd tendency, dependence, the individual’s fear of being different from others.

⁸The eternal “I can’t believe”, “I can’t imagine” of emotional thinking seems to presuppose that the nature of reality or the processes of existence are dependent on what we believe or imagine. When will mankind learn this fundamental fact that it is quite unable to attain knowledge where the problems of world view are concerned, that everything we know is a gift to us from the planetary hierarchy?

⁹Esoterically emotionalists are termed negative, mentalists positive in a life sense. In this

connection, “negative” means that the monad’s conception is determined by the vibrations of the envelopes, also vibrations of collective “thought-forms” (mankind’s illusions and fictions, ideologies, etc.); “positive”, that the monad’s conception is self-determined. The intelligentsia still believe in authorities, of course, but that demonstrates that the intelligentsia are at the emotional stage. In fact, it is in the very nature of thinking that it gradually becomes independent in the individual. The risk involved in this process is that people believe that they can think right without facts.

¹⁰When the monad tumbles down into the solar plexus centre (the emotional world), reason is eliminated. Then you must wait until it returns to the throat centre (the mental world).

¹¹As long as mankind is at the emotional stage, it is of the greatest importance that all concepts are exactly defined, for that is the only way of reducing the unclearness that characterizes the thinking of most people. Symbols are only for causal selves who do not need exact concepts. But as long as the striving of mankind is aimed at making individuals mental selves, mentality with its concretizing activity and putting of concepts into their right contexts so as to make an ordered system must be the foremost requirement for a scientific work. The matter aspect is the essential one for the monad in the first triad; and the consciousness aspect, for the second self. Second selves may well be subjectivists, but if first selves adhere to subjectivism, they run a great risk of drowning in imaginative delusions.

¹²The mystics at the higher emotional stage (48:2,3) reach the insight that there is only one religion, expressing itself in the will to unity. The mentalist at the higher mental stage (47:4,5) arrives at the realization that there can be only one philosophy, only one correct scientific conception of reality. It will be long before theologians, philosophers, and scientists acquire that insight.

¹³The mentalist, who states the facts as facts, impersonally, unemotionally, emotionally unconcerned, is constantly told that he is ruthless, hard, does not have a “heart”. Anyone who knows many kind-hearted priests and loves them personally and realizes that they idiotize mankind from the noblest motives should be allowed to point this out without being considered brutal. If, not the truth is always brutal.

7.56 *Perspective Thinking*

¹Perspective thinking implies a survey of the requisite number of facts put into their contexts, so that each concept has its right relative significance and a mental vision is obtained, a total view that liberates mentality from slow inference thinking and principle thinking done with long ago. Of course this presupposes all-round familiarity with the content of the subject-matters in question. As a rule a number of new, more general conceptions (generic concepts) have been formed, which facilitates perspectivization.

²Contradictory principle thinking has in itself a tendency to absolutization which has been the psychological ground for dogmatic thinking: that a truth has only one meaning. Perspective thinking discovers eventually more and more “aspects of the truth”. It might be said that thinking in thesis–antithesis–synthesis forms the transition to the faculty of perspective thinking of discovering more and more relations.

³To the human intellect relations are practically unurveyable. We obtain perspective consciousness by not stopping at a judgement as the final one. We constantly find new relations that necessitate constantly modified judgements. Impatient people make the objection, “anyone who wants to have a hundred viewpoints on each thing will never arrive at a standpoint”. A reply to this may be that no standpoint, however necessary it may be in a situation that requires the taking up of a stand, can be considered absolute, unless absolutely all the facts have been ascertained and put into their right contexts, something that is possible only in the simple, trivial circumstances of everyday life, such conditions as everyone can ascertain.

⁴The human cultural élite should endeavour to emancipate themselves from the scholastic juggling with concepts and the scientific pedantry with insignificant data, and instead aim at the acquisition of perspective consciousness and of system thinking with simultaneous survey of the reality content of the system.

7.57 *System Thinking*

¹In the matter of concepts all thinking presupposes systems of thought as its logical basis. Without the system the concept would be isolated and lack inner connections. Thinking proceeds from generals to particulars, and this it does in ever wider concepts, principles, etc., which ultimately rest on systems. All ideologies, all disciplines are systems. Anyone who has assimilated the conceptual content of all known systems is in a position to begin thinking in systems, that procedure which forms the transition to subjective causal intuition. Objective causal intuition sees the objective material reality of the lowest three atomic worlds and how in their material processes effect follows on given causes. It also sees those factors which in the immediate future will be causes of effects in the chain of events. It sees the causes that have effected past events.

7.58 *Comprehension and Understanding*

¹There is an essential difference between comprehension and understanding. We comprehend what we have worked at, and we understand what we possess latently.

²“You can comprehend without understanding, and understand without comprehending.”

³Comprehension is mental, is the result of reflection, on one’s own initiative or with the aid of others.

⁴Comprehension consists in fitting facts or ideas into their right contexts.

⁵Science helps us to comprehend. Fiction literature can be a shortcut to understanding of what we have learnt to comprehend.

⁶You can teach people how to comprehend, but you cannot teach them understanding. Under the impact of the lecturer’s strong mental vibrations, many people can for the moment grasp the meaning of what is said in the lecture. Afterwards, however, when these impressions have faded, much has become unclear what was formerly so clear. This is often the case when latent learning does not pre-exist.

⁷To give an account of the Pythagorean hylozoic system is a simple matter. But to realize that it agrees with reality is quite another matter.

⁸Understanding is spontaneous, instantaneous conception, which ignorance calls intuition.

⁹Experience is necessary to understanding. Without your own experience it will be comprehension at the utmost.

¹⁰Understanding is recognition and is due to the fact that the individual has in previous incarnations acquired learning and worked it up.

¹¹Working up in the mental world after the end of the incarnation not only affords clarity but also brings about (when learning is exact, “causal”) a contact with causal consciousness in this respect. This is what affords understanding.

¹²There is remembrance of another kind: the facility with which the subconscious masters what you have once comprehended. This affords no understanding in the esoteric sense, however, even if it amounts to conceptual sovereignty, an ability which most great orators display.

¹³For comprehension to turn into understanding it is necessary that theoretical learning is put into practice, is used in real life. Everything else is a makeshift recourse. The normal individual is a subjectivist in everything except that which directly refers to visible reality. He must employ mental constructions, which always are more or less unclear, vague, inexact.

¹⁴It is not necessary to have the same kinds of experiences time and again in life after life.

Very many of them are below the individual's level. Often he learns from the experiences of other people, since his latent memory is brought to life of what he sees and hears of other people's mistakes.

¹⁵There are things which require such a thorough working-up that a long sojourn in the mental world is needed for its consummation. Many thoughts in which we took only a passing interest during our earthly lives can later ripen into ideas.

¹⁶People believe they understand when they can fit new fact into the fiction systems that control them. However, they understand only when their system of thought agrees with reality.

¹⁷Just as there can be comprehension without understanding, so there can be understanding without comprehension. You can understand hylozoics without being able to explain it or having made all the facts in their contexts clear to yourself. Anyone who has the experience and its working-up latent in his subconsciousness from previous incarnations has an immediate understanding of a similar experience in his new life. But that does not mean that the individual immediately comprehends and can explain what he understands. Understanding is the self's remembrance anew. Comprehension is the brain's work. For understanding to be turned into comprehension it is necessary that the new brain assimilates the requisite facts and works them up into a system.

7.59 *Idea*

¹When they see how the world is ruled (with a minimum of "wisdom"), many people refuse to accept Platon's dictum, "ideas rule the world". Then they have not understood what Platon meant by "idea". There are many principal kinds of ideas, ideas of different degrees of reality content (truth content): from such "ideas" as emotional illusions and mental fictions to Platonic causal ideas, essential (46) ideas, and ideas of still higher kinds in an ascending series all the way to those cosmic ideas which direct the processes of manifestation. Idea in the ordinary sense of the word "idea" is more or less the same as mental conception; it may be however false. In the esoteric sense, the word "idea" denotes only "reality ideas", energies endowed with finality that are directed by collective beings having knowledge of reality.

²The more the individual develops mentally, the simpler the ideas appear. While the reality content is widened and becomes increasingly inclusive, the formulation becomes ever simpler, so simple that such readers as have not had the corresponding experiences and so have not worked them up do not apprehend the reality content of those ideas.

³It is so difficult to understand new ideas because all apprehension spontaneously starts from the individual's system of thought, which is largely subconscious, a result of his working-up of his own experiences in past lives. New ideas imply new experiences and their working-up, and are adjusted in this process to the old system, which brings about a modification of it. This modification requires a mental work that most people either are unable to do or unwilling to take the trouble to do.

⁴The individual's religion, philosophy, scientific world view is conditioned by his nation, environment, and dominant view. Only those capable of experiencing a causal idea can present something essentially new. In this it is to be noted that every future coxcomb prophet who has heard the word "causal idea" will regard his fancies or misconceptions as causal ideas. Even now readers of occult literature are ready to "preach the gospel" as if they had mastered the absolute system of knowledge. They should first learn to be silent.

7.60 *Intuition*

¹The intuition always contains some prevision. Since all events are determined by causes in the past (along with the new factors that are added in the present), prevision of various degrees of probability (certainty) is possible, the degree being dependent on the perspective, which in its turn is determined by the requisite facts in their right contexts.

²Living with his emotional illusions and mental fictions (in a chaos of facts), man is in no position to have intuition. It is this general disorientation that has been called “wandering in darkness” or “living in appearances”. Assessment is made more or less at random.

³Inspiration comes either from the superconscious or from without through telepathy.

⁴Instinctive, rapid understanding is called “intuition” by many people. When appearing as rapid assimilation of facts, for example in a Goethe, it indicates that the individual has acquired perspective consciousness (47:5).

⁵True intuition is the discovery of the hidden causes of effects in unfolding events. Objective causal consciousness sees the pertaining processes of matter and energy as well, the entire course of events in the chain of causes and effects.

⁶There are many kinds of intuition. In the future, when consciousness is studied from the esoteric angle, it will be deemed necessary to define these different kinds: mental intuition (47:4), causal intuition of three kinds (47:1-3), essential intuition of seven kinds (46:1-7), etc.

⁷The simplest truths are the hardest ones to find and the easiest ones to understand once you have received the explanation. But their discovery requires, where the most fundamental truths are concerned, the highest mental capacity and the greatest possible experience. This is the deficiency, seemingly paradoxical, of the human intellect. We must start from the simple truth and thus walk the entire way through all complicated relations, until we discover the self-evident truth in what is directly given. This is also what has been the crux of all philosophy. The wise man is humble, for he has all too often been made to see that he was an idiot when he thought himself wise.

⁸Intuition makes man humble, for its revelations indicate such things as he afterwards consider obvious and as he has seen without seeing, has not possibly been able to discover. Therein, too, lies the difference between intellect and intuition. The intellect can analyse for a thousand years what the intuition sees and knows.

THE ABILITY TO THINK

7.61 Introduction

¹People believe they are able to think, which is a great mistake. They have been taught parroting, and they believe that is thinking. If anyone dares to think for himself and say something that others have not read or heard before, thus do not recognize, he is faced with the question, “who said that?” You must be able to invoke some generally recognized authority. Otherwise it is not science, is not scholarship, cannot be correct. The independent thinker replies to that question, “I said it”, and notices how a general ridicule spreads over the faces of those present. The poor wretch has made a fool of himself. For himself he observes that he has got into the wrong company.

²Most people cannot think since they have not acquired the ability of activity in the consciousness of the lowest mental molecular kind but one (47:6). Simple inference thinking (47:7) hardly deserves the name of “thinking”. Real thinking begins with the faculty of differentiation, of discrimination, of conception of main issue and side issues.

³Events are the result of a great number of interacting factors. The simple intellect discovers one factor and so believes it has explained it all, having no idea of the absurdity of such a manner of explanation.

⁴The fundamental flaw of people’s so-called thinking is that they believe and presume, this never-ending speculation without facts or sufficient facts. You may dismiss most of people’s talk by questioning what facts they base it on. Having heard or read something does not equal knowing the facts. Gossip, above all, is 99 per cent imagination pure and simple. This never-ceasing gossip makes those who have begun reflecting for themselves avoid as much as possible such company as only serves to while away time in those who are unable to activate

themselves, occupy themselves with something sensible.

⁵Man learns by comprehending real things and the relations between those things by means of his mental consciousness (47:7). He learns right relations with human beings and all living creatures through the higher emotionality (48:3).

⁶It is by ascertaining facts and combining them that man develops his faculty of reflection and inference. There is a great difference between the facts we are given by others and those we ascertain for ourselves. Only what we have experienced ourselves has a lasting reality value.

⁷In most cases we are compelled to accept facts without our own examination of them. Where exact disciplines are concerned (those which can be treated mathematically) we can reasonably accept facts that have proved tenable in practice. As regards descriptive disciplines, however, there is no ground of principle for a firm conviction. And as regards speculative disciplines (theology and philosophy, for instance) it all remains a matter of belief.

⁸Man is ignorant of reality and life. In so far as mankind develops, increasingly more facts are acquired (by being ascertained, not by speculation), which are put into contexts that are conceivable for the time being, into systems. These systems are constantly changing because new facts are being added. This is a condition which people do not seem to have realized yet. Otherwise they would not be so loath to rethink and replace their old system with a new one. But people evince a marked reluctance to use their reasoning power. Thinking is apparently too great a strain on them. They want to be “left alone in their world of ideas”. You must not, however, if you want to develop mental consciousness and increase your knowledge of reality. That is a work which never ends. And the system you have got is just a provisional one. When will philosophers realize this?

⁹People seem to have difficulty in learning from their experiences. They prefer to keep to their theories, although at least the intelligentsia should have realized that they have all proved untenable. Those theories have engraved themselves so deeply that they make thinking outside the tracks indicated by the theories impossible. The poor wretches have nothing else to keep to, and you must have some firm ground on which to stand. The only rational ground has been rejected by the authorities without examination, and authorities must surely know. Otherwise they would not be authorities. That is the logic of people’s thinking.

7.62 *Learning Does Not Afford Us the Ability to Think*

¹School and university education aims at teaching people, not to think right but to think theologically as theologians, philosophically as philosophers, and scientifically as scientists, to think in accordance with the ideologies ruling and by the methods prescribed. Esoterics breaks with all this. Small wonder then that most people are unable to comprehend hylozoics. They have never been taught how to think for themselves. *An Esoterician’s View of the History of European Philosophy* in KofR was an attempt at making people think for themselves and setting them free from the work of studying philosophy. Instead you may hear people say that they have to study philosophy in order to read Laurency.

