

## A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF "THE IMPENDING GOLDEN AGE"

I am writing this out mostly for myself, since the matter has been on my mind since reading this book by "Sanctilean". But I intend to show this collection of thoughts to any other person who might be sufficiently interested. I will not do this with any idea of discouraging or promoting their belief in or acceptance of the teachings contained in the book. This is certainly not my purpose, which is to marshall my own thoughts on an important subject. Only after I do this can I determine to my best ability what my own opinions should be, which is entirely different from what I might prefer. This distinction is important for a person of my type, perhaps not important for other types. But my type - or "ray" - or "consecutory" - must be able to respect his own reasons for belief.

Accordingly, I must insist that whoever reads this refrain from considering me either a protagonist or an antagonist in regard to the Sanctilian information. My purpose is to balance what I consider negative with what I consider affirmative, and I have no illusions about the equipment with which I consider.

For many years I have been deeply interested in the matter of belief. I think it is true that indiscriminate believing can be a maker of much mischief. (After all, how many millions have really believed in the efficacy of human sacrifice.) I recognize in myself the tendency to organize and categorize and set rules for procedure, so why fight my own nature--my analysis must proceed along these lines.

It seems to me there are certain sound bases for belief, and certain unsound ones. Most fundamental is to discriminate between belief and knowledge and probability. Reincarnation is a belief that I hold- I do not know it. My deep acceptance of the reality of certain mystical states is knowledge: I cannot deny my own inner voice without destroying myself. My opinion on karma is what I call a probability - I have what I think are many sound reasons for believing it to be true, but I do not know it in all respects to be true. (That all crows are black is merely a strong probability.)

In my opinion, the following are sound bases for belief:

1. Definite statements by those I accept as authorities
2. Assertions by credible witnesses.
3. Data consistent with mental logic.
4. Data having nothing to do with "logic" but which elicits an affirmative inner response.
5. Data which is subject to mundane corroboration and which has been corroborated. (This is different from data which has merely not been disproved.)
6. Data or assertions, particularly applying to assertions in the occult field, which are consistent with other teachings to the degree that other respected teachings and teachers are not excluded by the new data.

Again in my opinion, the following are sound bases for doubt:

1. A teaching that is inconsistent with itself.
2. Inconsistency with general experience, including known laws of nature.
3. Lack of corroboration where such would seem probable.

I would also add that to a person of my type, interpretive plausibility is not a sound basis for belief. I do not mean that a plausible interpretation by a second party, relative to statements made by a source, are without value. For example, on first reading Sanctilean I found myself objecting to his emphasis on chastity. I thought of several reasons why this seemed illogical and impossible to apply in regard to populating a new continent. A second party offered a plausible interpretation, namely, that Sanctilean may have meant something else by chastity; I have later discovered that chastity does not mean what I thought it meant, in the purely dictionary sense. Now I have no difficulty on that acceptance. The plausible interpretation proved valid. On the other hand, I was offered a plausible interpretation of the book's statement that "Steam, rising from the Pacific Ocean, as the result of this volcanic activity, is causing much cloudiness on the Pacific coast of the U.S. It is the cause of the unprecedented precipitation of rain and snow, not only in the central and eastern portions of North America, but in Europe." I objected that no such steam had been reported, and that it seemed to me that an amount of steam capable of such weather effects would surely be seen from the air or from ships. The rejoinders were plausible but represented to me a severe stretching in the direction of belief, namely: the steam might be coming up in parts of the Pacific where no one ever goes; the military could be withholding the information; the steam might not be visible.

One ought not to reject such plausible interpretations in lack of definite data to the contrary. But there is equally no sound reason for accepting them. I confess to a long-held attitude, perhaps open to censure, that a body of teaching which requires plausible interpretation in instance after instance, is perhaps not as clearly presented as we would like a truly important teaching to be. Particularly if the interpretations themselves are not subject to corroboration and indicate, rather, a strong desire to believe.

