

The Science of the Occult

The Fabulous Findings of PSI Lab Tests--
from Westernmost USA to Easternmost USSR--
Seen in the Critical Light of Christian Realism.

Carsten Johnsen

First Edition

Published on the 25th Anniversary
of the Death of Carsten Johnsen

Copyright © 2012 by Health Ministry Foundation, Inc.
www.CarstenJohnsen.org

Foreword

The interface between the occult and science continues to develop quickly. More and more science is being made the bond-servant of a philosophy that is anti-science and totally unrealistic. We have begun to see the consequences, if indeed our eyes are open and not captivated by the latest imaginative invention of a self-centered culture.

In his typical fashion as a historian of ideas, Carsten Johnsen herein reveals to us the inescapable connections between the interpretations generally being given to modern parapsychology, and the ancient philosophy of spiritualism. He saw clearly when he wrote this manuscript, near the end of the 20th century, the direction our culture is headed. Though much has changed in our world, particularly in the political realm of the Soviet Union which was in its last gasps in 1987 when this manuscript was completed, more has not changed in the least whit. The last 25 years serve only to confirm Carsten's perception, from the revelation that astrology has guided White House decisions in Washington, D.C., to the paranormal entertainment in the television shows, masquerading at times as good and real by promising to reunite people in this world with their loved ones who have died, as Carsten so aptly put it, "something meaningfully personal on the highest level of humanity."

In 1995 the Adventist Pioneer Library (APL, a service then of Health Ministry Foundation, Inc.) published a comprehensive collection of Carsten's writings in an auxiliary section of the CD-ROM entitled *Words of the Pioneers, Second Edition*, which was an extensive library of early Seventh-day Adventist pioneer writings. We were

given permission by Oslo University to include the one work under their copyright, *Man the Indivisible*. In response to our request for the family's permission to publish the other writings in electronic format, Per Johnsen, Carsten's older son, encouraged us in our plans. He added that he especially wished us to include the manuscript his father was working on at the time of his death, which eventually was found to be this document. The problem was, no one seemed to know where the manuscript was.

Near the end of his life Carsten had sent the manuscript of this book to Timothy Hullquist, who had published many of Carsten's early books. Carsten had intended for Timothy to publish this one, through his publishing business, Teach Services of Brushton, New York. Carsten's untimely death prevented the publication from being completed at that time, though the first computer draft had been made. No one with APL thought to check with Timothy in the early 1990s when Per Johnsen mentioned Carsten's last manuscript. But later Timothy realized that due to APL's interest in Carsten's works, this last manuscript should be added to the collection. Thus in 1999 he transferred to APL the original manuscript and the initial computer draft.

Over the next two years Irmgard F. Lazar, R.N., working with Karen Beckwith, John Kelly, M.D., and Martha Ruggles donated with pleasure many hours of reviewing the computer draft with the original manuscript. Minimal editing was done. Carsten's love of long chapter titles was preserved in the subtitles to some of the chapters. We initially hoped to publish this at the 15th anniversary of Carsten's death, but circumstances have delayed that another decade.

More than once I have observed the telling insight and accuracy of Carsten's writings dealing with the history of human ideas, as unfolding in our day. There is indeed nothing new under the sun, and I am continually amazed at the breadth of content of his works, and the perception that God gave him in so many areas. I tend to agree with Pastor Bill Brace from Massachusetts, who was a student of Carsten's at the seminary, and who phoned me a few years back from when this document was acquired. He spoke of how blessed he has been with the books of Carsten that he has, and inquired if there was more written that was not published. He stated plainly, "This man was a prophet without honor. The trends in our church that are becoming very obvious at present, Carsten perceived 15 to 20 years ago, and wrote concerning them."

Carsten's perceptions of the integration of philosophy and religion, all in the context of the great controversy between good and evil, speak eloquently of the simplicity of holiness, and the depth of biblical realism. Richard Davidson, previous Chairman of the Old Testament Department at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University, was also a student of Carsten's at the same seminary. In 2002 he gave a powerful presentation in Loma Linda on the choice between the two beings in heaven, the two trees in the garden, and the two days in our time that serve to prove one's belief in the word of God. The roots of his talk, he acknowledged, were in Carsten's seminary classes.

As we worked to prepare this manuscript in 2002, Carsten's second son Andreas (Andrew to his English-speaking friends) arrived in the USA to pursue

undergraduate studies. He enjoyed learning more of the American side of his father, and the impact his writings have made and continue to make on this side of the Atlantic.

With a fair sense of what the author would have wanted, this book is dedicated to Per Johnsen and Andrew Johnsen, in memory of their father, on the 25th anniversary of his death

Fred Bischoff, M.D.
Health Ministry Foundation, Inc.
Loma Linda, CA
August 2012

Biographical Sketch of the Author

Carsten Johnsen was born in Norway February 23, 1914. He memorized the dictionary from A to Z when he was a student of Latin, English, French, and German at the University of Oslo, becoming a linguist par excellence. During his early student days, he read *The Conflict of the Ages Series* by Ellen G. White, and gave up his inborn enthusiasm for romanticism, and dedicated his life to what he called, "the rock-bottom realism of Seventh-day Adventism."

He finished his "Lektoreksamen" (a seven year university study, equivalent above a masters but below a doctorate) at Oslo University in 1940, specializing in Romance Philology.

After many years of teaching he went into new fields of study, this time in France, at the University of Montpellier, where he earned a doctorate in Philosophy and the History of Ideas. His dissertation was entitled *Essai sur l'Altérocentrisme contre l'Egocentrisme en tant que Motifs Fondamentaux du Caractère Humain* (Université de Montpellier, 1968). This was translated into English with the title of *The Part of the Story You Were Never Told About Women*, published in the USA just prior to his death.

He also studied at Faculté de Théologie Protestante, where he earned a doctorate in Theology. His French dissertation here was *Essai sur l'Unite de l'Homme*, which was published in 1971 by the Oslo University Press in English with the title of *Man the Indivisible—Totality Versus Disruption in the History of Western Thought*. At the time of his death this book was still in use by the universities in Norway.

He married Ester Henriksen, and had a son Per by this marriage. Ester died of tuberculosis. He remarried, and with his second wife Sylvi he had a second son Andreas.

He had a lifetime of teaching at Adventist and other schools in Norway, Denmark, Austria, France, England, Ethiopia, and the United States. His last assignment prior to retirement was as Professor of Philosophy, Systematic Theology, and Christian Ethics at the Graduate School and the Theological Seminary at Andrews University, from 1968 to 1978. During his retirement he continued teaching and writing, spending his time between Norway and the United States, with short-term volunteer teaching assignments in Jamaica and Kenya.

In 1972 as a result of cooperation between Andrews University and the Norwegian Universities, he began to conduct summer courses in Alpes de Provence, the French highlands bordering on Italy and the Mediterranean. On a mountain farm near Sisteron, described by tourists as "La Perle de la Provence," youth from many countries gathered every year to find, in the Ethics and Philosophy of Christian Realism, a knowledge which makes life meaningful.

His motivation did not come from the marketplace. Like the prophets of old, he did not speak because people listened or write because his views were in great demand. He worked tirelessly, inspired by the grandeur of the message on which he staked his life.

He died July 30, 1987 in Norway at age 73.

(With thanks to Sigve Tonstad, M.D.)

Preface

In my preparatory little volume containing the little-known drama of the more or less clandestine science of the occult in the Soviet Union, I also tried, as conscientiously as possible, to draw up my balance sheet.

My reader had opportunity to listen to a more than fantastic story. But that story is true from one end to the other. Its almost incredible truths, however, have forced me to take a new, hard look at the science of the occult in its first modern homeland, America, and the Western world by and large.

What on earth is it we are actually up to, dear fellow Westerners? This is a mirage that has to be scrutinized with redoubled caution and an open mind. Too long, indeed, have possible angles of interpretation been pushed under the rug. I must strike my balance only after having paid fair attention to every single alternative.

Introduction

Parapsychological research has obviously made its triumphant march *everywhere*. Particularly in the most civilized parts of our globe this scientific approach to the many phenomena of the occult has had a resounding success. The research laboratories of universities from the westernmost parts of America to the easternmost parts of Soviet Russia have, during recent decades, unfolded a hectic activity in order to find out the deepest secrets in the abyss called "hidden man."

And now, what have the learned ones managed to come up with as the result of this intensive research? Well, in one way the unanimity appears quite astounding, and I would say existentially gripping. It all converges into one great message. If that message is true, it turns the most essential part of all previous scientific knowledge upside down. I am speaking about the fundamental relation between body and soul in a normal human being. That includes the topical question, "What possibilities does man's deepest consciousness have of surviving the total corruption of the body?"

We should here keep in mind what the traditional viewpoint of modern sciences has been regarding the body-mind relationship during recent centuries. Scientists felt that they had every good reason to think that body and mind are just two sides of one and the same reality, *man*. We call that a monistic anthropology. And it coincides with the views of both Judaism and original Christianity. When man dies, it is a totality that dies. The Biblical view of man's limitations is consistent enough. Death is again and again compared to a perfect *sleep* both in the Old and the

New Testament. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not any thing." Ecclesiastes 8:5. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." Ecclesiastes 8:10. This is consistent Judeo-Christian body-mind realism.

From the beginning our modern scientist actually went right back to this, and stayed there for centuries. In other words, they discarded the pagan Greek philosopher's spiritualistic belief in an immortal human soul automatically surviving the body. This eternal immortality was looked upon as pagan superstition from antiquity and the Middle Ages—a heritage, in later Christendom, not from Moses or from Jesus Christ, but from Plato (427?-347? B.C.) and Plotinus (A.D. 205-270). In the psychophysiological departments of modern medicine all laboratory findings had converged in one general realization: The body and the soul of a living human being constitute one inseparable whole. Whenever the nerve cells of the body are damaged and die, it is a totality that is damaged and dies. This then is the inevitable fate of man's consciousness (his mental activity). It suffers an exactly corresponding damage, and finally dies.

The opposite view to this realistic monism is platonic dualism. That pagan Greek view of man has been called dualistic, because it inevitably implies a certain duality or doubleness—that is, a destructible body on the one hand and an "indestructible soul" on the other hand. That soul is assumed to have an inherent and quite automatically functioning immortality. Its existence is from everlasting to everlasting.

The idea of a "resurrection of the flesh," as the early

Christian Church formulated its future hope, would of course seem to be an absurdity to the pagan platonic anthropology, which gradually insinuated its philosophy into the Christian faith. The ensuing mixture between paganism and Christianity was bound to be nonsensical. It caused theologians endless logical problems (cf. Thomas Aquinas). The first Christians had not been troubled by any similar confusion. They had had an implicit faith in what the Bible stated so clearly and so simply: It is *man, as a totality*, that dies. So the only hope is that man, as a totality, rises again from the dead. Man has to be waked up as a body-soul reality. That necessary *waking up* meant to those first Christians a life-creating intervention on God's part. In the midst of a pagan-platonic environment, with its one-sided stress on the "Soul" as the great thing, it obviously appeared natural for all Biblical Christianity to express its confession of faith in terms of "*carnis resurrectio*" (the resurrection of the *flesh*). The idea was, of course, a "resurrection of *man*." And all real human beings, according to Judeo-Christian realism, do have bodies—tangible, visible, literal bodies—as well as a mental awareness, of course, permeating those bodies every bit. The soul ("animus") *animates* the body, *makes it alive*.

This psychophysical monism is, of course, the diametrical opposite of platonic-Greek spiritualism—also called "idealism" in speculative philosophy, since it implies that the abstract *idea* is the only reality worthwhile. That is tantamount to saying, in the case of man, his "pure soul" ("pure" in the sense of "not contaminated" by a physical body). This is seen as the only worthwhile reality, humanly speaking. Do you see the splitting happening to

man in this philosophical type of "idealism"?

It should be easy here, then, to make out which view of man, of these two, is in favor of wholeness, and which is lacerating and disruptive—tearing the totality asunder. Christian realism is based on a wholesome principle of totality. Pagan spiritualism is based on a principle of utter disruption.

A parallel distinction between Christianity and the prevailing philosophical tradition of the Western world (platonic spiritualism) is then equally obvious. To the monism of Christian realistic thought, it is bound to appear as a matter of fact that a *personal intervention on the part of a saving God* is absolutely indispensable. In order to make a realistically dead man alive again, one thing is required: The great Creator must take a new initiative. He must create anew. How could anything less than that miraculous intervention, on the part of a personal God, change a dead cadaver into a living man? This personal initiative was exactly what Christians found described again and again by Jesus of Nazareth and by his disciples in the New Testament canon, that is, Jesus Christ was going to appear again at the end of the ages, and then His believers of old, after their long and perfect sleep in the grave, maybe for centuries, were to be waked up and join their Saviour. It is Paul, the great preacher of the gospel hope in Gentile territory, who writes about the capital historic event of the future in these terms in his letter to a Greek congregation: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God

bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [come before] them which are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18.

Modern Historical Research Unanimous about the Early Church's Views on Man's Nature and Destiny

An intensive research activity has been undertaken by outstanding theologians all over the world, both Protestant and Catholic, in the course of the last 100 years or so, to find out what early Christianity actually believed about man, his nature and his destiny. And the result of their investigations is pretty unanimous. The anthropological views of the Bible and of early Christians were quite consistently monistic. Body and soul are looked upon as one inseparable unit. The "two" are just two aspects of one and the same reality, *man*. It was a pagan Greek infiltration into Christendom, on the part of platonic and neo-platonic philosophy, that by and by introduced the notion of an eternal self-existing soul, a soul without any possibility of dying, in fact. That is, a soul going on to live *automatically*, from aeon to aeon, either in a heaven or a hell. I should leave to my individual reader to evaluate on his own whether these new elements entering our theology gave Christianity an increased possibility of impressing

sober-minded people as something heartily meaningful.

I stressed one fact of platonic idealism (dualism): It assumes that the soul goes on existing forever. And that existence is a matter of absolute automatism. Now, one important question, "Is automatism, as a principle for human life, something meaningful?" How could it possibly be? That automatism, which is a basic theory of all spiritualism, inevitably takes away every bit of contingent historicity. It fundamentally takes away every bit of personalism also. It causes both gods and men to be reduced to automatons. Of course, I do know that certain modern forms of that same spiritualism pretend to take care of man as an individual person. But I shall demonstrate for you, in due course, that this new trick which modern spiritualists avail themselves of, and the appearance they thus provoke, is just something they manage to the same degree as their spiritualism is inconsistent with itself. Plato, their true father in the Western world, had a philosophy a thousand times more consistent.

What I must limit myself to saying for the time being is just one thing here. The confusion that was peculiar to spiritualism as a philosophy has gradually caused traditional Christendom to be equally confused. For it goes without saying that operating with two diametrically opposite views about man within one and the same movement was bound to create a hopeless confusion among both the learned and the laity.

*A Promising Trend of Realism Asserting Itself within
Modern Science in Its Incipient Approach toward the
Reality of Man*

The more encouraging it has been to note a considerable harmonious relation between that realistic Biblical anthropology of early Christianity and the first tradition of Occidental psychophysiology. During several centuries our medical scientists, quite unlike our traditional theologian-philosophers, grasped the fullness of a realistic vision about man as an indivisible unity. This was before the time when parapsychology emerged as a sensational new science. Of course, even psychology proper, which is much older, had for a long time tended to adopt the character of a speculative philosophy rather than a matter-of-fact science.

Two Armies Arrayed Against Each Other

What I have tried to make you aware of is a forthcoming fight between two opposite views on man, assuming dramatic proportions in our culture. This is at a time that the Bible happens to call "the time of the end."

Now you may of course say, shaking your head with an ironical smile: "But, after all, is this a matter so important that it is worth fighting about, wherever and whenever it arises? Is it anything more than a dry theoretical-metaphysical question? Does it have any real significance outside the narrow circle of a bunch of academic gamecocks?"

To this I should reply: remember that we here have to do with the fundamental nature of living human beings. Would it not be logical to suspect that this might be of decisive importance for your destiny and mine, for time and eternity?

You should know something grippingly relevant about what is about to take place—in your day—among laymen, as

well as among learned specialists in scientific circles. For it is sensational indeed: People by the millions surrender unconditionally today to the evidence they think they find absolutely convincing in the clear data of parapsychological research.

Evidence for what? For dualism, and not at all monism, being the truth about man's nature and destiny. Every day there is a handsome increase in the number of thinking persons who land in the harbor of a philosophy that for thousands of years has pretended that it has something tremendously valuable to offer to human beings.

Well, if this is true, then how could the Biblical teaching of a monistic view be true at the same time? And if truth is what we should go in for, whatever it tells us, then we had better get duly informed. This must apply to Christian circles, as well as to non-Christian circles. We must be seriously concerned about both Christians and those already-mentioned natural scientists of the older school who have continually espoused the cause of a consistently monistic thought-form, exactly like first and second century Christians used to do.

It is in the pressing urgency of this upsurging battle that I have dared to take up the issue at hand in its full breadth. I have forced myself to give the recent laboratory data of present-day parapsychological research an open look. And I have not failed to be impressed by its apparently quite revolutionizing findings. As a result, I have come up with a perspective that nobody else, to my knowledge, has ever made available to a critical debate in an open forum.

Why shouldn't I be permitted to ask clear and decent questions about the historical development of man's views

about man? And now, suppose my investigations lead up to an indisputable discovery about the anthropological views of the vast majority of present-day Christendom; namely, that they have moved away from the stern realism of original Christianity into the fanciful spiritualism of disruptive platonic paganism, believing in an automatic survival of a "pure soul" (a sort of consciousness without any bodily basis). And suppose I make a similar discovery about the historical trend of Western science: Scientific research is gradually leaning the same way. That is definitely so, if we regard parapsychological researchers as scientists, which we would like to do. Institutions having enjoyed for centuries a high-ranking reputation for their academic dependability in the world of sober-minded investigation have now simply left their realistic traditions of old in favor of thoroughly dualistic views about man. Well, should I then calmly accept this development in both science and religion without challenging those nominal Christian believers and those nominal scientists? Or should I rather ask them insistently to tell me what intelligent reasons they *do* have for this radical change in their views?

Part I

Chapter 1 The Occult and the Sensational

The Occult and the Thrillingly Sensational in Man's Life from the Dawn of Human History

Let me first present some circumstantial evidence for an attitude of realism rather than sensationalism in the Bible, from its very beginning.

I have tried in such works as *Man the Indivisible* (Oslo University Press, 1971) to point out the attitude Christianity takes to *sensationalism* and *super-excitement*. Some people tend to think that this emotional instability is the very essence of intensive religiousness. But the religion of the Bible evidently has a very different opinion about that. Whenever man enters the zones where he becomes sensation craving and over-excited, the Christian signals of warning against imminent danger suddenly go up.

Clearly the oldest document containing an account of something super-sensational and super-exciting in man's life is to be found in the third chapter of Genesis. It is the story about a serpent that began to speak. The alluring and flattering words spoken on that occasion did not fail to provoke in the listening woman precisely that excessive tension that is the eerie thrill happening in human minds when the border between safety and lurking danger is being passed. It would be a mild expression to characterize those words of a serpent as just exciting and sensational.

That early chapter of the Bible has few details as to the actual conditions leading up to the exciting experience here related. Some ask, "How could God expose His first human couple to an atmosphere as dangerously exciting as that?" Well, was God the one to blame at all in this case? It would

hardly be in accordance with the general picture which the Bible otherwise presents of God, and the way that God deals with man, to assume that He would take the initiative Himself to expose an innocent and inexperienced creature of His to an atmosphere of excitement and sensation of a truly dangerous nature. It must rather be reasonable to assume that the intelligent creature, *of her own accord*, had already chosen a trend of behavior which gradually was bound to end up in that super-exciting situation. One thing seems evident from the tenor of the Biblical account: Eve had placed herself where she would be standing *alone* on the ground of a perilous temptation. Obviously she had started to indulge in making some peculiar experiments in life--away from her husband's side. She had failed to seek counsel, either from God or from the companion He had given her, regarding the solitary walk in the garden she had planned to undertake. She was no longer where she belonged.

What we know for sure, as a present reality in our degraded world, is the sad consequence and ultimate fruition of such indulgence. We know the far-reaching result of Eve's determination to yield to the allurements of the dangerously novel and the thrillingly exciting. We need not know every detail in the subsequent gradual fall of mankind into the night of sin and misery. We are clearly informed that Adam made common cause with his erring wife. Together they ventured to take the hazardous step right into the *terra incognita* (the unknown land) which God had warned them against.

The main theme for our present study is the occult in its historic illumination. So to us it must be essential to point

at some decisive tricks in the magic game played by the forces of evil, enabling them to lead thinking human beings right into the wild world of tragic deception. Most men would hardly ever dare to place their feet on the forbidden ground of enemy territory, if it had not been for the fact that the arch-deceiver has from the beginning made thorough preparations to camouflage his own identity. Eve had felt the proud urge to possess superhuman powers, even by the means of some magic device. So she had come to the point where she accepted sham reality as though it were reality itself. She permitted herself to be impressed that she had contact with the right spender of supernatural forces, the one that was able to lead her right up to her desired goal. And then later it turned out that the one with whom she had been conversing was not at all the one he had pretended to be. She thought she was facing a well-intentioned and super-gifted serpent. And then she had the painful disappointment of learning that she had been in the clutches of a spirit medium.

"A spirit medium!" you may exclaim protestingly. "Where do you find it written in any reliable source of information that this unusually sympathetic and unusually clever beast, suddenly starting to speak in the way of intelligent persons, was a medium?"

The *Bible* is simply teeming with testimonies to that effect. I could not desire a more reliable confirmation of what I claim. You know what a *medium* means. It is a "go-between," a "middle-man," an "intermediary." Between whom does that "middle-man," or "middle-woman," if you like, go? Well, in our historic instance, the personality behind the entire flow of pleasant words was no other than

"the great dragon." The Bible also describes him precisely as "the old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." Revelation 12:9 goes on to say about him, "He was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

Originally his name was an entirely different one. It was Lucifer, that is, the "light bearer." Isaiah 14:12 calls him the "Son of the Morning," an "anointed cherub that covereth." Ezekiel describes him in this impressive way:

"Thou wast upon the holy mountain of God. Thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee." Ezekiel 28:14,15.

The Bible is eloquent in the terms it uses to portray the beauty of this tremendous personality created by God, and raised to the pinnacles of personal honor by Him, with the sublime intention of reflecting the glory of the Most High. Unfortunately Lucifer ceased to have an eye single to the glory of God. His eyes began to turn inward, toward himself. As the first creature in the history of the universe, he yielded to the temptation of misusing the matchless gift from God of a free will. He used it to pave the road for his own downfall. This happened in the way of a gradual progression, similar to the subsequent course of Eve, step by step downward. The point of departure was also a similar indulgence in thoughts of a weird, illicit excitement. The most difficult part to understand, of course, is how the movement could start at all. But the Bible makes it clear that the possibility of such a trend downhill was there. It must necessarily be, from the very moment when the Creator pronounced his decisive word: "Let a *person* be

created." A creaturely person necessarily means a creature equipped with *freedom of choice*. The thing this creaturely person is supposed to choose, according to the Creator's intention, is precisely *good*. And the alternative to good is *evil*. Without the freedom of a choice between the two, there can be no meaning whatsoever in the very notion of personalism. But being created as a person must also inevitably imply that the person in question is, all the time, conscious of his eminent rank compared to most other creatures. And this very eminence should always be tempered with the following realistic acknowledgement (in terms of humble admission): the creaturely person should constantly keep in mind the fact that, after all, he is something *infinitely less than the Creator*. A creaturely being has been called into existence by the only Self-existent One. To start being dissatisfied with the basic fact of one's having been created (that is, one's basic dependence on God), is the height of "irrealism". It is also at the very root of the fundamental motif of all Western spiritualism, from Plato down. Another term for it is *foolish pride*. There is no difference between Occidental and Oriental spiritualism in this respect.

If you ask me what I think is the essential characteristic of the pagan philosophy which has become the great pattern of thought of our Western world today, and infinitely more so than in the days of Plato himself, my answer knows no hesitation. It is *self-sufficiency*; in Plato's own language: *autarkeia*. It is precisely that foolish pagan pride that told the humanistic idealists of old the absurd story that their soul was in existence from eternity. It had never been created, they claimed. In other words, it was

self-existent like God. And, of course, if man (or the "soul" of man, the "part" of him that is supposed most real in him) is in this way nothing less than divine, then how could such a foolish notion produce anything but haughtiness of the most unrealistic kind possible, namely, the basic motif of self-sufficiency.

So it is also noteworthy indeed to ask, "When the arch-deceiver presents his temptation to Eve, what is it he appeals to?" It is her secret, but gradually increasing desire to "be like God." That, you see, happened to be the absurd temptation to which Lucifer himself had once succumbed. All spiritualists finally succumb to the sentimental romanticism of this illicit type of excitement. This is the false soaring up that unfaillingly announces the abrupt going down. It is the tragedy of the *falling star*:

"And I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth. And to him was given the key of the bottomless pit." Rev. 9:1.

The writer of Proverbs 16:18 knows what he is speaking about: "Pride goeth before destruction."

Perhaps the most incredible thing happening is this: The convinced spiritualist, whether of the ancient philosophical type or the modern spiritist type, gradually gets entangled in an inveterate false idea. His soul is supposed to have, in itself, an automatically continuing life through all eternity. So he comes to imagine that he has found an entirely new kind of spirituality, an infinitely superior kind, an inherent virtue, endowing him with absolute self-containment, thus rendering him independent of any God outside himself. He is thus being transformed into the absolute likeness of God. I mean likeness, not in the sense of some degree of resemblance, but rather perfect identity.

Now Plato, the father of all spiritualism in the Western world, did manage to realize that identity in his own peculiar way. That was along a downhill road. What took place was a reduction of God rather than an upgrading of man. In fact, in this business there hardly exists any other road. Here something must be known about Plato's only God. He is nothing but the abstract *idea*. And, of course, that is bound to be absolutely impersonal. So for man, as well, there is one top ideal exclusively, that is, perfect "impersonalism". And even if you come across an outstanding spiritualist (spiritist) of the present age honest enough to tell you the ultimate truth about the way he conceives of his spiritualism, you may be astonished indeed. That man will admit his total contempt for the common foolish story which typical spiritualists cram into the minds of naive people about a *personal* life continuing on the other side of death. To him that fairy tale of a personal survival, as Christians would tend to dream about, is a "stigma of the mediocre minds." Philosophical spiritualism states openly, even today, that personalism is nothing but a special brand of "opium for the people," so a ridiculous idea. A man who has not yet gotten into the great concept of the painless and joyless Nirvana is still deluded by his abject attachment to personal feelings. The philosopher has elevated himself far, far above such vanities. To him, feelings are nothing but passions. That applies to emotions of any kind, be it hatred or love. Such attachments are deemed totally unworthy of a truly spiritual philosophy. The great ideal, you see, is to be absolutely unperturbed by feelings, or any personal "hang-ups."

Strange, isn't it, that this should constitute a spirituality

so crushingly superior to that of intensive personalism, such as we find in the Christian religion! Pride in one's own ideas must have reached quite a summit of downright foolishness, when superiority is measured in that way. In fact, it was a weird sort of pride that was at the root also of Satan's downfall, according to Holy Writ:

"Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty. Thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness." Ezekiel 28:16.

The end of this megalomania is complete ruin, for what it implicitly says about God is blasphemy. And what it says about creaturely beings is presumption. It is open rebellion.

The rebel has for so long caused his highbrow type of intellectualistic pride to alienate him from the God of realistic wisdom that his strutting spiritualism one day turns into sheer materialism, the very opposite of what he originally proclaimed. The occasion for the greatest philosophical foolishness of all is suddenly there, rife and rampant, namely *pantheism*. Even Plato could not prevent that from happening toward the end of his life (see *Man the Indivisible*, pp. 128-149). God's verdict about the boasting fool, Satan, is remarkable:

"Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffick. Therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee." Ezekiel 28:18.

I have sometimes wondered what it could really mean to be "burnt in the fire of spiritualism," a similar formulation on the part of the abiding Spirit of Prophecy. What is that? Evidently it is the apostate creature's own fire. The fire of

his own cupidity, his own self-made light; that is, a spurious type of wisdom, a wisdom he indulges in because of his "itching ears" (2 Timothy 4:3). What a strange category of "spiritual" excitement! It is the culmination of all foolishness in creatures, the birth of atheism, the spurious type of wisdom that virtually finishes by bluntly denying the existence of God!

So let us notice carefully the solemn sentence passed by the Most High, with whom no creature can try to equate with impunity. "I will bring forth a fire from the midst of thee." Not in God's own sanctuaries does that fire have its origin. No, according to the Bible scripture above, it is an unholy fire surging up from the creature's own heart. The hotbed of spiritualism is the hidden depth of smoldering embers far down in the creaturely person's own bosom. This is the human sanctuary that has been desecrated and laid waste. Its peculiar fire is of the magic self-nourishing and self-consuming kind, burning on and on, until everything is burnt out. The fast liver, immoderately greedy for marginal inner experiences of the dangerously exciting kind, thinks he has nothing to seek outside himself. The "light" he finds in that hearth he himself has lit is a miserable twilight. He becomes, as the Bible says, a "light unto himself." He comes to boast of a wisdom that pretends to be wise but is utter folly.