²Learning does not afford the ability to think logically, to distinguish main issue from side issues, to see what is essential in all things. You are not fit to be a lawyer merely because you have a degree in law. So-called hedge lawyers (without degrees, “natural talents”, having an innate reasoning power) are often much more acute. Power of memory is all you need to obtain your degree. So much cramming seems rather to have a stupidizing effect. People take a course and believe at once that they are experts. Precisely such courses demonstrate that people must be fed the thoughts of others. Thinking for oneself may be risky. Lots of pedagogy makes people mentally passive, inactive, merely receptive. The right methods force people to think for themselves, develop their reasoning power. Robot thinking is not self-

initiated thinking. Most people think by stereotypes. It is a rare event if you chance upon someone who brings up his own thoughts. You recognize the thoughts that are just adopted from others. Habitual thinking and parroting is what most people call thinking. And they believe would-be wisdom to be wisdom.

7.63 Philosophy Should Teach Us How to Think

¹The aim of philosophy should have been to train the faculty of reflection, to teach people how to think for themselves instead of parroting what they have learnt from others. But its aim is instead to make the students memorize the fictions produced by the thinkers: lessons in parroting.

²At a philosophical seminar a diligent quoter was enjoined to “think for himself”. The quoter was an erudite gentleman who interspersed his talk with “Roman quotations bright as steel” and other quotations from a great number of thinkers through the ages. He was a typical example that you may be “omniscient” without having a judgement of your own. When will people realize that learning and erudition are not wisdom, not even knowledge? Quite the reverse, experience seems to demonstrate that the greater the learning, the weaker the power of judgement. What we have learnt from the ancients is mostly misunderstood. The “humanities” deal with illusions and fictions, and the mathematical disciplines with the matter aspect of existence and technological application. But neither humanistic nor mathematical disciplines can afford us a tenable world view and life view, a tenable working hypothesis.

7.64 Accept Nothing without a Sufficient Ground!

¹The ability always to distinguish what you know and what you do not know is a difficult art, for it presupposes the development of the power of judgement. Philosophers have certainly put forward the thesis: assume nothing without a sufficient ground. But then the question arises: what ground is to be considered sufficient? Philosophers have in all times contented themselves with subjective proofs, which has led to the saying that proofs prove nothing at all. The only tenable proofs are the requisite objective facts.

²Before you “assume” something, you should ask yourself: what facts do I have for it? Through assiduous exercise in this respect you eventually learn how to distinguish what you know from what you do not know. Soon enough you will learn that you are very ignorant. Anyone who believes himself “clever” is the victim of his own conceit, his own fancies.

³Most people are unable to distinguish what they know and what they do not know. They have never reflected on why they accept something as true, why they consider precisely that authority infallible and omniscient, precisely that paper pope to be in possession of the absolute “knowledge”. An esoterician accepts no freaks (“ingenious ideas”), makes no assumptions without adequate facts that agree between themselves in all respects. He concurs with Sokrates, who knew that he knew nothing (worth knowing). Those who have not arrived at that realization are bereft of common sense.

⁴There would not be so many erroneous views, if people learnt how to distinguish what they know and what they do not know. Strictly speaking, they do not know more than what all can ascertain. If they venture beyond that, they will need grounds based on facts for every assumption.

⁵One is every now and then amazed at “prominent authorities” who dare to make themselves world views and life views on the basis of opinions held by earlier philosophers or accept the hypotheses of research as logical grounds on which to erect further constructions. For sure such views are obsolete after ten years. Does such an enterprise demonstrate a responsible attitude? They may have been successful and achieved worldwide fame. Was that the main reason? The fact that they have misled thousands of people and idiotized them for an incarnation or more does not seem to bother them much. But perhaps they should think it over

a bit, if they knew that they had blocked the way for themselves and that they must fall victim to mad fictions once again.

7.65 *Relativism*

¹Spencer's somewhat careless expression, "everything is relative", has been transformed by academic would-be wisdom into "every truth is relative", so that truth has been made subjective, a matter of taste. It would hardly amaze us if causal idea research should find that those academic authorities who deliver such rubbish are reincarnations of those sophists who sought to idiotize the Athenians in the days of Sokrates.

²According to the esotericians there is an absolute truth which must be one and immutable, since it affords us the true knowledge of reality. In contrast, the relativists hold that the truth is what a given epoch deems true. Disorientation can hardly be more serious. How little they have understood Platon to whom the truth was accessible in the world of ideas. However, since that world is not accessible to mankind at its present stage of development and the authorities of would-be wisdom, the life-ignorant guides of mankind, cannot reach it, Platon must be degraded to a dreamer.

³Those who assert that "everything is relative" do not realize that this would imply that "the absolute is relative". Perhaps they now see the absurdity of their assertion. If not, they should refrain from philosophizing.

⁴Relativism is masked skepticism. But as one thinker said, "Every good beginner is a skeptic, but every skeptic is but a beginner."

7.66 *Absolute*

¹The term "absolute" has been abused almost as often as it has been used, since few there are who know its proper meaning. Absolute in a logical sense is every right application of the law of identity ("law of thought"), every right ascertainment of a fact, every right conclusion. Concepts are absolute as concepts and if they agree with reality, which seldom is the case.

²According to Swedish philosopher Boström, "philosophy is the doctrine of the absolute and the explanation of the relative from it". More simply put it is an infinite noise about an infinite being.

³The same may be said of the word "god" as of "the absolute". It is abused every time it is used, because it has been idiotized.

⁴When Hägerström asked whether the "present" is subjective or objective, Hedvall replied: "It is absolute." That is an answer which philosophers should take to heart.

7.67 *The Law of Identity*

¹If logic means every application of the law of identity, then all correct consciousness perceptions must be logical. It seems as if the opposition logic – psychology has caused a confusion of ideas to the effect that logic is deemed unnecessary to psychology. However, the law of identity is absolute just as causal law. In the paradox the law of identity is well masked. Its discovery requires experience, often humour (sense of proportion). Attempts at "developing logic" carry certain risks of which both Hegel and Russell are demonstrations. It is so easy to lose sight of the law of identity.

²Practically all philosophers in the West and the East have sinned against the "this is this" of the fundamental law of identity ("law of thought"). Had the known how to apply it right, they would have avoided most of their misconceptions, they would not have fallen victim to the freaks of their ignorance. It is high time they realized this. This law of thought prohibits the use of a conception of reality from one world in another world. The conception of reality of each world is something apart. The law of analogy makes it possible to draw conclusions from the different worlds, but must not be applied so as to abolish the law of identity.

7.68 System

¹The experiences of the individual during thousands of incarnations are gathered into units (“systems”), which rule in the subconscious as instinct (spontaneous conception). This does not mean, however, that mankind at its present stage of development is able to think in systems. It cannot, and immature attempts at doing so will only result in superstition and counteract the system thinking of the future. Mankind must be content with generalizing and putting facts into their right contexts.

²Man must have a system, however, if he is not to live in a mental chaos. That is why many people revert to old systems they abandoned once. A philosopher once stated: “What do I care for truth, if only I have clarity.” This statement has of course been misunderstood by all who were not familiar with the way of looking at things that dominated philosophy. To this philosopher the “truth” was something inaccessible on which all must always disagree. “Clarity”, on the other hand, was a firm mental system (the highest construction accessible to thought) that afforded its possessor certainty and security, a starting position from which he could assess the realities of life and the grounds of right action. Even if it sounds strange, his statement showed an exceedingly uncommon insight and understanding of the fact that precisely the “system” is man’s most important possession.

³The dissolution of the old systems of thought, which certainly were the constructions of ignorance, has had deplorable effects in many respects. The inductive method does not yield any certainty. To be able to think exactly you must proceed from generals to particulars, use the deductive method. All real conception is by nature deductive. You comprehend by proceeding from what is general, from the principle, to what is particular. That expedient does not exist any more when you have not found any context or do not want to admit any one. Hypotheses constitute such contexts, but they are too short-lived for perspective thinking to admit them as valid.

⁴How about taking the trouble of examining Pythagorean hylozoics, which made up the basis of thought in the old esoteric knowledge orders? That system has in all times demonstrated that is incontrovertible. It afforded the initiates an unshakable ground and an absolute sovereignty in their thinking. However much they still persist in refusing to concern themselves with hylozoics, they will nevertheless finally be forced to accept it. It is the same old story: obstinately keeping to the views they are used to, however insufficient they be. When will they learn to see through the idiocy of that tendency?

⁵There are already many people who are learned in esoterics, and chock-full of esoteric facts. They could be excellent encyclopedias. But they lack in judgement. They live in a mental chaos of isolated facts. Without the absolute system of knowledge facts end up in the wrong contexts, are misinterpreted and distorted. Erudition is not wisdom, is not even knowledge and understanding. Facts are absolute but meaningless if they are not made relative by being put into their right contexts.

⁶The realization that all doctrines except the absolute system of knowledge are beliefs should eventually teach people that it is meaningless to try to force one’s illusions and fictions on others. Probably it will take at least five hundred years until a sizeable minority has realized this.

7.69 Language

¹We speak different languages, even if we use the same words. Everybody puts his own conception into the words. That is one of the grounds why people at different stages of development find it difficult to understand each other and why misunderstandings abound. Esotericians in particular have that experience. Most of what he says is misunderstood. He constantly hears that he has said something that he quite simply cannot have said. It has even happened that he is alleged to have written something that he never wrote. What he writes is

largely misapprehended, so this merely confirms what has been said here.

²If a new word is adopted into the common usage, it very quickly loses its original sense. Often it becomes the designation of the most varied things. Strange enough this happens in philosophy and science as well, so that new terms have to be found to denote the thing in question. You may think that at least the philosophers should find the original sense and be able to stick to it. The general vocabulary apparently is too poor to suffice for all concepts.

7.70 Auxiliary Concepts Are Necessary

¹“Peu nous importe que l'éther existe réellement” (“It matters to us little whether the ether really exists”) are the famous words with which Poincaré started his lectures on the mathematical theory of light. What he meant was that the ether hypothesis was an auxiliary concept that made it easier for us to comprehend scientific principles.

²The same may by and large be said of our philosophical and scientific concepts. They are auxiliary concepts which are eventually replaced by more expedient ones. This does not imply, however, as modern concept analysts seem to think, that they can be safely discarded. Quite the reverse; they are necessary, if mankind will ever acquire exact or final concepts. Without them, the “thought machine will run idle”, which, to be sure, it already does in the semanticists.

³This is true in esoterics as well. Esoterics must in many cases use auxiliary concepts, before the understanding of exact concepts is possible. The critique of such concepts evidences an inability to see the educational importance of auxiliary concepts.

7.71 Logic

¹Logic cannot yield knowledge. The history of philosophy in its entirety is one long demonstration of the fact that logic cannot produce knowledge, cannot determine whether knowledge is knowledge or whether fiction is fiction. Whatever is mere logic may be however false. Life reduces all logic to absurdity. Logic is turned into fictitious logic when not starting from facts and keeping to them all the way. Logic cannot explain anything. Only the knowledge of facts and factors can afford a correct explanation. Logic is no criterion of truth.

²All logical constructions using hypotheses and theories sooner or later prove to be false. Their usually short lives demonstrate their unreliability. Logic refutes by pointing out “formal” contradictions, not by finding factual errors. Using logic they have refuted everything rational and proved that all new knowledge is not knowledge.

³Esoterically, the logical process, the process of concretion of schematic discursivity, belongs to the mode of functioning in the lowest mental molecular kind (47:7). Logic is the simplest of all simple things and can be performed by the simplest intellect: the affirmation of identity in a step-by-step procedure.

⁴Logicists made reason the master of sense and put logic above facts. Logical argumentation replaced the experience of reality by sense.

⁵Logical certainty afforded absolute certainty. They ranked it without further ado in the same category as mathematical certainty. They overlooked the fact that mathematics is an infallible construction on the axioms of three-dimensional space and that all its constructions can be proved by visual evidence (and of course by logical induction).

⁶Deduction proves what you know, that facts are facts. Being seduced by the absolute validity of this formal schematism, they granted the same absolute weight as evidence to logical induction even when it was a matter of fictions. As long as they lacked the wee bit of knowledge of reality which we nowadays possess, they of course did not surmise that the fictions were fictions. Dogmas of countless kinds were regarded as facts. With that disdain of the material criteria of reality which characterized ignorance, they could scarcely distinguish

facts from fictions whenever dealing with the simplest “abstractions”. The dominant concepts were and still are, more widely than ignorance can grasp, constructive concepts that more often than not contained and contain something fictitious.

⁷When closely examined, logical reasoning from ground to consequence is clearly seen to rest on a process of abstraction that is as one-sided and limited as the old idea of causality, which deduced an effect from one single cause. It is the thinnest thread of a thought drawn from the tangled Gordian knot of the things and events of life.

⁸Logic formalizes, forces the idea into a form, selects a more or less arbitrary quality from the tangle of qualities and treats this isolated “abstraction” as a totality without connections. Logic absolutizes an idea, a condition, a relation, a quality. By removing something from its context, however, logic brings about the loss of relativity, which must not be lost.

⁹Logic and sense of reality have nothing in common. Logic leads us away from reality if we allow it to replace the knowledge of facts.

¹⁰In spite of its logical contradiction the paradox tells us more than a simple logical proposition.

¹¹Using analysis you will never arrive at synthesis. Analysis makes clear what exists in the synthesis, which thus must precede it. The same phenomenon is seen in the fact that particulars can be understood only from generals; and generals, from still more generals and ultimately from the idea, the Platonic reality idea, which agrees with reality and in that sense is the “truly being” (this said to those who understand symbols, which the philosophers never did).

¹²Logic can mystify and idiotize us. The Eleats, sophists, and scholastics show this. The others were helpless before this intellectual sleight of hand. If only you are sufficiently quick-witted, acute, familiar with the fictions, you can by the aid of logic prove what you want to prove to the ignorance of reality. The theologians know this.

¹³Problems are solved by reason working at the facts that sense provides through never-ending research. Knowledge is knowledge of facts.

¹⁴Admittedly, logic has a certain importance. This lies in its didactic usefulness as a method of subsequent checking for non-experts. By revealing masked errors it raises the demand for clarity and explicitness and trains the ability of clear thinking and clear expression.

¹⁵The philosophers have always sinned against those laws of thought which they have tried to formulate in their clumsy manner incomprehensible to the “uninitiated”:

¹⁶“The first law of thought reads A equals A.” Why not simply call it the “this is this of the law of identity”?