May I state again that I find nothing wrong with the desire to believe. It is merely that I, personally, have more respect for reason to believe than for desire to believe. And I am not talking about inner spiritual promptings when I say desire.

It seems to me beyond question that the general body of information presented in "The Impending Golden Age" has implications of the greatest importance. If this teaching is in large measure true, our lives will be radically affected in the very near future. Even more immediate, there is implied the futility of all courses of current action directed towards the improvement of the human condition, and inasmuch as my personal life is presently oriented in that direction, nothing could be of more importance to me. Therefore it is necessary for me to decide what my attitude should be towards believing, or disbelieving the teaching in its more far-reaching aspects. It is too important for me to allow myself to believe what I might desire to believe.

Now to take up and offer comment on some of the salient positive and negative reactions I note in myself when carefully reading and re-reading the book in question.

It should be said to begin with that I am bound, in honesty and fairness, to categorize at least seven-eighths of this writing as "positive", or at any rate neutral. I mean by this that if I read a sentence and no question or doubt about its contents arises in my mind, I certainly cannot put it under the negative heading. But of my reactions to many facets of the work which have been definitely positive, I will list several outstanding ones:

1. The underlying cyclical aspect rings true to me, even though I do not understand why Sanctilean's cycles feature 13 and 9, whereas Theosophy's cycles feature 7 and sometimes 12. Three is common to both.
2. The "Veil of Antiquity" concept would seem to explain why long-past civilizations are still undiscovered; further, the philosophy of preventing human attachment to the past seems sound.
3. The constitution of man as outlined is generally consistent with Theosophy, as are such matters as "supramundane planes" or states of matter & consciousness.
4. The hierarchial emphasis is consistent with other teachings, particularly the Alice A. Bailey books, Theosophy, and Freemasonry.
5. The motive for writing the book seems basically altruistic; I detect no obvious mundane motives that I would be inclined to consider suspect. (This is not to say that I detect no mundane intrusions into this body of allegedly supramundane teaching, but these are so obviously of mundane injection that they scarcely can be confused with the main body of teaching.)
6. The high valuation of Jesus is certainly positive. On the other hand there is no mention whatever of Buddha or Krishna. I get the impression that these latter are not considered avatars. Millions hold the belief that The Buddha was "born of woman", whereas Sanctilean states most definitely that a true avatar is never so born. Aurobindo, of whom normal birth is a known fact, would seem to come out much the worse for this teaching.
7. There is reference to "Rays", a subject which, though rather neglected in Theosophy, is present within it.
8. The metaphysics relative to central suns, the gradual elevation or spiritualization of solar systems, etc., is consistent with the general teachings of Theosophy.

References to continental drift and polar shift, both of which are currently-held scientific theories, might be considered positive, but these matters are not thoroughly treated. There is one scientific statement which is beyond question true, appearing on page 93: "The sun rises and sets daily because of the rotation of the Earth".

I would like to group together next some inclusions to which I assign negative value, but only minor negative value. In other words, these are the kind of things which may well prejudice a reader against a body of teaching, but which in themselves to not undermine or weaken the basics of the teaching.