But that desecration of the sacred is usually something a creature ventures to undertake only by degrees. Almost imperceptibly he permits the everyday human things to take the place of the holy things of God. He does this in a state of intoxication. This has a paralyzing effect on the conscience. See the Biblical account of Aaron's two sons.

Hilariously intoxicated, in a literal sense, they proceeded to commit the sacrilege of lighting the altar fire with "common fire," instead of the holy fire kept continually burning in the sanctuary for that special purpose. The resulting catastrophe was just the final stage of a long process (Leviticus 10).

No movement in the entire history of our world has been more effective than spiritualism in the direction of erasing the line of distinction, a God-intended distinction, between the holy and the profane. What is meant by the "profane" in this context is not the unholy, but the *common*, the creaturely routine of everyday human life. Do you see the threatening danger of gradually developing godlessness?

This is the fateful domain in which spiritualism in its definitive form, also known as *pantheism*, has entered human history as the most foolhardy eraser of the holy in all times. Pantheism might, with good reason, be called a *killer* of the holy. It should not surprise us if we are warned that an inextinguishable fire must burn up the manipulators of blasphemous thought systems of that category. Malachi describes that as a fire from without, so a literally observable one. It is from God, the realistic Initiative-Taker; and Malachi states, with blessed Biblical totality in his clear formulation of that prophecy, that this fire has very little to do with the sadistic type of fire so many of our "eternally-burning-hell" ministers today threaten us with from the sublime heights of their pulpits. What they speak about is a literal flame that repairs while it burns, so that God, the great "superintendent" of the macabre *auto-da-fe* (roasting of heretics) can keep on torturing his enemies for aeons without end. But Malachi-- God bless his realistic

moderation--evidently knows a God who does *not* find his special satisfaction in roasting sinners, but in *annihilating* them, along with their sins from which they can no longer be separated.

How could this have been more clearly expressed than in Malachi 4:1:

"For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble. The day that cometh shall *burn* them *up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that *it shall leave them neither root nor branch.*" (Emphasis supplied)

According to the Bible, in all its parts, God is a Creator who has made man with the blessed possibility in him that he *can* die. He *must* die if he does not accept to choose the only kind of life that a merciful God can offer him.

The immortal-soul theory is a pagan philosophy that has caused untold harm to God's reputation. *How* and *why* popular brimstone preachers in the majority of Christian churches today go on accusing God of such inhuman cruelty night after night!--this is something we cannot go into at the moment. But let one thing be said. How can these people expect that a human person can become *better*, in terms of decent ethics, than the *God* he has gotten to know? Impossible! We are all gradually transformed after the image of the ideal we contemplate. So what is it that inexorably happens to millions of churchgoers in a so-called Christian world?

Well, they are simply being conditioned to develop into future persecutors, exactly as cruel against "heretics", that is, against all believers having a religious conviction different from their own. What do you think is going to

happen to the freedom of belief some day when the "moral majority" have developed so close and forceful an alliance with the secular authorities that religious behavior has become a matter of civil legislation?

We can only guess at the final result. We should just permit common sense to draw a conclusion based on historical happenings in a well-known past. Did I say a well-known past? That may be an exaggeration. Did you ever hear about a protracted historical event called the *Inquisition*? If not, I know the almost unbelievable reason for that ignorance. Most of our present-day school manuals of elementary history have simply skipped this dark chapter of human history. It is a crime reaching almost all the way into the present. Still it is practically unknown. What a shame, as there hardly exists any more important drama worthy of being known and remembered!

Chapter 2 The Holocaust and the Inquisition

Why Then Do Our Historians So Diligently Fasten in Our Memory the Holocaust Monstrosities Committed by Purely Secular and Political Regimes Such as that of Nazi Germany, While They "Mercifully" Bypass the Atrocious Torments Inflicted by the Church Against Equally Innocent Victims of an Equally Inhuman Discrimination?

How could facts as poignant as those of the *Inquisition* pass into oblivion? Is this a willful conspiracy on the part of certain historians? Perhaps, but not necessarily so. It may be an urge in human minds to be "constructive", to forgive and forget. Nevertheless, the result is often fateful in the lives of those who need to be told what really happened, so that one is able to evaluate what is on the verge of repeating itself.

I am gradually getting to know the bitterly unfair cause of this inveterate discrimination. The Church has had nearly 2,000 years of experience acquiring a shrewd diplomacy of dissimulation and false prestige. That is a diplomacy which openly worldly diplomats never knew. A gradually falsified Church is described by the true Revelation of Jesus Christ (the last book of the Bible) as the *great Whore riding on the Beast*; that is, allying herself with worldly authorities to have *them* perpetrate the atrocities of unhampered persecution against dissenting believers. We suddenly find ourselves right in the midst of a fearful historical reality: the faithlessness of a persecution planned by the Church herself without one grain of mercy. This was the drama filling the history of the Inquisition. The Bible tells us to watch out for a repetition.

And please do not think you have to be a Roman Catholic in order to have a part in this shrewd type of cruelty. Protestant churches of the highest official standing are being gradually conditioned to play the same deceitful role as "innocent" persecutors. (See my book about the treacherous treatment we are giving our most faithful brothers and sisters in Communist lands at the present time, entitled *The Bottomless Pit: A Biblical Term for Modern Communism*.)

It is frightening to observe to what extent we human beings tend to be incurable opportunists, even in a matter as sacred as that of religious faith.

The great ideal seems to be: See to it that you come out on the side of the "winning ones," those who happen to be in power, materially speaking, at any given time. If only that condition is fulfilled in your life, then you are actually on the side of God Himself, for He is the great Winner!

And here a further great argument comes in: Man says to himself, there is no need of fearing that persecution, even of the most violent kind, is necessarily a bad thing. For what do we see? In fact, God Himself is the Champion Persecutor of the world.

Where does such a blasphemous idea stem from? It has its natural roots in pagan dualism invading Christendom with the bastard heritage of Hellenistic philosophy. Please get to know what dragon seeds resulted from the apparently innocent philosophy of Plato's immortal soul-ism. A God who is accused of having created man in such a way that he just *cannot die* is bound to be the Master Sadist of all times. How could the pogrom experts of Nazi Germany vie with Him in the art of torturing human bodies and human

minds? The apocalyptic beasts of Biblical Revelation must appear like lap-dogs compared to that God, roasting his enemies *in secula seculorum*. Instruments of punishment within human circles such as the Iron Maiden of Nuremberg, or the rack and the thumb-screw of the Inquisition, must be regarded as tools prepared for conveying gestures of endearment in comparison with what God Himself is said to have invented. Just think of those frigid fires of a divinely machinated "Christian" purgatory, taking care of the relatively "good ones" among human sinners. What the Church for centuries has tried to bring home to us about the great majority of men and women is that they are doomed to stay alive for millions and billions and trillions of years suffering the unrelenting pains of hell fire. This is the mystic flame of a more than platonic abstraction. For it manages an absolutely incredible accomplishment. It causes all the excruciating pain of a burning inferno without ever consuming one bit of the material it burns.

We have arrived at the tool of torture which even men were not wicked enough to invent. Theologians of old used to call it the *ignis sapiens*. That means "the *intelligent* fire." And now, how does the "intelligence" of that peculiar fire assert itself?

Well, the fire we common people know about must be a rather backward kind. Its peculiarity is to burn things *up*. That also applies to the fire the Bible speaks about. Regarding even the most rebellious of human sinners, the endtime prophet par excellence, John of Patmos, says, "Fire came down from heaven and consumed them." We everyday people are quite familiar with the meaning of that

consumption. It means to be burnt up!

And if we still should not know what that "burning up" normally stands for, then certainly Malachi, the Old Testament prophet, can put us straight on this point:

"For, behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."

The notion of this kind of burning would not cause much of a problem to a child who has had an elementary experience of practical life, would it? But now we are in for an entirely new concept, launched by "Christian" theologians just a few decades after John had suffered his martyrdom. The specialty of the "*ignis sapiens*," invented by philosophizing magicians in a far more distant antiquity, was the strange activity of *repairing as it burnt*.

So, if those burning in that fire happened to be beings with anything like feelings in their respective bodies, then the relatively merciful concept of a "consuming fire" would seem to have gotten lost completely. The burning can go on forever. The process itself sees to it, in its own magic way, that the life of the victim is being "saved" indefinitely. Of course, a salvation of that kind is rather the summit of all systematic mercilessness. It is also called the *occisio aeterna*, the eternal killing.

I observe that the Roman theologian Tertullian (A.D. 160?-230?) is the first one within the area of Christendom who has ventured into a closer description of that *occisio aeterna*, which the *ignis sapiens* makes possible wherever the main intention of manslaughter is to inflict a maximum

of pain to the victim. It appears from Tertullian's book *De spectaculis* (chapter XXX) that he adopts a pretty positive attitude to the matter at hand. He even seems to derive quite a bit of personal satisfaction from the scenes of torture he indulges in depicting to his readers:

"What a mighty spectacle it is that here presents itself before our eyes! What an admiration it is that catches hold of me! [*admiratio* does, of course, also mean simply wonder, since *mirari* actually means nothing but "*stare at in wonder*".] The sight of it causes me to laugh mockingly ["*derisio*"]. It makes me exult. For I see in front of me many famous monarchs. About those it was once officially announced that they (at their death) were taken right up into heaven. But now I hear them groaning down there in the darkest depths, together with Jove Himself. The same moaning can be heard from the province governors... who persecuted the Christian name. Now they themselves are lying in a fire more violent than the one they, in the days of their pride, made use of in their rage against Christ's followers."

After this, Tertullian is eager to give a more detailed description of the ingenious qualities of that "new fire" which today keeps burning in hell. It is a "divinely eternal flame with the precious gift of "repairing while it consumes."

That zealous church father, by the way, confides to us some information that I for my part appreciate quite a lot: The idea about that *ignis sapiens* goes much farther back in history than Christianity. The old philosophers, says Tertullian, were quite familiar with this curious distinction which "we Christians have taken over," namely a

distinction between common fire and holy fire. (*Apologia*, chapter XLVIII.)

It is this terrible thing that a story of mine about a pacifist's trauma-filled life during World War II (*Drommen omdet tapte land*) calls "*the chronic war*." Can you hear the despairing cry from a peace-loving soul hurled out into the night, seeking a comfortingly meaningful answer? For the cruel dogma by which human beings in so-called Christian circles today are constantly haunted, proclaims something about God Himself which is certainly anything but filled with true meaning. It is about *Him* we are told that He is running a dark line through every remaining morsel of elementary justice. In this respect even Adolf Hitler never went to any similar extremes, did he? True enough, Hitler did proceed toward the realization of a beastly plan. He wanted every single Jew in this world simply cremated. Today we know something about the true extent of that holocaust scandal. And still it has to be admitted that the criminal projects of that madman did have their definite limits after all. They limited themselves to a plan of *annihilating* the Jewish race (consuming them all, *burning* them *up!*) As far as I know, at least, Hitler never, even in his most furious fits of rage, went to the point of planning to start a campaign in which he decreed to have one and the same Jew roasted through billions of years--nay, eternities without end!

I remember one of those fire-and-brimstone preachers trying to scare his audience into membership of the local church. Once more the topic was Cain whom the preacher described as having been spending some 6,000 years already now in the lake of fire. In order to give his listeners

an adequate idea of the reality of eternity, the preacher made a rapid excursion into a distant future. He made a "restful" stop at the time when Cain would have spent six billion years in that same "lake." How great a part of his total sentence would the poor fellow have served by that time? None whatsoever. For compared to eternity, six billion years is just *zero*.

What a heavenly piece of mathematics!

No wonder my non-Christian students, in the beginning of our *philosophicum* courses in Alpes de Provence, where they felt the freedom to breathe and express themselves, used to state again and again their optimistic belief that such a God did not exist. But *if* He existed, "He must be the devil." I could only agree with them. If God *were* "one like that," He could only be identical with Satan himself.

So I also had to tell them how perfectly well I could understand the reaction of so many still quite intelligent men, having been brought up in this culture calling itself Christian. They are desperately looking for a more humane, a more meaningful *way out*. So they must consider even a frankly pagan alternative to present-day Christendom as a sort of deliverance. They then simply apply for an immigration visa to a dreamland of Far Eastern make. In that blessed Nirvana which they are now bound for, the concept of *body*, for instance, has ceased to exist at all. How have these friendly spiritualist philosophy experts of old managed to prepare the great "deliverance"? Simply by letting the very concepts of time and space cease to exist. And what then about that eternally roasting Hell certain would-be Christian preachers have made the climax of their preaching? They suddenly run out of the very material their

greedy flames have kept licking around? The concrete *bodies* are henceforth non-existent. So the conflagration is doomed to die out--automatically. "Pure spirit" is not a very combustible thing.

Can you see why some hard-pressed, would-be realists seek refuge in a head-over-heels flight right into the no-man's-land of pure spiritualism?

That is where the merciless boogeyman of a carnivorous godhead can no longer reach the prosecuted sinner.

Chapter 3 Experimental Science and Occult Phenomena in History

The Oldest Known Serious Attempts in History to Apply the Honorable Methods of Experimental Science to Verify the Genuineness of Occult Phenomena

A Christian realist should, according to what I have already stated, have no reason to fear the outcome of *true scientific research*. If there should be any true reason for such fear, then there would have to be something wrong with Biblical Christianity.

Now, as we all know, our 20th century has been an epoch of intensified material research. At the same time it has been an epoch of intensified mental research. I am still speaking of research in a laboratory context. What impresses me most of all, however, is the incredibly intensified *parapsychological* research, and even this in a definitely laboratory type of context! We must give full examination to this phenomenon of ultra-modern times.

Modern men insist on obtaining scientific evidence, preferably in the form of laboratory tests. That kind of quantitative testing, with reliable statistical figures, pro or con, seems to be particularly in demand for the validation of the more or less sensational phenomena taking place just in the realms of the occult. In all fields of psychic experience the human factors are bound to be dominating. So please be alert, man of ultra modern times! Don't fail to watch out along the road of your pilgrimage for a science of the most remarkable. It is a science that has made up its mind to give an explanation as plausible as possible of even events taking place in the obscure séance rooms of spirit

mediums, so it must deserve some serious attention, don't you agree? And, of course, it does not bypass any other area in which occult phenomena are taking place. Here, then, there could be just one result, they seem to think. Sooner or later, the day was bound to come when the urgent need was felt among serious researchers to subject the most obtrusive spiritualist phenomena to a rigid scientific testing program--in fact, the same rigidity traditionally practiced in all other domains of modern human life.

It should be quite fitting for us too, then, to go back in time to see what traces we find in history of a similar urge, in inquisitive and somewhat critical minds, to get a firmer grasp around the reality behind such extra-normal happenings. How far back must we go in order to register the first notorious records of such an urge of critical research? Did you know that we have to go all the way back to antiquity? Herodotus, the great historian, presents one most interesting case of parapsychological testing experiments. He tells us in fascinating detail what *Croesus* (died c. 546 B.C.), King of Lydia, proceeded to do before he went to the regular act of consulting the oracle of Delphi. We all know from our history books that famous incident of how he turned to that well-known institution in order to obtain some important knowledge about the future. He was turning over in his ambitious mind certain plans of waging a war with the Persians. Now he wanted to know what possibilities he had of winning such a war.

But few people among us seem to know the whole story. What has escaped our attention is the first part of it. Therefore, we may tend to think that there was no limit to that king's credulity. In reality, however, as we shall soon

see, Croesus was not all that uncritical. He actually took measures very similar to those our modern parapsychological researchers take today in order to "screen out the possibility of fraud in occult happenings." So the case at hand is extremely significant to the topic with which we are most concerned right now. It would be good then to have a careful look at it from its very beginning. Maybe we could learn something extremely important from our confrontation with this fascinating personality, Croesus, King of Lydia.

Herodotus informs us in his First Book that Croesus was alarmed by a certain "intelligence from abroad." He had learned that "Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, had destroyed the empire of Astyages, son of Cyaxares, and that the Persians were becoming daily more powerful. This led Croesus to consider with himself whether it would be possible to check the growing power of that people before it came to a head."

Of course, a war with a mighty rival is always a heavy risk. Therefore Croesus thought it wisest to seek advice from higher intelligence concerning his plans to start a war against the Persians.

But Croesus' doubts went farther than you might think. He had room for some doubts about the Oracle in Delphi as well. He intended to put that institution to the test. That is just the test experiment we are going to hear more about. It might shed a curious light upon what is happening in ESP science today.

First of all, however, I would like to mention one little thing about which that gallant warrior of old did not have the sound amount of doubts he ought to have had. I think

that has to do with doubts any man ought to have about *his own person*, and the position he may be entitled to take in the estimation of his surrounding world, including those "higher intelligences" to whom he makes his appeal. Is it a becoming modesty in a person, even a king, to take for granted that those "higher forces" should necessarily be "on *his side*." What guarantees did Croesus have that the "intelligences" with which the Oracle of Delphi had contact--if any contact at all--would be immediately eager to place themselves on *his* side of a battle with the Persians? Why not just as soon on the Persians' side? And what kind of response could Croesus expect, in *that* case, to his self-assured inquiry? It is just incredible how foolishly cocksure a man can be about one thing. "If gods do exist at all, they certainly must think *I* am just the fellow they should stake their last treasures upon."

Particularly the men who have put it into their heads that they are going to start a major campaign against a rivaling adversary, seem to have a fantastic faith in a glorious fulfillment of the wishful dream they have come to fondle. In ultra-modern times we may shake our heads at an inflated army leader like Adolf Hitler. He sought expert counsel from astrologers whose horoscopes gave satisfaction to his self-conceited ego.

I have observed for a long time that spiritualism tends to make its man *self-centered*. Tampering with occultism for the purpose of finding a way out of our personal dilemmas robs us of the bit of common sense we may otherwise still possess.

But let me now say one frankly positive word about Croesus. That man impresses me as having still preserved

an admirable degree of carefulness. At least he does insist on gathering some critical information about the *oracles*, in the first place. His question is not only this one: "Do those alleged higher forces exist at all, and if so, do they at all intervene in the lives of men in terms of announcing reliable messages about future events?" No, Croesus also had this special question: "How can one know whether this or that oracle is a reliable transmitter of such messages?" In his environment there happened to be a whole series of oracles available. Which one should he choose, if any at all? If an institution of that kind possessed any supernatural virtues, such as they boasted, it ought to be able to present visible proofs in that direction. Why not subject each one of the available oracles to a decisive test?

What the king now did was just that. He simply prepared a parapsychological experiment, maybe the first one in our history. The test program he devised--to *him*, for sure--seemed very reliable for the purpose of "screening out fraud." It ought to give a measure as reliable as any man can expect of an oracle's abilities.

Was it a 100% reliable test? Let me only say, so far, it seems to have been exactly as reliable as any of the tests available in the current ESP test programs of our day.

Soon the experiment was in full swing. Herodotus describes it as follows:

"He (the Lydian king) sent his messengers in different directions, some to Delphi, some to Abae in Phosis, and some to Dodona.... These were the Greek oracles which he consulted. To Lybia he sent another Embassy, to consult the oracle of Ammon. These messengers were sent to test the knowledge of the oracles, that, if they were found really to

return true answers, he might send a second time, and inquire if he ought to attack the Persians." (Op. cit., p. 16.)

The historian goes on to describe in more detail how the various delegations were dispatched to the various places to get the desired information. The king had provided them with very clear instructions:

"They were to keep count of the days from the time of their leaving Sardis, and, reckoning from that date, on the hundredth day they were to consult the oracles and to enquire of them what Croesus, the son of Allyattes, king of Lydia, was *doing at that moment* [emphasis mine]. The answers given them were to be taken down in writing, and brought back to him. None of the replies remain on record except that of the oracle of Delphi. There, at the moment when the Lydians entered the sanctuary, and before they put their questions, the Pythoness thus answered them in hexameter verse: 'I can count the sands, and I can measure the ocean; I have ears for the silent, and know what the dumb man meaneth. Lo! on my sense there striketh the smell of a shell-covered tortoise, boiling now on a fire, with the flesh of a lamb, in a cauldron. Brass is the vessel below, and brass the cover above it.'"

We are further told that the Lydians took down the words as soon as the prophetess Pythia had pronounced them. "Then they set off on their return to Sardis. When all the messengers had come back with the answers which they had received, Croesus undid the rolls, and read what was written in each of them. Only one approved itself to him, namely that of the Delphic oracle. This one he had no sooner heard than he instantly made an act of adoration, and accepted it as true, declaring that the Delphic was the

only really oracular shrine, the only one that had discovered in what way he was in fact employed. For on the departure of his messengers he had set himself to think what was most impossible for anyone to conceive of his doing. He waited till the day agreed upon came. Then he acted as he had determined: He took a tortoise and a lamb, and cutting them in pieces with his own hands, he boiled them both together in a brazen cauldron, covered with a lid which was also of brass." (Op. cit., pp. 16-17.)

And now what did he get to know? Pythia in Delphi rendered those strange activities of his with perfect accuracy. This is shown by every detail in her answer to the inquiry of the delegation from Sardis, or even before they had time to inquire.

We can perfectly understand the king's reaction, can't we? He was overwhelmed to discover how masterfully the Delphian oracle had managed to describe the weird things he had been doing in total secret, all by himself, in a room of his castle in distant Sardis. To him this was conclusive evidence that the oracle of Delphi could be depended upon as a genuine center of spiritual forces strong enough to transcend all conventional barriers in space; that is, there had been a remarkable going beyond all the well-known limitations of ordinary matter. What had been triumphantly overcome was every normal human being's "pitiable dependence" on his physical senses. The illustrious Pythia had delivered evidence of not being thus limited and dependent. At least, the king thought, sufficient proof had been produced already regarding the inherent ability of that woman to annihilate distances in space. For certainly the literal distance was considerable between the temple in

Delphi and the royal fortress in Sardis where the king had been carrying out his erratic deeds on the same day that the delegation visited Delphi. What could be more convincing about transcendence than that poetically formulated message, prepared at a moment's notice? Was not this a lady who could truthfully boast of seeing the invisible, hearing the inaudible, and smelling the "unsmellable"?

Croesus' ovations are just as unconditionally capitulating as Pythia's acceptance of them is proudly triumphant. Notice how superbly every item in the proclamation of the prophetess is in the first person singular: "I" can do this, and "I" can do that. "I" even am the unique owner of an olfactory sense perfectly independent of all material ingredients. So distances mean nothing whatsoever. They are skipped just like that!

Of course, there still is one thing the prophetess does not, so far, mention with one clear word in this preliminary message. That is the human *first-person's* further expertise, the greatest of them all, the genius of *precognition*. I here use the word that modern parapsychology has consecrated in its current jargon in order to denote the most border-transcending maneuver human beings have ever claimed they have the ability to realize--*foreknowledge* of future events!

The Gift of Prophecy Proper--the Most Fantastic of All

It is only in a temporary way I here touch a capital point in my later discussion, namely the alleged faculty, in human individuals, of looking right into the future as though it were the present. Here, you see, we have arrived at the salient point. This was also bound to become

Croesus' decisive problem as soon as his inquiry #2--the really great one--came up for due treatment.

Chapter 4 The Great "Proof" of Dualism Being *the Truth About Man*

You should know one thing as early as possible. It so happens that the matter of "precognition," in terms of an "*inherent human ability*," has established itself as probably the most sensational, and certainly the most problem-haunted, one in ESP research's entire history. The decisive question one has been forced to face is this one: Do human creatures possess, in their inborn nature, the endowment of pushing aside the barriers of time, just diving into some sort of timeless eternity where all "troubles," not only of space, but of *time* as well, cease to exist?

To begin with, parapsychologists used to call this absolute gift of foreknowledge simply "prophecy." But perhaps they soon felt that this sounded a bit too Biblical, or generally religious. At least they have now substituted an entirely new word for it, namely "precognition." This has become the technical term for a concept that, of course, in itself is a rather new creation. It is man-made, and it is made for men.

A relatively small number among us--whether we call ourselves Christians or liberal humanists--seem to be aware of an essential difference between what Biblical thought-forms conceive of as "prophetic gift" and what our modern science about the occult calls "precognition."

A Striking Fact All Realistic Christians--and Realistic Scientists as well--Should Note Down Carefully: The Precognitive Powers in Man, that Parapsychologists Arrive at as Their Great Dogma, is Based on a Philosophy of Radical Dualism

In this respect, modern parapsychology is in harmony with the tradition of platonic spiritualism, not with Judeo-Christian realism--nor with the classical tradition of Western science.

We have no reason to be so overly surprised at this. For, apart from modern material scientific research, the general tradition of men of letters in the Western world has all the time leaned heavily on a heritage of pagan idealism (spiritualism). The more those Western men were concerned about matters of the "spirit" (such as theology and philosophy), the more they tended to favor an anthropology of platonic dualism, not of original Christian monism.

So we are not astonished to ascertain that the way this new "spiritual science" looks upon man is a fundamentally dualistic one. What else could we have expected? The cultural heritage on which Western man bases his entire thinking is the classical Greek one. With Plato as our main teacher of philosophy, how could we Hellenistic humanists of the Western world avoid visualizing both space and time as something the "perfectly spiritual" man might as well leave out of the question? According to our venerable master thinker (Plato), it is only miserable matter that needs space and time in order to unfold itself. In other words, precognition becomes spiritual man's demonstration *par excellence* of his exquisite spirituality, his proud

determination to let time ebb out completely, merging, as it were, into something "diametrically opposite", that is, *eternity*--"eternity", mark you, made identical with *timelessness*, so not at all with *endless time*, which is the only way Biblical realism is able to conceive of eternity. Timelessness is a concept enjoying a tremendous worthiness in our spiritualistic Western tradition of philosophy.

Prophetic gift, as the Bible's consistent realistic thought pattern is bound to understand the concept, could not fail to be something infinitely different. Here time is not something a magic "abracadabra" can pulverize all of a sudden. It is not something we "spiritual beings" can and must get away from, the sooner the better.

*Don't Be A Fool In The Biblical Sense Of Simple
Godlessness*

According to both the Old and the New Testaments, God is the only One having foreknowledge as an inherent quality. That it must be that way (a quality all that unique) becomes easier to understand at the moment when it dawns upon your mind that nothing whatsoever of the species "hocus pocus" is possible within the framework of Biblical realism. God Himself is the one who, least of all, could afford to give Himself up to such erraticism. The Lord of perfect wisdom was never known to practice any kind of unworthy acrobatics, either in matters of sound logic or in any other capacity. So how could He think it compatible with His dignity to skip the reality of time, a dimension without which nothing can take place? Evidently we imagine, in our incredible light-mindedness, that this is the

way God manages to keep up a nice reputation for being "the Eternal One." He just dives down into timelessness--that is, virtually nothingness. Still He takes credit for being the "God of all times," the "Self-existent One from everlasting to everlasting." Well, if this is our trend of thought, then our idea of God is that of a miserable cheat, a master boaster, excelling in one thing: just empty phrases. For then, of course, that age-old contention of His, claiming to be the Omniscient One, the only one that knows everything, past and present and future, would simply mean *the one who knows nothing*. For past, present and future, in the case of this eternal fraud, have been annihilated, philosophically and practically.

Only "the fool says in his heart: there is no God" (Psalm 14:1).

Oh no, dear friend, if you shake your wits together and get back to a bit of realistic thinking, some plain common sense thought, then you will realize that it takes quite a bit more than that diving into timelessness (non-time) to be really worthy of the attribute of omniscience, and along with that the attribute of eternal foreknowledge.

Are you having a hunch of what a pitiable thing this "precognition" business is reduced to at the moment when our parapsychological theorizers actually make it synonymous with a regular disappearing act, practiced by weak-minded magic against the realistic concepts of space and time? If this is the only way you too can manage to become "precognitive"--just crushing the entire reality of the time concept--and the reality of yourself along with it, in a suicidal attack--can you buy a "bargain" like that? No - no! The subject matter *you* would like to have

foreknowledge about is just the thing an intelligent science calls events, isn't it? Is it happenings *taking place*? But what about an absolutely timeless and spaceless world of the platonic fantasy kind? In that world the last remnants of actual happening must have ceased inexorably to exist. So what "precognitive" man has precognition about is sheer nothingness. Have you and I fallen so hopelessly in love with nonentity?

Chapter 5 Timelessness Is Meaninglessness

That inexorable annihilation of everything that exists is an idea I have come to fear quite existentially. In my opinion the worst part of it is this--it ends up in atheism, and that is the culmination of all nihilism.

Are we aware of the fact that the image we so-called Christians, in a culture permeated by platonic spiritualism, tend to have about *God* is a catastrophically meaningless one? We find ourselves in a continual "God-is-dead" environment. Or do we manifest any serious hesitations when those mentioned ideas cross our minds: "God is a timeless and spaceless entity." In other words, "He has His reality somewhere beyond time and space."