¹⁷“The second law of thought reads A does not equal not-A.” Why not call it the “not-this of the law of opposites? This cupboard cannot be that table. Learn how to distinguish a cupboard from a table!

¹⁸The law of sufficient ground (assume nothing without a sufficient ground!) was forgotten in school logic, precisely that law which is the supreme law of common sense. It was too embarrassing, since the philosophers did not possess any real facts for their assumptions.

¹⁹Another flaw of the old school logic was the invocation of the so-called third law of thought, which introduced a quantitative way of looking at things into logic. What remains must not be omitted, if man is to learn how to think right. The inductive method is suited for the scientific outlook. The deductive method is the only tenable one for ordinary thinking activity. The logicians will have to return to it.

²⁰The philosophers have believed that if they only thought logically right, then they would think right, not making clear to themselves that even the most perfect work of logic is in itself only a construction. They have believed that if only they thought logically right, then it would have to agree with reality. But this is nothing but logical superstition. Thinking logically and thinking objectively right are two different things, and only if logical thinking is factually

correct, is knowledge obtained. Logic helps us to think methodically and systematically with the material of thought at our disposal. If that material is not made up of real facts, however, logic cannot help us but will just blind us.

²¹Just as the great mistake of scholasticism was its superstitious faith in logic, so our epoch suffers from a superstitious faith in mathematics. It is a new sort of scholasticism. Logic and mathematics are only aids. Using them we produce no new knowledge, no new facts, we make no discoveries.

²²It is in consciousness that we make the discoveries, which consist in ideas. Neither logic nor mathematics finds any ideas. We receive those ideas as free gifts when we show that we want to use them in the right way: to serve life. The purpose is not that we should serve ourselves who are the enemies of life. Exaggeration? Yes, but largely true. Not only history but also our own times bear witness to this. To demand more and more for oneself, when most people are in want of the most necessary things is no demonstration of universal brotherhood. And anyone who does not want to serve life is its enemy. That axiom has not even been discovered yet. People accuse life of the misery they have caused themselves. They demand help. What for? To go on violating the laws of life?

7.72 Training in the Art of Thinking

¹Training in formal logic should be replaced with training in the art of thinking. Manuals of the art of thinking should be written. Such manuals should consist of collections of carefully selected examples of generally occurring false conclusions and errors in reasoning. That would be the best method of teaching people how to use the law of identity and the law of opposites. It would be far more instructive than the whole schematism.

²Elementary training in the art of thinking should be given even young children. Logic does not teach us how to think. Every intelligent child learns this even before he has heard of logic. Being given typical examples of illogical thinking he would learn it even faster.

³Even in the first grades at school they should teach pupils to comprehend the difference between individualization, generalization, and absolutization. There are learned men who have not realized the importance of this. Therefore, teaching people this should be begun as early as possible.

⁴Absolutization is the simplest of all simple things. Everyone can do it from long inveterate habit. Everything is absolute. It is so simple. And that idiocy persists in most people to the end of their incarnation.

⁵And then the philosophers (subjectivists) arrive, saying that everything is individual. That is quite obvious, of course. Even the sophist Protagoras at his time realized it. David Hume realized it. Bertrand Russell realized it. And all parrots say so. Only there is the error of using the word "everything", which implies absolutization. Whenever that word is used, danger is at hand.

⁶We constantly deal with concepts that are universally valid. In so far as they are fit to be such ones, they must not be subjectivized and individualized. Doing so is sophistry, consisting in extending a matter to the point of absurdity by absolutizing it, a procedure which so-called logic facilitates.

EPISTEMOLOGY

7.73 The Law of Analogy

¹"Everything repeats itself", for the movement of evolution is that of the spiral. Everything returns but in a quite different way, because everything is unique. The analogy is even the foremost logical way of looking at things, because the cosmos is built according to the law of least resistance, the law of dimensional reduction in analogy carried through. Anyone who is

to use the analogy when drawing his conclusions must, however, be cognizant of all the common factors and separating factors. More knowledge of reality is required than it is possible for mankind to acquire to be able to apply the analogy more than as a metaphor. The ability to distinguish between what is analogous (higher and lower), typical (general), and unique (particular) is not sufficient.

²The “know thyself” of the Delphic oracle did not mean that the individual is able to understand himself, or even that this is possible for him. As is the case with all esoteric sayings, also this one has different meanings. One of the most far-reaching meanings is its indication of the all-pervading analogy between the microcosm and the macrocosm; in its hermetic formulation: as above, so below.

³The law of analogy can perhaps be better understood as the law of correspondence.

⁴The structure of the cosmos has its correspondence in that of the organism, and the cosmic processes in the material processes of the envelopes.

7.74 Knowledge

¹Knowledge is power. Most people seek knowledge for their own power and glory. This means that they seek knowledge in order to abuse it. Only those who have taken their stand under the law of unity, who live in order to serve life, are ripe for power. If their aspiration is sincere, they are given opportunities to develop higher abilities, right instinct of life, insight and understanding. It is part of the wisdom of life to renounce power until you are in a position to use it right. Until then you should strive only for the knowledge that helps you to understand right.

²In their almost total ignorance of life and their perverse instinct of life (acquired through inherited views and habits), people seek the knowledge that affords power to egoism and so more opportunities to commit lots of stupidities in life that increase the number of incarnations of suffering for themselves. The wise man seeks the knowledge that affords him insight and understanding to help and serve unity and development.

³The total disorientation in reality and life has had the result that the instinct of reality and life has degenerated into perverseness. What people deem “normal” is mostly of this category. Their “common sense” is a sense misleading them to a great extent.

⁴Perverseness manifests itself in philosophy, for example. The more abstruse, the more complicated all the way to absurdity a matter can be made, the more correct philosophers believe it to be. The assertion that the knowledge of reality must be all but incomprehensible is a “philosophical axiom”. Likewise that the problems cannot be presented in a comprehensible manner to others than those who have familiarized themselves with the traditional philosophical fictions. Against this perverseness esoterics asserts positively that knowledge is facts, that ignorance is due to the absence of facts, that everything within the domain of the physical world can be presented simply, clearly, and comprehensibly, that simplicity is an essential criterion of a final solution, that the full understanding of facts about higher worlds requires objective consciousness in those worlds, that the basic facts of existence can be made comprehensible to everybody.

⁵According to Patanjali there are three possibilities of acquiring knowledge of the external world: through direct observation, through reliable information, through conclusion drawn from either of the two sources first mentioned. But man’s observation is deficient, his sources of information are unreliable, and his conclusions are uncertain. If these facts were taught to children in school, it would do them no harm.

⁶Knowledge that is not understood only turns into a new sort of superstition. Everything that is accepted on faith sinks down into emotionality and is idiotized in it.

⁷The most radical way in which the individual is liberated from his belief in superstition, whether it be religion or social ideology, is becoming a victim of it himself. Conversely, he is

strengthened in his faith by becoming a martyr for it.

⁸Many people want to have knowledge of principles and rules of action. This turns into a new kind of dogmatism. Without knowledge of reality they do not understand those principles or rules of action, do not understand why they have been laid down, do not know how to individualize them, to apply the rules rationally in individual cases and each new circumstance. Without knowledge of reality they act on their faith in authority and are not in a position to judge either the case or the rule.

⁹All knowledge is knowledge on the basis of authority in all domains we have not explored ourselves. We have received our learning from others, from teachers, textbooks, etc. We are dependent on the systems of learning we have studied. Only those who have acquired expertise through their own research in reality and life (not in scientific literature) are independent of other people's systems of thought. True insight has begun with doubt of the infallibility of one's own learning, with self-criticism, and a good share of healthy skepticism (but not dogmatic skepticism). In any case no wise man accepts anything because the tradition teaches it, we read it in "sacred writings", holy men have said it, public opinion believes it, authorities have said it, or because it seems possible or probable to us.

¹⁰Not all knowledge is remembrance. If that were the case we could never learn anything new. But if we find it difficult to grasp some matter, then this is a sign that we did not have latent knowledge of it.

¹¹In respect of knowledge practically everything remains to be discovered. And when the discovery has been made, it is required that the new knowledge be put into its right context. Every new idea implies a revelation, a whole system of thought that requires a man's whole time and attention.

¹²According to esoterics the "truth" is always immediately, directly self-evident to unconfused, uncorrupted common sense. People speak of common sense and mean what logically follows from given premises. Only their error lies in the fact that where superphysical reality is concerned 99 per cent of the premises they have accepted are false, and so "common sense" is mistaken.

¹³It cannot be too strongly inculcated that true knowledge of superphysical reality can never be a product of speculation but is a direct and, where the receiver is concerned, fully conscious gift from the planetary hierarchy. The ability to ascertain knowledge of reality is acquired only in the fifth natural kingdom. Clairvoyance does not afford knowledge of reality.

7.75 *Certainty*

¹Certainty is a very good thing when the vibrations of thought, emotion, and will are in harmony with "cosmic" vibrations. At lower stages this is regrettably the case rather seldom. Development can be said to consist in the discovery of the cosmic vibrations and the adaptation of the vibrations of one's own consciousness to them. That is a long and arduous way and nobody walks it without work. It is certainly possible to follow along in the usual jog-trot, wait until general development has reached the point where the envelopes of all people have been automatized, and then imitate the others. Anyone who prefers to be the last one in all fields need not make any effort at all. Being among the last laggards who almost have to be helped to get along is choosing an empty and flat existence. No god can deny the individual making such a choice. But of course he will have to take the consequences of it and remain at his stage of development and do the lowest chores while his clan advances to higher posts. Such drones can gain a good reaping and exceptionally in some incarnation be placed on the pinnacles of the community. But they remain parasites, and neither the law of destiny nor the law of reaping is a charitable institution.

²Certainty is always a good thing when you are right. Certainty may be disastrous and fatal, however, if you are wrong. Therefore, you have to be quite clear about the fact that certainty

as mere certainty is not sufficient, does not indicate that you have judged right, is no proof that what you are about to do is right and will succeed. No ones are as certain as blind fools.

³For the ignorant of life certainty is a treacherous state. In a war all parties are certain of their victory however idiotic such a certainty may prove to be.

⁴Certainty gives strength and endurance – a good thing if the cause furthers life. But the fool's certainty is his doom.

⁵There is the certainty of emotion, of reason, and of sense. There is moreover the certainty of instinct and of remembrance. There can also be talk of the certainty of ignorance, of egoism, and of self-will. And the certainty of emotion is of many different kinds, the certainty of belief, the certainty of hatred, etc., with all its subdivisions. Certainty is a difficult thing, and most people would be very wise not to be so certain.

⁶The purpose of this analysis of certainty is not to increase the uncertainty and despondency of its readers. It is instead an encouragement to them not to accept certainty but to test its ground. For certainty does not in itself presage success. Certain is seductive, the enticing siren that has led countless to destruction.

⁷Certainty is often a matter of temperament, a characteristic of optimists and sanguine persons in particular. It might be said that it is a "quality" of blind will in itself, which does not shrink from any obstacle because it never sees any one. To a starry-eyed sanguineous person obstacles are just illusions. But the mountain is no illusion, and the collision with the rock face may be a fatal event if you take it to be a deceptive mirage.

⁸Contemporary science affords no scientific certainty, only short-lived hypotheses, since by using the inductive method, the only one that scientists can use in their great helplessness, they never arrive at exactitude. That method proves untenable as new facts not only refute the hypothesis but also necessitate choices between an increasing number of hypotheses that make science eventually drown in hypotheses and increase resolution. Only such scientific or scholarly disciplines as can be treated mathematically receive exactitude. All the other disciplines can only borrow a false light of science from the mathematical ones. The public is not able to tell science from "science". And strange enough even scientists let themselves be deceived partly because uncertainty is too awkward, partly to stand out as authorities. For without his authority the teacher is a ridiculous figure. He must know most and best.

⁹Mathematical certainty and certainty of facts are the two only kinds of absolute certainty, the only secure ground. Everything else is more or less uncertain. There would not be so much blind belief, dogmatism, cocksureness, and intolerance, if people comprehended how insecure the ground of their wisdom is.

¹⁰As long as emotion (the "intuition" of ignorance) is the authority, and it is this in all those who have not reached the higher mentality (at least 47:5), the individual will remain injudicious in a life sense and with respect to his behaviour. This absolute emotional certainty is as incurable and as unamenable to reason as it is treacherous and seductive. It is the cause of most mistakes in life and failures. If in addition there is a pronounced self-assertion of his individual character, the individual must be grateful for a "mild destiny", if disaster does not befall him. You find this self-assertion in most leaders and authorities even in the so-called spiritual field. Certainty is no true criterion of knowledge, insight, or understanding. Nobody is as certain as the fool, he may then be just a fool but also a prophet or a professor.

7.76 Belief and Knowledge

¹In language the word "belief" is used in two different senses: belief that and belief in. It is of course only in the first sense that it appears as the opposite of the word "knowledge". Believe in, trust, have faith, confidence is surely something quite different.

²In the usual combination, "belief and knowledge", an insurmountable opposition has been intentionally presented. Then by belief is meant blind acceptance without knowledge, without

comprehension or understanding. Belief is taken as a dogma that has been established once and for all and must not be doubted, analysed, criticized. This kind of belief is based on emotion being unamenable to reason once it has been absolutized. Belief is emotional unshakable conviction that its content agrees with reality.

³Knowledge can be said to be a system of thought made of ascertained facts about reality, which may be the subjective reality of the consciousness aspect or the objective reality of the matter aspect. Isolated facts are on the whole useless. They gain their importance to knowledge by being put into their right contexts – the latter may be historical, psychological, logical, or causal.

⁴No chain is stronger than its weakest link. As for facts, most chains of facts prove to have too many weak links.

⁵We comprehend by means of systems of thought. If we analyse these systems of thought, most of them are seen to be made up of a heterogeneous combination of some definitively ascertained facts, pseudo-facts, emotional illusions (beliefs), and mental fictions (hypotheses and theories).

⁶Whether and to what extent knowledge agrees with reality is quite another matter. But the essential difference between belief and knowledge is that belief rests on an emotional basis and knowledge on a mental one. Beliefs or dogmas are unshakable, whereas knowledge by nature is amenable to criticism and changes as the knowledge of reality increases, as new facts are added.

⁷Learning should be based on facts. But people think that they can reach reality by guessing, without having to do the tiring work of ascertaining facts. Guesswork is the assumption of ignorance and is a great mistake, closely examined it is a curse on mankind. People take their guesses for facts and always draw the wrong conclusions.

⁸New facts appear correct to us if we can fit them into the fiction system we have already formed.

⁹The so-called belief of most people is a combination of trust, acceptance as true, and subjective certainty.