1. The whole complex represented by the Hra Maiac language, its alleged relation to all earthly languages, its equation with certain current words with alleged derivation, etc. I have a feeling that a good etymologist could have a field day pointing out weaknesses in this area, but the fact is, it is not germane to the essential message of the book. (But in passing I cannot resist the observation that cereal does not derive from the Cereus, or saguaro, as stated, but is patently derived from Ceres, the Italian or Roman goddess of agriculture. To connect Ceres with the saguaro, even through the medium of a "Pa Scuan" who floats in the air for several hundred years, would seem a bit far-fetched.)
2. Reference to the "fourth dimension" as a higher or supra-mundane dimension. Since modern science accepts time as the fourth dimension, and very logically so, it would seem another numeration would have been preferable for Sanctilean.
3. On p. 46 the reference to the Passion Play of Oberammergau assigns it prime causation in the "debacle of Europe". If this is meant symbolically the wording used is clumsy.
4. On p. 58 it is stated that (certain laggards) are brought by Nature into an environment of increasingly high frequency; in which their evil desires and criminal tendencies are so enhanced that they are "driven into all manner of bestiality, crime, and violence". Which is the "drastic process of their cleansing". This would seem to violate the responsibility factor in the law of karma, but I will quickly add that I never did understand the law of karma in detail.
5. P. 105: "The letters USA are found hidden in UrSula" (the first name of Mother Shipton). I confess this sort of thing tends to make me ill when encountered amid a weighty subject.
6. P. 109: "And nations (shall) wane as babes decrease". A prophecy of Mother Shipton, which time and events have proved to be exactly contrary to the facts. Yet below it the commentator says, "These forecasts are so clear as to require no comment". I consider this type of thing to be evidence for the probability that at least one mundane writer has interjected his work into a matrix that may have come from a supermundane source.
7. P. 113: "He or she who believes in gods and goddesses, or believes that he or she is one of Thot's chosen people... dies with his or her gods and goddesses..." This would not be at all hard to accept were it not for the fact that the preceding chapters speak repeatedly of chosen people, chosen races, etc.
8. P. 117: "The Yisrealites were a remnant of the Lemurian, black-skinned race." The context makes clear that it is the Jewish race that is referred to. Now I do not feel it fair to reject this statement simply because it conflicts with the theosophical tenet that the Jews are Semites and not included in the third root race or the Lemurian group. ~~But~~ I am no more personally sure of one teaching than the other. But...I would feel a bit silly if I didn't reject it on the grounds that Jews are not black.

9. P. 122: "...as pictured to St. John in his Initiation as a neophyte in the Temple of Pad Mi Hum on the Island of Hralta in the Sah Ara Sea thirteen Golden Ages ago." Nowhere can I find in the book any information setting a time period for an entire Solar Cycle, or revolution around a central sun. It is however, made clear that a Golden Age is about 900 years long, more or less, and is one of 13 ages comprising an "elevation" or Solar Cycle of Progress. Multiplying this out, assuming each age is about the same length, we have something happening to St. John 154,100 years ago. (Now obviously, says my plausible interpreter half, one of St. John's earlier incarnations was meant. Then why wasn't that written? rejoins my critical half. If it is possible for a book to be written concisely and self-consistently - and I possess at least one book that is - then why can't a "supramundane" source produce one as good in this respect? Doesn't a subject of this gravity deserve care in its communication?)
10. P. 122: (Speaking of the great seal of the U.S.) "The thirteen stripes running southward from the 'Great Sea' represent the thirteen conectories, the thirteen streams of life..." Why not the thirteen original states of the United States? There is a useful dictum of the so-called "scientific procedure" which states that if several hypotheses seem to provide answers to a problem, the simplest one should be preferred.

All the above negative findings are relatively trivial, and I mention them to point out how an important message can be occluded by negative trivia to the point that most intelligent readers will reject the whole thing out of hand. This, of course, is not a wise thing to do, particularly when respected persons of stature incline towards endorsing some of the body of teaching. But in the case of those negative findings which follow, and which in my opinion are major weaknesses in the book, I feel the only course of wisdom is to use every discriminative faculty at one's command. There are four areas in which I, personally, find major flaw:

- (A) What can be described as a very human kind of nationalism pervades many parts of the book. The United States is again and again pictured as the "great nation (which is) the Torchbearer of Freedom and Enlightenment throughout the world". This may be so, but other democracies are consistently belittled along with the general run of all foreign nations except Canada, Australia, & New Zealand. There are so many examples of this that all cannot be quoted, but this one, from P. 84, will suffice: "The declining psychic inspirations of Europe and the Orient are not the spiritual inspirations of the New Age now unfolding in the USA. These psychic inspirations are not loyal to the USA, its ideals, its purposes, or its people. ... (They) are loyal to their own countries, traditions, institutions and people. In their reaching out to America, they are attempting to repossess men and women who have migrated to America, and through them to possess their native-born American friends. This is spiritually destructive to America".