If this were the truth about God, why then does not the Bible have one single passage that could reasonably be interpreted in that direction? Nowhere in this unique document about the Christian concept of God, and of *man*, and of the *world*, do you find a single sentence suggesting that time and space are dimensions that can be conjured away, just like that; or dimensions that *ought* to be conjured away because that would give access to a "deeper category of reality."

Where have you and I got these ideas from, then--particularly the idea that God is the One who lives and thrives perfectly in a world of eerie magic? When shall we grasp the simple fact which serious science has for about half a millennium endeavored to bring home to our minds? I am speaking about an axiom to this effect. "Anything that is to exist must necessarily exist in time and space; that is, a point of time called *now*, and a spot in space called *here*."

The only "thing" that is being granted some sort of existence by spiritualism (and that is a merely nominal existence) is the pure abstraction, the *idea* of platonic invention, the most impersonal thing ever known. Hopefully we are not on our way toward making God Himself into such an abstraction. For that "impersonalism" certainly is the quality you least of all could ascribe to the God of the Bible, the Living God.

The different reasons why it has become somewhat of a tradition among us to look upon God as the timeless and spaceless One I explore in a fascinating chapter in my book *Day of Destiny* (pp. 117-130).

"Well," you say, "but one fact remains. It is just in the tangible research grounds of literal laboratories in some famous universities on both sides of the Iron Curtain that modern parapsychological science experts have now reaped their results in the form of incontrovertible quantitative findings! Don't you have any respect in front of such a fact? Can you challenge its validity?"

I do have a profound respect for what has *taken place* in those laboratories. On the other hand, I still challenge the validity of the *interpretation* that those clever research experts have given to the quantitative figures they have arrived at.

The very fact that *their* conclusions, drawn from the material at hand, and *my* conclusions are so dramatically divergent makes a thorough but most captivating discussion inevitable. First of all, we must go back to that first parapsychological experiment undertaken in known history.

Details in the Historian's Record Sheds Rays of Light

*Over Some of the Experimenting King's Erroneous
Reasonings and the Sources of Those Errors*

We had come to the point where Croesus was overcome with amazement at the incredible skill with which the "prophetess" responded to his preliminary inquiry. She had so far coped brilliantly with that shrewdly excogitated parapsychological experiment of his. His immediate conclusion was that the "world of the spirit" had here celebrated a splendid triumph over "filthy matter." This is nothing but the customary pattern of conventional thought in a spiritualist environment. Our culture was never healed from the effects of that, in spite of its later encounter with Christianity. A pagan king like Croesus evidently had no trouble imagining that the laws of matter had here been "switched off" completely at a moment's notice in favor of the laws of the "pure" spirit. Partly the credulity here observed is due to the born humanist's cocksureness about the fantastic innate abilities of *men*. Man is assumed to have, in himself, a boundless endowment of "raising himself above the thralldom of wretched matter." A "far higher reality" is his proper realm. It is something infinitely elevated beyond the "false appearances of the physical senses."

The king felt an urge, no doubt, to demonstrate in front of the eternal gods of the Olympus the sovereign contempt it behooves every believer in the spirit to nourish toward that "despicable material world of ours." So he did not shrink from a considerable sacrifice. It is astonishing how generous infatuation can make a man.

"Croesus, having resolved to propitiate the Delphic god, ... offered up three thousand of every kind of

sacrificial beast, and besides made a huge pile, and placed upon it couches coated with silver and with gold, and golden goblets, and robes and vests of purple, all of which he burnt, in the hope of thereby making himself more secure of the favor of the god. Further he issued his orders to all the people of the land to offer a sacrifice according to their means.... He also caused a statue of a lion to be made in refined gold, the weight of which was ten talents. At the time when the temple of Delphi was burnt to the ground, this lion fell from the ingots on which it was placed. It now stands in the Corinthian treasury, and weighs only six talents and a half, having lost three talents and a half by the fire." (Page 17.)

Good old Herodotus certainly does have a series of sad notes here that seem to grant due tribute to the law of perishability. Still it is a tone of optimism that prevails in the historian's report, where he goes on to describe the confidence and thankfulness streaming out from the king's inquiry #2 to the oracle, in which he puts forth his final request:

"Croesus, king of Lydia and other countries, believing that these are the only real oracles in all the world, has sent you such presents as your discoveries deserved, *and now inquires of you whether he shall go to war with the Persians, and if so, whether he shall strengthen himself by the forces of a confederate.*"

Do you see how overconfidently and rashly he glides into his second and fatally formulated question, the one that was to grow famous in history for its catastrophic effects? Catastrophic because of the ruthlessly positive answer it was going to receive.

Here it must be appropriate to sum up a little, and first ask some questions in earnest. *Did* Croesus already, in the answer received to his first question, have any conclusive evidence of the oracle's supernatural ability to transcend the physical world's natural barriers in time and space? Did he, so far, have any intelligent reason to conclude that the "psychic" he had turned to for advice had any license to overpass the God-given laws regulating our time-space universe? In other words, did he at this stage have, on this basis, any convincing reason to go on and ask his capital question? Whatever we do, let us be more careful, more stringently consistent in *our* logical course of thinking than Croesus appears to have been. Our discussion of this question ought to serve as an excellent preparation for our later discussion of the weird problems confronting modern parapsychology's intricate pattern of research today.

The Ancient Experimenter's Status So Far

From his everyday experience Croesus ought to know one thing. We common mortals do *not* possess any such supernatural powers. The common pattern of sense-perception among us does not suggest anything of that kind. So what about the case of some Pythia, or whomsoever you might run into casually in this world of ours? Suppose the person in question suddenly is seen to be in possession of knowledge which, according to the normally valid laws, should not be accessible to human beings. Is it a matter of course that a case of that category *must* be interpreted in terms of an *inherent* endowment belonging to the person concerned (or the institution of which the person forms a part)?

No, not necessarily so. Notoriously there does exist in our world something called mediumistic activity. And, as already observed, *medium* means middleman (an intermediary agent). That is one who mediates, serves as a medium between two parties. A person may be a mere go-between making communication possible between the two parties. So this current designation for a spirit agency in modern times is not a bad or misleading one. And the ancient oracles very obviously had exactly the same role. The message communicated has an entirely *different* origin, obviously a far more *distant* origin. It may be an entirely unknown center of radiating power, a personal will that is perfectly autonomous.

And now, what does the Bible say about certain power centers of such autonomy within the sphere of influence of our world? We must be on our guard against them! For the influence they exert may be a dangerous one. We have been equipped with an understanding mind just in order that we should be able to distinguish between true and false, good and evil. In other words, the searcher (or researcher), just because he is a fallible human being, has the responsibility of ***postponing*** his final conclusions until there is a valid basis for a dependable decision.

Suppose Croesus had had the privilege of growing up in an environment in which realism, as an alternative philosophy about man and the occult, were more dominant than the one-sided spiritualism of a pagan Greek culture. Then he might not have drawn such a far-reaching conclusion from such flimsy material. But his indigenous tradition of thought tempted him to think he had indications enough, and so he went ahead taking a decisive step--on his

way downwards!

Well, you may object, do we have any indication that the "autonomous power" behind the oracle of Delphi was of the evil kind? Let me answer by asking a question of *you*.

Have you got to know the further course of the historical events, evaluating critically the final thing happening to Croesus? If so, then you should have basic facts more than enough to draw your own conclusions.

Let us then first examine the answer the oracle gave to the king's question #2.

By the way, Herodotus here inserts an additional piece of information that did not appear in his account of the first part: Croesus did not base himself exclusively on the response from one single oracle. There was a corroborating testimony from one other oracle, the Oracle of Amphiaraus. The king rejoiced that he had here found a voice #2, also speaking "the word of truth."

The historian only regrets that he is not able to produce any detailed information regarding the response coming from that oracle, "since there is no record of it."

What is definitely known, however, is that the king did feel impressed on that occasion to send to the shrine of Amphiaraus a shield entirely of gold; and a spear, "also of solid gold, both head and shaft. They were still existing," Herodotus adds, "in my day, at Thebes, laid up in the temple of the Ishmenian Apollo."

Obviously both oracles were now consulted a second time regarding the king's possible plans of going to war with the Persians. For in the historian's formulation of the famous answer to that capital question, it says:

"Both oracles agreed in the tenor of their reply, which

was, in each case, a prophecy that, *if Croesus attacked the Persians, he would destroy a mighty empire*,--and a recommendation to him to look and see who were the most powerful of the Greeks, and to make alliance with them." (Emphasis mine.)

Croesus was overjoyed to receive such positive response. There was no more doubt in his mind that he would destroy the Persians. In his thankfulness toward the Delphians, he donated two gold staters to each single subject of the land. To that end he had secured careful information about the number of inhabitants. It is quite pathetic to read about the way the Delphians, in their turn, demonstrated their own thankfulness. Herodotus states that they manifested their gratitude with a "generosity" on their own part that must be regarded as an impressive honor granted to a foreign nation. I say "impressive," but of course it all depends on what values you permit to impress you.

"The Delphians granted to Croesus and the Lydians the privilege of precedency in consulting the oracle, exemption from all charges, the most honorable seats in the festivals, and the perpetual right of becoming, at pleasure, citizens of their town."

Of course, this must be the apex of what any oracle enthusiast like Croesus could imagine in terms of kingly honor and glorious rank.

But now comes the great question the history student must be excited to get an answer to. Did the oracle of Delphi manage to save its reputation for truthfulness and dependability during the events that followed? Historical happenings are not easy to hide. Well, what actually

happened is known to everybody. Croesus did meet the conditions stipulated. He did attack the Persians.

Did he also, in so doing, "destroy a mighty empire"? Sure he did. But the empire he destroyed happened to be his own. Was this result contrary to the wording of the prophecy? No, not literally. So the Delphian oracle could still enjoy its immaculate standing as a true prophet. That a king had been led to his ruin because he "misinterpreted" the message was no business of the oracular institution. Every man will have to take the consequences of his own "misunderstandings."

An oracle is and remains an oracle. This is the way its men would defend the institution. Its task would have to limit itself to a strictly impersonal objectivity in any formulation of the neutrally given message. Its main duty is to be indisputably true.

Again an eloquent example of the hard type of "truthfulness" embodied in dead letters, cruelly dead indeed.

But right here, tell me. Is it, after this, so hard to answer my previous question? How can you form for yourself any well-founded opinion about those "autonomous spirit powers" we are concerned about? From time immemorial they have unfolded their fabulous arts of "precognition." And they have done brilliantly. But who can tell? Are they *good* or are they *evil*? This is the question to which we insist on getting an answer. In the case of Croesus and the Oracle of Delphi the answer would not seem to be a very farfetched one. The ambiguous answer he received was a definitely *cruel* one. Ambiguity will, as a general rule, tend to be cruel, maybe not always immediately, but the more so

in the long run.

Our tacit assumption here is of course that concepts of *elementary ethics* do have their justified place in human lives. It seems rather meaningless to discuss anything at all of the human kind if it is assumed that *non-ethics*, or *anti-ethics*, is the prevailing rule. In a world of true ethics, ambiguity--or so-called neutrality--may be the worst crime a man can commit against his fellow man. Some "truths" may give the person they are aimed at an impression so cruelly false that the crushing effect of it may be more destructive than a vertical falsehood. Indifference is the most common weapon used by one man to crush the life of another man. A day must inevitably come when each one of us is placed in front of the highest Judge. Before *His* judgment throne it will yield no protection to seek cover in the "impersonalism" of "institutions." Once a creaturely being has been endowed with the inestimable treasure of a personal life, he cannot find one single hiding place for his criminal callousness. Not the tiniest loophole can be found in all the universe for such criminality.

Chapter 6 Your Speech Should Be "Yea, Yea; and Nay, Nay."

What is the Meaning of Such Weird Talk?

The one thing lacking in the ethical peculiarity of the Delphian oracle was the educational blessedness of being a student in the classroom of Jesus of Nazareth. In that classroom the Delphians might even have learned how their manner of dialogue ought to be:

"Let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay."
Matthew 5:37.

Many a Bible reader has wondered greatly at this. What could the good Lord mean by such a precept? Did He really think it an ideal for you and me to be all that monotonous and poor in our vocabulary? Should we be some sort of monosyllabic word machines, reducing our conversational skills as sheepishly as that? Should we be going around all day like a bunch of trained parrots, just cackling our "yes, yes" and "no, no"? Of course not. But what did He mean then? He just wanted to give us a serious warning against cruel Delphian ambiguity. His stern command is simply: Your "yes" should be a clear "yes," and your "no" should be a clear "no." It shouldn't be a "yes/no" or a "no/yes," for that is a mercilessly satanic way of speaking to your fellow men.

What the world of demons all the time machinated to arrange was exactly that wicked ambivalence in inter-human conversation. We members of a fallen race never needed any proficiency course in that kind of dialogue. For with you and me it is second nature to seek loopholes we can drop into, wherever we have our walk among fellow

men. We have become experts in the art of suddenly, at a given moment, withdrawing "in good order," and "with perfect innocence." The important thing is "to have it said without saying anything; that is, expressing oneself in terms so void and vague that one never runs the risk of engaging oneself fully. There should always be a side trip, some sort of neutral territory in which you may await the course of events as a "pure observer"--without any duty to make a personal decision.

Non-Committal Flirt, A Typical Case

We have arrived at an instance of wicked deception that is rarely realized as such. But it is a case in which Jesus' warning hits the mark (the squinting bull's eye) with remarkable marksmanship. I am speaking about a very common phenomenon, something causing most men to laugh rather than to cry, I'm afraid. A young man behaves in front of a young woman as if he loves her sincerely. He does not hesitate to cultivate with her a relationship so intimate, perhaps, that she would seem absolutely entitled to think that marriage must be right around the corner. Every move he makes speaks about eternal fidelity. On the other hand, not one word dropping out of his mouth has made his promises definitive and binding. And one day he withdraws silently and unforeseeably. He leaves her as if nothing had happened. The poor victim of his faithlessness is left behind with a bleeding heart, maybe a wound that refuses to heal at all. But this does not seem to trouble him one bit. On some occasions it may happen that the girl overcomes her feminine pride and reserve. Perhaps she goes straight up to him, accusing him of open treachery.

And what is the weapon he then pulls out in order to defend his "masculine honor"? He simply exploits every sophistry of his non-engagement. "Tell me, foolish girl, when did I ever promise to marry you? Not one word have I ever uttered about marriage, as far as I know. What reason did you have to interpret my conduct in that direction?"

Do you recognize the tacit points of argumentation filling the atmosphere of the Delphian oracle? If you and I have principles of dishonest communication in our lives, then we should at least get to know, the sooner the better, whom we have chosen to be our "master teacher." It is the one whom the Scriptures call "the father of lies." Biblical revelation gives straight information about the *source* of "occult" messages of such dubious ethic. It should not be sought in a higher world, but in a lower one. There was never any lack of a sufficiently numerous pandemonium of evil angels to man every obscure spirit chamber of this earth.

The ancient oracles already had their tradition fully made up. The human beings attached to those institutions did not constitute the end of the communication line. No, they were nothing but contemporary mediums for messages from the "other world"--a non-human demon world. We already find ourselves in a historical era and a cultural environment in which the spiritualistic theories of matterlessness had started their triumphal procession across our Occidental territory.

*Similar Dubious Cases of Oracular Responses Recorded
by Historians of Later Eras*

Let us control the correctness of our impression by

supplementing our first case with other ones that may provide a broader historical perspective. The same oracular institution seems to have been "still going strong" at the time when a new great empire was gradually coming to power in the Western world. Pyrrhus of Epirus wanted to know for sure whether he ought to engage in a fight with the Romans. He too went to the Delphian oracle to get his doubts away. And the answer given him was just as ambiguous as the one Croesus had received in a remote past.

But what is this now, you may ask headshakingly. Had not that man learned anything from his predecessor's tragic destiny?

Obviously nothing to speak of. But don't blame the new man too harshly. "Those who themselves live in houses of glass should not throw stones." What do I mean by quoting that proverb? I mean that you and I may have little to boast of. I am suddenly reminded, you see, of another proverb, a proverb referring to anyone among us. It says, with an irritatingly general formulation in the first person plural, "The only thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history."

In other words, we all behave more or less as if the catastrophes of our forefathers had never happened, or at least as if they had never been recorded as a deterrent to the survivors.

Anyway, what answer did Pyrrhus, the great enemy of Rome, get from the oracle? It was an answer exactly as ambiguous as the one given to Croesus, and accordingly just as misleading to a mind bent on war and glorious victory. Latin was now becoming the great world language,

and in its literal wording the message ran as follows:

"Aio [the same as Dico] te, Accido, Romanos vincere posse."

If we translate this, word by word, it will run, in somewhat distorted English:

"I tell you, Accido, the Romans vanquish to manage."

"Dico te vincere posse." "I say you to be able to conquer." We moderns would rather use a main clause, plus a subordinate clause introduced by "that." "I say that you are able to conquer." But if the first verb is a verb of statement, like "I say," "I declare," etc., the Latin language has a construction called "Accusativus cum infinitivo" ("accusative with an infinitive"). But often that infinitive, in its turn, may have an object that is always governed by the accusative. In this way there will happen to be two objects in the sentence, and accordingly two accusatives. This is called "double accusative." And that is where the duplicity comes in. Here you may object: How can there be any duplicity in our present case? Should there not be a clear difference between stating "I say you to be able to conquer the Romans," and "I say the Romans to be able to conquer you"?

In those two *English* sentences, to be sure. The *word order* in such a modern language makes it clear which is the subject and which is the object. But in the Latin language the sequence of the words does not decide that. The word order mainly decides which part of the sentence has the stress. It is the grammatical *case* that usually decides which is the subject and which is the object of a verb. But in the present case we have the unfortunate coincidence that both "you" and the "Romans" are in an

accusative case. So the ambiguity is there inevitably.

But what then decides, in the mind of Pyrrhus, which of the two must be meant as the great conqueror? I have already told you. It is his character as the self-assured warrior, the foolishly *proud* and *self-conceited* warrior. I should rather repeat to make my point clear. The interpretation in favor of *him* as the great victor was the result of a light-minded, in fact fatal, optimism, without any trace of realistic foundation. In other words, it was not safe logic that made that man free from every doubt. In his mind what the oracle had said was, unambiguously: "I tell you, *Accido*, that you are fully able to vanquish the Romans. Just go ahead and conquer."

And then the calamity came--not for the Romans, but for Pyrrhus and his famous war elephants.

And what about the fabulous oracle prophets at that stage of events? Like Pilate of old, they could "wash their hands." Looking with mingled surprise and contempt at the poor fool, they would say: "Who told you to read our message in that self-inflated way?"

You and I do know the human race by now, don't we? So our question is rather: What is it, deepest down, that causes warlike persons to almost entirely screen out the negative alternative of interpretation? Our psychiatrists sometimes call that tendency, in its rather extreme cases, *megalomania*. Our own unhappy era has known one particularly dangerous megalomaniac of that kind: Adolf Hitler. He, too, turned toward the occult world for advice regarding the wild campaigns he wanted to undertake. And when the advice came, he too excluded the negative alternative of an interpretation. Hitler felt absolutely

cocksure that the "gods," if they existed at all, just could not fail to take *his* side in the battle.

So if a prognosis from those astrologers happened to say something like this: "Going to war at this moment against the land you are determined to conquer, you will be, for generations to come, the most talked-about man in the whole world"--well, how would Hitler react? To him a statement of that kind would seem in itself to bear an inevitable guarantee of its wonderful fulfillment! How so? Simply by virtue of the fact that the prophecy had the sympathetic nature of coinciding with what the great General Field Marshal's own inflated ego had arrived at all along.

There was one question which that "*most spoken-about*" war hero of several generations had forgotten to ask. *Why* would people all over the world keep talking so much about him? Was it because they loved him or because they hated him? Was it because they admired him, or because they despised him?

In many respects, Adolf Hitler may be relegated into the same category as the Roman army leader Maxentius of old. Neither was he scared by the bitter experiences suffered by his predecessors in the war business--and the *oracle* business. You see, the Sybillian oracles had given Maxentius this answer to his eager inquiry regarding a formidable attack he planned to make against his rival Constantine on one special day:

"On this day Rome's enemy will be destroyed."

And now, *who* was going to be destroyed so dramatically? It was the one Maxentius did not for one moment think about. It was Maxentius himself. One thing

is historically indisputable. Whether he was the enemy of Rome, or the enemy of Constantine only, Maxentius did perish--miserably, in the great battle of that particular day.

What Do We (You and I) Learn From History?

Let me sum up by just repeating this strange proverb: "The only thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history."

Down through the ages something seemed to secure an incredible credit for the oracular messages, at least in the minds of those super-excited ones who look for nothing but the super-sensational. They do not appear to be troubled at all by the vast inconsistencies they have to swallow down in the form of an apparently total meaninglessness in human lives. It is precisely that *inconsistent* character of the spirit message old Cicero refers to in his dissertation *De Divinatione*. I am quoting from volume I:

"Nor do I think that any confidence should be put in the prophets of Mars or the revelations of Apollo. Some of these are pure fiction. Others are loose talk, entirely devoid of authority. Even men of mediocre intellectual endowment can understand that... Chrysippus filled a whole volume with thy oracular statements, O holy Apollo, partly false, in my opinion, partly true, by pure coincidence, as this may happen with all dissertations; partly also so ambiguous and unclear in their formulations that the interpreter, in his turn, has to be interpreted. And whatever is determined by the casting of lots, only demands, immediately afterwards, a new casting of lots."

Here, however, one serious warning is needed. Please do not run into the greatest risk of all--for your life and for the

lives of millions of men today in the midst of a culture permeated by materialism on the one hand and by an equally formidable spiritualism on the other hand:

The Greatest of All Dangers Implied in Our Subjective Attitudes Toward Occultism.

On the other hand, take this admonition also with equal seriousness. Every one of us is in dire need of this warning voice. It would be dangerously subjective--in fact, fatal to you and me some day as human beings, fatal indeed to the very attitude any responsible person should adopt toward *truth--if we were to take for granted that all occult phenomena must be discarded en bloc as pure nonsense (sheer humbug).*

Here, fortunately, responsible men in the field of parapsychological research do have a far more careful and, scientifically, a far more correct attitude than what so many traditional experts in plain natural science have displayed. As far as that is concerned, I agree quite heartily with my late Professor Harald Schjelderup of Oslo University. In his book, *Det skjulte menneske (Hidden Man)* he says:

"There is certainly no reason to treat the spiritualist conception with that condescending attitude of contempt so common among scientists and others who have no knowledge whatsoever of the experiences upon which it bases itself." (*Det skjulte menneske*, 1961, 4th edition, p. 228.)

There certainly is no reason, either, for you and me to ridicule so readily the oracle stories of antiquity, adopting that condescending attitude of mere contempt toward the subject matter they are reported to contain.

Chapter 7 Croesus, King of Lydia--History's First Known Serious Experimenter in Parapsychological Laboratory Research

In reality this man had much of the same depth and genuine concern about the hidden facts of another world that inspires our parapsychologists in ultra-modern times. Croesus was by no means so dangerously superficial that he gave the matter a lick and a promise. He did not say with an air of arrogant superiority: "It is all just deception and a jumble of sleight of hand tricks altogether." No, he did not for one moment deny the possibility of something supernatural really talking place in Delphi. He decided to postpone his verdict about this matter until the day when he could truly say, "I have subjected it to a critical test."

Croesus made just one error. He had not been critical enough. He had drawn rash conclusions from the material presenting itself. His interpretation of it was lopsided. So it was by no means as scientific as he thought. Alternative possibilities of interpretation had been overlooked. And that is not good science.

But we can very well understand the man and sympathize with him in this awkward matter. We ourselves may have very little to boast of. Behind us we have a whole series of facts. Therefore we find ourselves upon vantage ground. Our overview is larger. We may have the privilege of overcoming prejudice to which older generations notoriously did succumb. The Lydian king belonged to a different milieu and a different epoch. It was a milieu and an epoch deprived of the familiarity we can enjoy--with, for instance, precisely *Biblical realism*. That does not

necessarily mean that a given individual in our time and in our part of the world has *availed* himself of the privileges freely offered by that access we have to a greater realism in our view of the world and our view of man. On the other hand, it ought to be our responsibility to relinquish every bit of false pride, and do our best to understand the preconceived ideas barring Croesus' vision of reality. We ought to be quite able to appreciate those preconceptions. For they are the same we ourselves are battling with in our own minds, in *our* special day and in *our* special environment.

*Two Basically Opposite Conceptions of Reality--and
What it Means to Human Beings Whether They Choose
One or the Other of Those Opposite Views*

We have already given a sketch of an introduction to the two philosophies now arrayed in battle order, one against the other, and without any possibility of a compromise. On the one hand you have been introduced to the philosophy of Christian realism with its holistic view of man (holos = totality). It has found its worthiest expression in the Bible's idea about man and about the world surrounding him. According to this philosophy man is always seen as an organic totality in which body and soul interpenetrate completely. They just cannot be visualized at all as separate realities, at least not without doing violence to logical reality. Body and soul simply constitute two aspects of one and the same reality: MAN. Any attempt of abstracting (drawing aside) "one of the two," calling the ensuing result of that abstraction "pure spirit" on the one hand, and "pure body" on the other hand, is something absolutely

meaningless. It leaves you in either case with just *nothing* in your hands. Or we ought rather to say, it is *worse* than nothing. For it means a cruelly lacerated reality. And that means a tragic drama in human hearts and human lives. It means an abyss and a virtual crime. It is a monster without any rights of citizenship in the world of reality.

You should get to know, the sooner the better, *what* this tendency of abstraction, so prevalent in our Western world, actually stands for. It is a chronic disease you and I--and our kinsmen in any typical non-Hebrew and non-Christian (non-Biblical) culture--seem doomed to be encumbered with, like some leaden weight chained to our feet. We shall soon see whether the research teams within the ultra-modern centers of ESP laboratories share something of that illness with us. If so, then you and I ought to be quite able to understand them without any great difficulty.

You might almost say it is the basic structure of our thinking that seems to have suffered irreparable damage. And this sad condition avers itself in the same degree as our cultural heritage happens to be pagan.

So what do you expect from a staff of Western humanists who make up the picket troops in our parapsychological research? The same lack of wholeness (that is, of sober-minded Biblical realism) is, of course, bound to assert itself on a broad front and in all fundamental interpretations of the paranormal phenomena that are being investigated.

So the question presents itself to us irrepressibly. Which view about man, as a body-soul being, is the truly scientific one? Is there an anthropology that asserts itself as indubitably realistic? If we have to choose, should we then

choose Biblical monism or parapsychological dualism?

Now you will also more easily understand why I dwell so long upon Croesus and his peculiar case. Nothing could be a better preparatory move. Certain sides of that man's reasonings are particularly suitable for throwing an interesting light upon things we see happening today in the lecture rooms, and the laboratory rooms, for parapsychological research at so many universities. The clear tendency in these environments, so far, has been very one-sided. It seemed to go in almost exclusively one single direction. It insisted on "proving" that the truth about the world and about man is *not* to be found in the view of *totality* launched by Christian realism. No, on the contrary, what has received an enormous prestige once more is classical dualism. That is, the platonic and neo-platonic ideal is dogmatically separating two elements--on the one hand an element called "the purely spiritual," and, on the other hand, "the purely material."

Chapter 8 What is Contained in the Very Designation *ESP*?

The tendency of abstraction is already clearly expressed in the very term ESP. The three letters stand for Extra Sensory Perception. So the phenomenon in focus is precisely *a perception bypassing the physical senses!*

We know that the physical senses are absolutely dependent on their respective nerve cells. Wherever those nerves function, certain electrical discharges are seen to take place. And it is not a question of "*spiritual* electricity." This is something tangibly physical indeed. So, if you prefer to take your stand for some mode of perception rather opposite to this one, a perception absolutely "*independent of matter*", you are opting for something that the most modern and most sophisticated psychophysiology knows nothing about. You are landing in a territory in which matter is supposed to be perfectly excluded, allegedly in favor of an absolutely discarnate ("*bodiless*") function of your personality. What ESP is bound to mean, then, is nothing less than this radically spiritualistic idea about man and the world.

I can in a way understand those who feel that there is something weirdly attractive in the prospect of such independence. For what you and I depend on is apparently a more or less "*boring*" *material* world, a prosaically commonplace world of time and space. In that world we sense restrictions of so many kinds. I do not deny it. Just imagine, the persons otherwise known by you and me are persons we commonly assume to depend on being *here* and *now*, if they are to exist at all. But for the ESP the

assumption is that such "materially bound" creatures suddenly cease to be bound any longer. They are suddenly enabled to tear themselves loose, as it were, from the "fetters" of everyday matter. They manage to soar freely into some other and "higher" world, a fabulous non-space and non-time type of world. Of course, it must impress ordinary mortals as a bit of a sensation to go--just like that--into an entirely new category of existence. That is what spiritualists call "eternity." And I have already warned you against thinking that what they mean by that is something like "endless time." By no means. They are the soaring aeronauts of the mind who go into the mystic skies of non-time, non-space, the fascinating world of Jonathan Livingston Seagull. It is quite another philosophy, the childlike philosophy of Biblical realism, that is "prosaic" enough to equate "eternity" with "endless time." Western man's heritage from Greece causes him to have an entirely opposite idea of "eternity." To him it means *timelessness*, whatever that stands for! By Plato, the father of all Occidental spiritualism, time was branded as something far too vulgar to enjoy any prestige among intelligent men.