¹⁰There are lots of intellectuals or “educated people” who cannot distinguish between belief and knowledge. They believe they know, which implies that they have neither comprehended nor understood. It was such people that made the great Goethe give the deep-drawn sigh: “I should be most willing to carry the teacher’s burden for a long time yet, if the pupil did not at once want to be a teacher.” There are, strangely enough, those who have not yet acquired perspective consciousness (47:5) but who believe they are in a position to find faults with causal selves. This enterprisingness of ignorance and self-overestimation may be called presumption.

¹¹Belief, the blind assumption of arbitrariness, is nothing on which to base your views. Sooner or later believers find that they have “built their house on the sand”, their life view on an illusion. The only rock-bottom is fundamental facts about the three aspects of reality. Without that base a sufficiently sharp, ruthless analyst must end up in skepticism. Nothing else will hold. It is therefore not to be wondered at that mental geniuses, having seen through the ruling ideologies, end by questioning the meaning of existence, questioning whether things are ruled by laws, whether there is anything but the sovereignty of the genius. Without a bedrock basis for your conception of right, arbitrariness will be your law.

¹²We look at the Nietzschean superman apes with a compassionate smile. The question is, however, whether every one of us in some incarnation is faced with the same problem to solve it on his own, at the transition from authoritative learning to self-acquired knowledge of reality (something quite different from the philosopher’s faith in his own mental system).

¹³Many people do not realize the importance of learning how to distinguish between what you know and what you do not know. This is what everyone must do sooner or later,

however. Anyone who has learnt this has a more secure ground for his judgement. To his instinct of life and understanding of life it is vitally important that the individual comes to realize what he can know and what he cannot know.

¹⁴Belief, assumption, guesswork, hypothesis, fancy, speculation are not knowledge. Knowledge must be based on ascertained facts or on a mental system which, being without inner contradictions and irrefutable, explains what was previously inexplicable in the most universal manner. It seems as if this could not be said too often.

¹⁵Illusions are what you believe, fictions are what you assume. The level of culture appears in art and literature; the knowledge of reality acquired, in science; the wisdom of life acquired, in religion.

¹⁶Belief, comprehension, understanding belong at different stages of development. Most people believe much, comprehend less, and understand little. They are unable to assign their fictions to the different stages.

¹⁷What people call “refutation” is criticism of a system starting from another system, which they believe to be the only true one. You refute nothing by your beliefs. Let the believers be however convinced, yet belief remains just a subjective and individual opinion. If it is a collective view, this fact still adds nothing to its logical conclusive power. Billions of people have been convinced of various idiocies. What are the views of most people but beliefs? If you wasted your time on analysing the grounds of their views, you would soon find how loose they are. They believe what they have read or heard of what someone has believed.

¹⁸When mankind receives knowledge of the different stages of development, the conflict between “belief and knowledge” will be called off in the realization that it is a matter of different “working hypotheses”. It can never be anything else until the individual has attained the world of Platonic ideas and is able to ascertain facts by himself.

7.77 Our Prospect of Knowledge

¹The monad—the self can know only that which it has experienced and ascertained itself. The monad that has attained the human kingdom possesses in its subconscious the experiences it had in the lower four natural kingdoms. This is the fund of knowledge of reality that constitutes its level of development and enables its future understanding. The theoretical learning that the monad receives during incarnation it can understand to the extent that it corresponds to the monad’s latent experience. As for the rest, this learning remains an assumption for the time being, until facts have been ascertained. It is important to realize that not everything existing in the subconscious is knowledge of reality. During all our incarnations we have been fed and accepted beliefs of all kinds which, when meeting them again in a new life, we recognize and easily take for obvious. Reason must examine such things anew and ask whether they are part of that which is beyond possible human experience or seems unacceptable for other reasons. We are fully entitled to look at everything with a good share of healthy skepticism. In life after life we start from some mental system we have accepted and test its reality content in our own experience. Since all ideologies are erroneous constructions, they are eliminated in life after life, until we receive a tenable system, a true ideology which can only be a correct combination of facts we have received from the fifth natural kingdom and of reality ideas from the world of Platonic ideas.

²Whether that system is tenable can be decided only by human experience gathered during many generations. When you see how all the learned men of India are convinced that their yoga philosophy is the knowledge of reality, then this is an additional reason against a rash acceptance. That hylozoics is the supreme working hypothesis that has seen the light of day hitherto is probably not contested by those who have mastered its system.

³Thus man can from his own experience know nothing of his origin, that he is a monad, a primordial atom. He can know nothing of the reality content of his causal envelope, of higher

worlds and higher kingdoms. Man is reduced to developing common sense (common to all people of the highest mental level) and as for the rest relying on an incontrovertible mental system explaining that which other systems cannot, and does so in the simplest, most general way.

⁴Mental consciousness development goes on as emotional illusions, mental fictions, religious, moral, political, social, philosophical, and scientific assumptions or faith-based dogmas are continuously eliminated, and simultaneously as man acquires common sense, ever wider experience of reality and life.

⁵It is man's duty to himself to doubt everything he cannot accept. He has the divine right of life to be his own authority, being guided by his endeavour to understand more and more. Development is endless. If he accepts dogmas it means that he has ceased to develop.

7.78 Man Cannot Reach Knowledge

¹What philosophers and other thinkers are able to do is criticizing the work of other exoterists. Critique is almost always correct or at least warranted. Because the detection of flaws in speculative systems is wholly within the limits of physical knowledge. The greatest scientists admit without reserve the enormous limitation of science.

²Thus: they are able to criticize. But then they believe they are able to present something new. That, too, is rejected soon enough.

³We should be able to learn from all those philosophers and scientists, who have believed themselves capable of informing us about existence, how utterly unwarranted is the claim to knowledge and judgement. They were all in error. When will people learn that they can by themselves know nothing worth knowing? When will they arrive at the Sokratean realization?

⁴Man is his own authority and decides what is true and false for himself if not for other people. The objection of esoterics to this is that man's assertion of his own authority is presumption, since man is not capable of embracing reality with his thought. Reality as reality is absolute. It consists of 49 cosmic worlds each of which is totally unlike all the other ones. Each of those worlds is its own reality. The fact that man is ignorant of this state of affairs shows that he is not in a position to solve the problems of existence. The Buddha made this clear, and man should have realized it if he had had sufficient common sense.

⁵Precisely this common sense has been absent in the philosophers. The esoterician asserts that the whole of philosophy is a misleading imaginative speculation by life ignorance and will remain so.

⁶One of the most evident proofs of man's ignorance of reality and life is the multitude of different hypotheses to be found in every subject matter. Every thinking human being has a view which always in some respect deviates from that which is officially proclaimed. Every professor has his own views on almost anything. Every philosopher has his own philosophy. Every human being looks at reality in his own way. Everyone's apprehension is also a proof of his ignorance of reality, a demonstration of which illusions and fictions he has acquired on the level of development on which he is found.

⁷This is how it has always been and this is how it will remain until people have learnt how to think synthetically and have acquired esoteric knowledge. When human beings work with synthesis and not with analysis, they will be able to unite the different hypotheses into a higher perspective. When human beings have acquired esoteric knowledge, they will have learnt that superphysical reality is inaccessible to others than those who are members of the fifth natural kingdom or at least are far advanced on the path leading to it, that the true knowledge of superphysical reality which they possess they have received as a free gift from the planetary hierarchy.

⁸It would be interesting to know how many centuries it will take until human beings come to realize their enormous limitation in all respects. At best they have got to know reality in

very limited physical fields. Thousands of new fields of research await their discovery only during this new zodiacal epoch.

⁹Man has been aptly described as a “historical animal”. The organism connects him with the animal kingdom. The content of his consciousness is made up of illusions and fictions that have been collected and handed down through the ages, all of it being speculation and chiefly parrotry. Only with the advent of scientific research did human beings begin to gain knowledge of reality on their own. They began to ascertain facts and above all to experiment. They realized that knowledge implies prediction. The laboratory worker knows that he has found a relation when after thousands of experiment he can predict the result infallibly. Natural law is a constant relation. That realization, too, came with scientific research.

¹⁰Theology and philosophy are the imaginative speculations of life ignorance. Science ascertains facts within the lowest three physical molecular kinds but is more often than not unable to explain their significance, since it sees only the matter aspect, can ascertain movement (though not explain it), and is blind to the consciousness aspect. The facts that science can definitively establish can never answer the question of the meaning and goal of existence.

¹¹It seems to be long yet before the philosophers (those representatives of acuity and profundity) arrive at the realization that mental consciousness is not sufficient for the solution of the social problems and, even less, of the problems of life. Inference thinking and principle thinking cannot discover the great multitude of existing relations hidden in what seems to be the simplest problem. Philosopher Herbert Spencer pointed out the imperfections of the human intellect, but his very justified warnings went unheeded by all the keen reformers who never cared about the amount of unnecessary suffering they caused by their thoughtless legislation. Not until sufficiently many people have acquired causal intuition can it be hoped that those so-called rational beings who have in all times been self-sufficient will realize the incapacity of their reason and learn from Sokrates whose golden precept is valid after more than two thousand years. He remained the great asker who was never certain that his conclusion was right. He only asked the questions. When our wise men have advanced as far as that, they have learnt at least something.

OBJECTIVITY AND SUBJECTIVITY

7.79 Objective Consciousness

¹The philosophers have not realized yet that consciousness can be both subjective and objective – or, expressed more exactly: both subjectively and objectively determined – but have considered that it can be only subjective, which is the basic error. On this error depends the fictitiousness of the entire philosophical speculation.

²Nor have they realized that all consciousness expressions are simultaneously matter and energy. Emotions and thoughts are consciousness as well as energy and matter. “Thoughts are things.” It is not to be wondered at that their speculation has been totally abortive.

³Only objective consciousness can perceive objective material reality right, and this is true of all worlds.

⁴The objective perception of objective material reality by objective consciousness is different in each different world. Therefore, there are 49 radically different kinds of perception of reality, each of which is right in its particular world.

⁵Man has a correct world view when his concepts, principles, systems agree with objective facts that have been definitively ascertained.

⁶Since, at mankind’s present stage of development, man is not in a position to perceive more than one per cent of the entire material reality, all his statements about higher worlds are just the subjective assumptions of ignorance, and these have been called philosophy.

⁷It is perhaps understood that there must be in the physical world one perception, valid for everyone, of the matter aspect of existence; that there cannot be more than one single exact one, that matter cannot be in more than one way, independent of subjective conceptions of it, thus only one objectively valid perception. People have become so misled by subjectivism, which has dominated philosophy during most of its existence, that the difference between subjective conception and objective reality must now be made clear.

7.80 *We Occidentals Are Objectivists*

¹It is through objective exploration of nature that we become objectivists. The Greeks were the first ones to engage in objective research, culminating in the Aristotelian system of which only small remnants are extant, and misleading as such. It may be said with full justice that we owe it to the Greeks that Occidentals have become objectivists.

²The knowledge that existed before the Greeks was a gift from the planetary hierarchy and not the result of human research. As the planetary hierarchy “went under ground” and the knowledge was taught in secret knowledge orders only, human beings were thrown upon their own speculation. Thus began the reign of subjectivism, which resulted in periods of arbitrariness and lawlessness interspersed with dictatorship and terror.

³Without esoterics subjectivism will recapture its reign time and again, no matter how much science goes on working at objectivism, for science cannot explore higher worlds. And clairvoyance, while seeing objects in the emotional world, cannot judge their reality content. Rather it reinforces subjectivistic arbitrariness inasmuch as imagination is sovereign in that world. All clairvoyants (Swedenborg, Steiner, Martinus, etc.) as well as the yoga philosophers bear witness to this.

⁴Anyone who is to write comprehensible for Occidental people should be an objectivist and not, as the Orientals, a subjectivist. Subjectivists have always caused misunderstandings in Occidental people. Being a subjectivist the Oriental does not deny the existence of matter. But he disdains matter, considers it unessential.

7.81 *Sense and Reason*

¹“Sense” means objective consciousness, the ability to ascertain objective material facts. In contrast, reason is subjective consciousness, which can put facts into their right contexts. This is true in all worlds, not only the physical world.

²Of course the two terms, sense and reason, had eventually to lose their rational content and reality content. To begin with, “sense” meant apprehension according to the law of cause and effect, and “reason” apprehension according to the law of ground and consequence. The subjectivists, however, were not at all interested in keeping the two clearly apart and let the distinction fall into oblivion. The fact that they so long confused the law of cause and effect with the law of ground and consequence was due to their failure to distinguish between sense and reason and hence confusion of them.

³It is about time to restore the original meanings to words so that the confusion of ideas ruling in this respect can be brought to an end.

7.82 *“Objectivity”*

¹The word “objectivity” is used in two different senses. The one sense, belonging to the world view, refers to objective consciousness, its objectively determined perception of the material external world. The other sense, belonging to psychology, refers to matter-of-fact, impersonal conception in distinction to subjective valuation.

²“Psychological objectivity” presupposes the ability of self-criticism. Applying it you must not allow your own views on what is right and wrong, or whether the matter discussed is valuable or harmful must not influence your treatment of it. You may account for how the

matter is viewed in various quarters and in different respects but you leave it to the “public” to draw their own conclusions. Thus you are not entitled (as some people seem to think) to make the hypotheses of contemporary science your starting-point, even if you do it impersonally and matter-of-factly, to judge the matter “objectively” from that viewpoint and so consider the problem solved. Neither theology, nor philosophy or science has arrived at anything final and thus absolute. And only that which in respect of reality and life is absolute (inaccessible to man) can be made the basis of an “objective” way of looking at things. It is clear from this that the invocation of any scientific “authority” whatsoever is incompatible with “objectivity”.

7.83 *Subjectivism*

¹After the sophists introduced epistemological subjectivism into European speculation, philosophers have denied the reality of that which has been the cause and ground of their perception. In order to get to know the qualities of an object you have to study that very object. If after ascertaining those qualities with your consciousness you assert that there is only consciousness, then what you demonstrate is to common sense a proof of madness.

²Subjectivism has deprived the philosophers of the possibility of discovering the objective perception of reality by common sense as the only exact one, made so-called logical proofs more valid than universally valid, objective sense. Logic is an instrument for the processing of facts and not a criterion of reality. Using logic you can prove whatever you want to. It has always been possible to defend all kinds of madness with overwhelming “proofs”. “Proofs prove nothing at all” may be an exaggerated manner of speech but quite defensible from a psychological point of view in circles of logical fanatics afflicted with logicomania.