I would find it difficult to chide a man who referred to this passage as paranoid nationalism.

(B) I believe I understand what is meant in the words attributed to Jesus, summarized by the phrase "turn the other cheek". I think I am perhaps evolved enough to see the occult as well as the social value of this directive. But I feel that the outright directive not to resent or resist evil could be very bad advice if taken in the breadth of scope in which it appears to be given. And it is given, baldly, without interpretation or explanation, on page after page of the book in question. Of course, the principle of reinforcement of evil through attention to it is a sound one. But the admonition is given in an awesomely broad form. For example: "He who resists evil, who strikes back, who hates, who lives impurely, unchastely and selfishly, who relies upon the death rite as the way of salvation, cannot rise even into the Enlightened Sector of the Human Estate." I can find no fault with this except in the first four words. Striking back does not seem to be what is meant, since this is given separate mention. What it could well be taken to mean - and herein, I feel, lies its danger - is that no organized, group, national, or personal resistance should be offered to evil (including all kinds of evil since no limitations are given.

I find myself imagining what would have happened if the USA, and England, had simply offered no resistance to Nazism under Hitler. What would happen to the social community in this nation if no resistance were offered, in any way, to the Mafia? To income tax cheaters? What would happen to me if I offered no resistance to my own vital elemental's frequent craving for alcohol?

All sorts of apologies may be offered, but I am afraid I must take the position that I consider this awfully bad advice, the way it is put. And I do strongly feel that a supramundane teacher has a responsibility to put important teachings before his readers with care.

(C) The chapter on Outer Darkness presents a picture which is difficult to reconcile within its own framework. In other words, using its own idetic elements as given, the resultant conclusions or developments contain seemingly fatal flaws. In reading over this chapter, I invite those who might be interested to ask themselves these questions: If infra-red radiation pushes the evil emanations outward, and balance is maintained by sunlight pushing them inward, then what should be expected to happen on the night side of the Earth, every night? If evil emanations are not physical but astral and lower mental and etheric, how can a physical entity such as infra-red light push it? If this collective "beast" actually collapsed onto the surface of the earth on "Tuesday, November 19, 1919", shouldn't something pretty drastic have been noticed on that day? If this "Ab hram" will ignite and burn "just as does gasoline fumes" in the near future, filling the entire atmosphere with smoke and flames, how will animals, birds, and insects survive, not to speak of people pure as well as impure?

I freely admit this appeals to me as a lovely way to get rid of a lot of psychic evil all at once, but I am worried by the side effects. I am also not reassured by what knowledge of history I have, inasmuch as it would seem there was as much or more active evil hereabouts while the "beast" was "bound" as there now is since its "unloosing upon the earth for a season".

- (D) The last alleged (by me) "major defect" in the book is one which can be briefly delineated, but which seems to me to be absolutely in contradiction of the laws of nature. Of course, high initiates and Master Craftsmen must be granted the ability to supersede nature, as it were. I grant the inadvisability of being too materialistic when challenging concepts in the realm of the occult and metaphysical. Still, on page 78, statements appear which can be summarized thus:

When our planet enters the aurium of the central invisible sun Vela, it becomes plastic as a consequence of the nearly complete suspension of cohesion and gravitation. This enables the Master Craftsmen to modify the crust of the earth with almost kaleidoscopic speed. Granite, for example, flows like lava. Every trace of the former habitation of the Earth by man is obliterated.