In the tradition of Biblical realism, however, there was no room whatsoever for exploding, magically, the time concept in that super-sophisticated way. According to the thought forms of Judaism and Christianity, time is something we could never, never prevent from going on and on indefinitely, millennium after millennium. That literal and inevitable movement of time is something going on and on, whether you and I happen to have any part in the trip or not. And what does the Bible subsume as a matter of course, even regarding *God's* relationship to time? The

realism of Biblical theology is to such a degree realistic that it simply does not find it either logical or meaningful to make any suggestion whatsoever that God should find it unworthy in any way to have His existence in this elementary reality called time. What fills a realistic thinker on the human level with boundless admiration is, on the contrary, the simple fact that God manages the far more impressive feat of being eternal in the tremendous sense of *time without end!* His time is endless time, backward and forward, No hocus pocus, if you please! And are we aware of one thing about Biblical theology? I am speaking about something as essential as the basic idea of its God in terms of His nature as the Unique One from everlasting to everlasting. Does the Bible ever insinuate that it would be a shame and an unworthy depreciation to think of God as one existing in that elementary dimension called time? Never. What makes Him impressive to the Bible reader's mind is, on the contrary, the tough but simple fact that He alone accomplishes the tremendous feat of being ***eternal*** in the hard-core sense of endlessness *in time*. (See *Day of Destiny*, pp. 117-153, Chapter XX, "A God Who Interferes In His Only Possible World, The World Of Time-Space Reality.")

Perhaps the most overwhelming part of the story, to you and me, is this. As far as endlessness in the future is concerned, that incredible God has made up His mind to spend it--literally and tangibly and visibly--*together with us* humble creatures! Where? Well, in a spot of the universe as humble and ***apparently*** insignificant as the *planet Earth*. Our Creator and Savior Jesus Christ does not make a secret of the fact that He looks forward with personal thrill to the

time when He is going to spend year million after year million together with you and me--provided that you and I find we can take the risk of being with Him as infinitely long a time as that. For please don't be fooled. A literal eternity *is*, of course, quite a bit of time. We may get somewhat dizzy just thinking of it.

This is where our well-intentioned spiritualists, from Plato on, have felt called upon to come to our "rescue." What is *their* solution to the "problem"? They simply launch the idea of a new dimension, a pure fantasy dimension, that is "eternity" in the harmless sense of *timelessness*. That must present itself as a most comforting button to press--for security's sake--whenever reality becomes too oppressive to cope with for a wee human being!

Yes, indeed. It does. To some, that invention does seem to be an expedient "safety valve" helping them to escape from the hardships of intrusive realities. But the price they must pay is a heavy one. There is automatically a heavy penalty in human lives for fleeing away from unpleasant realities.

There is one thing we should all know. And that knowledge ought to be accepted, the sooner the better. Our parapsychologists have fallen in line unconditionally in front of our Occidental culture's classically platonic conception of what is "ideal reality." That is, idealism in the pagan philosophical sense of the term, not in the practical sense of "*possessing ideals*."

A Problem of Historical Evaluation

The question then particularly causing me some trouble,

but at the same time providing a considerable urge toward intensive research, is the following. (And notice now, I am directing that question to modern researchers who obviously felt the natural scientist's need of following the research principles of a present-day laboratory environment, with its natural leanings toward stringent realism.) Well, how in the world could they still land in something as anti-realistic as the spiritualism of Greek antiquity in their anthropological and cosmological research conclusions? This has brought contemporary parapsychology into a full-clash collision with the psychophysiology departments of our most famous medical schools. For it was a completely holistic and monistic trend of philosophy our natural sciences had arrived at, as they established their lasting attitude toward a coherent view of man.

What is Death?

I shall presently touch some statements that must surprise us, the more so as they come from a specialist in something as realistic-sounding as "*quantitative* ESP testing." We shall listen to the now so famous Professor Rhine of Duke University. In his reflections he even brings up the topic of man's encounter with death. Rhine describes death as "man's coming to a halt in the time-space universe." In other words, death is represented as nothing but a mere transition from time to timelessness. Here you get your first intimation that even the best among the ESP researchers of our day lack every foundation of a realistic philosophy. They have opted for a diametrically opposite road to the one we had, so far, gotten into the habit of

regarding as a pretty well-established tradition of modern science.

Now, of course, we have all the time been conscious of what spiritualistic philosophers--and along with them the practical performers of modern spiritism--had as *their* basic idea about man. And let us not forget what the main intention was of those purposeful parapsychologists, at their first emergence, toward the end of the last century. They had precisely made up their minds to test the validity of that spiritualist claim about man. Spiritualists through all centuries and millennia of our human history have believed and taught one thing. When man dies, his soul establishes for itself a complete further existence quite independent of bodily functions.

The intention of this form of a message of survival may have a pathetic beauty. The process is envisioned as a "liberation of the human spirit." Our condition in this life is down-rated as a sort of incarceration. In that prison life the body is seen as *the* oppressive straightjacket. All through her life in this psychophysical condition, the soul (poor thing) has had to suffer under the unworthy strain of a wicked limitation caused by those miserable dimensions of time and space. Only at the moment of death does the "soul" (the "real man") manage to break out triumphantly from this "undignified imprisonment."

The reasoning is unmistakable. It is only bodies (wretched devices of an evil destiny) that depend on space and time for their existence. From times immemorial there has been a tradition in all lands, penetrated by a spiritualist culture, of thinking that those troublesome dimensions must be something belonging to "this world" exclusively. How

different from this miserable destiny of a constant claustrophobia is not the world of the oracle of Delphi, for instance?! Here the divine Pythia had the bliss of diving down--or soaring up--into a kingdom of beatifying "freedom." What a blessed privilege enjoyed by the spirit medium of all times!

Chapter 9 The Deficiency in Croesus' Thought Pattern

Does It Announce Something about the Pattern of Thought Governing Our ESP Research Today?

There is no doubt about the locus in which Croesus sought and found the great promise of his life. It was in Pythia's masterful ability to tear herself loose from "the enslaving fetters" of time and space. What else, if not the following, could be the trend of his thought: Sardis was, by the standards of locomotion of the contemporary world, far, far away from Delphi--at least the distance was great enough for the material events taking place in Sardis to be entirely out of reach to a normal sense perception among people in Delphi. Here, to be sure, the dimension of space had to be annihilated in order to make communication possible. And once that dimension had been successfully conjured away, all natural hindrances would also have to be declared annihilated. To Croesus the inference seemed inevitable. If the dimension of *space* could be handled in that masterful way, the dimension of *time* ought to be something the same lady could rid herself of with equal virtuosity.

To the king of Lydia that latter disappearance act, on the part of the pythoness, was of particular interest. For, so far, an impenetrable veil happened to cover the future, a future he was extremely anxious to know something specific about. He was longing frantically for a certain positive answer about that future, an answer to a question he had not even dared to ask yet. Nothing short of the phenomenal feat--called "precognition" in *present-day* occultism--could accomplish the hotly coveted wonder, as far as Croesus

could see.

This is where I feel bound to establish a fact about the reasoning of that ancient king which startles me a good deal. In fact, it forces me to associate his case with that of our ESP researchers today. Both parties seem to be running amuck against everything that has ever constituted the realistic foundation of sound traditional science. We know--don't we?--the simple realism that has secured, for our university laboratories during several centuries, victory after victory. What else could it be that has made them victorious even from the first day of a dawning research in modern times? The laboratories of an awakening Europe, ridding itself of the superstitions of antiquity and the Middle Ages, never dreamt of dropping back into the dualist spiritualism of a superstitious past. I am speaking about the general trend of Western science up until the revolutionary day when modern parapsychology emerged with laboratory tests and test interpretations of an entirely different kind.

It will be my task to demonstrate how confusingly divergent the two sets of laboratories in modern times are growing. What the most advanced psychophysiology departments of our medical schools arrive at regarding the relationships between a human body and a human soul are diametrically opposite to what our ESP research laboratories arrive at. This sensational divergence must have an explanation that makes sense. Otherwise we must simply give up our faith in the dependability of science.

But just here we are in for the surprise of our lives. The quantitative research leaders of ESP laboratories of well-known universities solemnly declare--and I do believe in

their personal honesty--that they base their investigations on exactly the same scientific principles that natural science has always espoused. Still the outcome is sensationally divergent. What was it natural science arrived at as far back as the days of Aristotle? That ruggedly realistic Greek experimenter of old made his observations in nature in order to find the true relationship between matter and spirit in man's world. But every bit of his most realistic findings is now being declared null and void. It is Plato's dualism, not Aristotle's monism, that allegedly constitutes the truth about the human being.

Well, then, what is it that convinces this novel school of modern "Neo-Platonists" in the world of science that the age-old tradition of body-soul monism has gone bankrupt?

It is one thing above all other things. It is the sensational results they feel they can conclusively substantiate regarding precisely the phenomenon of PRECOGNITION!

Chapter 10 Foreknowledge of Future Events as an "Inherent Human Endowment"

An entire world of observers is breathless with amazement at this solemn proclamation on the part of serious scientists. And how could they fail to be impressed? Researchers by the thousands all over the civilized world keep staring, open-mouthed and speechless, at the phenomenon that is being demonstrated. My question now, however, is, do we have a legitimate reason to be all that impressed? You have not forgotten, have you, that we asked a similar question about Croesus? Did he have any logically legitimate reason to be all that enthusiastic about the "fabulous accomplishments" of the Delphian prophetess? What if that boundless admiration for her was without realistic foundation, a rash move with fateful consequences?

Well, what alternative interpretation could still be suggested?

I have already told you. Suppose that the puny human being, Pythia of the Delphian oracle, should turn out to be nothing but a *medium*, a *go-between*? Then some entirely independent agency could claim the whole honor for the fabulous accomplishment. Isn't that a matter of course? Playing the part of a mere go-between in a matter like that cannot be so much to brag of. You have already guessed what I am driving at, haven't you? The great question we must be permitted to ask in the case of modern parapsychology, as well, is a similar one. Who is the great master of the impressive test results, the incredible scorings registered in the name of human test subjects? To be more

specific, are those test findings indubitably in favor of "precognition" in human beings? Are they necessarily all that admirable? I here assume the eventuality taken into account that someone *other than the man in question* functions as *primus motor* in them. Some creatures even considerably limited themselves in their ability to accomplish things, may still be placed on vantage ground--and so much so, compared to other creatures, that their accomplishments are looked upon as a token of divinity.

What if the Christian philosopher should still have a fair chance to salvage his meaningful monistic conception of reality, right in the midst of apparent meaninglessness? So far, I just ask my childlike little question. To me that is an existential question in the best sense of that modern adjective. Please don't think that the logical quality of a person's religious beliefs is an insignificant thing. "To be or not to be"--that is the question which may be decided for any creed, in the balance of simple logic. At least, to a staunch adherent of Christian realism some firm intellectual basis for truth and meaningfulness in man's world is a decisive issue. It decides all the difference between Agape and Eros as alternative fundamental motifs. Even Plato himself will admit that Eros is the master of spiritualism as a philosophy and as a virtual religion. (See C. Johnsen: *Agape and Eros, the Part of the Story You Were Never Told*, p. 183, ff.)

Here there is something many Christians are not aware of, however much they may be sincere in their good intentions. Still, a missing link in the chain of truth may aver itself as fateful.

*Let Us Get to Know the Radical Realism of the Bible
and the Concrete Verities of Plain Natural Science Which
That Realism Proclaims About the World and About You
and Me*

The spirituality the Holy Scriptures speak about is never--never!--some spooky, bodiless type of spirituality. Biblical philosophy never deals in pure abstractions. But remember, such abstractions are the only possibility available in a "world" beyond time and space. Not even God Himself could reasonably be imagined to exist in a kingdom as empty and meaningless as that. No-No, He least of all! I am speaking about the God of the Bible, of course; not about the God of Plato's Dialogues. For Plato's God, also called the Idea, has a merely speculative type of existence. And those timeless and spaceless abstractions have their imaginary existence in that Nirvana of pure nothingness that constitutes the "heaven" of sheer automatism. A personal Creator-God, interfering actively and lovingly in the lives of His creatures, just could not have anything whatsoever in common with that absolutely impersonal God of consistent spiritualist automatism. The God of the Bible is a Participant in historical happenings, in a chain of events *taking place*. Wherever the Bible speaks about God, He is, either explicitly or implicitly, alluded to as the One who has a residence, a throne, a center of hectic activity, and--mark you--activity of a practical kind. The special place where that throne is said to be located now, according to the entire Gospel report, is a literal City, the New Jerusalem. According to the Revelation of Jesus Christ, with its most concrete testimony, that Jerusalem is a capital in exile. For a little more time, still, it will remain in

that condition of banishment. But the drama-filled record of that banished Holy City does not stop there. No, at a definite point in time this pearl of the universe is going to be repatriated. To the gray-haired Apostle John, himself banished to the loneliness of the Isle of Patmos sometime toward the end of our first century, it was a wonderfully encouraging experience to receive a vision of the way that pearl of Edenic beauty was going to come down "adorned like a bride prepared for her bridegroom" (Rev. 21:2). Since that revelation, it has been the comfort of Christians in all lands to be longing for the day when every one of them is to enjoy, in a world of reality, the event of that city coming down through the enormous passages of the galaxies to place itself in gentle flight and with an elegant landing *manoeuvre* on Planet Earth, at a minutely planned and thoroughly prepared specific spot of territory.

And then comes something constantly scorned by all spiritualistically conditioned thinkers. And the same scornful attitude is found in certain scientists with their predilection for the *timeless* and the *spaceless* in their speculative thinking. Those would hardly ever be able to imagine the following as a living reality: God Himself, the Creator and Savior Jesus Christ, is going to establish on man's *Earth* His very throne, His future center through all coming eternity. (Read, "through all *times*, billions and billions of literal years." Just go back to the last two chapters of the Bible in case it is some time since you read them.)

Between that throne of God and our Earth today there is a definite distance. Don't let your platonic fancies of speculative spiritualism take away your sober realism now!

So that distance is an astro-geographical matter of course, according to the thought pattern of Biblical cosmology. Choose whatever linear measure you like for your drawing board--miles or light years. A distance, whether short or long, is something that has to be covered realistically. And those distances we are here speaking about *are* literally covered, again and again. This is the concrete testimony of Holy Writ. The angels surrounding God's throne are the ones rendering service as ambassadors, performing the travels back and forth. There is no word in the Bible indicating that the distances are made shorter--or simply annihilated--by magic. There is no conjuring away of time-space reality. There is no suggestion whatsoever of canceling the distances, or nullifying the reality of space. No, never! That would be a platonic-metaphysical solution. But here Plato is not the one planning the solutions. By no means! The Creator Himself is the Project-Maker, not some haphazard demiurge. The only one who could be entrusted with forming the realistic devices, and with supervising their being carried out faithfully, is Jesus Christ, the one "without whom nothing was made of all that was made" (John 1:3). It was the Son who received from the Father the great task of carrying out the magnificent projects of creation which the two together had conceived from the dawn of the ages and prepared with infinite love and solicitude, quite minutely in all details, during endless periods of realistic time. For God's past is just as packed with meaningful reality as His present and His future. Where do you think you could ever lay bare one tiny bit of meaninglessness in the formidable macrocosm of our Creator, as the Bible describes Him?

And now what about the microcosm on which we have been focusing our special attention? I am speaking about Croesus' concrete little world. On the map of that mini-world, every single point is a topographical reality. Here is Delphi, and over there is Sardis. The *distance* between those points does not demand light-years for being measured. But still it *is* there as an inevitable reality. So something elementary has to be faced realistically regarding what happened on the very day when a certain delegation presented itself at Delphi, while their king stayed in a secret kitchen department at Sardis. We must concentrate on the ways messages can travel between two points.

We do have a problem on our hands, don't we? Should we solve it simply by saying: "Hocus pocus--let the distance between Sardis and Delphi shrink to the point of nothingness--abracadabra"?

No. Here we must make one thing clear first of all. What *is* the attitude of the philosophy I call "Biblical realism" toward the generally valid laws of nature?

Chapter 11 God and His Natural Laws

Is God a Market Juggler Enjoying to Play the Role of the Magician, Specializing as His Favorite Hobbyhorse in the Practice of Abolishing His Own Natural Laws?

No-no. From a Biblical viewpoint a vulgar passion of playing around with reality in that vulgar way would be absurd and rather ridiculous. It is equally absurd and ridiculous on the part of serious Christians to imagine that Jesus of Nazareth "abolished the law of gravity" for awhile in order to permit Peter to walk on Lake Gennesaret. One thing we all fail to realize sometimes is the fact that all God's laws, including the law of gravity and other natural laws, are divine in the essential sense that they have their origin in Him. This implies more than you thought, I am afraid. It means that even the laws of nature constitute an eternal and irrepressible expression of God's deepest nature. So they are valid for all times. For they simply have their source in something as eternal and unalterable as His fundamental trait, *agape*.

True enough, you and I do have the habit of expressing ourselves very inaccurately. We say again and again that creatures *break* the laws of God. Is that realistic language? By no means. God's laws are of such a lasting quality that no puny creature could ever manage to tear *them* to pieces. How could he crush them, annihilate them? On the contrary, it is God's laws that break *you* and *me*. That is what we are going to experience in a fatal way if we have the temerity to neglect the reality they stand for. We shall have to observe then, some day, that the divine laws manage to get along perfectly well without one single

breach in them, while you and I may be miserably broken. God does not have legislation (the making of laws) as some kind of pastime entertainment to distract Him during "tedious moments" when He would otherwise tend to be "bored." Of course that would be a light-minded idea about God, bordering on blasphemy. But many people act as if they did think of God as a *saltimbanco* amusing Himself with making laws on one day which He enjoys to unmake the next.

Well, you say, what was it the Lord actually did then in the case of Peter? How did He prevent that disciple from succumbing to the effects of the gravitation law there on the Lake of Tiberias?

Would that be such a difficult question to answer? He *raised Peter up*, of course, in a fatherly and literal manner. What would you yourself have done, for instance, in the case of some fellow creature in the process of drowning? How would you counteract that realistic force which was about to drag him downwards into the deep? Well, simply by using an *opposite* power, of which you might happen to have free disposal. You would drag the poor fellow *upwards*. You would *not*, would you, rather start chanting your magic formula, "Hocus pocus, abracadabra?" Of course not. You would not say, "Let the law of gravity be annihilated, made null and void for so and so many minutes in this cruel law-haunted world of ours."

Suppose you did manage, by means of your formidable magic, to really *abolish* the law of gravity for so many minutes: What do you think the result would have been? What would have happened to the many creatures, the many worlds in our universe, that depend absolutely on the

right functioning of that tremendous law for their ordered existence? Would you like us all to be in the kind of "pickle" that astronauts find themselves in as they float around in their cabins when total weightlessness sets in? Poor puny you and me, if some thoughtless master-conjurer were to have his petition literally granted by God when he prayed, "Let the gravitation cease to be."

But this is typical of human thought-forms in our environment. It is the foolishness with which we have got into the habit of considering laws, by and large. The laws and the Lawgiver are equally looked down upon. What we admire is rather the great *miracle* which is supposed to reduce laws to zero. The supernatural is to us the great thing. Nothing less than that would do in order to impress *us*. Natural processes are found to be boring stuff. The commonplace is something we almost consider as having been hit by a terrible curse. That is the degree of hostility we have gotten into--hostility toward anything that seems to smack of law and order. Only at the moment when we have the exciting experience of what we assume to be a *miracle*--only then do we feel an urge to rise on tiptoe, shouting out our enthusiastic "hallelujah." Why? Is this a kind of gloating--or some other destructive trend within us--filling us with a weird kind of malicious pleasure at the moment when we feel that finally all things may be falling apart in ordered nature and in the entire complex of laws that govern our everyday world?

Let us rather ask a question for which it may be easier to get an answer. Is such deep-seated enmity against laws a notorious part and parcel of Biblical realism? Far from it. If our hearts and our minds were in unison with God's

philosophy (the only true realism existing in the world), we would, on the contrary, rejoice in the face of God's laws and their unbreakable validity, something we can depend upon right in the midst of the foam-topped breakers of a storm-tossed sea.

Notice, with this I have not said that the God of the Bible is the One who does *not* interfere in the lives of His creatures. For He does! Certainly His realism is just what causes Him to interfere most realistically. He interferes ever so often, even in the way you and I, in our confusion, insist on calling "miraculous." Suppose He did *not* interfere. Then what would have happened to Peter, for instance, on that noteworthy day in his life. He would have gone down mercilessly, and on many other days as well. The natural law called gravitation would have seen to it that the number of his days had been counted.

But please tell me, why do we insist on degrading God to the position of a light-minded sorcerer at the moment when He intervenes? Why should it seem so far-fetched to imagine that the way this super-realistic Personality (God) intervenes is what we might perfectly well describe as *natural*.

Or how would you describe the way you yourself intervene at the moment when you happen to see a poor child at the periphery (outskirts) of a merry-go-round? That child is just about to "go off at the tangent" because the speed of that carousel is too wild. Do you say, "Hocus pocus. Let the law of the centrifugal force come to a sudden stop in this universe?" Of course not. You respectfully leave the law of the centrifugal force alone. Instead you rather start pushing the child toward the center, or reduce the

speed of the wild wheel, don't you? In other words, you avail yourself of some force you yourself still dispose of in order to keep that wild centrifugal power in check.

*Just Don't Let the Proud Pythia Get Away With Anything
Less Than Being Unmasked by the Medium Theory's
Implacable Research Rays*

With a particularly fearless totality-analysis we must now focus our attention on both the Delphian and other centers of occult forces. How can we account logically for the fact that Croesus' incredible acts in Sardis could immediately be conscious knowledge in the mind of a human creature in Delphi at the same time? Is it mandatory that we should postulate as an absolute presupposition for this to happen that the time-space world (the only world conventional science has ever known) should simply be pulverized, conjured away with the stroke of some magic wand? Must I concede that a dualist view of the world has totally ousted the Christian monistic view for all times because the oracle of Delphi proved able to accomplish the feat it did?

This is to me a capital question of course. For the principles we here lay down will necessarily make precedence for the dispositions we shall have to take toward the claims of modern parapsychology. So do not blame me for taking the case of the Lydian king so seriously.

Chapter 12 An Important Rule of Thumb in Scientific Research

It has become a well-known rule of thumb in all human science that wherever two alternative explanations of one and the same phenomenon are available, a simple one and a more complicated one, preference should be given to the simple explanation.

Now what about the contention that Pythia, without anything else at her disposal than her own inherent human ability, managed to have her abstract, matter-less soul roaming about in the top-secret halls of a palace in Sardis at the same time as her material body was bound to stay put in Delphi? Does this sound like a *simple* assumption or a rather *complicated one*? I mean, compared to *another* alternative.

"Which one?" you are eager to know.

Well, I am still speaking about an alternative that does not demand any metaphysical transcendence of the realistic dimensions of either time or space. That is this one--Pythia is *not* operating on her own. She has the assistance of an outside agency. That agency has the advantage of a considerably higher ground and, therefore, a considerably broader view. No actual transcendence of barriers of time and space is necessarily needed in order to manifest a knowledge that will impress common human beings as "transcendental."

Well, you say hesitatingly, is it not the demon spirits of age-old spiritism you are referring to as that other and simpler alternative? If so, then how could that be more in keeping with the philosophical foundation for conventional

science in modern times?

Definitely so. The fact of the case is simple indeed. But it is a fact too little known both in Christian and in secularly humanistic circles. It is this: the philosophy of the Bible never, never alludes to the demons (that is, the fallen angels) as a category of *bodiless* or *discarnate* beings! It was, on the contrary, our philosopher-theologians of antiquity, and of the Middle Ages, who led all Christendom astray with their spiritualistic interpretations of the Bible, thus causing us to believe that the angels were "pure spirits"! So-called Christian thinkers such as Thomas Aquinas got entangled in a cobweb of the most absurd sham problems because of pagan/platonic misconceptions.

*Do Angels Have Bodies, According to Biblical
Philosophy?*

There is one thing you must know. It may astonish you greatly to hear about it. From a time as early as the second century, a pagan/platonic tradition had been making its way right into the midst of the Christian Church. The spiritualist mirage of a completely discarnate ("pure") soul had been generally accepted as the one great ideal for both angels and men. Thomas even came to the definite conclusion, quite seriously, that the angels, since they were bodiless spirits ("totally immaterial"), simply could not exist as individuals! No, each angel must exist as an "*entire species*" only. For it is the species that represents the general. Only the species can form a pure abstraction. (For instance, "humanity" or "mankind" is such an abstract, a general notion.) The individual is the specific thing, the concretely corporeal thing.

Does the Bible accept Thomas Aquinas' speculative philosophy of that pagan-Greek pattern? Nowhere. You may go to the Old Testament or to the New. Wherever the Bible talks about angels--whether good ones or evil ones--there is no question whatsoever of beings *without a body!* That would be a nondescript monster, not a being created by the great Lord of creation. Of course, there is a definite limit to what we get to know about the nature of the angels. Just what *kind* of a body they possess, for instance, compared to your body and mine, this we are not informed about in any detail. But one thing is evident. The angel does have a body, something filling time and space. That is commonplace and a matter of course in Biblical anthropology and "angel-ology." Where there is a body, however, there must also be a place for that body to exist. Bodies do have this characteristic--they enjoy having places where they can "take place." And when we say *take place* we are in a historical context. We are indispensably wound up with time as well as space. Bodies are never anything less than three-dimensional. In fact, they are four-dimensional. They are not zero-dimensional. Let us not be fools.

Particularly that crowd of demons the Bible speaks about, as the source of all the intrigues of wickedness and sorrow on earth, must get to "feel in their bodies" every new day. I dare say that they are *limited in space*. At the moment of history when they were "cast out" of heaven, as the story clearly goes in the book of Revelation (12:7-9), there certainly was a *place* into which they were cast. There must have been a most realistic movement from one place to another place. It is eloquently described as a

"downward" movement. Of course, that may be seen as "value description." But that value sense does not take the contingent reality of *space* out of it. Something very tragic in the destiny of those evil angels was demonstratively expressed by this literal movement from one place to another. A most concrete *enclosure* had taken place, quite perceptibly reducing the "radius" (range of operation) of those rebels against God.

Believe me, it was not from the Holy Scriptures that the great "philosophus angelicus," Thomas Aquinas, derived his theory about angels not having any possibility of presenting themselves as single individuals. It was his great teachers Plato and Aristotle who had taught him that yarn of speculative reasoning. The incredible thing happening, you see, was that the comparative realist Aristotle ended up in the trap of speculative foolishness that his teacher Plato had set up for him. So even the Aristotelian Thomas falls a victim to the same absurd philosophy. He is not wrong when he says that individuality demands a being of flesh and blood and bone. He is wrong when he assumes as a matter of course that angels do *not* have such bodily qualities. So they must be, each one of them, a "species" rather than an individual. How much farther from sound common sense could speculative philosophy ever get?

*According to Biblical Demonology, Demons are
Psychophysical Beings*

I must here guard myself against a false interpretation of my words about angels, good ones and evil ones. I do not at all accuse the Bible of teaching that they are all equipped with exactly the same bodily attributes as human beings

are. Their bodily natures may be very different from what we know to be ours. I might mention the fact that they seem to be at freedom to choose whether they want to appear in front of human creatures as visible or invisible. That would seem to indicate a considerable difference. But invisibility, as every physicist well knows, does not necessarily mean "bodilessness." What I want to stress in a particular way is only this: There is nothing in the Bible's mention of the angelic beings that suggests anything contrary to a psychosomatic nature. The idea of something "purely psychic," as the current philosophy of timeless spiritualism goes, has no birthright in Biblical Christianity. The Bible's records are not at any point platonian-idealistic in their thought pattern. They know nothing about monstrous creatures without any physical attributes.

A long series of things in nature happen to be invisible to the eyes of common men. Nonetheless, they are eminently physical. We know something definite about that from the world of magnetic fields, as they establish themselves in specific areas. We know this also from the behavior of phenomena belonging to spectral physics. Invisibility proves nothing in the direction of mental abstraction. Short and sweet, we may safely say: Nothing in our universe has ever been known to *take place* without finding, somewhere, that *place* which it can "take"--that is, occupy it realistically as its own. The "spaceless" and the "history-less" is a cheap myth, an illusory type of existence. Looking for illusions has never been a piece of advice communicated by the Bible to its readers.