³Subjectivism always is individualistic, too. That is why every philosopher has had his own opinion. Reality is one, however, and the knowledge of reality must be objective and universally valid. Neither theology, nor philosophy or science will ever be able to afford a critical intellect a tenable world view. Only hylozoics can do so. Everything else is built on the sand. Skepticism is a belief, too.

⁴Individual arbitrariness as a criterion of reality and truth must lead to intellectual chaos and real arbitrariness in every life sense, to complete irresponsibility. Experience should have made that clear long ago (and history, if it consisted of facts). But no experience makes any impression on those who have assimilated a fictional system.

⁵The matter aspect is the most fundamental aspect of reality to the Occidental who possesses some knowledge of chemistry, physics, geology, astronomy, and biology. In times when this knowledge was lacking and life-ignorant religious faith saw matter as evil, it easily suggested itself to the imagination, with its exhaustless resources, to dream of an immaterial existence beyond space and time. From its starting-points, subjectivism could even prove that matter was imagination. This left the field open to any excesses of the imagination whatever.

⁶Scientific research, which is nowadays acquiring knowledge of the energy of the lowest etheric matter and so becomes practically sovereign in the purely technological process, seems to make otherwise judicious people lose their balance and rave about man’s capacity for solving the problems of existence. Thus not more is needed to make yourself god. Then you are very modest in your expectations. Then you are ignorant of everything except what is closest to yourself, ignorant of about 99 per cent of reality.

⁷The basic error of subjectivistic philosophy is the fact that it starts from consciousness as its “firm basis of knowledge” and in so doing disregards the matter aspect, not realizes that consciousness is conditioned by matter. Esoterics starts from objective material reality as the carrier of consciousness. There are as many different kinds of material reality as there are different kinds of consciousness, as many different kinds of material envelopes for the self as there are kinds of self-consciousness: sense perceptions (physical reality), feelings (emotional

reality), thoughts (mental reality), intuitions (causal objective material reality). The assessment of the individual's level of development starts precisely from the objective observation of the material composition and molecular energies of his envelopes demonstrating as light and colours. The self is found in all its envelopes as long as they are the object of the self's attention and the self identifies with them. They are the instruments of the self. "What is the self? Only a passing guest."

⁸In all ages, philosophers seem to have held reality deeply in contempt. Otherwise they probably would not have occupied themselves with the construction of systems that are as slaps in the face for all people possessed of common sense. "If reality does not conform to my system, then the fault lies with reality." If Hegel or Boström or some other subjectivist said this is irrelevant. That was the underlying thought, however, which is clear from their systems. Something of that tendency seems still to be around. The subjectivist need not care about objective reality. It is still not a general realization that it is the task of reason first and foremost to afford us knowledge of precisely that objective, material reality. Only thereafter, when the foundation has been laid by the study of the matter aspect, are we able to explore the consciousness aspect without losing ourselves in the subjectivistic imaginative delusion, which otherwise remains inevitable.

⁹It was the great merit of the Uppsala philosophers that they laid the solid basis of objective perception of reality and sought to demonstrate the errors of all philosophic systems presented so far, which all of them were subjectivisms. The demand that we do not have a logical right to accept truths that are not within the limits of the possibility of being ascertained by all (the demand for universal validity and logical inevitability) was a healthy reaction to the arbitrariness and visionary delusions of the subjectivists. Then it depends on what you mean by "possibility" and "all". If you extend the proposition so as to be worded, "being ascertained by all some time in the course of evolution", then you will have an esoteric axiom.

7.84 Typical Subjectivistic Fictions

¹All categories are constructions, and none of them has anything to do with the perception of material reality by objective consciousness. The arbitrary assumption of the subjectivists, that consciousness perceives something through categories, led philosophy astray. Reality is immediately given to us in its objective materiality.

²The subjectivists, to whom there is no external world but the one constructed by our five so-called senses (a subjective world, not having objective existence), carefully avoided the use of the term "physical world" and therefore always spoke about the "sensuous world". That expression is still somewhat used today, although its unsuitability should have been seen.

³Those logical perceptual units, which according to Kant logically synthesized psychological perceptions, are pure inventions. No such ones are needed, since the material object determines the content of consciousness. All objects radiate energy and influence the subject. But Kant could not know this.

⁴Kant's talk about "empirical reality and transcendental reality" is an untenable fiction. The use of only subjective consciousness can never produce objective consciousness. They are two radically different faculties of consciousness which must be successively acquired in the lowest three natural kingdoms. This is the reason why the monads must be first involved into the solid physical state of aggregation. Only in this matter is resistance sufficiently strong to enable the opposition of matter and consciousness and hence objective perception.

⁵From of old it is a cherished manner of speaking that all our concepts, even the objective ones, are symbols. This is the same old story once again, judging reality in one world from reality in another world. Logically it is as unwarranted as calling matter illusion. Matter is a cosmic reality, and the denial of its existence is simply a lie: a stupid and bold lie.

⁶What is objectively ascertainable, universally valid, what all are able to ascertain, is real.

The objective concept, the perception of the object itself, is no symbol.

⁷The logical concept is the perception of the thing in itself in its concrete objectivity. The remembrance of the object once observed is not the concept. Some people mean by the concept the summary of all the characteristics (descriptions) ascribed to the object. Such a concept is always incomplete.

⁸Indian learned men always prove to be more or less influenced by the Advaita illusionist philosophy, even when they do not consider themselves Advaites in other respects. Some sort of illusionism easily slips into the conception of material reality. Subjectivism is apparently hard to overcome. This is clear from the subjectivists' manner of presentation. Thus they may assert that "there is no time" in the emotional and mental worlds. By saying this they mean that consciousness is unable to record the lapse of time in those worlds, which is quite another thing. Strange to say, subjectivist ways of looking at things seem to occur even in the fifth natural kingdom. The emotional envelopes of its members are empty of all content, and they take no interest in the phenomena of the emotional world. They can even speak as if there were no emotional world at all.

⁹Boström's assertion, "to be is to be perceived, be apprehended", is a logical absurdity. Perception denotes the relation between a subject and an object, between someone perceiving and something perceived. Perception cannot simultaneously be both perception and object of perception. If we could perceive our own perceptions only, then we could not assert, "to be is to perceive". Being is self-identity. The being of an object is its identity with itself (Pontus Wikner, Axel Hägerström). "If absoluteness is the basis of all reality, then what is outside of it must be unreal." "If all knowledge must be derived from the subject (consciousness), then we cannot explain the opposition of subject and object."

¹⁰It is quite regrettable that not even such an "authority" as psychoanalyst Jung realizes the difference between subjective and objective. He says that a legend "is psychologically true in so far as it exists. Psychological existence is subjective to the extent that a conception appears in one single individual. But it is objective to the extent that it is established by a society." Here Jung confuses what is objective with what is collectively subjective. What is merely subjective can never become objective. A lie can never become objective however many people believe in it. The conception is objective only if it is true and so objectively real.

7.85 Values

¹So-called value philosophy is a typical example of the disorientation of philosophers. They speak of "two worlds", the world of matter and the world of values, as if they could be placed on an equal footing. Apparently they do not realize that objective material reality belongs to world view and subjective values are connected with life view. They confuse objective reality with subjective value.

²The value attributed to an objective thing or event is subjective, perhaps even individual. This does not affect the reality content of the thing or event. Valuation perhaps need not be emotional. Intellect, too, can value. But valuation is always subjective. Therefore, objective assessment should be strived at.

³On account of the new kind of philosophy launched by life-ignorance (so-called value philosophy), the very concept of value has lost all its rational content, and so the word "value" is now one of those many old terms that should be struck from our vocabulary. They only cause confusion of ideas. If you want to keep the word, you may consider the esoteric definition of life value (significance in life). Since life has a meaning and this is consciousness development, everything benefiting this development has a value and a value that increases as its power of benefiting increases.

7.86 *Subjective and Objective Criteria of Truth*

¹Philosophers have their own criteria of valuation. Hitherto only those philosophers have been appreciated who have presented new fictions to be added to the subjectivists' speculations of epistemological imagination. In new incarnations theologians and philosophers recognize their old systems. The recognition of a system, the facility in assimilating it, is taken as a proof that it is correct. They have found the "truth".

²Anyone seeking after reality ideas observes that philosopher Herbert Spencer with his revolutionizing theory of evolution made the greatest contribution to the development of human thought during the 19th century. Biological research received support from philosophy that had a highly seminal effect. Biologist Ernst Haeckel could describe the results of this liberating thrust at theological dogmatic thinking. Minds began waking up more and more.

³In subjective respect man is the measure of all things. And we have seen the consequences in the sovereignty of arbitrariness. Without the criteria of objectivity the consequence is total disorientation. Subjectivity has resulted in those imaginative speculations of ignorance that have hitherto idiotized mankind and brought it to the verge of destruction.

WORLD VIEW

7.87 *Introduction*

¹It might be said that the typical Occidental world view is the scientific one, starting from the matter aspect as its firm ground. That view is not more than about one hundred years old, however. The basis was laid by Spencer with his theory of evolution, later supported by Darwin's proofs of biological evolution. Physical scientific disciplines must start from the matter aspect. Subjectivism (philosophical "idealism"), which denies the existence of matter, has been the greatest obstacle to the exploration of the matter aspect of which fact India is the best proof. In the West, the Church with its teaching of matter as evil and sinful has always fought and persecuted and tried to exterminate all pioneers of research and science, using all the means at its disposal. An account of the struggle of science for the freedom of research in times as near to us as the 19th century would be informative. Historians talk about "man without a history" but are themselves incredibly ignorant in essential respects.

²Every attempt at presenting a world view must necessarily be adapted at the general comprehension and prospect of understanding there are at the time. Add to this the fact that the perception of reality is totally different in the different worlds, that the view of reality held by the planetary hierarchy always must be quite different from the view that is possible to formulate with the mental concepts valid for a certain time. A mental system thus always remains something of a provisional system. It only remains to be seen whether it comes up to the need, felt at the time, of the most adequate explanation of reality.

³The illusions of the philosophers in all times, that it should be possible to formulate an "absolute system of thought" in agreement with reality, is the best proof their total ignorance of life. A system can never be anything but a working hypothesis connected to the fictions of reality ruling. The important thing, however, is that such a system is formulated in such a manner that it is conceived as the only exact one. This is as far as they can reach. Exactitude is necessary, however, to provide a basis of reality to start from for all relations of life existing.

⁴You do not discuss world views and life views. The pertaining problems are too fundamental and extensive to be treated in a discussion. Those are problems that demand years of work from the individual and that are latent in the subconscious of the intelligentsia. What people dispute about are matters of faith about which nobody knows anything, just believes. And all such things are meaningless, similar to the disputes among the schoolmen about the colour of Archangel Gabriel's tail-feathers.

7.88 *Fictions about the Problems of Reality*

¹In former times it was a common saying among those of a philosophical education that man lives simultaneously in two worlds: the world of reality (outside us) and the world of ideals (inside us). The one world was the world of natural necessity, natural laws; the other one, the law of free-will, the world as it should be. In fact, we live in many worlds, all determined by law, although we are as yet not conscious in more than three – the physical, emotional, and the mental – and are ignorant of all except the lowest world.

²The philosophers also divided reality into the “sensuous world” (the world of the five senses) and the “spiritual world”. By the “sensuous world” they meant, expressed more comprehensibly, the physical world.

³The philosophical terms, “reality” and “illusion”, have idiotized thought to such an extent that they should be definitively eliminated where the matter aspect is concerned. All worlds are material and none is an illusion. All have dimension, duration, matter, motion, consciousness, and law. The greater the density of primordial atoms, the more composite (“coarser, lower”) the matter and the world of that matter. Those terms, reality and illusion, are positively misleading and should be replaced with the only exact ones: higher and lower kinds (of matter).

⁴Terms and expressions are illogical and really erroneous because formulated through viewing one world by means of the consciousness and conception of reality of another world. This is quite abortive and factually unwarranted. Each world has its own kind of reality to which you must keep if you are not to end up in irremediable confusion of ideas.

7.89 *Fictions about the Aspects of Reality*

¹According to the scientific way of looking at things, it is energy, being inherent in matter, that “forms matter” according to mechanical laws of nature. This is the very cardinal error. It is consciousness, immanent in matter, that directs and forms according the Law (final causes, finality in nature). Even mechanical events serve finality. Scientists know nothing about this, however, and that is why they say that life is without meaning.

²Ignorant man quite naïvely takes the self’s apprehension to be the self. But the self is not its emotions, not its thoughts. Those are products of its envelopes.

³During the entire consciousness development from the lowest to the highest world, from the lowest to the highest atomic kind (49–2), the self identifies itself with the highest kind of consciousness it has attained, until it has acquired self-consciousness in it and can distinguish between consciousness and its apprehension of consciousness. Once you have realized this fundamental fact, that “life” is the primordial atoms (the monads) and that everything else (all material forms) are envelopes for life, lots of problems are solved by themselves.

⁴The consciousness (potential, actualized, activated) of the atom is the ground explaining the finality of life.

⁵The higher the kind of consciousness, the greater the part of worlds and times belonging to the present.

7.90 *Superphysics*

¹The Chinese had a generic term, *tian*, for everything belonging to the unknown, super-conscious (god, providence, heaven, higher worlds, the unexplored). It corresponded more or less to what philosophers, not knowing any better, call metaphysics.

²“Metaphysics must be destroyed” was the stock slogan of Uppsala philosopher Hägerström. In this he was undoubtedly right. The “metaphysics” of philosophy should disappear to leave room for the superphysics of esoterics. The two have nothing in common. How many philosophers realize this?

³Nuclear physicists or so-called atomic scientists are, without their own knowledge, occupied with fission of the “chemical atom”, the physical etheric molecule with its content

of 49 different layers of matter. In so doing they have entered the physical etheric world and have left the gross physical, visible world of the chemists. It is a mistake on their part to start working out hypotheses about the composition of the “atom” at this early stage. All hypotheses presented so far are erroneous. The correct explanations of these phenomena can be given only by an “atomic scientist” who has acquired physical etheric objective consciousness. It is exceedingly inappropriate to drum these erroneous hypotheses into future chemists and physicists as early as in secondary school. The wisest choice is to keep the old conceptions from the beginning of the 20th century starting with Mendeleev’s periodic system.

⁴In the 21st century it will be demonstrated by filming the process of dying that man has both an etheric envelope and an emotional envelope, that the emotional envelope sets itself free from the etheric envelope when the latter has been extracted from the organism, that the etheric envelope always remains in the vicinity of the organism and dissolves at the same speed as the organism. This definitively eliminates all assertions that the “soul dies with the body”. But the hardened will certainly go on injudiciously denying the immortality of the self. It will never be possible to film the material phenomena of the mental world, thus not man’s mental envelope, still less his causal envelope. “Immortality” can never be “proved”. This problem reminds one of the story about the old woman who had heard that a parrot could live to be two hundred years and bought one to see whether this was true.