Now it is made clear that this will be done while humanity is in occupancy of the planet, for we are told that Americans of the eastern states will retreat to the Appalachians, which will become an island, the rest will be led into a new continent, etc. It seems to me that even though one may grant great salvatory powers to the Arisen Master Craftsmen, one should be forgiven for assuming that what applies to granite should apply to water, wood, air, and living flesh. I for one am completely unable to see how the complete eradication of all life could be avoided. Without cohesion, how can any form be maintained? Yet afterwards we have the spectacle of living survivors being "led into what was once China", etc.etc.

I do not say that one should not believe this, extreme as it sounds. But I must say that I feel no intelligent person should allow himself or herself to believe it lacking good and sufficient reason to do so. I cannot accept that this book, in itself, offers such sufficient reason. This teaching may be accepted on faith, but I myself have insufficient cause for placing such a degree of faith in an unknown author or authors.

It always develops, when a "fair critique" is undertaken, that the negative points consume far more attention than the positive ones. I regret this. But after saying "this seems reasonable" about a positive point, little else remains to be said.

A few other inclusions strike me as merely questionable. I assign them no negative valuation, but will merely put them as questions:

1. If the "early Greeks" represent the first race to emerge after the last Golden Age, and if the early Greeks are the ones I am familiar with or even their compound-great grand-fathers, what of the time element involved in this elevation of 13 ages, when here we are again, already, about to undergo another Golden Age?
2. If we are indeed on the very edge of the Vela aurium, as is repeatedly indicated throughout the book, our sun s<sup>h</sup>

far into the "blue-white" range and emitting a preponderance of ultra-violet light, as stated. If this is true, and it is now susceptible of corroboration by space vehicles whether or not it is, then the consequent predictions should be observable now. Is sunburn more of a problem than it was 50 years ago? Are desert areas now habitable?

3. Is there any indication that the Japanese Current, as stated, has already been deflected into mid-Pacific? Is, as a consequence, the climate of the Pacific Coast much colder?
4. If it is true that infra-red radiation, coming through the center of the Earth from cosmic sources, radiates outward "vertically" from all surfaces of the earth, can this radiation be observed as issuing equally from polar regions as from tropic regions? I am under the impression that infra-red radiation is accompanied by heat.
5. Several interesting questions arise in connection with the statements made to the effect that the moon was pulled from the Pacific Ocean by the close passage of the planet ~~Vetolyn~~ Seth, which made asteroids out of the planet ~~Vetolyn~~ (from which the word "veto" is derived) on the way.

Setting aside the matter of a seeming conflict with theosophical doctrine, which I am sure can be resolved, we still have these questions to ponder:

- (a) If this event took place during the human habitation of the earth - and it did, according to references made to "early Atlans" inhabiting Atlantis at the time - how could such a tremendous pull have failed to draw away all the water on earth and all the atmosphere? It was sufficient, we are told, to pull a solid rock mass of approximately 1/20th the weight of the earth out of the crust of the planet.
- (b) If the atmosphere and water were indeed pulled away and later fell back to the heavier mass, what would have happened to the unfortunate Atlans meanwhile?
- (c) If this event happened no longer ago than a few million years, how account for the roundness of the moon? The material could not have been plastic or molten in entirety at that late date.
- (d) How did the planet Seth manage to break out of its orbit, against the laws of physics, and fall into the sun? Where is its companion planet, "Can"?

In concluding I must say that my position as regards belief-disbelief is equivocal. I am prepared to accept some of the Sanctilean teaching but I must tentatively reject other parts. I cannot discard the idea that this teaching may have been badly garbled by the interjection of embellishments from mundane followers and scribes of Sanctilean, and that it still contains much of value. I will continue to repress the tendency to throw out the whole when the part seems bad. There exist, I believe, relative "authorities" in my acquaintance. They are, it is to be hoped, in a position to add substance and credibility to the message of this book. If its message is as important as it presents itself as being, then I for one ask that it be done. Until it is, in view of the division of positive and negative, I can respect my own attitude.