And now, what is the practical evidence delivered by the spirits themselves as they sometimes unfold their savage

game in the course of certain spiritualist séances? Would the tangible result of this tempt us to conclude that it must be the "pure idea" in its platonic conception that is out in the night for a spooky moonlight walk? Hardly. There must be some very material shaking of some literal molecules astir. For how could "pure spirit" make all that infernal noise?

Chapter 13 Human Body and Demon Spirit

Human Body and Demon Spirit in Some Macabre Cuddly-Muddly Fondling of Each Other During One Incredible Kind of Séance

In his book, "Secrets of the Spirit World," Roy Allan Anderson has an authentic report, partly shocking and partly touching at the same time, during which you experience precisely that ever-returning encounter between the "visible body" and the "invisible body," if I may express myself in such a way. It is the story of a grandmother in a town in South America. She had once been somewhat of a devil priestess. The main emphasis, however, is on her grandchild, a little boy who had grown up, as it were, in that same demon environment:

"The spirit with whom the grandmother communed was just as real to her as any person in human flesh, and eventually the grandchild too began to have experience with spirits himself. Even on the playground at school he would suddenly break away from the children and talk to someone. They would hear him calling out and then he would run over and appear to spring up on someone's lap. No person was visible, but the lad would talk and appear to caress some personality, all the while being suspended in midair.

"The children on the playground, as well as the teacher, had seen this happen many times. His association with this unseen personality would last a quarter of an hour or more. They would see him talking, just as a child would to an adult. They often watched as he would lay his head back, as if on someone's breast. And I repeat, all of this in midair!

"When the interview was over, he would slip quietly to the ground, as if being helped by someone, and go on playing with the children. This occurred so often that nobody took notice of it. It is difficult for most of us to understand that such a thing could happen, but in certain areas of the world such occurrences are so common that they are taken for granted." (*Secrets of the Spirit World*, p. 16.)

Here it would seem appropriate to consider critically a couple of relevant questions. Of course, it must be consistent to regard the little boy as the *medium* in the present case. Now, the one with whom the medium communicates is called the "control," a very proper term, I think. It puts the emphasis where it really belongs. So parapsychological terminology in this case is right to the point. The one really in charge is the spirit. And now this question: How come the "control" is so able to handle "purely" material things with which it is confronted--in fact, more able by far than the poor medium would ever seem able to manage any similar practical accomplishments?

Some might like the explanation to be this one: The "control" is precisely the one eminently able to transcend the laws of simple matter. And that would include annihilating the reality (or "unreal sham phenomenon") of space by means of some magic trick.

Would this be a piece of logical thinking?

Impossible. What logically convincing argument should there be for drawing such a conclusion? Take the practical purpose of raising a guy up in the air, even an ever so heavy one. Would it seem necessary for that purpose to

abolish completely that fellow's very existence as a bodily creature? Of course not. That kind of magic would be entirely superfluous. The only thing actually needed would be a certain amount of literal, natural, physical forces, maybe coupled with a muscular dexterity you and I have little idea about. Why should we be all that surprised at our own limited knowledge?

Some Patristic Testimonies Regarding Striking Features of Occult Phenomena as Early as the Days of Antiquity

The church father Lactantius explains the ambiguities of the prophetic answers coming from pagan oracles in this way:

"They do know many future events, but not all. For they have not been given the knowledge of everything in God's counsel. Therefore they have made it a custom to answer in such a way that they are always right."

What must we say about this "limited degree of precognition" which Lactantius admits in honor of intelligent creatures? The least I can say is this: It has been dangerously formulated. For, as we shall presently see, precognition, in the modern ESP sense of the term, does not, according to the Bible, have any existence whatsoever in human beings. That inherent faculty of knowing the future events is reserved for the Creator. For both men and other creaturely beings one rule holds good: Their computations, or mere guesses, may be shrewd enough. Particularly the Bible knows about the intelligent way demons in this world exploit the knowledge they do have access to. That ability of exploitation is admirable. But as for the *gift of prophecy*, properly speaking, in their nature

there is no trace of any such thing. So a sort of automatic foreknowledge of the future, as modern parapsychology conceives of it, is nonexistent. It is sheer self-conceit.

Otherwise Lactantius has a quite thought-provoking description of the activity exerted by the evil spirits (the fallen angels) on earth:

"These contaminated and godforsaken spirits, as already pointed out, do roam about all over the earth, seeking comfort for their own perdition. They find this in the destruction of human beings. That is why they fill all places with snares, deception and confusion. They cling to individuals, and occupy entire houses from door to door. The name they claim is that of "geniuses" (*genii*, plural form of *genius*). This is the way the Greek word *daimon* is translated into Latin."

Still this good church father of old has something not too good in common with us Christians of a modern Western world. He, too, was rather fumbling in his conceptions of orthodox Biblical anthropology. That appears from what he goes on to say:

"But now we do know that the spirits are without any substance."

Where did "we" get that "knowledge"? What Lactantius evidently means is that the demons are without any material physical reality. They are among the "pure spirits" in the sense of platonic abstraction. Here Lactantius is not one bit different from his contemporaries in a would-be Christian milieu. His ideas about spiritual reality have been led astray by an infiltrating pagan philosophy. And it is not an astray-ness of insignificant kind. It may, on the contrary, be catastrophic to the lives of living men. How could it be

an insignificant error to believe that the concrete reality can be spiritualized away in that arch-pagan manner? That is an infiltration of lacerating effect on everything that is truly meaningful in Christian doctrine and Christian life.

*Bible Anthropology Marvelously Immunized Against
Pagan/Greek Spiritualist Views*

Fortunately the Biblical canon has been miraculously preserved against that kind of infiltration. Even the books of the New Testament canon (none of which go beyond the second century A.D.) seem to have been blessed with a strange immunity against such platonic or neo-platonic influences. The apostle Paul, for instance--in spite of the fact that he grew up in a milieu soaked with pagan cultural influences--still has managed to preserve an Old Testament Hebraic realism in his views about man and the world that experts in religious anthropology find to be absolutely uncontaminated. By believers this has been regarded as nothing less than a divine wonder.

*Then What Does Paul Mean by His Striking Expression,
"A Spiritual Body"?*

Is this also Christian realism? Or is it a meaningless bastard mixture between realism and spiritualism?

I can understand these puzzled questions on the part of Western men. In reality, that expression of a "spiritual body" only shows the rugged foundation on which the Christian idea of spiritual life is based. Even spirituality is grounded on the firm rock bottom of time-space reality. What the Master Creator has informed the apostle about is something very interesting indeed regarding human *bodies*.

Someday they are to adopt a new nature. In this world, you see, they have necessarily remained corruptible. They can weaken, rot, be destroyed. However, on the resurrection morning, at the time of Christ's second coming, as the dead are called out of their graves by the re-creating divine shout of the voice of the Archangel, suddenly quite a transformation is going to take place in the nature of human bodies! They used to be mortal, corruptible. Now they are suddenly becoming immortal, incorruptible. But the remarkable point here is this: All the time they do remain *bodies*. Make no mistake about that. They do not unexpectedly begin to disintegrate, turning into "pure spirit."

True, the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (15:44) does say about that resurrection or "translation" of man something Plato, the grand old man of Occidental spiritualism, would be startled to hear. And not only startled, but profoundly disgusted. Paul says that the result is going to be a "*spiritual* body." What an adjective in connection with bodies! Plato would never have used a word as elevated as that to describe something as low--in his opinion--as a "matter-infested" body. For notice, the first thing a man has to do, according to pagan Greek spiritualism, in order to become truly spiritual, is to shed every bit of what can be suspected of being bodily. Biblical anthropology is miles apart from this. Just imagine, man's body is described by the Bible as a *temple of the Holy Ghost*. What could be more worthy than that?

Now Lactantius has a mixture of Christian and pagan concepts about man, and about spirits by and large. This applies also to what he says about the evil spirits. So please

do not discard as "paganism" or "irrealism" everything he says about them:

"They cannot be grasped (by us) in a literal sense. Still they do penetrate into a human body. Secretly they work in men's interior lives, destroying their health, increasing illnesses, scaring the minds with dreams and follies. By means of these evils they force men to seek refuge in the aid the spirits themselves can provide." (Ibid.)

The latter piece of information may appear unlikely. But even today something similar is taking place. The demon world is causing people to be oppressed. In fact, quite bodily speaking, a terrible pressure is visibly being exerted, as we shall soon demonstrate historically. And then, what happens at the moment when the evil spirits permit that pressure to be relieved? Then they seize the opportunity to boast that the suffering person has been "*healed*" by their generous help.

Another Christian leader of old, Iamblicus, wrote a book quite early in the fourth century known as *De abditis rerum causis*. In this work he expresses his opinion very clearly about the forces behind the "devilry of the oracles." It is simply evil spirits, and "certainly not deceased human beings, *nor good gods*." (Emphasis mine.)

A Remarkable Difference Between the Spirits Presenting Themselves in Modern Spiritism and Those Presenting Themselves in the Old Days

It is worthwhile noticing something quite significant as regards the historical evolution taking place in spiritualist manifestations from one age to the other. I am referring to the way spirit personalities often identified themselves, in

ancient oracle occultism, as compared to the identity they claim to be theirs today. In the old days the spirits currently referred to themselves precisely as "gods" and "goddesses." Imagine a modern client paying his due charge to a modern medium that she may connect him with the spirit world. Then suddenly he gets through, but only to be greeted with the following words: "This is Apollo speaking." Or: "This is Venus. How is your love coming, young man?" What would the customer think? He might think, to say the least, "This institution evidently has not been kept quite up to date. I had expected something a bit more fashionable."

The customer would seem to have good reason for his surprise and the less than satisfactory way in which he was being served. For this would have to be listed as an anachronism, to say the least.

Let us rather get the enlightenment Iambelicus can provide on the topic. That might keep us duly informed as to the historical development:

"Evil spirits have a particular trick they use in order to convince people that they are *gods* and *good* demons. This is the deceptive means they avail themselves of in order to appear good like the gods. But by nature they are evil. Therefore they commit evil quite zealously, as soon as the conditions are favorable for preparing a temptation. They urge us to do evil. Through the messages of the oracle they fill us with falsehood and deception. They give us advice resulting in evil actions, and they themselves engage in such actions without any hesitation. Otherwise it must be pointed out that the nature of these evil spirits is extremely unstable and inconsistent. The counsel they give is at one moment in this direction, and then in the opposite."

You may have noticed in this quotation the expression: "good demons." You should know that the Greek word *daimon*, from which our modern word "demon" is derived, used to be rather ambivalent. A "daimon" might be a good spirit as well as an evil one.

It also appears quite clearly from Clemens of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Gentiles* (volume I, chapter 4), that the spirits announcing themselves in occult circles in antiquity still pose as GODS, and only more rarely as deceased human beings.

Well, "tempora mutantur et nos cum illis." This old saying might easily be changed into: "Times change and *man's spirit ideologies* with them." And what else would you expect? You only need to accept, as a likely theory, what the Bible says about the spirits that appear: They are demons belonging to the crowd of evil angels expelled from heaven to find their temporary abode on earth with darkness, and a precariously reduced freedom of movement but an *increasing shrewdness* in the art of deceiving. Then you will not ask in wonder, "Why have they changed their form of presentation from age to age?" It would seem a matter of course that they adapt this presentation to the conceptions--true or false--that happen to prevail among their "customers" at any given historical era. Their long experience ought to teach them quite accurately what particular shape of sham would appeal most efficiently then and there, here and now. So don't wonder any more why the spirits of modern spiritism no longer present themselves as "god So-and-So," or "goddess So-and-So." That would be an anachronism that must inevitably fail to hook any victim in modern times. The spirits would not be the intelligent

imposters the Bible speaks about if, at a time when sober-minded science is so much in vogue, they neglected to appeal to the most worthy ideals within a circle of fairly well-educated humanists in a highly civilized generation.

Then here comes an interesting question: Was not the same spirits' form of presentation just as well chosen and culturally decent in antiquity as in modern times? You may be surprised to get some information that will enable you to answer for yourself.

Chapter 14 Ancient Occultism Viewed from Its Rudest Angle

Clement of Alexandria complained that the evil spirits caught innocent men by hypocritically displaying a nice character they did not possess. They behave like gods, he says, while in reality they are filled with impurity. It would have been fairer if they presented themselves as men.

Now, however, we are going to show cases when the pandemonium of antiquity, too, really presented themselves as human beings, and certainly not as paragons of virtue. And once more I feel like sending out the serious warning. Don't commit the blunder of pushing aside these occult phenomena of a remote past as mere myths and superstition, and--apart from that--nothing at all. An attitude as light-minded as that toward historical records would mean a real danger; in fact, it might mean the greatest danger of all, not only for your personal life perhaps. Worse than that would be a dubious lack of intellectual integrity face to face with sober science. Don't think it is necessarily a sign of intellectual sagacity to pronounce immediately: "These stories must be humbug altogether."

The story I am now going to pick out from Herodotus' historical work is just as interesting in our context as anything we have dwelt upon so far. For here the matter concerned is not only a message from the world of the occult in a distant antiquity, but once more remarkable elements of "parapsychological testing" interspersed here and there. Moreover it is a case in which the concept of *daimon* certainly appears in a form of the decidedly satanic

and the definitely inhumane.

It is in his Fifth Book the famous historian tells us the sensational story about Periander. That unscrupulous tyrant of Corinth had killed his wife Melissa; which, however, did not prevent him from doing his utmost "to have converse with her." It so happened, you see, that the ex-husband was in desperate need of her advice. He imagined that he could manage the problem by contacting the medium of the "Oracle of the Dead" in Thesprotia.

Now, I may perhaps here interject that Periander does not impress me as the kind of man that depends on advice from the "spirits of the dead" in order to make wicked designs, nor in order to carry them through with perfect cruelty. He seems to have been pretty open to influences in that direction from *living men*. We are told that he corresponded beautifully with Thrasybulus, the Tyrant of Miletus. A worse companion could hardly have been chosen among fellow tyrants. We get an inkling about the tyrannical wickedness of Thrasybulus through a little digression Herodotus treats us to as a sort of extra. There we are fully informed about the tyrant's somewhat peculiar lifestyle:

Periander had once asked his colleague in the "tyrantship" what counsel he could give regarding the kind of government that was "safest to set up in order to rule with honor." In fact, he sent a man all the way to Thrasybulus with no other purpose than getting this important information about the "right kind of safe and honorable government." The messenger certainly had occasion to be highly surprised at the form in which the answer was presented by the expert in "safe and honorable

government principles." Thrasybulus simply led him outside the city and straight into a corn field. And what did the tyrant start doing there? Well, all the time he bombarded the boy with all kinds of apparently irrelevant questions regarding his travel from Corinth. But at the same time he did undertake some hectic activity. Rather ruthlessly he made his way through the grain field where it grew most luxuriantly. And all the time he kept breaking off and throwing away every ear of grain that overtopped the others.

"In this way he went through the whole field and destroyed all the best and richest part of the crop. Then without a word he sent the messenger back."

On the messenger's return, Periander was of course anxious to know what Thrasybulus had counseled. But the boy could only say: "Nothing. As far as I could hear, absolutely nothing."

The messenger expressed his astonishment at what his master Periander had done. Why had he sent his servant out with an inquiry as serious as that to a man who seemed to have lost his senses completely, since he "did nothing but destroy his own property." But Periander evidently grasped and appreciated the message his fellow tyrant had given without words. What the advice meant was the simple destruction of every outstanding citizen. It was as if Thrasybulus had said in full spelling: "If you want to be safe in your position as the one man at the top of the government in Corinth, then, whatever you do, see to it that every other man emerging like a tower in the Corinthian state is made a head shorter."

Periander did not fail to take the advice to heart. "From

that moment on," says Herodotus, the tyrant treated his subjects "with the greatest cruelty."

*A Message of Similar Cruelty Pretending to Come
"From the Dead"*

That is the counsel received by the same tyrant this time, however "*from the dead*" as Herodotus credulously expresses it. It is the fantastic one we particularly ought to pay attention to. For it unveils tremendously important facts. The circumstances were as follows: Periander had with his own hand put to death Melissa, his wife. But then one day he got into a tight spot, a sorry squeeze in which he could not manage any longer without "getting Melissa's gracious help." For although dead, she happened to be the only one who "could give him a piece of information he desperately needed." It was concerning a pledge, the hiding place of which she and nobody else was supposed to know.

So Periander thought he had just one thing to do. He had to betake himself to the dark chamber of a spirit medium to have his dead spouse brought up from the kingdom of the dead.

And now, what about the dead one? Was there any help she could render to her once so inhuman husband? Was there anything the cold grave could do for him? Even those who might feel ever so convinced that Melissa still existed somewhere or other, and that she could still marshal the necessary amount of energetic action he demanded, probably would have their doubts as regards her willingness to be 100 percent at Periander's disposal. Would the good lady deign to appear, and even to give her previous husband and murderer the information he begged

of her? Would she report at all to the headquarters of an ex-husband who had once murdered her in cold blood?

Are you not curious to know what the time-honored annals of the guild of professional spiritists have got registered on that matter? No disappointment there, I assure you. Melissa's willing spirit is said to have been there right on the spot. Let us give the word to Herodotus:

"Melissa appeared, but refused to speak or tell where the pledge was. She was 'chill,' she said, 'having no clothes.' The garments buried with her were of no manner of use, since they had not been burnt. And this should be her token to Periander *that what she said was true*: the oven was to be cold when he baked his loaves in it." (Italics mine. Text still quoted from George Rawlington's translation of the *History of Herodotus*, edited by Manuel Komroff, Tudor Publishing Co., New York, 1941, p. 299.)

I would like to dwell for a moment on that remark about the "*token to Periander, that what she said was true*." In a modern parapsychological context it is really worthwhile paying due attention to this element of a "research test." We notice once more a sincere attempt--on the part of observers at least--at "proving the genuineness" of the paranormal experience made by a human being. Such things should really catch our attention. And so should the readiness with which Periander happened to bend down in front of the offered "proof" material!

One thing is evident enough. Like our contemporary ESP researchers, he does seem to possess a certain intellectual ideal, a minimum requirement of credibility. Periander is glad to have revelations he can "firmly rely upon as being true." Preferably that credibility (or

credulity) of his should be subjected to a conclusive test. Otherwise occult phenomena do not enjoy the best of reputations. They are rather known to be whimsical. Whom they stem from is a question leaving you in some uncertainty, to express it mildly. So we perfectly understand Periander's satisfaction at being offered a "token of truthfulness," don't we? Most people enjoy being able to have some criteria for testing the truthfulness of the revelations that are being given to them. A guarantee of scientific validity--isn't that something very nice to have? What more essential thing, by the way, could those who insist on carrying on "realistic research" demand?

Well, let us have a more critical look at the matter at hand. In what, exactly, did that "verifying token" consist in Melissa's message? Many would think it abundantly convincing. In the first place it did contain certain details which allegedly none but Periander and herself could have any idea about. Humanly speaking, absolutely none. In the second place, Periander had that promised "double-check" token he could look forward to: At the next bread baking process the oven was going to feel entirely cold. And you should not be overly anxious lest the bread baker would have any disappointment coming to him in that respect. Oh no. The spirits do not permit themselves to appear helpless or perplexed even in the face of human creatures making room for any amount of doubts in their imperfect hearts. The spirits are visibly patient and apparently incredibly efficient in the art of removing doubts.

Periander was overwhelmed by the "proving value" of the given token. The spirit manifesting itself to him *must* be his late wife Melissa.

And in the mind and the heart of that man there was not only a readiness to grasp "Melissa's proof," but also a perfect willingness to grasp the suggestion of an abominable act cryptically implied in the message. In this case, as well, theoretical faith demanded a follow-up in terms of practical action, you see. The wording of the message did not leave him in any nagging uncertainty, as far as that goes. It was no small thing, in terms of spectacular orgies this freezing ballerina in the nude, "Melissa," had sufficient imagination to devise and to demand authoritatively of her ex-husband. Still, Herodotus does not seem to think for one moment that Periander was troubled by any hesitations to follow the recipe:

"Wherefore, he straightway made proclamation that all the wives of the Corinthians should go forth to the temple of Juno. So the women apparelled themselves in their bravest and went forth, as if to a festival. Then, with the help of his guards, whom he had placed for the purpose, he stripped them, one and all, making no difference between the free women and the slaves. And, taking their clothes to a pit, he called on the name of Melissa, and burnt the whole heap. This done, he sent a second time to the oracle. And Melissa's ghost told him where he would find the stranger's pledge."

Here I feel like joining my voice to that of the Spartans on one occasion, exclaiming with terror and disgust:

"Such, O Lacedaemonians, is tyranny, and such are the deeds that spring from it."

For, verily, verily, the spirits manifesting themselves through the oracles of spiritualist séances both in antiquity and in modern times, deserve one clear attribute. They are

tyrannical, more than anything else in this universe. And audaciously so. Just have a look at the aim they undeniably planned to reach with their cynical calculations. For what is it that happens right in the midst of their hypocritically ingratiating eagerness to get every point of the program "scientifically" verified? Simply this: To a genuinely truth-seeking observer they inevitably verify themselves as *tyrants of the most abominably cruel kind*. There is no other possibility in the long run. But my question here goes out in all seriousness to my fellowmen who accept that kind of cruel tyranny coming to them from devils and demons. How could some men step down to the abysmal level of submitting their lives to such a tyranny?

Or tell me, please: What do you think about the alleged "tokens of credibility" which an alleged "Melissa" produces in her first message in order to "prove her identity"? They are simply so indecent in their eventual details that they can hardly be rendered in a decent book. I can only leave it to the good judgment of normal readers to evaluate for themselves the degree of "dignity" that can be ascribed to this spectacle. I mean intellectually as well as morally speaking. Christian realism, you see, has to stress the intellectual side of the evaluating with particular intensity. For, please note down already, we have now seen a new day coming when the spirits have evidently found it imperative to demonstrate a moral level of the greatest beauty. I say beauty, for the aesthetic side of the matter is catered to with equal perfection.

Part II

Chapter 15 Psychic Research in Ultramodern Times

We Are Obligated To Adopt A Clear Attitude Toward Parapsychology--A Sensationally New Phase Of The History Of Our Ultra-Western World

In this second part of my work I shall make a somewhat unique effort. It is something I have missed painfully among Christian writers up to the present day. At least to my knowledge, no open push in favor of holistic realism seems to have been made in order to defend Biblical philosophy in a systematic way, as regards the attack made against it on the part of ultra-modern ESP research. For it is virtually a formidable assault against precisely the Bible's views about men and demons that is here undertaken by an impressive phalanx of secular humanists. What is it that they present as a scientifically validated fact--a validation of axiomatic trustworthiness? How can we accept its spuriousness without even trying to defend ourselves?

Are we so late in our reactions against this most shrewd challenge defying the rock-bottom realism of our faith for one regrettable reason? Perhaps we just have not really dared, so far, to face unflinchingly certain facts we cannot take. Would not that indicate that we are on the brink of losing faith in our own cause?

Let us rather decide to be open-minded and implicitly sincere. Let us admit what has to be admitted. We are confronted with some particularly troublesome facts, set forth by a worldwide network of well-established university laboratories, in the course of recent decades. The topic around which they concentrate their research is

fascinating enough. It is called ESP, that is, Extra Sensory Perception. So nothing less than a human mode of perception simply happening without the help of the human senses at all.

In my opinion the laboratory findings in this field are something we must look at very carefully and without any disturbing prejudice. We Christians must meet reality with an open mind and with the greatest seriousness. This is what I say to myself. I say it to our scientists of the old guard. I say it to the new parapsychological research teams, maybe more than to anybody else. I say it to all people in this furiously revolutionizing time. We must all wake up and look at the overwhelming facts in an unbiased and matter-of-fact way.

What right do I have to present the new parapsychological research as a turning point of the most sensational in the history of modern science?

First of all, I have to point out what this psychic research actually deals with, and how infinitely far its ambitions go. It claims to deal essentially with one thing: ***non-physical personal agency***; that is, a personal activity in man that is *non-bodily*. Allegedly, it does not need to base itself on any material substances whatsoever. Such hidden forces in human beings are just what one has decided to investigate with the old established methods of modern science; that is, under rigid control for the purpose of screening out all possible reality-disrupting factors. Maybe the most unexpected point of the research program they have placed on their agenda is this: They do not even shrink away from applying the same research methods of time-honored Western natural science in order to settle the old question.

Does there exist in man any demonstrable component that survives visible death and decomposition?

For a long, long time our scientists in the Western world did not seem too eager to take part in the age-old disputes that have been going on in this field. On the contrary, they seemed to consider such matters as belonging exclusively to a world of metaphysical and theological speculation. But just here, then, a striking change is seen to take place in our environment today. Scientists--including a remarkable number ranking among the most outstanding of this last century--have seen it as their proper task to tackle the question about man's condition after death. So it would appear as if there was room for a science sufficiently many-sided even to take religion quite seriously. And then, why not also the religion of Jesus Christ?

*Something This New Science Should Not Be Mixed Up
With: The Religious Philosophy of a Modern Church
Called "Christian Science"*

In order to avoid such unfortunate confusion and misunderstanding, I should inform those of my readers that do not know *who* "Christian Scientists" are. Names may be terribly disconcerting sometimes. For what characterizes these people is that they are neither *Christians* in the realistic sense of that term, nor *scientists* in the normal sense of that term. I do not want to discredit the honorable intentions of modern ESP scientists. I sincerely believe that many of them are deeply concerned both about true religion and true science. But now, first of all, what about "Christian Scientists"? I do not want to be unfair to them either, or the importance of the philosophy they stand for. The movement

of that religious denomination is a definitely important one. And there is no reason why its importance in modern religious history should be neglected. On the contrary, it would be most improper to regard as negligible a movement which, to that extent, has managed to remain in the tradition of time-honored philosophical speculation and pure metaphysics, even in the ultra-modern era of our Western world. I would rather point out the amazing fact that Plato, the great father of Western spiritualism, has nowhere had more radical followers than the "Christian Scientists" of today.

I could hardly think of anything more attention stirring in the history of Occidental spiritualism than this religious philosophy--or philosophical religion--founded by that remarkable woman, Mary Baker Eddy. So, just as I pay due respect to Plato in a number of works, I could not fail to pay a similar respect to Mary Baker Eddy in my treatment of a subject I must regard as central in my present study. To demonstrate the truth of what I am stating about "Christian Science," it will suffice to quote an official profession of faith made by George Channing, leading representative of the denomination, First Reader of the Mother Church, Boston, and trustee of the Christian Science Publishing Society. In fact, his remarkable words may furnish an excellent background to a study to which we shall soon have to give our closest attention afterwards--a science in the more proper sense of the term, a science launching right into the field of precisely some most problematic spiritualist phenomena:

"What is the basic premise of Christian Science? That God is *divine Mind*, the conceiver of man and the universe,

and *Mind is all that exists*. Mind expresses itself, and its expression is *man*. Spirit is eternal and real; *matter is an unreal illusion*, subject to decay and dissolution. *Evil has to do with matter--therefore evil is unreal, an illusion. Spirit and its expression, man, are indestructible. Death is an illusion of moral sense*, which may continue to appear until destroyed by spiritual sense, either on this or on the other side of the grave. The individual continues to live even though unseen by persons on our plane of existence.... *Man, the idea and image of God, is immortal, perfect, wholly good, untouched and untainted by evil because man expresses God.*" (George Channing, in a symposium: *The Religions of America*, edited by Leo Rosten, 1955, p. 22. Emphasis mine.)

Of course, the author's statements here are nothing but a faithful reflection of the teachings of Mary Baker Eddy, founder of that movement. In her book, *Science and Health*, read like a Bible by ever increasing multitudes all over the earth, she states boldly, "*Man is deathless, spiritual.... He coexists with God and the universe*" (p. 266; emphasis mine).

In all this there is not only a trend of pure humanism, making man into a demi-god, or into God, short and sweet, but there is a clear trend of downright *pantheism*. Man is described as having a central and dominating position in the divine evolution toward perfection and toward a realization of the absolutely immaculate. Pagan humanism has hardly ever asserted itself in a more proud and impertinent way: Man is the glorious revelation of what is bound to come about, automatically and irrepressibly, wherever spirit is eternally existent.

Where, exactly, do you find that practical tendency coming out in Mary Baker Eddy's statement?

Of course, unmistakably in that very sign of identity she places between *God*, *man*, and the *world*, man is described as being just as much from everlasting as God is. And the same applies to the "*universe*." The material world "co-exists" with God, just as man does. So *its* existence, too, is from eternity, from everlasting to everlasting. What could be more notoriously pantheistic than that? Matter is not the result of a divine act of creation in time and space, as the Bible claims. But notice, please: That idea of pure automatism and an absolute *non*-beginning of original matter seems to be exactly the same in the thinking of many natural scientists in the field of evolutionist research. Isn't this remarkable: Pure spiritualists and some natural scientists arrive at one and the same conclusion--virtual pantheism; matter is self-existent, and accordingly divine.