⁵Besides, the doubters are essentially right, comically enough. All the envelopes of the individual, also those which he acquires in ever higher worlds, are dissolved eventually. No envelope is immortal. The only immortal being is the primordial atom, the monad, the self. It is true that the proof of this can never be more than one of (overwhelming) probability.

7.91 Form

¹“Form is the manner in which matter exists.” There are countless kinds of form from solar system, planet, world, all kinds of aggregates, to molecule and atom. Thus even the atom is form. When form is discussed in esoterics, however, only aggregates of molecules are meant. And such ones do not exist in the atomic worlds, only in the molecular worlds.

²“Form is the manner in which multiplicity makes up a unity.” Thus this is true of concepts, the multiplicity (content) entering into the concept and making unambiguity possible.

³Intuition differs from conceptual apprehension in the fact that it does not need form, is independent of form. When intuition is to be explained, however, this can be done only by returning to the explanation of concepts. Since human beings do not have intuition, they are also unable to understand what intuition actually is.

⁴The esoterician must be prepared to hear, every now and then: “Nobody told me that” or “Who said that?” or “That is new to me”. In fact, there is nothing new, since everything (except, of course, the form, which is the only essential thing to most people) exists in the world of ideas. Historically, most things have been said but are forgotten of course. How about making the history of ideas replace both philosophy and the history of literature? The idea is certainly the essence. Forms have their time, but the idea does not die. As it is now, the idea is drowned in the masses of words. Most people do not discover it if it is not particularly emphasized.

⁵Both Greek and Indian philosophy have each built in the mental world a powerful thought-form, which is increasingly strengthened by later thinkers who have started from the original form and have added to it, making it ever more difficult for people to liberate themselves from it. However, the thought-form of European philosophy has received such a death-blow by hylozoics that its days should be numbered. In contrast, the Indian thought-form will probably make attempts at adaptation to the original, symbolic teaching, although this adaptation will take much longer to achieve full agreement with hylozoics.

⁶It remains to be seen whether the mental form of European philosophy will die of itself or if an esoteric philosopher will be needed demonstrating the illusoriness and fictitiousness of every detail of the great conglomerate. The lower the general mental level, the lengthier the process of dissolution. Will five hundred years be necessary for the West?

⁷Esotericians of the future will demonstrate that the different cultures with all their consciousness content are a series of physicalistic mental constructions.

PROBLEMS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

7.92 Introduction

¹“He who knows evil knows good.” The expression is misunderstood by all people ignorant of life who think that they get to know good through evil. The problem of good and evil in a philosophical sense is not for the masses. The understanding of it requires a knowledge of life that most people still lack at the present stage of mankind’s development. Most people cannot distinguish right from wrong and still less good from evil.

²“Resist not evil.” People have absolutized this principle all the way to idiocy. In so doing they have turned might into right, stripped goodness of right, given power up to evil, to satanism, and allowed beasts to give vent to their aggression without restraint. The problem is not whether we should resist evil, but how we should do so. To the essentialist it is not a matter of resisting evil. He realizes unity, and in his endeavour to raise and ennoble beings he embraces evil, too. It has other things to do than going down to lower stages to take part in the fight against evil. At the stage of barbarism tit for tat holds sway, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. At the stage of civilization, madmen are re-educated and taught to respect the equal right of all. At the stage of culture, you are the helper of the erring, if help is needed. At that stage a word of disapproval is sufficient, if the cultural individual does something wrong.

³“Freedom” is a word that has been much abused, abused as often as used. In the absolute sense there is no freedom, since we are dependent on conditions in all respects. However often we change conditions we necessarily end up in new ones. We are dependent on our envelopes, on the vibrations that penetrate them without our knowledge, on the content of our envelopes. All life is determined by law, and only the fool believes himself able to change laws of nature or laws of life.

7.93 Erudition, Learning, Knowledge, Wisdom

¹It is important to be able to distinguish between erudition, learning, knowledge, and wisdom.

²Erudition is learning and knowledge. Erudition is theoretical learning consisting in knowing what others have written or said.

³Learning consists of facts and pseudo-facts, too many pseudo-facts, as is to be regretted. Learning without experience is useless unless it agrees with previously gained insight expressing itself in a new life as instinct. Learning is often a hindrance to knowledge, the hindrance that makes people narrow specialists without understanding of the relative importance of their specialty in the whole. Learning does not liberate us from our prejudice, idiosyncrasies, illusions, and fictions.

⁴Knowledge is learning that has been tested in experience and been found tenable. Knowledge is facts in right (not constructed) contexts. Knowledge requires perspective consciousness.

⁵Wisdom is the ability to apply knowledge of life acquired.

⁶The philosopher is not wise. He is, as the word indicates, only a “friend of wisdom”. Pythagoras, who said this, in so doing showed that he knew that wisdom is essentiality, a stage of consciousness that is attained only after the individual has passed to the fifth natural

kingdom. How far from that esoteric insight are the philosophers of our days! They have not even acquired perspective consciousness (47:5).

⁷Man becomes wise to the extent that he acquires a sense of proportion. One is amazed, practically on a daily basis, at people's lack of the pertaining power of judgement. Only when something turns into what is grotesque do they seem to notice the absence of proportion.

7.94 The Knowledge Is Only for Seekers

¹Most people do not care to examine from where they got all their "ideas". They just have them and so they must be right. It is hardly worthwhile to try to set them free from their illusions and fictions. Besides, those who have got their learning through people's talk or newspapers, etc., are not in a position to acquire common sense. They can be safely entrusted to coming evolution. Some time in the future, after the requisite number of incarnations, they too will be in a position to critically assess the reality content of what is offered at the fancy-dress balls of life. Those who are content with what they believe and believe they know are not benefited by being "disturbed". Those who never ask themselves the questions, "what is reality?" and "what is the meaning of life?", do not need esoterics. They do not even need philosophy, which during the time of its existence (2500 years) have in vain tried to guess the right answers. Those who doubt, who seek, who thirst for the "truth", the knowledge of reality, you may supply with facts about reality and life.

7.95 Self-Knowledge

¹"Man does not know himself." This axiom has, as usual, been absolutized by the ignorant, by those who lack the requisite knowledge of all facts and principles. Man knows himself, his "horoscope type", his habits, interests, common reaction patters, what he has learnt, always can do, etc., all this which his waking consciousness can immediately establish. The normal individual at the present stage of human consciousness development may be said to be his waking consciousness five per cent, his "instinct" (superconsciousness) perhaps one per cent, and his subconsciousness and latent possibilities the remaining ninety-four per cent.

²Being perhaps thousands of incarnations older than others and so having had more experience is no merit, no remarkable achievement, no grace. A genius who does not realize his enormous limitation is rather to be pitied. Priding yourself on what you know and are able to do has a restraining effect on your further development. And what remains is immensely much. There is an enormous distance between a mental self and a causal self and between each one of the 46 ever higher selves.

³You cannot assess people's stage of development by the sayings they have learnt and often use. Many there are who can lecture on philosophical problems without understanding that they are dealing with pseudo-problems. Most people can learn how to use words without understanding the realities which those words originally represented. The esoterician learns how to distinguish between the word, the concept (the mental content), and the reality referred to. Both the concept and the reality may be something quite different from what ignorance believes it to be when using the word.

⁴"Human beings are the most deluded of all beings." (D.K.) They believe, imagine, assume, accept, deceive themselves by their irremediable conceit. They have not learnt to distinguish what they know from what they do not know and can seldom decide whichever it is. Anyone who does not assume anything cannot be deluded.

⁵Human beings on the whole make nothing but mistakes. This is inevitable, since they lack knowledge of reality and life and the laws of life. The day mankind realizes this, it will have made its greatest discovery hitherto.

THE RULING IGNORANCE OF LIFE

7.96 Conception of Reality

¹Only an esoterician can see how primitive a conception of reality human beings generally have had and still have.

²Such concepts as law of nature, consciousness, evolution, etc., are little more than a hundred years old. Still in the 1930-ies, a professor of philosophy, Hans Larsson at Lund University, could wonder what evolution means despite the fact that English philosopher Spencer had given an adequate definition of it. And the concept of law of nature was not better understood than scientists pretty generally beginning to doubt the existence of natural law. Laws explain events, not facts. The proof that a law is correct is infallible prediction.

³In such conditions it is not to be wondered at that philosophers and scientists prove unable to understand the description of reality given by esoterics. At the end of the 19th century everything superphysical was declared to be superstition. They had explored the universe and knew all but everything about it. Anyone who had then talked about radio, television, or computers would have been locked up in a madhouse. These inventions and the scientific discoveries enabling them have at least had the advantage that the learned nowadays are not quite as cocksure that they are able to judge everything, although they still dismiss without examination such phenomena as homeopathy or telepathy and many other things as old superstition. They “do not condescend” to examine it scientifically. It is “below their dignity”. In former times they would have burned such “magicians” at the stake. The learned have a very long way to go, however, before they can gain some understanding that they should not make statements on things of which they can know nothing, on things they have not examined methodically and systematically. The esoterician may tell them that they are not in a position to grasp the nature and origin of matter and forces of nature. Rather than admitting this they do like modern philosophers: declare their scientific concepts to be fictions. Then everything is lost save their honour, which indeed is the most important thing. Subsequently they can go on bluffing.

⁴The three aspects of reality is a condition of our very existence. The study of these three aspects in all relations of life develops consciousness, affords greater understanding, and enables realization. Seeing these three aspects in unsurveyable multiplicity reveals illusoriness and fictitiousness, is arriving at what is the most fundamental and simple of everything.

⁵Anyone who sees the truth of the paradox, “the simplest of all is the most difficult of all”, “the simpler, the more difficult, the more correct”, is in a fair way to conquer perspective consciousness. The more complicated, the further away from reality and life. All fundamental truths are directly self-evident to the simplest reason. No human being can discover them, however. They must be pointed out to us by the planetary hierarchy. That is also the reason why the knowledge must be kept secret. What we are told are such things as we can understand without abusing them. It is precisely the risk of abuse that has to be prevented. Also idiotization is abuse.

7.97 The Disorientation of Mankind

¹By constantly repeating their fictions people idiotize themselves until they become unable to think but what they have imprinted indelibly on their minds. The right thing to do for those who want to develop mentally is to think constantly something new, try to derive new viewpoints from the observation of ideas and things. But most people only want to hear, learn, think whatever they recognize. That is their criterion of truth.

²“The history of thought is the history of an ever-increasing approximation to the truth.” (E. Fromm) Such is certainly the belief of philosophers, but a quite wrong one. The history of thought is the history of an imaginative construction of ignorance that has removed us further

and further away from reality.

³“We must come to the realization that reality does not guarantee us anything, that it does not even offer us a firm structure, but that it is on us that the whole system depends. It is we who ask nature the questions and shape the desires whose answers determine how our reality will be. All the different kinds of history show us how thoroughly beliefs condition the life of communities and individuals.”

⁴Disoriented man’s attitude to life cannot be better expressed. Anyone who does not know the nature of reality or does not see the meaning of life always becomes a subjectivist and assumes that reality agrees with his own unconscious way of looking at things, his unconscious system of experience. Even the sophists (Protagoras) knew this and after them the German Kant. “We see only that which we already know” and have learnt to see, said Goethe.

⁵A striking proof of mankind’s total disorientation in reality is the mental chaos produced in the so-called world of culture whenever some subjectivist in the manner of Kierkegaard or Nietzsche raps out his imaginative delusions. It is about time that esotericians appear to clarify to those who possess common sense (even if ignorant of reality) the absurdity of the things that the “cultured” people accept without discrimination.

7.98 *Conception of God*

¹The question, “do you believe in god?”, should be replaced with the question, “what is your conception of god?” The answer given indicates the individual’s power of judgement (the result of his knowledge of reality and understanding of life). If by “god” you mean something transcendent, then your instinct of life is not totally stifled for this incarnation.

²There are many people who instead of the word the “godhead” sometimes use the abbreviation “god”, not written with a capital initial letter, at which those dependent on theology seem to take offense. Their reaction is a leftover from those days when god was regarded as a person. There are no logical reasons for keeping the word capitalized, however, unless you wish to go on embracing theological fictionalism. Since we do not capitalize the word “godhead”, there is no reason for doing otherwise with the abbreviation

³At the stage of civilization people do not feel the need of higher consciousness development. They are quite satisfied with physical, emotional, and lower mental life in the physical world. Fear of the unknown and fear of hell drive them into the bosom of the Church. To the extent that science convinces people that there is neither a superphysical reality nor an individual life after death theological intimidation loses its power, and that of the Church goes with it. A “religious need” awakens only then their instinct of life tells them that physical life cannot be the only life, that there must be something different and more.

⁴It is quite natural that theologians should be horrified at atheists and regard science as an enemy, ignorant of reality as they are. The esoterician, who knows that the individual is immortal and that consciousness development is inevitable, does not care about what people “believe”, but encourage them to work at the development of consciousness, the acquisition of qualities and abilities. Amusements are harmful only if they foster laziness, dislike of work, listlessness, and deterioration in taste. An idle life is an incarnation wasted.

⁵Atheism as a modern phenomenon may be considered justified in the war against theological tyranny and dogmatism. However, both parties lack that knowledge of reality and life which is a condition of settling the dispute.

⁶The constantly recurring questions about god and whether god exists demonstrate how helpless people are with all their religion, philosophy, and science, but without the right knowledge. Even in the year of grace 1963 a professor writes a book where he treats the question whether god exists. Even more questionable is that he labels as “absurd” the scientific hypothesis of existence and the processes of nature as expressions of eternal,

mechanical laws of nature, a hypothesis accepted in the West ever since Epikuros. The professor's defence of the existence of god is untenable, however. It thus seems possible to be appointed professor without being able to apply the simplest logic.

⁷It is understandable that theologians reject everything that is not part of their dogmatics. They have once and for all decapitated their reason. The fact that philosophers and scientists cannot be bothered to examine hylozoics demonstrates the power of fictions and the perverseness of epistemological and historical views.

7.99 Public Opinion

¹Public opinion on the whole is part of the lower emotionality, habitual thinking, unintelligent parrotry, the breeding ground of all manner of psychoses. It is the weathercock of mankind, swinging to and fro as the wind of gossip blows, uncritically and injudiciously, ruled tyrannically by the fashion of the day, even the most tasteless one.