Now, as far as the philosophy of some speculative theologians is concerned, I am not at all surprised to find that pantheist element. I have for a long time known that the almost inevitable destiny of extreme spiritualism sooner or later is bound to end in pantheism, the most impersonal and dehumanized of all religions. Even their legitimate father, Plato, ended up in that burlesque mixture of extreme spiritualism on the one hand, and extreme materialism on the other hand. I have been amazed to see how historically inevitable it is that the bastard phenomenon of just *pantheism* must be expected to turn up its ugly head wherever religious thought-forms of the spiritualistic kind develop naturally. In my book, *Man the Indivisible* (Oslo University Press, 1971), I have (in the chapter, "The Genius

of Platonism," pp. 128 ff.) shown how helplessly even the super-idealist Plato himself finishes by succumbing to the temptation of choosing pantheism as his desperate solution. This happened in his old age, at the time when he wrote one of his most fantastic dialogues: *Timaios*. Imagine that the man, whom philosophers in the West through all ages have praised boundlessly for his impeccably anti-matter and anti-body thought pattern, by and by abandons miserably everything he has cherished in his previous pretty consistent spiritualism in favor of something as hopelessly inconsistent as sheer pantheism. And then the world's greatest masters of the history of philosophy do not have one word to say about this amazing event in Plato's life! Are they blind or do they hate to tell the truth?

We should know what pantheism is. It is the human thinker's surrender to the ultimate absurdity. It is the bastard below all bastards, the absolutely monstrous one, conceived in utter shamelessness. I am speaking about the totally meaningless concubinage between pure spiritualism and pure materialism. I give additional details about this in my book, *The Mystic Omega of Endtime Crisis* (The Untold Story Publishers, 1981).

It is the tragedy of tragedies that this pantheism is bound to be the ultimate end phase of all spiritualism. There is then no possibility any longer of distinguishing between the Creator and the created things, between the holy and the profane (the non-holy). God is everything and everything is God. To "coexist (coincide) with God and the universe," as this great speculative philosopher and founder of "Christian Science" states about man, that is an eternal co-existence (coincidence). It is bound to mean a divine super-star type

of man. Now, of course, that has always been the great message of spiritualism. The additional message of pantheism is that dumbfounding. It says: Not only the deathless soul of *man* has, quite automatically, that super-spirit aristocracy of being equal to God, but the same glorious divinity even applies to *any piece of dead matter*. The universe (nature, the world) is God, and God is the universe (nature, the world)... It is all eternal and divine. This then is pantheism's message about God, man and matter. What a barren and meaningless message!

Why do I use epithets such as "barren" and "meaningless" right in the midst of all this humanistic excellency? For one evident reason: As a man myself, I have the sacred duty to mobilize some minimum of realistic thought. So I must discern one catastrophic consequence of this burlesque mixture of creaturely baseness and divine glory. For the result of the mixture must obviously be this: Not only have you and I been reduced to the character of impersonal automatons, but God Himself has turned into the enormous Super-Automaton.

Now my next pertinent question will be this: Is that same nirvana automatism a principle guiding the philosophy of ESP research of our present day? If quite a different respect for stern quantitative research should, after all, be a predominant factor in that research, then it certainly would be terribly unfair to lump it together with the metaphysical eccentricities of "Christian Science." It would also be a terrible unfairness against Christianity proper to have it lumped together with the total lack of realism characterizing that denomination bearing such a high-sounding Christian name. That is why I have pointed

out: Two characteristics decide the real nature of the "Christian Science" movement:

- (1) It has nothing to do with Christianity proper.
- (2) It has nothing to do with science proper.

Let us here then, so far, keep to an apparently well-established fact. No matter what religious or philosophical ideas that new laboratory activity of the ESP teams may have arrived at in the last analysis, they must be said, after all, in their point of departure, as well as in the ideal level of their aspirations, to be scientists in quite a different sense of the term than that of "Christian Science." In fact, the methods the modern parapsychologist advocates for his investigations are those of traditional empirical science. What could be wrong about the firm intention of finding out whether there is a verifiable validity on which man's faith in a higher world, beyond this immediate one we all know, can be safely based? It should not be contrary to either true religion or true science, should it, to investigate the factual reliability of our dearest religious aspirations? Frankly, we must fully agree that modern ESP research is perfectly right when it cries out to an entire world, listening in tense anticipation:

"There is one fundamental question that must be asked of all religions. Is there a valid basis for spiritual reality?"

Chapter 16 A Resounding Call for Open-Mindedness Coupled with Reasonable Caution

We should not meet with immediate suspicion and denouncement that enthusiasm and obvious sincerity of this sensationally new type of scientist. We should, on the contrary, hope that something better is in the offing. For let it be said with serious regret: Our typical men of science, so far, down through the centuries have hardly ever been famous for paying too much attention to the "spiritual aspects" of human nature and human destiny. This might be the main reason why most of us now react with open-mouthed astonishment. But, sincerely speaking, why should not scientists have the same rights and the same reasons as other people to be heartily concerned about the spiritual reality and the valid basis one may find for such things to exist? In fact, I like to believe that these pioneers of a new science are idealists in the best practical sense of the term. I also think they have considerable reason to stress one thing: In this modern empirical era, no theological or philosophical argument will be taken seriously without some kind of empirical evidence. So, true spirituality and true science ought to go harmoniously together. Why not? What could be more meaningful than that? What could be meaningful at all *without* that? A living experience right in the everyday life of reasonable creatures--that is what we all claim as an inalienable right, isn't it?

And then, admittedly, right in this epoch of unexpected things, something extremely unexpected has happened. Prominent scholars from the finest and most well-equipped

laboratories claim to have established something arousing the greatest attention. By means of quite scholarly methods, thoroughly proven by contemporary science as a whole, they have established nothing less than the presence, as they unanimously claim, of an "extra-physical" capacity in man which they have agreed to call **PSI** ("Symbol" Y, the first letter of the Greek word psyche, soul).

In a highly mechanistic and materialistic society, like that of our modern Western world, it must be recognized as something sensational indeed that such zealous efforts are being made at all to demonstrate the presence of an absolutely spiritual element in human life.

But please notice. Just here something appears which ought to warn us that we should be extremely careful about the way we evaluate the new phenomena. I am thinking of a tendency prevailing in the great multitude of people, as our culture knows them today. They tend to rejoice at sides of a matter that are the least joyful of all. I tremble in front of the consequences of one fateful prejudice the great majority in our culture have fallen a victim to. And our honest parapsychologists share it entirely with them. Worst of all, that preconceived opinion of the crowd claims to have its origin in very Christianity. And our culture does, of course, consider itself to be a "Christian" culture, which is not generally true at all. The prevailing prejudice I am going to put down in capital letters will be the best proof one could ever have that it has nothing to do with Christianity.

*The More Extremely Non-Material and Non-Bodily a
Given Phenomenon Is, the More Genuinely Religious it is*

Supposed to Be

Now, don't forget, please, what those new teams in science were most eager to find. They were looking for precisely convincing signs of a clearly *non-physical* element in man! That is, something completely detached from the notoriously corporeal. Do you notice how jarringly loud the old dualist axiom about the totally "discarnated" human soul keeps buzzing in the air? "*Discarnation*," you should remember, is just the opposite of *incarnation*. I would be surprised, however, if you have not noticed, a long time ago already, how "obstinately" Christianity sticks to a concept it calls the "incarnation." What is it, by the way, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ stigmatizes as the great anti-Christian infiltration par excellence, coming about as a result of pagan philosophy? It is just the obstinacy, on man's part, of not accepting that fundamental fact of this humble concept the Bible glories in, namely *divine incarnation*, God's historical reality of *becoming flesh*. (See 1 John 2:18,22 and 2 John 7.)

So what does the Gospel of Jesus Christ emphatically declare to be the sign par excellence of the *antichrists* announced as suddenly one day coming upon the scene (notice the plural of that abomination)? They have the audacity to say that Christ Jesus "has *not* come in the flesh."

We should be aware of something absolutely noteworthy. You and I are members of a culture that certainly still does call itself Christian. Nevertheless, it practically does not have the remotest notion of elementary Christianity. The Bible and its philosophy of Rock-Bottom Realism are unknown even to many nominal Christians.

That book evidently never managed to assert itself in our culture as the documentary foundation of all Christian faith. So then, what is our cultural heritage at the present moment? It is, in all essentials, a Hellenist, pagan-platonic pattern of thought and belief.

And what has been from the outset the most anti-Christian trend of that basically Hellenistic pattern of our paganism? It was a consistent down-rating of the lowly things. What it is furiously infatuated about is the excellence of the *purely mental*. In other words, as true heirs of Plato, rather than of Jesus Christ, we are predisposed to a "pure spirit-ism" that would do great honor to any spirit medium. Definite priority is given to the discursive intellect favoring radical abstractions. The "purely spiritual" is looked upon as the "only good." As an obvious contrast to this, our pagan Western minds look down with definite misgiving, even downright contempt, upon anything more or less "bodily." Our depreciation of the "physical" is just as great as our appreciation of the "metaphysical."

We do not seem to have any serious doubts about our spiritual life depending on that one-sided favoring of anything that distinguishes itself as non-bodily. Not that we are necessarily so furiously bent on being *spiritual*. Our classical shying away from bodily things is more a sort of holiday garb we put on, instinctively, on more sanctimonious occasions, whenever we feel the time has come to honor, at least outwardly, the faith of our forefathers, namely a religion we imagine to be genuine Christianity.

It goes without saying that there must be a serious

danger connected with such a spiritualistically biased conception of the "spiritual." The road is paved in advance for the fatally disruptive view of life, to which I have given the main term of dualism. How could a life philosophy as internally lacerating as that fail to produce in the depths of our hearts--a priori, as it were--an indestructible bias against anything that is humbly corporeal? In an environment as infatuously spiritualistic as that, you see, there will immediately be a condemnation--without lawful trial--of everything having the bad luck of being intimately connected with simple matter. Such things will inevitably be rejected as unworthy of the "spiritual life" on the highest level.

After this you may more easily understand the enthusiasm--and sometimes genuine thankfulness--gripping the hearts of some people, many of them truly religious souls, at the moment when they have their unexpected encounter with a body of scientists suffering from the same ignorance about what Christian spirituality is really like, and therefore impressing them as "wonderfully Christian."

We do understand the scientists, also, when they immediately *expect* to be welcomed in this enthusiastic way. Such prominent leaders of psychical research laboratories in American universities as J. B. Rhine and J. G. Pratt, in their work *Parapsychology, Frontier Science of the Mind* (1957), make no secret at all of their own high evaluation of the many blessings now finally bestowed upon religion, thanks to the epoch-making appearance upon the scene of psychical research. Religion, they think, must deem itself fortunate in having eventually had an encounter with objective science under so favorable circumstances:

"In its confirmation of the presence of a non-physical and spiritual element, it would seem that science has, for the first time, made a positive contribution to the ground held by religion in refuting the counter-claim of the mechanistic theory of man. The result even of psi investigations already made have undermined religion's most menacing opposition." (p. 119.)

Those are proud words, aren't they? They are words that seem to command authority. There appears to be a self-assurance in them apt to convince a new public standing face to face with a new science. Who, then, among religious men would be so odd that he refused to clasp this generously outstretched hand on the part of a status-possessing ally? For who is, in fact, that formidable new companion here wooing for the religionist's favor? He is a respectable scientist! He is even a most idealistic-minded scientist. What a comrade to get allied to at a time of life-and-death struggle for the survival of religious ideals! I imagine a whole team of learned researchers offering to give Christianity a new varnish of scientific respectability.

And who is that "*most menacing opponent* of all religion" they promise to "undermine" for the purpose of finally procuring for genuine religion a victory it has never previously known in the academic world? We shall soon see who that great bugbear is. It is a movement whose equally impressive battery of wily arguments has now for a long time threatened to get its stranglehold around the thin neck of all spirit in our world today.

This is approximately how I visualize the enthusiasm naturally taking place in the camp of contemporary Christendom. And the rejoicings seem to have every chance

of becoming reciprocal--just that reciprocity that promises harmony and intimate cooperation.

And, nevertheless, a pessimistic voice seems bound to "sneak in" here, changing the original mood into disharmony and distrust. It is the positive type of distrust I call Christian realism. Is this a brutal intervention that must be characterized as unfair and even criminal? No, no. Nothing could be more fair or merciful indeed than the activity of shattering the sham fortifications of wishful thinking among otherwise normal and intelligent men. Our new scientists should know that there still happens to be among Christian thinkers a little nucleus of men who have preserved a conception of spirituality entirely different from that. And so they are duty-bound to say, "We cannot offhand accept your arguments. It would be rashness--and probably high treason--on our part to grasp your outstretched hand."

On the other hand, let it also be admitted squarely and frankly: The intellectual honesty and hearty zeal with which eminent researchers today dive down into the dark recesses in search of truth, do impress me a good deal. What many of them are looking for wholeheartedly, you see, is *the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth*. And still there is something these honest and absolutely well-intentioned researchers have not taken into account. The reason for that is simple, dishearteningly simple. They just have not come across any Christian yet who could help them get out of their ignorance about original Christian anthropo-logy and theo-logy. So they were left at the mercy of their own preconceived ideas about Biblical spirituality. They evidently thought platonic philosophy and Biblical

religion was very much the same thing, as far as the views about man and God are concerned.

Notice then, I do not blame them for that bias. Who is to blame? It must be we, so-called Christians, first and foremost. It is we who must take the blame for those parapsychologists obtaining a thoroughly falsified conception of religion in our sphere.

Here some stern critic may still have some degree of accusation against the parapsychologists as well. Why did they go by popular opinion exclusively? Would it not be more in harmony with the intellectual ethics of their own group to *dig* a little, and find out what scholars specializing in the history of Christian anthropology have arrived at almost unanimously after almost a century of intensified investigations? Experts in this field, both Catholic and Protestant, have brought out the amazing fact that New Testament Christianity agrees quite perfectly with Old Testament traditions in this important respect. And what else could anyone expect? The writers of the New Testament, giving literary expression to the fundamental philosophy of Christianity, happened to be *genuine Jews*, every one of them. You can't change the basic philosophical realism of a person's thinking into "irrealism" overnight. The conception of man as an inseparable soul-body totality is inalienable. It is the pagan-Greek view of body-soul disruption that constitutes the great anomaly. It was philosophizing theologians of a later date who infiltrated the general (Catholic) church with the spiritualistic platonic ideas that have prevailed. And that part of a falsification of the original thought-forms in Christianity was perpetuated quite efficiently in the subsequent Protestant churches.

Hence the general unfortunate controversy--or I should rather say inconsistency and absolute meaninglessness--of a mortal human body on the one hand and an immortal human soul on the other hand, is a sad reality.

Well, since you and I, proud representatives of the Christian ideas about man today, have not managed to keep ourselves uncontaminated by that classical-Greek dualism, what can we expect of modern non-Christian ESP researchers? Of course, they ought to have some legitimate right to assume that ideas prevailing in that large body called Christendom are somewhat characteristic of Christianity. This should be understandable, but unfortunately it is a most regrettable misunderstanding.

We must then also understand a further regrettable *faulty conclusion* made by the ESP teams (and only one thing would put this matter straight again). If they are to be of any help to the Christian Western world (whom it is their generous plan to help efficiently), then they have just one thing to do. They must test the validity of a dualist conception of man, period!

How could the present outcome of scientists' pathetic reasoning be anything but a bitter disappointment in the last analysis? True enough, so far they may rejoice at being applauded by many Christians, but certainly *not all* Christians. They should face that fact, the sooner the better. For, after all, there still happens to be one group, however inconspicuous, of good Christians who hold fast, imperturbably, the monistic ideas of original Christianity. How could it be of any substantial help for any person to be "liberated" from that radical realism of body-soul totality?

Of course, it must be recognized as something essential

for an intelligent being to be spiritual. But if the idea of an absolutely bodiless survival is regarded as an integrating part of this spirituality, then a sign of inequality is set between Christianity and realism.

Chapter 17 The Problems Keep Mushrooming All the Time

We Christians have certainly done those modern researchers a disservice of fatal consequences, to them and to us. We have encouraged them to seek labyrinths for their thoughts, confusing mazes crowded with bars and pseudo-problems of all kinds. How fortunate they would have been if only they had kept to the simple rules of their original realism in thought and action. This I shall demonstrate with relevant examples pretty soon. But for now we must focus our attention on some serious problems you and I have to face unflinchingly. For today we, too, have been entangled, as it were, in a cobweb of thought problems that have to be settled in a conscientious way. Frankly speaking, you see, we find ourselves in the midst of what could appear as a downright dilemma. Our worst foe at the moment is not the flight from reality, a flight bequeathed to us by classical dualism and its dangerously modernized spiritualistic trend. There is something far more dangerous than that.

Some Will Wave Spiritualism Off as Sheer Humbug.

This is an equally unrealistic way out, and even more dangerous. But believe me, spiritualism too has arguments at its disposal that we cannot push under the rug in that irresponsible manner. Giving the "cold shoulder" to some "hot realities" is not realism. The true realist is not the one who goes around with a pious daydream that the problems will gradually dissolve all by themselves and vanish into thin air, if time enough is given for such automatic dissolution. No-no. The research findings from an entire

world of university laboratories are not to be trifled with in that light-minded manner.

On the contrary, the realist--also the Christian realist--is one who patiently and conscientiously examines the matter and does not give in before a satisfactory solution has been found. Closing one's eyes to problems here and now that you are bound to meet again, only bigger and uglier a little bit farther down the road of your life, is a philosophy I have called an *ostrich* philosophy. Just boring your head into the sand in order to avoid seeing the problematic--such an attitude certainly could not deserve the name of realism. No, not in any field of truth seeking, be it spiritual or material.

What we cannot just run away from is a serious contention on the part of serious researchers. They claim to have proved conclusively the existence of powers in man, totally detached from every material substance, in the form of something non-bodily, non-physical.

So what is it that has really happened in these dignified laboratories for sober, quantitative psychic investigation? Is it of such a nature that the monist is bound to surrender unconditionally? What about the former realist principle of centuries of scientific research maintaining that man is a psychosomatic unity (body-soul oneness)? Has it gone bankrupt completely? That is approximately what some men in the team actually say. They openly claim that the old view has been shaken in its very foundations.

The Alleged Total Failure of Scientific Monism

Some skeptics among my readers may ask incredulously: "That bold new conclusion cannot be clear-

cut or universal in psychical research, can it?" Well, it has been gaining ground so rapidly and so thoroughly that you may safely characterize it as clear-cut and universal in representative circles. So let us just as well face the issue frankly and openly.

In that respect I should quote one characteristic statement made by W. H. Gillespie of Maudsley Hospital in London several decades ago. It certainly is not with any romantic nostalgia that man goes back in his memories to the "naive" old days when psychiatrists still "absorbed the doctrine of psychosomatic unity." That was, as he expresses it, before "the majestic fact of parapsychology" had really yet begun to "impinge upon them." Obviously in those "childhood days" of science, Gillespie thinks, learned men were still feeling quite happy in their candid conviction that body and mind were entities only artificially and figuratively separated. Now our increased knowledge is, allegedly, too great for such naiveté.

"That orthodox psychiatric position has been shaken by the findings of parapsychology. If these facts of parapsychology are indeed facts, and particularly if precognition is a fact, this monistic point of view is shaken in its foundations.... This seems to me to be the most shattering impact of parapsychology on science, and yet, at the same time, the most stimulating one." (Part of a symposium published after the great parapsychological convention of 1946, CIBA Foundation of ESP, p. 200.)

What is there, even today, in the serious compilations of ESP exploits during four more decades to justify conclusions as far-reaching as that? Is this the time when intelligent and well-informed men have no choice any

longer but to plunge headlong into the deep, dark ocean of radical dualism? Is Mr. Gillispie's "most stimulating" outlook something logically and inevitably devolving from present scientific data? Do the recent precognition research data, and the most recent spirit medium séance research data, imply nothing less than this? Whether they do or not, one thing seems absolutely safe to admit. Never before did contemporary science, including also the science of historical anthropology, have to face a more revolutionary concept. And let me add: Never did Christianity have to face a more searching inquiry. *To be or not to be*, that is again the question.

My accusations so far have mainly been directed against myself and the entire group I call faithless Christians. The best I can say about us is that we are a bunch of paganized Christians--which is, of course, a contradiction in terms. As such we have fooled even stern scientists--the last would-be realists of our culture--into adopting that weird disruption as their ideal of "perfect spirituality," a sort of indefeasible interiority in man which is visualized as going on living and functioning impeccably even after every cell of the human body has been totally broken down; that is, a neo-platonic vision of minds *independent* of bodies--"pure minds," perfectly *self-sufficient* from eternity to eternity.

Chapter 18 A Dramatic Encounter: *ESP* Researchers, Face to Face with the Multifarious Troop Called Spirit Mediums

The serious scientists who founded the American Society of Psychic Research, undoubtedly had a most sincere intention of giving due trial to the claims of all parties concerned. Mediums themselves had never failed to ventilate their personal convictions about what was here taking place. They were modest enough to regard themselves as mere instruments through whom *the dead managed to communicate with the living*. If now, in an age of experimental science, this could be proved to constitute the reliable truth about spiritism, that would of course be no negligible matter at all. For nothing could be more catastrophic, in fact annihilating, to the old realistic viewpoint of psychosomatic oneness than that piece of proof. Contemporary science would then definitely be obliged to revise basically its traditional holistic views on the mind-matter relationship. So it is a captivating epoch that is being introduced, believe me!

On the other hand, justice had to be done also to those observers who claimed that simple *human fraud* was at the root of the whole series of spiritistic phenomena. In fact, you have here the two mutually exclusive interpretations that have fought a never-ending battle among scientists by and large.

Hardly any mention, however, has been made in those circles of a third group, fully entitled, I should think, to having an opinion of their own. They happen to be neither spiritualists nor materialists. Is that a sufficient reason for

bypassing them in total silence? Well, in a book about "middle-of-the-road" realism, you should not expect me to pass them by in a similar mood of haughty non-concern. What I happen to call that inconspicuous little group is:

The Men of the Third Alternative

These men are definitely anti-spiritualistic just like those heavy doubters among classical natural scientists. So they go straight against the interpretation, so boldly heralded by modern spiritism, about "deceased human souls seeking contact with those still living." On the contrary, the men of the third alternative take very realistically the plain teaching of the Bible, expressing itself without one bit of ambiguity or sentimentality:

"The living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing." Ecclesiastes 9:5.

How could it be expressed more plainly?

"Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with all your might, for in the grave where you are going, there is neither working nor planning nor knowledge nor wisdom." (Verse 10.)

Well, even plain medical science has known this for centuries and millennia. Its realism could not swerve one inch from this obvious monism: As soon as the living human organism with its living cells, its admirably constructed nerve channels, have been disintegrated by death, there can be no question of any mental activity any longer.

And notice, this body-soul realism is not necessarily at the same time a virtual materialism. By no means. It does not claim that the individual human being's *identity* has

been blotted out, or sunk into utter oblivion. Far from it. The Bible is teeming with statements testifying that God has all things meticulously registered. Therefore, even during that interim period of total death, we do still live--*for Him*, as the Scriptures express it, that is, in His thought. And be sure, that is a thought knowing no forgetfulness whatsoever. We are in His "book of remembrance." We have a safe harbor in His solicitous counsel, in His definite will, His plan for our future.

True, even right in the midst of the clever theologians listening attentively to Jesus' preaching in Israel, more for the purpose of catching Him in His words than with the intention of learning from Him, there was a notorious group who just did not believe in a resurrection. In fact, the Sadducees had circulated a dogma teaching the meaninglessness that God did not have any plans of waking man up from his sleep of unconsciousness in the grave. In front of those more or less materialistic philosophers, the Lord maintains with firmness that God's solicitude is an indisputable fact. There is in His mind an absolutely meaningful plan of waking man up from his slumber one day. In order to demonstrate the logicalness of this contention, He calls the attention of His audience to a well-known fact. God does describe Himself as the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." But is it not also a fact that Abraham is dead today? He is stock-stone dead. The grave in which he was buried could be seen at any time. Here Jesus' argument comes very close to that of Peter at a later date. In his great Pentecost speech to Jews gathered from the entire world in Jerusalem, he tells something of a drastically factual nature about King David of old:

"Brothers, I can tell you confidently that the patriarch David died and was buried. And his tomb is here in this day." Acts 2:29.

But if this literal death is what has happened to both David and Abraham, then what honor can God find in describing Himself as the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob"? Is there so much to boast of in being the God of dead men? Even a "live dog," the most despicable roving creature of antiquity (Ecclesiastes 9:4), is of more worth than a dead creature. That would even apply to a dead king.

So what solution could there be to this apparently self-contradictory situation? Just one: By God those patriarchs are not looked upon as dead. They are all very much alive--"to Him." How is that possible? Simply by virtue of a future tremendous event--the **resurrection** (Luke 20:38). True, those ancient heroes of God do not seem to have much to brag of, where their skeletons are resting today. The existence they have is exclusively in God's counsel about their future, but that is indisputably a glorious thing. Hence the Bible's constant use of a perfectly understandable metaphor. Death is called a *sleep*. What is a sleep? Sleep means a temporary unconsciousness. But it definitely is an unconsciousness from which there is an awakening. Otherwise it would be absolutely nonsensical to use the word sleep for what is here taking place.

What could be more revealing than that simile? The great thing, according to the Biblical pattern of salvation, is the resurrection. It is **not** an automatic continuation of life. This latter concept of survival would, of course, make all talk about a resurrection a jumble of nonsense statements. The Bible does not excel in such logical absurdities.

In the later confessions of faith in the church the formulation was a somewhat astonishing one, particularly to the Gentiles who often had a platonic upbringing. "*Carnis* resurrection" (the "resurrection of the *flesh*") was the term consecrated by our theologians. It is not the Bible's term. The Bible is not that one-sided in any direction. The resurrection it speaks about is always the resurrection of *man*, that is, man in his totality with all the aspects a living man is bound to possess. One thing is sure: In Jesus' teaching about a "resurrection" there was no room for any dualism, either the spiritualistic or the materialistic variety. Luke concludes his story about the anti-resurrection querulousness of the Sadducees with these words: "Some of the teachers of the law responded: Well said, teacher! and no one dared to ask him any more question." (Verses 39 and 40.)

But your problem and mine is not at a definitive end with this. The next question is bound to present itself immediately: What can it be then that takes place in the dark chamber of necromancy all over the earth today? If we want to have the Bible's answer to that question as well, then we already have a definite indication in one fact. Necromancy was strictly forbidden under pain of death by the Yahweh of the Old Testament. And such communication with the spirits, presenting themselves as the "souls of the dead," is condemned with equal seriousness by the New Testament.

But notice here a very, very serious note:

*The Bible's Attitude to this Question of Spiritist Activity in the World is **Not** the Same as We Have Observed Among*

*So Many Doubting Thomases in the Circles of Modern
Natural Science*

For the latter assume that the force behind it is just simple **human fraud**. That is, fraud on the part of living men and women around us. I can understand perfectly then that the only attitude they still have toward that "unworthy kind of thing" is a shrug of the shoulder. Does Christianity have nothing but a contemptuous shrug of the shoulder in front of spiritism? Certainly not. This is a point of decisive importance. The Bible does not only have a clear-cut anthro-pology (doctrine of man). It also has a very clear-cut demono-logy (doctrine of demons). This is part and parcel of what I have called the "**third alternative**."

Now, since I demand that attention be given to my special solution to a riddle that has appeared indissoluble, it must be a duty incumbent upon me to pay full attention to any alternative solution presented by others. That would even include some speculative philosophical ones which may appear rather *boringly* theoretical to some readers.

There is a "sin of omission" of which I openly accuse modern ESP researchers. And it is one that no scientist worthy of the name should commit. It may turn out to be a fatal thing to bypass even one single alternative for the solution of a serious intellectual problem.

*Nirvana Philosophy's Speculative Solution Implying
Survival as a Collective Affair--Every Individual "Happily"
Swallowed Up by What the Philosopher Calls the "World
Soul"*

This is, of course, a form of "survival" more after the pattern of Plato's ideal of total "impersonalism." Now Jones

and Osty, two modern scholars, have resurrected the old theory, giving it a new form and a new terminology. According to this, the individual consciousness finds the untroubled kingdom of eternal peace in some sort of joint consciousness (common consciousness for all individuals). The term for it has often been *conscience universelle*. In reality, of course, this is neither more nor less than that joyless and painless nothingness which oriental religions have launched under the name of Nirvana. Within its roomy bosom, this weird type of a heavenly harbor is envisioned as providing "space" for the "life plans" of all humanity.

Dear folks, how could this desperately impersonal type of survival itself have any chance of surviving in the midst of a living multitude of human beings today? I mean among average unphilosophical men of flesh and blood and bones. What endless difficulties the "man in the street" must face here! How could he ever manage to be "existentially gripped" by a wave of enthusiasm over the prospects of having to abandon every bit of his dear little identity at the gate, just to "enjoy the bliss" of a *beyond* of that meager kind!

By the way, who would deny that even Plato of old must have been miserably mistaken if ever he imagined that he could gain popularity among tolerably intelligent and comparatively normal people with the type of spiritualism *he* originally suggested. For, in every average man there is, after all, a longing for a survival different from that "ideal" one. So it is even a historical fact that Plato's dry and bloodless type of speculative spiritualism just had to go through a radical revision before it could have the least chance of appealing to the dream that does keep glowing

deep down under the smoldering embers of every normal human heart. Nothing less than a radical process of *humanization* of the spiritualist ideology had to take place in order to become a popular success in modern times. This applies inexorably even in our own heartless and super-intellectualistic Western world of the 1980s. For that world is endlessly sentimental, right in the midst of its heartlessness and its intellectualism.

Chapter 19 The Balm of Nirvana

*Yet A Growing Multitude of Western Men, in Their
Desperately Increasing World-Tiredness, Grasp as an
Ultimate Balm the Rare Sedative of an On-Marching Army
of Eastern Nirvana Religions*

I note that Hans Driesch, a profoundly intellectual German scholar, compares Osty's "Weltbewusstsein" ("World Consciousness") to the theological doctrine claiming that human beings, with their various destinies, are "God's Thoughts." But probably this is far better compared to the "Akash Chronicle" of the Hindus. For it is generally imagined as a sort of "Super-Personal" consciousness. Anything ever happening to human beings on our plane of existence is "engraved," as it were, in this universal super-consciousness. Still it would hardly seem quite adequate to describe it as a "universal memory." For not only the *past* of all living persons is here supposed to have been "faithfully registered," but even every little detail destined to happen to them at any time in the *future*.

You notice the inevitable element in it of the absolutely *automatic*, don't you? In this I can only see something reminding me frightfully of the theory of "transmissive function" suggested by William James in his famous Ingersoll Lecture on Human Immortality (discussed in my work *MAN the Indivisible--Totality versus Disruption in the Thought of the Western World*, p. 72, ff., Oslo University Press, 1971). Did you know that it is this new receptivity of ours in the West for the Nirvana religions in the East that has caused Eastern philosophies and religions to have a

veritable renaissance in their own original countries today? To me it has been a particularly bad omen that such phenomena as Yoga meditation and Zen Buddhism are becoming a regular prairie fire sweeping across Western lands. Are we really all that eager to let our consciousness (including, of course, personal guilt and personal responsibility) sink definitely down into the painless ocean of "impersonalism"? It seems so sad to believe that we all, as a population group of the most significant ones in history, should be on our way toward the realization of a conscious dream of downright *self-deletion*, some sort of *suicide en bloc*!

It feels almost like a relief to come back to our original topic:

"The Great Solution" of Modern Spiritism

This is, after all, a doctrine of man offering a far more thrilling dream about "survival." Therefore, it also has promises of something far more meaningful than the dream of Nirvana. But does spiritism have the necessary realism in it to fulfill its promises?

Let us start on a positive note. The above-mentioned eminent expert within European parapsychology, Hans Driesch, manifests something of the same idealism and energetic drive that characterized the first American pioneers of the ESP research movement around the turn of the century. Driesch has the same sense of urgency in front of what has not yet gotten an important scientific answer.

One of the American founders, Sidgwick, thought it was "nothing less than a scandal in this enlightened age" that so little serious scientific study had, as yet, been given "to the

serious reports of serious people." He was obviously referring to the reports coming from "laymen" about the spiritist séances.

Driesch now makes the same claim, and with the same tone of "righteous indignation": Present-day spiritism should be taken seriously. The peculiar theory it sets forth to account for the stirring phenomena taking place in the séance rooms should be given the most serious attention. Just pushing that theory aside with a smile is an attitude Driesch cannot accept on the part of modern scholars. He qualifies that as a sign of "*shyness*" in such who think they must pay due tribute to the "tough modern spirit." Openly stating one's frank belief in a "more spiritual world" is not deemed sufficiently fashionable nowadays, he complains. But a time must come, he thinks, when it will be regarded as perfectly compatible with the honor of even the most enlightened persons to profess their adherence implicitly to a "*more open-minded spirit*." For there is one thing we should all know by now. "To be really enlightened is to have a mind open to the facts of the world." ("Wahrhaft aufgeklärt sein, heisst offenen Geistes sein der Tatsächlichkeit der Welt gegenüber," Hans Driesch: *Parapsychologie, die Wissenschaft von den occulthen Erscheinungen*, pp. 111-112).

Now, how could any man of intellectual integrity, whether scientist or not, fail to agree with Driesch concerning that highly respectable and even perfectly scholarly rule of realistic thought?

And now then, where are you and I standing toward the end of the 20th century?

In our world, by and large, there does not at all seem to

be the same mood of "shyness" any longer. The spiritist phenomena *have* been studied, openly and with the thoroughness of sophisticated laboratory technique, exactly what Driesch dreamt of as his great ideal. What has happened to the spirit medium's well-known theory, hoary with age? Well, that theory of the absolutely "pure spirit" as an inherent endowment in man, the *undying one*, has now been accurately tested with the exquisite apparatus available to modern research. This is a fact of the past.

To this, however, another fact should also be added. At the same time our conventional sciences have been carrying on *their* programs of research as well. They have done so with greater intensity than ever before. *Their* aim, also, was to have a more precise idea about the true relationship between a human body and a human soul.

And then, what is the final outcome of all this learned research on the highest hyper-modern level?

You will forgive me if I go on having my gaze intensely directed toward an adequate answer to my old question: Is dualism or monism the truth about human nature and human destiny? This now has to be the inquiry above all inquiries. The "splitness" above all "splitnesses" in our Western world is here.

*Modern Man's Experience of an Abyss, Deep as Hell, is
Becoming Absolutely Unbearable*

I hope I have already managed one thing at least, to show that you just cannot with consistency be a realist and a spiritualist at the same time. Modern parapsychology is trying a self-contradictory funambulist walk of that kind. With what success? It seems to insist on reconciling the

two deadly antagonists, making them join together. How have they fared in their attempt to balance successfully at the brink of their precipice?

"That is no business of mine," may be your "modest" reply. I am afraid that you are terribly mistaken. It *is* your business. Just don't go on flattering yourself that you alone are above this dilemma. You are right *in* it. And you should know you are. Unless you are dead or fast asleep. How could you alone in this matchless generation be able to skip the problem, perhaps the most shaking one in a hundred years of intensive research? Its either-or is equally shaking, whether you take your stand for the sternest realism or for the most ingratiating spiritualism. The drama of the ages is certainly working its way toward a decision. And the crisis of that decision is bound to be yours and mine. The realist, as well as the spiritualist, is bound to spend moments of confusion, maybe despair, as these things are approaching a definitive climax. For every day that is passing now is adding its new bulk of overwhelming material to the already voluminous collection of documents, drawn from scientific laboratories, belonging to the two opposite camps. And the lines resulting on either side keep diverging, abysmally, from year to year, from day to day.

As gaping onlookers, you and I are left with one certainty only, namely that of an ever-widening gap between two opposite sets of outlook on the world, a bridgeless precipice. Let us now, with all the calm and presence of mind we can rally, make a scrutiny of each side, one at a time.

Chapter 20 I. Natural Scientists Shake Their Heads

Of course, it has never been--and will never be--easy for a natural scientist of the traditional sturdy and unbendingly realistic kind to accept any such thing as the radically spiritualistic interpretation of phenomena in the séance room, now examined and verified by laboratory methods of the utmost circumspection--that is, as far as it proves possible at all for human mortals to be "circumspect." For circumspection literally means "looking around"--360 degrees, if you please, and no one-sidedness of any kind.

We all know the spiritualist interpretation to the full by now. What is naively assumed to take place is nothing less than a real communication between living men and discarnate human souls. It would seem ridiculous indeed to suggest that a man of natural science should accept such a theory, namely, the bold assertion that the human soul outlives the human body.

Even several centuries ago, when psychophysicists had just begun to gather some sparse knowledge of the ways human brains function, the difficulties were certainly great enough. How could a sensible scientist, even then, figure that an individual's entire personality could be perfectly preserved after every cell had been decomposed in the black earth of the graveyard, or after the ashes of the crematorium had been spread far and wide? Absolutely impossible. For even in those days there was no room any longer for the farfetched fantasy that the human mind constituted just some "purely spiritual" entity, independent of the complex physiological system called a living

organism. Since that time, however, man's knowledge of anatomy, psychophysiology, biochemistry, and a whole series of other natural sciences has been much further increased. In fact, our realistic knowledge has passed from triumph to triumph. And, at an exactly corresponding rate of acceleration the certainty has developed, in the minds of our sensible scientists, that no such thing as memory and thinking could ever do without the physiological equipment we call a human brain. In point of fact, a practical belief in the sternest psychophysical unity of man has never been more coercive than just today. It is simply invincible. Laboratory experiences of a thousand different kinds have forced psychologists and neurologists alike to adopt this monism as their basic view of man.

So how would this be related to the fact of death, and everything that death psychosomatically stands for? Could death, that final event visibly happening to one man after the other, be assumed to constitute nothing but a myth, a total misunderstanding? Could man's mental functions be intelligently assumed to bypass that bodily breakdown, as if the mental faculties had never in the least had any need of a body in order to exist?

Well, let us now pass over to--

II. That Other Edge of the Bottomless Chasm

Let us stretch our ultra-Occidental imagination as far as it can possibly go. Let us try, for a moment, that dizzying jump right over to the other brink of the yawning precipice, that is, the equally impressive lab data, apparently in favor of something happening quite contrary to the stern

verifications of natural science. This "jump" is, in itself, an unheard-of drama. Such sudden somersaults, or veritable death leaps, from one viewpoint to the diametrically opposite have become rocket-like today. In fact, a more or less sickening, somnambulant jump between opposite brinks of an abysmal chasm seems to have become part of our daily lot in this disrupted generation.

It is with imperative reason I face this fantastic area of research. It is like rushing, at the speed of lightning, through the fabulous land of sputnik weightlessness, from one world to the other. You may find it too dizzying indeed to be "pleasant travel." I can understand you and sympathize with you. It reminds you about certain tightrope walks across the Niagara Falls, or something even more dangerous, since it has to do with man's eternal destiny. A daily gymnastic exercise of that kind would seem enough to explain why a rapidly increasing crowd of men in our environment fall victims to schizophrenic fits of interior "splitness". But my solemn duty in this work is to avoid being one-sided. There is enough of that in the world already. My engagement must not be blinded by preconceived ideas. To the spiritualistic interpretation of the occult phenomena I owe a treatment just as fair as to that of realistic sciences of nature research. We must grant all reasonable attention to the ESP researcher's spoken arguments. Above all we must grant all reasonable attention to certain indisputable *acts*. And the spiritualist's acts speak an impressive, breathtaking language. So what right should I have--morally or intellectually--to run a thick black line through the whole voluminous file of authentic spiritualist phenomena of the present day? How could I claim

contemptuously: It is delusive and utterly devoid of sound reality--every bit of it?

Certainly many a scholar would personally have preferred to be able to say exactly that. But something called intellectual honesty may forbid him to say it.

Of course, we do see a large number of these engaged observers valiantly fighting to escape as cheaply as ever possible with both their classical psychosomatic unity and their intellectual decency unmolested. The liberal psychologist will strive heroically to incorporate both ordinary telepathy and the rarest forms of clairvoyance into his established system of scientifically acceptable human realities. Sometimes he will even stretch these categories of physical phenomena to extreme and rather dubious lengths, hoping that this may suffice to account for an incredible lot of doubtful things, thus apparently saving him from the ultimate surrender, namely the frank admission that a beyond does exist, and that some category of intelligent minds might be sending their weird call out to the land of living men on this side of the border.

Various alternatives of a rather this-worldly and non-metaphysical explanation have been suggested as a reasonable, scientific way out. For example, there might be some fantastic capacity in the spirit medium to appropriate and utilize telepathic and clairvoyant information from living human beings.

Still, even the cleverest scholars are here facing endless problems in trying to fit essential things, inherent in the obvious phenomena, into any rational pattern, even when they have recourse to just telepathy and clairvoyance as scientifically accepted facts. It has been a dramatic

spectacle to me to observe psychologists and historians of ideas, writhing in anguish and woe, in order to pass through the needle's eye without disappearing totally themselves with their proper identity of ideals gathered together through a lifetime.

I could not help being particularly sorry for certain inveterate materialists among them. They were fighting a losing battle against that sneaking possibility that there could still exist some kind of "other world" behind the receding horizons of the ultimate "this world". Is that panic something rational or something fearfully irrational? Is it meaningful or meaningless?

I would readily concede that much in men's views of the beyond may appear pretty devoid of meaningfulness to human lives. A purely automatic continuation of a person's consciousness behind the tomb certainly would seem a possibility swelling up into an eventuality more monstrous than anything happening to men on "this side." For that automatism is identical with the idea about a catastrophically immortal soul, inherent in man as such. That is to say, a soul that simply *cannot die*. It is *bound* to go on living indefinitely, if not in a blessed heaven, so necessarily in an eternally burning hell.

True, you do not find any authority or title for any such abnormity in Holy Writ. Or did you ever find any scripture in the Bible teaching that creatures such as you and I, or even a Lucifer/Satan for that matter, possess immortality in himself as an inborn capacity? Nowhere. The Bible states, on the contrary, that God only has immortality (I Timothy 6:16). True enough, it has been in His eternal counsel to *give* immortality--once in the future--to a definite group of

human beings. But then that is the result of God's free act. There is no automatism whatsoever in it, such as doctrines of pagan religions imply.

Death as a realistic negative fact is never for a moment denied in the Christian doctrine of man. Therefore nothing less than a new divine event of creation is indispensable in order to bring about a true restoration of harmony and meaningfulness in human lives. That is the glorious historical event of the Resurrection. About this unique event, a text strangely ignored gives wonderful information right to the point. That is I Corinthians 15:51-55:

"Listen, I tell you a mystery. We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed--in a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed. For the perishable must clothe itself with the imperishable, and the mortal with immortality. When the perishable has been clothed with the imperishable, and the mortal with immortality, then the saying that is written will come true: 'Death has been swallowed up in victory.' Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting?"

Here nothing indicates that the hazards of an automatic destiny have their fatal sway over man's life. No-no. Here an initiative-taking almighty God is in perfect control all the time. The last chapters of the Revelation of Jesus Christ inform us about the "second death." That is, the real death from which there is no awaking at all. That applies to those who are described, in a parenthesis, as "the rest of the dead," those who "did not come to life until the thousand years were ended" (Rev. 20:5). They, too, are raised from the dead, but only at the "second resurrection," and only in

order to be publicly judged and sentenced to die a second and final time, "according to what they had done as recorded in the books" (verse 12). They have refused to accept life on the only terms that God can offer it. They would be eternally unhappy if they were then still forced to go on living. But they are graciously permitted to really die, and remain dead forever. Fortunately they were not made as immortal creatures. They *can* disappear, and *do* disappear forever. That is the eternal sleep of the second death.

So how does the Bible consistently speak about man's salvation through Jesus from death to life? It is never in terms of an inherent, automatically functioning immortality. On the contrary, what the Christian is repeatedly said to possess is *eternal life*. He does possess that, it is true, from the moment he has accepted the ransom plan (Christ dying in his place).

*Is It Just an Empty Game of Hairsplitting to Distinguish
Between "Immortality" and "Eternal Life"?*

This is but a mere playing with words, you say. Is not the concept of an "eternal life" exactly the same, logically speaking, as the concept of "immortality"? Are they not synonymous expressions for one and the same thing?

By no means. In the expression of "eternal life" there is no latent danger of a spiritualistic interpretation, a purely humanistic expression. For the honest Bible reader knows that it stands for a gracious gift, handed out at the perfect initiative of the Creator, and Recreator, Jesus Christ, a gift that can be annulled at any moment if the beneficiary does not comply with the demanded conditions. "Immortality," contrariwise, is commonly described as unconditional, a

natural and indestructible, automatically functioning endowment of man. It is taken to mean that he just cannot die. A concept of that kind makes you extremely vulnerable in front of the most dangerous lie of occultism confusing human minds today. People seem left defenseless in front of that danger every day. The Bible stresses, from its first chapters on, the important fact that sinful man's natural destiny is to die, fairly and squarely. But if you rather accept the statement of a pagan and truly satanic philosophy, alleging that "man cannot die," what protection do you then have from an evil spirit (a fallen angel) coming to you stating, "I am your brother who died yesterday. In order to prove my identity I can tell you things that no other human being except you and I happen to know about. And now I have this following counsel to you, my dear brother...."

Do you see what a decisive difference there happens to be between the Biblical expression "eternal life" and the spiritualistically pervertible expression of "immortality"? It was one of Norway's most outstanding historians of ideas who forced me to become fully aware of this difference in terms, as he accused me of "smuggling" into a dissertation of mine a distinction that "did not exist." Be assured, dear friends, it does exist.

Chapter 21 The Mystery the Most Sharp-Witted Skeptics Find No Way of Handling: the Cross Correspondences

Before spiritualism could manage to become that much respected among Catholic and Protestant church members, a thorough change had to take place in spiritualist circles as well. The unworthy poltergeist humdrum had to yield room to manifestations not only "more civilized," but more acceptable to decent scholars and decent churchmen.

Probably the most stirring occurrences in spiritualist circles in recent years--and, by far, the most intriguing documents in favor of the spiritist interpretation suddenly thrown upon the desk of the skeptical rationalist--are those of the "Cross Correspondences." Nothing has caused more headache to the extreme doubters who insisted that the spirit phenomena were just a jumble of humbug tricks played upon credulous people by other people all normally alive on earth today.

I think it is fair to admit that a serious change has really taken place in the history of modern spiritism. But exactly what then has happened, historically speaking?

You should know one thing: Even some of those who started the American research work for tackling the problems of a scientific evaluation of paranormal phenomena around the turn of the century could not help giving weighty human reasons for their inability to accept the interpretation given by the spirit mediums. In fact, the personal experience they had in their confrontation, on a scientific basis, with modern spiritism in practical unfolding provided some of those honest doubters with

fresh arguments. I am speaking about arguments quite apart from, and in addition to, the original one, the basic one, of general psychosomatic realism. Some of these researchers simply ended up declining categorically to accept that common interpretation of a human soul. They just could not believe all that easily in an "independent human soul" surviving the body. Why not? Well, you see, ever so often the "controls" from the beyond, presenting themselves as deceased men, happened to betray so many deficiencies and awkward contradictions, both in their knowledge and in their intimate characters, that it became difficult, not to say infeasible, for an unprejudiced investigator to have unreserved confidence in their bold assertions. See also more recent reports in the same direction, for instance, Soal's "Report on some communications," *Journal. S.P.R.* XXXV, 1926. It is on a case where the "spirit of a deceased man" was presented in a séance with all the elaborate display of modern spiritism, and then it turned out that the fellow had never died. Whether intentional or unintentional, such happenings do have, of course, a highly bewildering effect on the minds of serious observers, to express it mildly.

William James--let it be admitted--was not, generally speaking, an unsympathetic student of psychic phenomena. He was a member eager enough of the research group. Still he did state with an audible tone of bitter disappointment:

"The spirit hypothesis exhibits a vacancy and incoherence of mind painful to think of as the state of the departed."

It may have been that same unpleasant feeling of "vacancy" and "incoherence" that caused Thomas H.

Huxley to say that the only good he could see in a demonstration of the truth of spiritualism would be to furnish an additional argument against suicide. "Better live as a crossing-sweeper than to die and be made to talk twaddle by a medium hired at a guinea a séance."

And still the merely vacant, trivial and incoherent is hardly what has antagonized such distinguished critics most. Corliss Lamont found that many of the communications and psychical manifestations occurring at the séances were not only freakish, but downright *mischievous*. Concerning that "mischief" he has a highly significant remark:

"The hypothesis that *impish* and *non-human* demons are the cause, is not without merit." (*The Illusion of Immortality*, 1950, p.159.)

We shall have occasion to come back to that remark and its interesting significance.

*The Cross Correspondences and the Case of **Gardner
Murphy***

Learned doubters have only rarely gone to the extreme suggestion of Corliss Lamont, quoted above. For with this we are right in the midst of a rejection of the most serious *ethical* reasons. The very question of good and evil is up for debate.

And now, what do the capital issue of the Cross Correspondences and the accidental affair of Gardner Murphy have to do with this?

Well, in an important sense the time of the Cross Correspondences does seem to mean a certain remarkable turning point in the history of spiritualism, as trained

scholars have come to visualize it. A new era seems to have been inaugurated. Spiritism is in the process of shedding its old ugly skin. The offending impression of vacancy and triviality of spiritualist phenomena is being overcome. It is in order to illustrate this radical change that I feel like bringing in the fascinating case of Gardner Murphy. But first, now:

What Are the Cross Correspondences?

How could they manage to create a turning point in the history of intelligent men's attitudes toward spiritualism?

In order to illustrate that dramatic change, precisely Gardner Murphy's personal drama seems to me a striking one.

The nature of the Cross Correspondences of modern times appears to have precisely an overwhelmingly purposive vigor, an inner seriousness which seems to give the lie to the entire humdrum and poltergeist flippancy of traditional spiritism spook. On the contrary, it seems to opt for an entirely new way of seeking a worthy dialogue with intelligent men. What is this new approach of an unknown world seeking contact with the known one? Is it to put on the table the convincing proof par excellence, a proof apparently able to shake up, or "knock out" completely the last category of researchers who might still dare to maintain "stubbornly" that total death is the last thing happening to a human being? What the Cross Correspondences now evidently have proposed for themselves is simply to *force* those "stubborn ones" to admit one thing: survival *is* the indisputable reality.

The process can be exemplified in this way,

approximately. Suppose one medium living in Australia unexpectedly receives a message some day by means of automatic writing. The contents of the message, however, are helter-skelter and without any apparent trace of sound sense. About the same time, another medium--in England this time--receives a message of similar absurdity. In its external appearance, as far as readers can make out, that message is equally devoid of common sense. The two mediums have no idea about each other's existence. They just have this one thing in common: They received meaningless messages. But then it so happens one day, by an apparent coincidence, that a third person has the weird idea of putting the two messages side by side, comparing them. And all of a sudden he discovers something very astonishing. Put together, the two messages make the most wonderful sense. They complement each other quite perfectly. This proves them, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to have one and the same origin. And that "origin" must be a personality endowed with fantastic knowledge. In a given case it may be in the field of classical philology. In another case the outstanding erudition of the "source" may be in another science. But it is always a field of knowledge with which neither of the two respective mediums can be seen to have the remotest conversance. Those modest "go-betweens" (as I have already given a translation of the term "mediums") evidently have just one single function--the relatively humble one of serving as channels for this brilliant communication. Now, if this endlessly complicated scheme does not have its origin in the departed, deceased scholars who are said to be behind it, where does stem from?

Academically speaking, the mediums have no background either in philology or in natural sciences. No one would ever suspect those two ladies of having the honor of smuggling in even one tiny bit of the sophisticated niceties that have here been produced. And when the one really responsible for the writings declares that he is Mr. So-and-So, who died so and so many years ago, then how could even the most incredulous research specialist help being impressed, or at least pretty intrigued. He is actually taken by surprise and so thoroughly disturbed in the depth of his mind that his old doubts tend to grow rather shaky.

Let us ask first a man respected during decades as one of the staunchest believers in the indefeasible realism of brain-mind unity in our present era. Today, however, he has apparently capitulated, like so many of his colleagues. In a recent publication of the famous "World Perspectives" series, *The Challenge of Psychological Research*, Gardner Murphy astonishes us. For now he has this to say:

"Struggle though I may as a psychologist, for 45 years, to try to find a 'naturalistic' and 'normal' way of handling this material, I cannot do this, even when using all the information we have about human chicanery and all we have about the farflung telepathic and clairvoyant abilities of some gifted sensitives. The case looks like communication with the deceased." (1961, p. 273.)

Chapter 22 What Has Happened to the Former "Stubborn" Realist?

Just Gardner Murphy would be a scientist particularly well suited, I think, to symbolize what I have called the "dilemma of psychical research", that is, the ambiguous position, the impossible position, of modern ESP researchers facing two abysmal chasms at the same time. Murphy is one of those who today think it impossible to squarely *refute* the solution offered by modern spiritism. On the other hand, for decades he has been finding it equally impossible to *accept* that solution. In both respects he is a remarkable exponent of a whole school of inwardly disrupted scholars, balancing on a thin line suspended over the gulf between realism and spiritualism, between a monistic view of man and a dualistic one, between a view of anthropological totality and a view of anthropological disruption.

I must here tell you the whole story about Gardner, the prototypical researcher, face to face with the dilemma. He first had a prevailingly negative attitude toward the spiritist interpretation of the phenomena.

Two Great ESP Researchers Meet

In his "Three Papers on Survival Problems," appearing in the 1945 Journal of the American SPR, you may see some of Murphy's reasons for that prevailing negativity. Most decisive was, no doubt, his encounter with Mr. Hodgson, one of the honest pioneers in the earliest American ESP research. Hodgson's history goes all the way back to the "days of the great mediums." This is, as it were,

the consecrated designation in the US for the "golden age" of American psychical research, as they looked upon it. It is with a sort of romantic nostalgia one looks back, even now, to the days when the grand old men of that research era had their historic encounter with one exceptionally sensitive testing subject, namely the ingenious medium, Mrs. Piper.

But it was at a much later date, of course, that Mr. Murphy met Mr. Hodgson. By that time the old man had been taken seriously ill with some definitely terminal disease. Before he died he had promised his colleagues that after his death he would do for them something they could be looking forward to with great expectation. He would do his utmost to provide them with dependable evidence of human survival. And certainly the group did not feel entirely disappointed.

A short while after passing away, "Mr. Hodgson" did appear in a séance held by his colleagues. And, as usually happens, the spirit had an abundance of nice things to gladden their hearts.

*The Practical Joke Prankster Murphy Fires a Deadly
"Spiritual" Shot at the Shiny New Mr. Hodgson*

This, however, is also the solemn occasion when Gardner Murphy makes *his* contribution. It would hardly be courteous toward the spiritist to call that a positive or "constructive" contribution. He had obviously prepared *his* part of the meeting very carefully. In it he had thought out his own secret test criterion quite shrewdly. He simply ordered the medium to ask the "surviving spirit of the late Mr. Hodgson" to be so kind as to give whatever details he might have about another person who had also recently

passed on to the new land of the "really living." How did that fellow thrive in his new conditions?

Perhaps the question came so spontaneously, and unexpectedly, that there was little time to mobilize any misgivings or any defense. One thing is certain. The spirit took the bait, swallowing it down "hook, line and sinker." He could give some picturesque details, making it obvious that this new fellow recruit in the army of the dead, or rather the finally living, was having the time of his life.

Murphy could only thank him heartily for the gratifying pieces of information. There was, however, this bit of a catch to the matter--just a little trifle, but still one that might spoil the broth. That person, with the name which Murphy had suggested, had so far not had the chance of either living or dying. He was just a child of Murphy's own mischievous imagination. And what do you think happened now? How did the control (the alleged Mr. Hodgson) react to this additional remark supplied by an ironical Mr. Murphy?

The reaction was such that the prankster's irony almost changed to pity. For the control's behavior was really to such a degree pitiable that Gardner Murphy was unable for a long time to get it out of his mind. For years it gave him a sort of nausea whenever the spiritualists' standard interpretations of séance phenomena were produced with the usual cocksureness which he, the observing doubter, could only feel as arrogance.

At the moment when Murphy had this experience, he felt sure that he would never, never be able to swallow down that old myth of the surviving, discarnate human soul. He had had counter-ideas and misgivings galore in the

past. Now this all grew up to take the volume of blank remonstrances. For what kind of a brand-new type of a "Mr. Hodgson" was it he had suddenly come to grips with, emerging right out of the "happy" hunting grounds of a discarnate humanity? Was this to be his great initiation into fascinating secrets of psychical research? What a sorry figure that "Mr. Hodgson" had cut in front of an old colleague in the land of the living. As soon as the unfortunate fellow realized himself caught, he got so busy trying to back out of his awkward position that it was a pitiful sight indeed. To Murphy his behavior seemed so unmanly, so dishonest, as the control stuttered forth his apologies, fighting desperately to cover up his own blunders, just like any astute liar on "our side of the tomb" caught in the trap of his own lies: "Oh, how terribly I am getting mixed up. The name you mentioned was so close to that of another fellow I have got to know. Forgive me, please."

But Murphy could not forgive, certainly not at this moment.... His disgust was too close to downright anger. He was angry in behalf of a late Mr. Hodgson he had got to know and admire as entirely different from this miserable cheat. It was a downright painful experience to have the true Mr. Murphy from this side of the graveyard lumped together with a gang of experts in dishonesty like the inmates of this dubious environment.

It is very evident that, at this time of his career, Gardner Murphy was coming pretty close to Corliss Lamont in his evaluation of the spirit hypothesis of the spiritist dogma. You will remember the unpleasant feeling that this man also ended up having about the spirits: "Many of the

communications and psychical manifestations were not only freakish, but downright mischievous." You also recall what this "mischief" observed caused him to conclude: "The hypothesis that impish and non-human demons are the cause, is not without merit." And then we do have, of course, the most serious question to ask--about Gardner Murphy this time!