²Public opinion knows nothing worth knowing. It is even much if one per cent of it is correct.

³Those are relatively few who have learnt how to distinguish between what they know and what they do not know. Most of it is false certainty.

⁴It is better being a doubter than being a blind believer, being ignorant than having erroneous ideas, being a skeptic than being a dogmatist.

⁵All dogmas sooner or later become hindrances to research, progress, the search for truth.

⁶Blind belief in authority has been a characteristic trait of public opinion. It is true that it has increasingly moved from theological to scientific fictionalism. Still the slogan "science" seems to have a paralysing effect on the power of critical judgement of most people. It is to be hoped that this paralysis passes off as people arrive at the understanding that there are several kinds of science and scholarship, learn how to distinguish between mathematical, experimental, descriptive, and speculative disciplines, come to realize that only mathematical and purely descriptive disciplines merit the great confidence granted to science.

7.100 The Intelligentsia

¹The intelligentsia are found in all social classes but are chiefly to be seen among university graduates. Those who are philosophers are dependent on some predecessor, such as Berkeley, Hume, Kant or, in our times, Russell. Nietzschean supermen are not to be classed among them, however, since they clearly demonstrate that emotionally they are subhuman and intellectually they are parrots.

²Those who are among the intelligentsia (47:6) flatter themselves that they are mentalists, which is a great mistake. The mentalist (47:5) may certainly allow himself be influenced by emotionality, if this is required, but he has overcome hatred in all its countless expressions, and he is not determined by emotional energies whether in his thought or in his action

³The intelligentsia strive after self-determination through critical analysis of the various views appearing in mankind, strive after a self-acquired system of thought. That develops reason and the power of judgement and is a necessary condition of further development. The content of that system of thought, however, is made up of elements of knowledge which we have received for nothing, the collected experience of mankind. Without them, even the greatest mental genius, reared on a desert island or among primitive people, would be as ignorant as those around him. Besides, reduced to his own experience, the man of culture would not advance much beyond the limit he has reached by the aid of other people.

⁴The phrase, a "free and independent mind", typical of human ignorance of life is, as are most such phrases, an expression of an irremediable fiction. All consciousness is by nature collective. Without this unconscious aid by the collective consciousness we would never have attained even the human kingdom.

⁵So-called educated people can be divided into two groups: those who deny the existence of superphysical reality, those who believe that the physical world is the only one existing; and those who know that there is a superphysical reality, there are superphysical material worlds. That is the only essential and decisive point. If then as a “cultured person” you are an “atheist” or “religious” or a “humanist” or whatever is quite irrelevant. Either there is a superphysical reality with a continuation of consciousness development or there is not: that is the issue. It does us no harm to have some clear ideas, so that we do not run the risk of mixing up unessentials with essentials.

7.101 Nietzschean “Supermen”

¹The union of intelligence with self-esteem produces the Nietzschean “superman”, who knows everything better than anyone else. Such types abound in all spheres and throughout history. The only remedy against this is the Sokratean realization, which was based on the acquired instinct that mankind at its present stage of development is too ignorant of life. That individual who understands that facts are necessary to everything and that laws rule in everything escapes the consequences of self-overestimation. It is only when the self becomes important and believes itself superior to other selves that man is on the wrong track. The only authority that is warranted is the synthesis of law of nature, law of life, and facts.

²Nietzschean “supermen” demonstrate their injudiciousness when believing themselves able to reach higher than they have reached on their own. They have no idea of how much remains to be explored, how many qualities and abilities still remain to be acquired. Such “supermen” show that with the parrot intelligence they have acquired they actually do not have power of judgement. Even if they are superior to the majority of people, yet that is nothing to boast of at the present stage of mankind’s development.

ESOTERICIS

7.102 The Knowledge in a Time Perspective

¹The knowledge of reality has always existed. But in “historical times” (the last twelve thousand years) it has not been available for others than initiates. Exoteric learning among the priests and the learned has always been fictionalism, misinterpretation and distortion of esoterics. Seeking for the “truth” in what people have thought and believed, said and written in past times indicates a disastrous ignorance of life. All that can be derived from such studies is fictionalism. That fact cannot be too strongly inculcated. What the Buddha or Christos is alleged to have said and taught, for instance, is mainly part of legend, just as the stories of their lives. Once again it must be asserted that “what we know about the great ones is the legend of them”. And once again it must be asserted that the knowledge of reality as “public opinion” is a thing of the future. What mankind at present accepts as knowledge and truth are illusions and fictions. Those who do not see this are immature for the truth.

²Before the sophists appeared, only the initiates of the knowledge orders had been taught how to think independently. The great masses of the people were led by the priests who told them what to think. The sophists started to think on their own. And this was the beginning of mental activity properly speaking. It is another matter that they could not comprehend or explain reality, but that they produced guesswork about everything. Not even today, after 2500 years do the philosophers succeed, because the problems of philosophy cannot be solved by mental consciousness, only by causal consciousness.

³Those who appeared as men of culture before the sophists were all initiates. It is certainly true that exceedingly few of these initiates reached the highest (seventh) degree. But they had learnt how to think and not just parrot what they were being told. Their understanding was sufficient for them to create a culture that became an unsurpassable standard down to our

times. Only as the esoteric knowledge was set free (1875) have we been enabled to achieve a still higher culture. Hitherto this has just remained a possibility, as is to be regretted.

⁴Philosophers view the history of philosophy as the history of a progressive understanding of reality and development of reason: They are ignorant of the fact that philosophy just like theology deals with misinterpretations of esoterisms that spring from the esoteric knowledge orders. To the extent that philosophers have succeeded in discovering the reality ideas, they find the same ideas as enter into the esoteric knowledge.

⁵What philosophers discover of the reality ideas thus are mental ideas that are downscalings of intuitions. More than what they can understand themselves it is an “ongoing discovery of what the ancients taught”.

7.103 Philosophical and Esoteric Dualism

¹There is philosophical dualism and there is esoteric dualism. Philosophical dualism is epistemological and distinguishes between body and mind, matter and consciousness, outer and inner, all of this to comprehend these concepts more clearly by distinguishing them.

²Esoteric dualism is of quite another kind. It is not oriented towards epistemology but towards self-realization, consciousness development. The esoterician has finished his work at distinguishing the concepts and has his main interest directed towards the practical problems. When esoteric dualism clarifies the opposition of higher and lower: kinds of matter, envelopes, energies, kinds of consciousness, the opposition between the first triad and the second triad, etc., it does so with a view to elucidating the problems that face the individual in his striving forward and upwards.

³As long as the individual – the self – the monad has not learnt how to control the different kinds of consciousness there are in his different envelopes and triads, there are unsolvable oppositions between these and unsolvable problems arise for the self. The esoterician reaches a theoretical understanding of these problems through the simple explanations of the hylozoic mental system. In so doing he does not solve those problems, for they are practical problems which the individual can solve only by actualizing what he is potentially. Yet it is of course immensely important that the esoterician has the possibility of understanding what otherwise had been incomprehensible to him. Not least important is that this liberates him from all the disorienting hypotheses and theories of ignorance which carry its adherents further and further away from reality and hence from the possibility of ever solving the practical problems.

7.104 Criticism of Esoterics

¹The criticism voiced by the adversaries of esoterics is of a description that reveals a downright terrifying ignorance of what they are speaking about. That criticism makes it clear that they have never bothered to examine the matter even superficially. They do not condescend to do such things. At the utmost an honest critic may concede that the facts presented cannot be ascertained by science and hence it cannot be expected that they will be accepted. Honest but superficial, because anyone who has mastered the subject must be convinced thanks to the multitude of inexplicable facts that esoterics explains in a simple and consistent manner. This is sufficient as proof in science, so it is justified to consider it valid outside science as well.

²When it comes to a scientific discipline – chemistry, physics, geology, astronomy – people realize that they must study it thoroughly before they may claim to grasp what it is about. When it comes to esoterics, however, which requires a total re-thinking in all respects, they demand to be able to grasp it all at once. Pythagoras considered that no neophyte should be allowed even to ask a question until he had studied esoterics intensively for at least two years. People have heard this but think they may dismiss it. Pythagoras lived so long ago, you see, and we understand everything better. Big mistake. Science in his days was more advanced

than it is in our times. But public instruction did not exist. Well, our public opinion makes it clear how little people have learnt to comprehend.

³The attitude of philosophers and scientists to esoterics is typified in philosopher Alf Ahlberg's estimation of Rudolf Steiner. He admits that he has not examined Steiner's attempt at knowledge and so has not been able to form an independent opinion of it. Yet he assumes a critical attitude to it. The first duty of a researcher is to examine everything before he makes a final verdict of it. Before he has done so he has no logical right to express any opinion about it at all. None of them concedes his lack of competence. None of them seems to realize that the attitude to the (in this case superphysical) problems he has acquired is at the bottom of his opinion of them. If you declare a system false, then you must be able to demonstrate that it is logically untenable. If you cannot, then your declaration must be deemed a personal opinion, thus a belief and so not to be taken seriously.

⁴What has prevented Occidentals from examining the problem of reincarnation is the absurd Indian doctrine of metempsychosis (saying that the individual can sink down into a lower natural kingdom than the one he has attained). A proof of how this idiotization has paralysed Occidental minds is their inability after more than a hundred years to see the radical difference between metempsychosis and reincarnation.

⁵It is typical of those afflicted with a superiority complex that they scornfully dismiss for example theosophy without having even examined it. They confuse theosophy with a multitude of occult fictions they have picked up. They cannot even keep the different "teachings" apart. Still they believe that they know and are able to judge the matter.

⁶Anyone who, when rejecting esoterics, bases his opinion on authorities, even in this demonstrates that he is not in a position to judge the case himself.

⁷That exoterist who really takes the trouble of examining whether esoterics is logically tenable must arrive at the result that that working hypothesis is irrefutable.

⁸If really intelligent philosophers or scientists took such an interest in esoterics that they achieved a full mastery of the hylozoic system of knowledge and could explain lots of previously inexplicable facts, then they would be convinced of the superiority of the system as a working hypothesis. It seems impossible, however, to make them take that step. They are already convinced that esoterics is useless pseudo-knowledge. The refusal to examine what so many reliable people consider indispensable is an evidence of dogmatic thinking still ruling. A true seeker examines everything.

⁹The skeptics still serve an important purpose in that they counteract the propaganda that the ruling ideologies make for their fictional systems and also in that they deter those who are in search of knowledge to exploit for their own good from taking an interest in esoterics.

7.105 The Planetary Hierarchy Alone Possesses Knowledge

¹Everything there is of common sense and reality content in philosophy and history came originally from the planetary hierarchy. What we know of physical reality is the results of scientific research. Human speculation has always led people astray. These are esoteric axioms that will be recognized as truths some time in the future. Only ascertained facts should be considered tenable. Human "wisdom" is vanity.

²To the esoterician it is obvious that only members of the planetary hierarchy can have knowledge of reality (beyond superficial knowledge of the physical world) and that all knowledge is to be obtained from there only. From the facts we have already received it is clear that the philosophers have been in error in all essentials and above all in all the fundamental problems

³The entire history of philosophy is an imaginative construction of ignorance. Learning without esoteric knowledge produces nothing but illusions and fictions in respect of consciousness.

⁴There is no other “scientific ethics” than the knowledge of the laws of life. Without that knowledge philosophers will always hold divergent opinions on the ethical problems, as they have always done.

⁵The individual is dependent on the knowledge he receives and generally also on the formulation of the ideas in his various environments, on the “cultural heritage” in the larger sense. Those ideas which make consciousness development possible are gifts from the planetary hierarchy. Nobody can reach beyond that system of ideas which has been formulated by the planetary hierarchy for each particular epoch, simply because the pertaining mental and causal molecules remain passive. This is explained by the fact that they must be formulated in the brain cells to be comprehensible. It is true that previously they have existed in the mental and causal envelopes, but the monad has not been able to utilize them.

⁶Mankind cannot solve the problem of reality, since this requires facts that research will never be able ascertain. This requires causal consciousness, causal intuition, unobstructed access to the world of Platonic ideas. Technically, this requires that the individual has been able to vitalize by himself all the centres above the diaphragm in all his aggregate envelopes. The technical procedure is not taught to others than those who have attained the stage of humanity and have definitively refrained from desiring anything for themselves, have consecrated their lives to the service of evolution. The firmness of that resolve is thoroughly tested to the utmost during many incarnations. If the individual passes the twelve Herculean tests, he “is received as a demigod in the circle of the gods”, joins the planetary hierarchy as a member of it. The esoterician realizes that the ancient Greek tales had a foundation in reality, that they, too, are proof that the initiates of the “mysteries” possessed the knowledge of reality.

7.106 How Hylozoics Becomes Generally Accepted

¹People should learn how to agree on what is objective, universally valid, and inevitable, and to disregard what is subjective and individual. What is universally valid is our instinct of reality. This is weakened by the ideologies of life-ignorance. These should not need to divide people, however. Tolerance is the first step on the path to unity. The individual has a right to his own opinion, and we must learn to respect that.

²In one respect ideologies have been important to the development of mental consciousness. They have contributed to the development of the power of reflection. It is an ill wind that blows nobody any good. The more they force people to think, the greater is their use, unless this entails fruitless brooding, mental disquiet that leads to mental disorganization and harrowing doubt. Generally speaking, they have done more harm than good. They prevent the acquisition of common sense. The result of this is seen in such thinkers as Hägerström who opined that “metaphysics” should be destroyed. The ruling metaphysical systems are untenable, but that does not prove that the knowledge of superphysical reality is erroneous. It certainly is to the majority of people at the present stage of mankind’s development. Yet there are such people as have acquired consciousness in their causal envelope and may bear witness to the existence of higher worlds from personal experience. But they do not care for such people.

³What will lead to a general acceptance of hylozoics as a working hypothesis is not it being understood by people at large, but only sufficient numbers being convinced, so that the masses “believe” because the leading authorities do so, thus no independent opinion in the majority.

⁴When esoterics has been accepted by the thinking portion of mankind as the only plausible working hypothesis, then thinking will be in agreement with reality and consciousness development can progress at an ever-increasing pace.

⁵Those who examine whether hylozoics is tenable are soon convinced of its resources to

explain the previously inexplicable. They are liberated from countless ruling ideologies with their fictions. That is a huge gain. But that does not make them some sort of supermen. Instead it brings responsibility. For if the individual does not use the knowledge in the right way, then his chances of even grasping it will be very scant in his future incarnations. What is latent in him will remain out of his reach and the necessary mental molecules will be unable to make impression. There are plenty of such examples: former initiates who have abused the knowledge and who have remained unable to grasp it again during many incarnations.

⁶If an individual has mastered the hylozoic mental system, then this does not at all need imply that intellectually he is as developed as the great leaders in politics, finance, or science. As is the case with most philosophers, esotericians need not be much more than specialists in their field, a result of the specialization of several incarnations. Reality ideas provide a greater possibility of a correct assessment, but possibility is not the same as capacity.

⁷When esoteric schools are established some time in the future and the rising generation is taught to comprehend hylozoics, then it will be seen that using ordinary logical and psychological training it is quite possible to make the students grasp the very mental system so as to account for it. That is all there is to it. Any person of average intelligence can comprehend it. However, that does not mean that those who have comprehended it can also understand how it agrees with reality. That is quite another thing.

⁸What astonishes an esoterician is that so few of those who otherwise take an interest in various world views and life views bother to find out what hylozoics is, study the most interesting of all “philosophical systems”, for that is precisely what it is. There is nothing incomprehensible in hylozoics. It might be said that it is simpler than any other philosophical system. That in addition it is something else and more may be disregarded in this connection. Hylozoics is not more difficult to master than any scientific working hypothesis whatever. And to present-day mankind it cannot be more than a hypothesis.

THE ESOTERICIAN

7.107 The Early Uncertainty of the Esoterician

¹The esoterician having latent knowledge of reality is uncertain of almost everything until later in his life (generally when between 35 and 42 years old), through contacting something that rouses his latency, he begins examining the ruling ideologies with their illusions and fictions, scrutinizes the basis of knowledge on which they rest, and lets most of it go down into the slop-pail. The conflict of the instinct of reality with the ideologies has a confusing effect. Nothing makes sense or holds water, and it cannot be as the learned say it is. He turns into a non-entity in the eyes of others, for he never dares hold an opinion, never assert a view. Even when he has found what his instinct surmised, that knowledge is possible and must exist somewhere, yet he remains a “queer fish” to the majority of his fellow human beings, and it is probably not an uncommon view among them that he should be taken care of by psychiatrists.

7.108 The First Lesson the Esoterician Has to Learn

¹The first thing that an esoterician learns is to distinguish what he knows from what he does not know, cannot possibly know, possibly can know. Why does one know it? How does one know it? Do I have the facts for it? Even those questions afford a sureness of judgement. By often asking them you arrive at the realization that people do not know if they know what they believe, assume, say, understand. Most of it is fictitious. How fictitious it is appears best from the fact that scientific “truths” seldom last ten years.

²Students of esoterics have every reason to be very careful with their assumptions and always ask themselves whether sufficient facts are at hand and which kinds of “facts” are at

the bottom of their assumptions. It is too easy to imagine that since esoterics affords liberating perspectives on everything and the esoterician has access to so many real facts, this enables him to judge without facts, which is a serious mistake. One might think that the power of judgement should have developed, but experience going back forty years has ascertained that all statements made by “esotericians” outside the domain of esoteric facts have been erroneous, whether they were statements about people or about things and events. It is very embarrassing to hear “esotericians” making cocksure statements on things of which they know nothing and things they have misunderstood. Sometimes it appears as if they gave their imagination free rein more than other people do. Such things always discredit esoterics. It is even more grotesque, of course, when so-called esotericians in their conceit believe themselves in a position to criticize their teachers, a very common phenomenon.

7.109 The Esoterician’s Own Development

¹Even if the esoterician has a conception of reality that is in fundamental respects correct, yet in practical life he is often thrown on hypotheses to help himself on.

²If he is without the requisite experience of life (a matter of his level of development), the “theoretical” esoterician is often wise to act on the principle of “as if” in his work for consciousness development, since he can have no certain knowledge. He has very good reasons for this auxiliary method.

³In his studies the esoterician is wise to assimilate, as a first orientation, the exoteric learning available, with its hypotheses, theories, and, above all, the results of experiments. Then he will find it the easier to discover mistakes made in the orthodox ways of looking at things, a procedure that will further benefit his all-round orientation and also his teaching skills.

⁴Another thing that is important for would-be esotericians is training in the use of paradoxes, because from the mental point of view paradoxes hold the secret of the esoteric. Many esoteric truths can be understood only as paradoxes. The understanding of the paradox calls for common sense, which is the opposite of wiseacreness, the lowest kind of thinking from ground to consequence. Esoteric understanding implies understanding that “it is like this to begin with, then it is the other way round” in a long series of mental opposites. Philosopher Hegel had an inkling of this, but could not advance beyond thinking by thesis–antithesis–synthesis, and so he only managed, as was his wont, to trivialize the idea by mentalizing it. The intuition dissolves the opposites applying its absolute objectivity, which does away with subjective mental thinking.

7.110 The Esoterician Endeavours to Live in Reality

¹Even to one who has acquired esoteric knowledge and with it the fundamental reality concepts, who is an “integrated personality” (thus with mental dominance), physical life itself with its strivings and efforts remains a life of illusions in too many respects, even when the highly intellectual person deems himself able to assess realistically, especially in his relations to other people. The difficulties involved in this are greater than even disciples of the hierarchy often think. At all events we may assume that those who think that they are secured against that risk more easily fall victim just because of that. Only essential selves (46) are protected thanks to the consciousness of community. Also self-satisfaction with one’s knowledge and understanding is treacherous.

²Many people think that acquiring esoteric knowledge of existence is all they need. But the initiates soon teach themselves to abandon that attitude. They do so because the more the individual understands of the whole, the more he realizes his relative ignorance. He becomes increasingly humble before the enormous tasks that he must learn how to perform.

³The humanist does what he can to discover the ideas and by their aid to dissolve fictions

and dissipate illusions. The new ideas, however, if they are new, are soon worn out by the thoughtless. They drown in the torrent of words, and the wordcraft of oratory breaks down never-understood and therefore lifeless ideals. Mankind is overwhelmed by all the truisms being preached to it. If the fundamentally new ideas seem self-evident, then they were not new. If it is repeated once and again, it remains as esoteric as it is familiar. The truths enounced by the great ones remain words without force. Technology is advancing. People are ever happier to live in the physical world and think that heaven can wait. Their will certainly have a paradise there. And when born again they will eventually become talents and finally geniuses and will rejoice at the laurel wreaths on their heads which prevent them from discovering the thousand-petalled lotus whose flowering they delay indefinitely.

⁴The esoterician seeks contact with his esoteric brothers, the fifth natural kingdom and human beings. He receives impressions from and establishes relations with all of these.

7.111 The Esoterician as an Educator

¹The esoterician has no interest in forcing his world view and life view on other people, in convincing skeptics and other immature people. He is on the lookout for those who have remained seekers, who have seen the insufficiency of the ruling ideologies and are willing to learn.

²The esoterician lives in two worlds: in the world of reality ideas and in the world of fictions. At the present stage of mankind's development he cannot convey the reality ideas to people, since they believe that their fictions are in agreement with reality. The esoterician as a teacher, therefore, has no choice but to meet people on their own plane. Since he must not force his view on others, little remains for him but to try and win them by loving understanding and, when an opportunity arises and there is a prospect of understanding, to demonstrate the untenability of a certain view, because many people doubt that the ideologies ruling are correct. By thinking the reality ideas himself he prepares for their acceptance, because those ideas wield their power to influence the superconsciousness of people so as to become easier to apprehend. In his dealings with those who have already discovered the exactitude of esoterics he may of course demonstrate the fictitiousness of general ways of looking at things with quite another kind of critical severity, point out the intransigence and incorrigibility of the learned in discussions about the tenability of deep-seated theological, philosophical, or scientific dogmas.

³That esoterician who senses the calling to become an esoteric educator should, when striving to develop his own technique, heed three factors: contact, impression, relation. The important thing is to develop the ability to contact people, to know how to strike up a conversation when meeting strangers, and to get closer and closer to them. Loving understanding wields a force of magnetic attraction that very few people can resist. Impression means a whole esoteric discipline but in this connection a sensitive response to inner contact and outer relations, the mark of a skilful psychologist: the right perception of impressions, ability of right interpretation and right conclusion. Relation means the ability to discover and win those who need the help he can give and who can receive it.

⁴“Throw out the lifeline, someone is drifting away,
“throw out the lifeline, someone is sinking today.”

⁵This is the feeling motivating also the esoterician to make his throws again and again, although he knows that few they are who care to grasp that lifeline which would save them onto the rock-firm shore.

7.112 *The Future*

¹Considering that the knowledge of reality was permitted for publication in 1875 only and that most of what has been published in the matter of reality and history was the speculation of life-ignorance it is by no means strange that people still lead their emotional lives in illusions and their mental lives in fictions. It takes time before all this balderdash has been weeded out and been replaced with the facts of reality; the more so as the entire world of learning is based on the old delusions and the learned refuse to consider the esoteric criteria of reality. It has been calculated that it will take about five hundred years until the whole historical heritage has been replaced with a content of true knowledge. It is quite another matter that natural science and technology have made such enormous progress in physical respect. People have let themselves be hypnotized by the triumphs and “miracles” of technology and have no idea of the fact that the visible world makes up only one per cent of total reality. They are still ignorant of the fact that everything that falls outside those limits has been inaccessible to research and that more than 99 per cent of what has been written about those inaccessible things may be called empty speculation, empty because without reality content.

7.113 *Conclusion*

¹Skepticism, pessimism, disillusionism are the lot of mental geniuses in our times. Anyone who at the age of 40 has not arrived at that point cannot be deemed discerning; let him then be an “authority” in matters of world view and life view to the cultured.

²There is a salvation, however, and that is the study of the knowledge given us by the planetary hierarchy. But this requires mastery of the esoteric knowledge system, and such excellence is not acquired applying the common cursory thinking. To realize how the system solves problems otherwise eternally unsolvable, how it makes exact deduction possible, it is required that you study the system for many years until it becomes mentally active and does not remain a mere encyclopedia for passive consultation.

³The question is whether anyone can be said to have a right to make statements on these fundamental problems at all unless he has been in direct or indirect contact with the planetary hierarchy. Only then will he be able to speak as “one having authority, and not as their scribes”. In that case no conviction however fanatical, no oratory however brilliant will suffice.

⁴The planetary hierarchy quietly points out that anyone who expects active help from the hierarchy in the form of energy and co-workers must show the teachers in the hierarchy that it is worth their while to spend time and energy on the aspirant. They have no need of zombies.

Endnotes by the Translator

7.11.8 “Wir haben es nur mit Erscheinungen zu tun” (German) means “We deal only with appearances”.

7.12.2 “Ins Innre der Natur dringt kein erschaffner Geist” means “no created spirit penetrates into the interior of nature”.

7.24.9 “Men of sense are really but of one religion.” The full quotation is: “People differ in their discourse and profession about these matters, but men of sense are really but of one religion.” Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, vol. I, book II, chapter 1, note by Onslow. Also in 3.30.1

7.25.2 *Tro och vetande* (“Belief and Knowledge”) was a book by Swedish professor of

practical philosophy Ingemar Hedenius (1908–1982), published in 1949. It contested the truth of the Christian religion on three grounds. See also note to 4.51.2.

7.26.6 The first Swedish edition of *The Knowledge of Reality* was published in 1961.

7.33.2,4 Compare with what American writer Robert A. Heinlein says of philosophy in his novella, *Lost Legacy* (1941), using college student Joan as his mouthpiece: “There really isn’t anything to philosophy. Did you ever eat that cotton candy they sell at fairs? Well, philosophy is like that – it looks as if it were really something, and it’s awfully pretty, and it tastes sweet, but when you go to bite it you can’t get your teeth into it, and when you try to swallow, there isn’t anything there. Philosophy is word-chasing, as significant as a puppy chasing its tail.”

7.35.4 Thomas Hobbes: “For it is most true that Cicero saith of them somewhere; that there can be nothing so absurd but may be found in the books of philosophers.” *Leviathan* (1651), chapter 5.

“*Nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri, quo me cumque rapit tempestas, deferor hospes*” Horace, *Epistulae* 1,15: “I am not bound to swear allegiance to the word of any master. Where the storm carries me, I put into port and make myself at home.”

7.41.4 “All knowledge is knowledge from a definite point of view.” “*Todo conocimiento lo es desde un punto de vista determinado.*” José Ortega y Gasset, *Obras completas* 3:199, Madrid 1963-69. “El error inveterado consistía en suponer que la realidad tenía por sí misma, e independientemente del punto de vista que sobre ella se tomara, una fisionomía propia ...”vemos que el mundo definido por esas filosofías no era en verdad el mundo, sino el horizonte de sus autores.” *El tema de nuestro tiempo*, cap. X, “La doctrina del punto de vista”.

7.66.2 In its original Swedish formulation, Laurency’s definition of theology as “an infinite noise about an infinite being” is humorous pun on two very similar words, but this is lost in translation.

7.70.1 “Peu nous importe que l’éther existe réellement, c’est l’affaire des métaphysiciens ; l’essentiel pour nous c’est que tout se passe comme s’il existait et que cette hypothèse est commode pour l’explication des phénomènes.” In English: “It matters to us little whether the ether really exists; it is the matter of metaphysicians; what is essential for us is that everything happens as if it existed and that this hypothesis is convenient for the explanation of phenomena.” Henri Poincaré *Leçons sur la théorie mathématique de la lumière, professées pendant le premier semestre 1887-1888*, Paris 1889.

7.83.7 “What is Self? Only a passing guest, whose concerns are all like a mirage of the great desert ...” *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett*, Letter No. 45.

7.85.3 Life value, see *The Way of Man* 9.91.8.

7.92.2 “Resist not evil.” The Bible, the Gospel according to Matthew, 5:39.

7.95.4 “Death is only recognized as a factor to be dealt with by self-conscious lives and is only misunderstood by human beings, who are the most glamoured and deluded of all incarnated lives.” Alice A. Bailey, *A Treatise on White Magic*, p. 534.

7.96.5 In his novelette, *What Dead Men Tell* (1949), American writer Theodore Sturgeon

has his protagonist Hulon sum up some seminal ideas: “What is important is basic. What is basic is by definition simple. What is complicated is therefore not important.”

7.97.2 “The history of thought is the history of an ever-increasing approximation to the truth.” Erich Fromm, *Man from Himself. An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics* (1947).

7.111.4 “Throw out the life-line ...” is the refrain of a hymn written by American hymnist and pastor Edwin Smith Ufford (1851–1910).

7.113.3 “For he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.” The Bible, the Gospel according to Matthew, 7:29.

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

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

Copyright © 2014 by the Henry T. Laurency Publishing Foundation. All rights reserved.

Last corrections entered March 15th, 2020.