*What then Caused this Haunted Realist to End Up
Making a Verdict in Favor of Spiritualism?*

A short answer to this question--perhaps too short, indeed--would be "*The Cross Correspondences*."

From his first writings we do know by now what was at the root of his downright reluctance against accepting, offhand, the assertion made by the spirit controls themselves regarding their identity. In much of this he did not only find cases of "mischief." He found something even worse than that. He found what he himself characterizes as *moral looseness*. He found *irresponsibility* and *improbability*.

To these sad findings the sophisticated spiritist may, of course, object, as is very frequently done: Some human souls *are* morally loose, irresponsible and dishonest.

But the unfortunate circumstance, for the case of the spiritualist manifestation mentioned above, was this: The famous old researcher Mr. Hodgson, whom Gardner Murphy happened to know quite well from "life on this side," never used to be either irresponsible or dishonest. So how could this be understood? Had the fellow turned that way after becoming a "free spirit"? If so, then the "other world" that spiritists keep speaking so highly about can

hardly be such a good place to end up in. It must be something less than what, after all, they have always boasted.

Well, that painful experience he had with the spirits took place in the early forties. Now what about the late sixties? What the historian of ideas needs to find out is, more exactly, what happened to this author during the time between "Three Papers on Survival Problems" and his "Challenge of Psychological Research." Let us have the crude facts, at least some of them: In his life new things have happened. One thing is the Cross Correspondences. And there certainly are a series of other things. The result is obvious: He has almost completely yielded to what he calls the "irresistible force" of the survival argument.

What is it, then, that has impressed him so immensely, and so indelibly, in certain more recent mediumistic performances? It is "the initiative, the directing force, the plan, the purpose of the communications." They show pretty plainly, in his opinion, that they do not come "from any living human individual." The will to communicate "appears to be autonomous, self-contained, completely and humanly purposive." This assumes "formidable and inescapable directness in the 'Ear of Dionysius'" (one of the most famous Cross Correspondences).

"It is the autonomy, the purposiveness, the cogency, above all the individuality of the messages, that cannot be bypassed." (Ibid.)

I should have liked to ask Gardner this question: Did you never for one serious moment consider as a workable theoretical solution Lamont's hypothesis "that impish and non-human demons" are the cause? Would it be so

farfetched to conclude that the demon unit having been assigned the special task of taking care of tough fellows like you, Mr. Murphy, was finally ordered to make more diligent efforts than ever before to prepare the program they must carry through to have any chance of breaking your tough resistance?

Second question: Would there be anything so astonishing about demons possessing "initiative," "directing force," "purpose," and "plan"? The Bible, at least, describes them as having a considerable amount of all those qualities. So why throw the realism of simple human death overboard so early? Does one have the realistic right to do that before one has exhausted every alternative to find at least one way out? In so important a matter there is no excuse for skipping a single avenue of an intellectually decent escape, that is, an escape with one's realism of body-mind totality unmolested. Moral looseness can have many aspects, and we are all more apt to fail in simple intellectual ethics than we ever realize.

Has Gardner Murphy ever taken into due and fair consideration the perspective the Bible opens up for an astonishingly straight solution of that sham-problem about life and death? I doubt it. He is evidently just as one-sided as most of his colleagues are in their barren humanism.

You see, the *Challenge of Psychological Research* is not alone in this "dechristianized" one-sidedness. I could multiply the examples of modern scientists similarly tossed from one end of the spectrum to the other. They permit any extravagancy of that mentioned brink of the chasm type to happen to them, rather than settle humbly for the middle of the road, that is, the realism of simple Christian thinking.

But what, then, is so completely unworthy about Christianity as a philosophy? I might name an impressive number of most critical scientific observers of the paranormal phenomena who have all finished by inclining toward the spiritualist explanation as "the most probable one by far."

There are certainly other sophisticated explanations men of science have endeavored to launch. They attempt the impossible to remain in the perspective of a purely this-worldly psychology in the non-religious sense. But in view of the immediate facts, those explanations have appeared so fantastic and so far-fetched that they tend to fall into greater and greater disrepute every day. But why, then, have not the *spiritualistic* views fallen into an equally increasing disrespect? This is also a question we must try to answer intelligently.

What is the remarkable thing that has here happened to modern science? Let us stand back in amazement for a while in front of the sensational portrait scientists have kept drawing of themselves during recent decades. In all frankness and candor, is this an entirely new type of scientist we here see emerging before our eyes? First, think of our natural scientists as they used to be. For centuries these most obstinately self-confident creatures on God's round earth were patiently fitting one fragment after the other, as Murphy himself observes, into the pattern of a great jigsaw puzzle they used to call their well-integrated outlook upon the world and upon man. Then suddenly these more or less dry and tedious researchers take a curious fancy to things in which they have never been particularly interested before. We have already mentioned the novelty

under the name "extra-physical capacities in human nature." We have also seen it called "the elemental claims of all religions." The fascinating thing was all the time "the manifestation of *pure spirit*."

But alas, precisely at the time when all these "spiritual things" begin to preoccupy the scientist's mind, he gradually becomes conscious of an abyss opening up in front of him. Where he had previously accustomed himself to the most harmonious integration, there the wildest *dis*-integration rises up. Where empirical facts used to fall with docility into their predetermined places in his beautiful mosaic, there they now turn "utterly irrational," "devoid of sense," and "affront to reason"--at least as he has heretofore conceived of the sensible and the reasonable.

Chapter 23 A Scientist's Incredible Confession

So what the rationalist of old chooses is the utterly irrational alternative of a spiritualist interpretation. This is the way he now chooses to look upon a whole series of paranormal phenomena. Yet, at the same time, he does *not* choose it. He chooses one thing: his own nagging uncertainty, the sickening vacillation from one alternative to the other, according as he faces one or the other of the mutually contradictory testimonies between which he finds himself placed. Reviewing his "Forty Years of Psychic Research", Hamlin Garland says:

"As I bring this record of my personal experiments to a close, I am urged by my friends to state my conclusions. To them I must reply: I have no conclusions. I am still the seeker, the questioner. I can only put into this final chapter some of my convictions along with a candid statement of the intellectual barriers which have thus far prevented me from an acceptance of the spirit hypothesis....

"In writing of my doubts I have no wish to weaken any other man's faith. I am merely stating the reasons which prevent me from accepting the spiritist interpretation of psychic phenomena which I have abundantly proven to exist--I am still questioning the identity of the manifesting intelligences. My dissent is not upon the phenomena but upon their interpretation." (Hamlin Garland: *Forty Years of Psychic Research*, 1936, pp. 386-7.)

What is it, then, that prevents *that* sober-minded investigator from accepting the spiritist interpretation? It is simply his inveterate scientific sober-mindedness, his heritage of monistic anthropology, of scientific mind-body

unity. It is a realization that dualism is not scientific. That applies to Plato's classical belief in an *impersonal* mind survival. It applies no less to the modern spiritist belief in a *personal* mind survival, which is logically quite inconsistent, so even more absurd, philosophically speaking, than Plato's idea used to be.

Your Dilemma and Mine

To modern science, then, this must be a vital issue. To those among its men who are most awake, it must be a critical issue. For what is here at stake? Nothing less than the very principles on which the mighty edifice of scientific research has been resting for centuries.

But that crisis of modern science is your personal crisis. It is *my* crisis. For, as far as we are realists, we have made our very totality in human life entirely solidary with that psychophysical oneness which is here at stake. Can we, then, at the present moment, avoid facing the same empirical facts that modern scientists are facing in the case of spirit manifestations such as the Cross Correspondences and precognition scores? Can we answer it to our conscience if we face those facts with a lesser degree of intellectual honesty? What avenue of escape shall we find for *our* dreadfully challenged anthropology? Parapsychologists today assure us that they have exhausted every possible alternative. Is that true?

To me this will have to be the great serious question now. *Has* human science exhausted *every possible alternative*? Has it given full attention to every possible alternative?

I can only think of one that may be said to be a

conspicuous exception. I do not assume that this need necessarily be due to intellectual dishonesty. In fact, I do believe that the "openness of mind" which Driesch was seen to recommend (a recommendation heartily joined by Sidgwick, William James, Sir Oliver Lodge, F. W. Myers, W. McDougal, Gardner Murphy and Harald K. Schjelderup) is sincerely meant to include openness toward *all* possible alternatives. The more surprised have I been to see how little attention is paid (through thousands and thousands of pages of serious literature in this field all over the world today looking for a fuller understanding of parapsychology's greatest problems) to *one* particular alternative of interpretation, as regards the modern spiritualist phenomena!

The "Third Alternative"--Most Disregarded of Them All

Let me rather admit at once: Driesch himself does, in one small paragraph at least, allude to that very possibility. I do not say that I would have expected a tremendous attention aroused, in the mind of an ordinary scientist, by that alternative. For I know the developmental background of scientists' minds in this culture. So I perfectly understand that the theoretical possibility here concerned would not--to them--immediately look as if it actually *deserved* momentous attention--at least not in the form Driesch has given to it. But I do claim that it should be given due consideration anyway; and this particularly in view of the momentous import of the question itself, to say nothing about the precarious position of the arguments otherwise available to decide the issue. Let us read Driesch's little passage *in extenso*:

"Endlich sei noch der in den Schriften der Laienspiritisten gelegentlich auftretenden Ansicht gedacht-- (*denn eine vollständige Erwägung theoretischer Möglichkeiten darf an nichts vorbeigehen!*)--, dass sich in den Sitzungen Wesen aussern, die nie materialgebunden, also nie 'inkarniert' gewesen, sondern immer 'freie' Geister gewesen waren. *Doch das nur nebenbei.*" (Emphasis mine.)

English translation:

"Finally we should remember one opinion occasionally appearing in the writings of amateur spiritualists (*for a complete consideration of all theoretical possibilities should not pass by anything*)--that beings express themselves in the séances who have never been bound by matter. They have never been 'incarnate' then. They have, on the contrary, always been 'free spirits.' *But this is just a remark in passing.*"

A faithful and complete consideration of the theoretical possibilities should *not pass by one single alternative!* That strikes me as a scientific principle of the highest order. Even modern ESP research must rigidly follow that honorable rule, if it claims to be rigidly scientific.

Now, what is that "theoretical alternative" Driesch, the convinced spiritualist, but admirably honest and carefully truth-seeking parapsychological researcher, alludes to, rather unexpectedly, and just *en passant* ("nur nebenbei")? It is simply that "third alternative" which otherwise I, for my part, hardly ever chanced to come across in more than one place, namely in the rock-bottom realistic philosophy (theology, anthropology and demonology) of the Bible. It is what Corliss Lamont also expressed, only quite a bit more negatively than Driesch's formulation would like to have it.

For Lamont speaks about the possibility of "impish and non-human demons or elves." And he openly dares to say that this hypothesis "is not without merit." Driesch's formulation is a rather neutral one. He speaks about the controls expressing themselves in the séances as a possible category of eternally "free spirits." What harsh words about their nature would you expect from a convinced spiritualist? In harmony with the views of Biblical philosophy we would rather limit the statement about such beings to this only: They have never belonged to man's world, to the human species. And in saying that, we have not necessarily expressed any spiritualistic views whatsoever, for, as we have already pointed out quite emphatically, there is nothing in the Bible suggesting "discarnation" ("bodilessness") in any creatures. Being a body is not by any means a concept of inferior status, spiritually speaking. On the contrary, even for God Himself, in the person of Jesus Christ, incarnation is stressed as an attribute of particular glory. Those who deny that the Christ has "come in the flesh" are described as the "anti-Christians" par excellence. (See the Epistles of the Apostle John.)

That Concept of the Non-Humanity of the Spirits--Where Does It Really Stem From?

There is, in Driesch's remarkable passage, one detail causing me particular surprise. It has to do precisely with the *origin* of that "curious theoretical hypothesis" which the great German ESP scholar deems worthy of mentioning "just in passing." He says it is an "opinion occasionally appearing in the writings of certain amateur

spiritualists" ("Laienspiritisten"). Sincerely speaking, the place that I, for my part, would find it natural to go to--if not absolutely indispensable--is certainly not a spiritualist circle of any kind, at least not if my aim is to locate the origin of that special "opinion." I would go to Christianity. Where else? On the other hand, you do remember, don't you, a certain "insight" seeming to appear even right in the midst of professional spiritists, at least way back in antiquity? The controls (if the modern term does not here sound as too much indeed of an anachronism) used to present themselves not only as gods and goddesses but also simply as *demons*. What a remarkable historical fact. What an incredible token of "insight." History has a sort of irony that is apt to scare people awake sometimes. But don't be fooled, please. Today, where would you find séance spirits that declare themselves to be demons? Almost without a single exception they assure you insistently that they are men!

*Humanism--the Unique Religion of the Twentieth
Century*

You should know one thing. Being a man is today the most prestigious attribute ever known in our environment. In the old days there still existed a traditional belief that the universe might be populated with other beings of some significance. But our humanism today has accomplished a particularly "glorious triumph." Man is and remains the unique one, the great and exclusive one. Intellectually and spiritually speaking, there exists nothing comparable on that level. So, in order to have any chance of arousing attention as something really worthwhile, as a humanist

you have one thing to do. For heaven's sake, have it duly publicized that you belong to the human species. Evidently the "controls" of the spirit séances have been wise enough to understand this status-deciding mood of the present marketing conditions. They are obviously not ignorant about this capital fact of the historic evolution of ideas and values. It is not surprising, then, that they cue up in the line bearing the inscription *men*. Of course, what could be better than presenting oneself as the late Mr. So-and-So, that extremely human person who died the other day? The survivors would have to be downright inhuman if they failed to be heartily curious to know what kind of destiny has happened to a person as respectable--and as sweet--as that. How is he, or she, getting along in his, or her, new world?

As for demons, and the prestige which that species may enjoy today, the matter is a very different one. In representative circles you will hardly come across too many who go around at this late hour still believing in the existence of anything as old-fashioned as demons, spirits of devils.

In a way, then, I can very well understand that the Bible's belief in a demon world could hardly expect to have any major chance of being too eagerly accepted as *the* solution par excellence of the present dilemma.

On the other hand, how could honest and responsible researchers be able to defend what has here actually taken place, namely just ignoring the demon tradition as a possible theoretical alternative? This is more than I can understand.

"I, for my part, understand it quite well," you may retort.

"The Biblical tradition about a demon world belongs to the things that may be grasped as a possible historical reality, it is true, but then only *in faith*."

Good, but then, still, a decisive question will have to be in the mind of any honest truth-seeker: Does that faith go sheerly contrary to anything that can be proven to be an inescapable fact, historically and scientifically speaking? No, not on one single point, as far as my knowledge goes. So we do at least have a test criterion in the negative here. And in the face of that criterion we must finally grasp one simple reality: A test criterion of that kind must be entitled to an investigation just as fair, and just as wholehearted, as the investigation given to the spiritualist interpretations. This is of evident importance as a first step on our way toward either a full acceptance or a full rejection of the suggested hypothesis. Is that hypothesis logically acceptable or is it logically unacceptable? Do you blame me for putting up a durable fight in favor of my "third alternative"? Why should I not fight for its rights, as compared to the rights of the traditional two alternatives?

What is the score of those latter two, if they are to be subjected to the same serious test? Let us repeat, for safety's sake, what those two usual alternatives do imply.

One group of scholars says that the paranormal phenomena of spiritualism are "just a hoax." Is that a safe contention, quite intellectually and scientifically speaking? No, at least in the light of what has, after all, indisputably been established by respectable laboratory findings. Natural scientists, who still refute the most irrefutable conclusions, cannot be accepted as serious scientists any longer.

And now, what about research group number 2? You

won't blame me for regarding that group as the one interesting me quite particularly. In it we do find the typical parapsychologist in our times. We shall have to take up his main research findings one by one. We shall evaluate them both from the viewpoint of a most stringent science, and from the viewpoint of the most deep-rooted Bible faith. Here a historic duel must take place between giants of which only one can survive. I must stake everything on what I have called "the third alternative." I have also called it "the most disregarded of all alternatives." Some may, with considerable right, say that this is a terribly misleading understatement. It should rather be "the *unknown* alternative," for it is practically unknown.

Anyway, in the end, it will have to be my reader's business to evaluate for himself whether there is something so endlessly more worthy in the spiritualist theory of an automatic survival of human souls as discarnate entities, compared to the Christian idea of a demon world bearing the main guilt of the confusing show staged by the prince of lies. I am speaking about worthiness in humanistic and in scientific respect.

What the Bible speaks about as the inevitable lot of all members of mankind for the time being does not diverge one inch from what any observer can see happening any day: "Man is destined to die once, and after that to face judgment." Hebrews 9:27. Even pure humanists ought to be able to subscribe to the truth of the first part of that statement. Nevertheless, just here the conclusions are abysmally divergent. Which of the two views is the rock-bottom realistic, and which is borne on a wave crest of light-minded romanticism? A historic fact everybody can

verify is this, at least: Romantic spiritualism is in the process of making its triumphant march over the earth like a wildfire. Would it seem too much ado about nothing to summon a call for the two parties to be put side by side for a just appraisal? That summons ought rather to catch the attention of a whole world, including both the scientist in his lab and the man in the street.

Here I must announce my own standpoint by juxtaposing it with what we have already quoted from a famous Norwegian ESP researcher. Do you remember the words of Professor Schjelderup of Oslo University?

"There is certainly no reason to treat the spiritualist conception with that condescending attitude of contempt so common among scientists and others who have no knowledge whatever of the experiences upon which it bases itself." *Det skjulte menneske*, 1961, p. 228.)

You may remember that I candidly assumed those words to mean a perfect openness to all possible alternatives. And now, with the same candor, I make my own testimony at the introduction of my radical battle by saying--*mutatis mutandis*--the same thing about the stern Biblical view on the matter:

There is certainly no reason to treat the realist conception of the Bible with the condescending attitude of contempt so common among scientists and others who have no knowledge whatever of the experience upon which it bases itself!

The principle Schjelderup and I maintain in favor of fairness in research is verbally very much the same, however otherwise divergent our respective experiences, and our resulting views on human nature and human

destiny, and philosophy as a whole, may happen to be.

Chapter 24 Scientists' Philosophy and Religion

Our Average Scientists Tend to Choose for Themselves Not Only a Specific Philosophy of Research but Also Their Own Specific Type of Religion.

A word of serious warning would be most appropriate here. For this is the time in history when serious scholars in various fields, one after the other, seem to find that conditions "are ripe" for attaching themselves definitively to a rather full-blown spiritualist explanation of the "otherwise absolutely inexplicable."

Nothing less than a veritable historic revolution is here in the process of taking place right in front of our eyes. Few people, it is true, have any real awareness of that destiny-laden process. But that fact does not make its impact less significant.

On the ruins of a downtrodden Christianity a new gigantic religion is being erected. The religion here establishing itself embraces people of all races and all confessions. The phenomenon we have to do with is a wildly expanding movement of the pseudo-religious kind. Modern spiritism is simply in the act of taking over as the world religion above all world religions.

The main aim of this book is just to give a summary overview of the drama that is thus about to be enacted. What I can hope for is only that some readers, instigated by this survey of dramatic happenings, may have their interest sufficiently awakened so that they may look for further knowledge about the fascinating details of the enormous spectacle. A new insight into various aspects of this might converge into a new vision of life, and of the world. You

have a hunch that I am again speaking about the Christian realism, something radically different from what was originally imagined. So I am not going to dwell too lengthily on peripheral details. I am rather going to plunge right into the most attention-stirring things that have happened in the ESP research so far.

Precognition--the Climax of All-Defying Titanism in the History of Western Man

ESP researchers themselves do not make a secret of the fact that this is very much the way they too look upon Precognition, as they understand it. To them it means nothing less than man's own inherent ability, as a man, of going beyond the barriers of time, of actually knowing what *is not yet*, but *is going to be*. So it has to do with an indwelling capacity of changing future events into present facts. "Prophetic gift" is a term used in religious circles, and usually its meaning is a very different one. It is mostly thought of as an intervening act of God, and entirely dependent on Him. Its aim is to provide his children with needed information, for instance, about the future, which is otherwise a closed book to them. Such special revelation then has its origin in God exclusively. Compared to that Biblical concept of a knowledge of future events, precognition in the ESP sense of the term is a humanistic concept of the most hardboiled kind in the sense of utter self-sufficiency. There is no dependence whatsoever on knowledge coming from the only Omniscient One. Primarily precognition is without any necessary basis in the typically religious. Therefore it may also seem far more naturally suited for ordinary research in a laboratory

setting.

The mutual incongruity between two concepts does, of course, present some difficulties for an adequate comparison. On the other hand, it would assume the nature of all illusory abstraction if I were to make an attempt at tearing the subject loose from a viewpoint of Biblical Christianity. Notice, please, precisely the indissoluble attachment Christian realism is bound to have, in all respects, to a definitely *contingent* world. This down-to-earth contingency of the Bible should be noted in sharp contradistinction to the inroads of philosophical spiritualism to which present-day ESP research has abandoned itself without any serious hesitation. That whole incongruity between opposite world-views would naturally force me to evaluate the differences, basing myself on a profoundly religious perspective. I think it is my inescapable duty to present the topic in the full and inexorable light in which I have come to see it, and with all the seriousness it has adopted in my thinking and my personal investigation.

The questions I have had to ask myself, you see, are no trifling matter: Is this the hour in which the body-soul realism of Hebraic-Christian anthropology is to receive its final death sentence? Or is it, on the contrary, the spiritualistic-platonic view of man in the Western world that is now destined to meet its doom, solemnly pronounced by the Faithful Witness presiding over the tribunal of a holy heaven? If what we hear is a death knell rather than a ring of triumph, then for whom are the bells tolling? One thing is certain. Up until now, what we have particularly seen is the proudest bravura of humanism in all

its history.

The situation seems far from plain. If we are to believe the latest proclamation of modern ESP research, it would appear more likely that the one having got the worst of it is the Christian philosophy of reality, and not at all that of pagan-platonic idealism. There is conclusive evidence already, says the triumphant voice of the quest of the paranormal. *Dualism* (pure-spirit-ism) is the liberating truth about man! The search for that truth has been crowned by perfect success. The proof has finally been found for the strange thing dimly perceived for millennia: the reality of *non-physical spiritual agency*. It is the final victory of spirit over matter.

You may recall Gillespie's shout of gladness: "The old monistic point of view is shaken in its foundations." Is this true? Gillespie, on that occasion, went on to say: "If precognition is a fact..." Well, what then? Then the Bible's monistic view of man and the world is a ridiculous lie. So far, we must admit that Gillespie is right in one hypothetical statement. For, of course, *if* the premise of that scholar's argument *is* correct, then the conclusion must be perfectly right also. And he has every good reason, then, to say that this is the "most shattering impact of parapsychology on science." This *is* a serious matter indeed. There just could not be anything to disagree about in that matter.

Just about his further and final remark there could be some serious disagreement still. For that is very subjective. He says that this impact is also "the most *stimulating*." I do not deny that we may come across a number of persons who would experience a considerable stimulation by

learning that all realistic science had had a sudden collapse, something shaking it in its very foundations. The question of stimulants is, of course, becoming an increasingly problematic one today, particularly among the younger generation. In fact, various types of "stimulation" have, for thousands of years now, asserted themselves as the most typical and the most deleterious hazard. That factor of hazard is the fundamental motif that has received the name *Eros*, dominating all pseudo-sciences from times immemorial. Eros was always out hunting for stimulants. This is part of the emptiness constituting the very nature of egocentricity (self-centeredness). That indwelling emptiness caused Eros to find no satisfaction in any sound and sturdy activity of the level-minded everyday kind. So those artificial stimulants seem to become imperious for the purpose of keeping the mechanism going.

Anyway, let us have good look at that solemnly announced cataclysm predicted for poor monism in human thought as something logical and inevitable, according to recent laboratory data. Our main field of investigation will then have to be

The Departments of "Quantitative Research" Opting for the Lab Rather than the Séance Chamber as Their Favorite Working Grounds.

So we are leaving the precincts of the "artificial stimulants," are we? Don't be too sure about that. And what about the ill-famed field of *religious* emotions; are we leaving that behind us? Don't be too sure about that, either.

To many men today--this is becoming increasingly true--the only religion they know is spiritism. Is that particularly

religious? It is not genuinely religious. Certainly not in the rock-bottom realistic Christian sense of the term. Why not? Just because its constant trend is to indulge in a definitely self-centered type of excitement, sometimes even in a dangerously closed-up atmosphere of super-tension. Now it might seem pretty burlesque to accuse Plato, the father of all Western spiritualism, of that kind of indulgence. Only modern spiritism is a stimulant of the rather nerve-shaking kind. And that makes superficial minds believe it is "religious." For, from times immemorial, men appear to have nourished the weird idea that entrancing ecstasy is a reliable sign of religiousness and spirituality. This is where we have erred catastrophically. For nothing could be farther from the truth.

I have already suggested that this mistake may even prove fatal to a false Pentecostalism. There is great danger of a special Pentecostal madness now coming up. I must repeat my warning about the current conception of God in many ecumenical conglomerations of religious bodies--Protestant and Catholic, with no distinction. Their pagan anthropology is getting the better of them. Their entire theology is saturated, above all, with the idea of the automatic immortality of all souls. A God who has created men in such a way that they are never permitted to tell Him goodbye and just die, is bound to take on the aspect of the sadist par excellence, the great Master Persecutor, tormenting His creatures through ages without end. Contemplating the cruel face of a God of that kind is bound to involve a terrible conditioning effect, as we have seen plainly enough. It gradually conditions its believers toward becoming themselves cruel persecutors of all dissidents

(dissenters). For in this, too, they must, of course, be fully and faithfully on the side of their God. And who are the dissenters? They are, above all, such who *do not share such spiritualist views of eternal and automatic torment.*

As for the element of super-excitement, who would deny this general rule: It is curiosity--I would say a presumptuous type of curiosity, and even a downright craving for sensations--that constitutes the essential allurements causing people today to start joining spiritist assemblies. That sensationalism is definitely rejected by the delicate conscience of the Christian child. Or is it purely accidental that a feeling of gloom and fatal unrest has been associated, for thousands of years, with places where the company of the spirits is being sought?

Particularly in environments where the Bible has been the mold of human sentiments and religious acts, that sensationalism was never seen to prosper.

Well, what we now have to face squarely and openly is the historic sensation of "quantitative research" in modern ESP laboratories in Western man's super-sophisticated world. There could be no greater sensation in the history of psychic research. Please don't permit yourself to be so excited that you lose your faculty of realistic thought.

Chapter 25 An Encounter with Dr. Rhine, a Highly Stimulating Personality in Our Era

Did you expect to find a dry theorist caring no whit about religious matters, or about the practical areas of more or less dangerous politicians in this shaky world of ours? If so, then you are entirely mistaken.

Do you imagine that this now world-famous professor of Duke University, the chairman of its "quantitative parapsychology department," thinks of "man's inherent capacity of surviving the death of the body" as something about which he "couldn't care less"? Again you are mistaken.

But first, now, some factual historical information about the general emerging of precognition as a triumphant secular idea. For that, too, is sensational.

The Precognition Test Experiments Get Their First Incredible Breakthrough

How did sober-minded scientists ever hit upon the prodigious idea of finding out, in a laboratory, whether human beings do possess precognitive faculties? That is, above all, the fabulous faculty of seeing things in the future. I am here speaking about foresight in a most serious sense, a "transcendental" sense, something definitely *metaphysical* rather than physical. I do not speak about your foreseeing that you will get a sad hangover tomorrow morning because you have been drinking quite heavily tonight. No, precognition is not a matter of logical reasoning like that.

The historic truth about the initial happening bringing

the theory about might be best expressed in this way: It was not the scientist hitting upon an idea. It was the idea hitting upon him. I am almost tempted to speak in terms of a regular assault, if ever it is right to think of an idea as virtually lying in wait for a more or less unsuspecting, and hence more or less "innocent," man. An ambush may be a many-faceted thing. The secret aspiration of a precognitive faculty precisely of this philosophical kind (a typically humanist kind) might easily be envisioned as taking its man by surprise. Perhaps most of us would be shocked to know what enormous aspirations we are unwittingly harboring in the deepest recesses of our human hearts.

However this may be, one thing is sure. Nothing less than that overpowering intuition was destined to happen to a man in the first half of the 20th century. But once the process had started, the ball certainly went on rolling, causing more and more men to have aspirations of downright megalomania in their lives. That is what I feel justified to call it.

What I realize as rather normal in the present case is simply this: The idea of precognition was too fantastic indeed for any normal possibility of any normal scientist "hitting upon it." So the first step of precognition research seemed bound to start gliding by what we use to call "mere chance." Or was this perhaps, after all, no accidental happening at all?

Anyway, what was it that happened one day to one of the ESP experimenters at Duke University in America? He had already for some time carried on some more traditional types of ESP testings. On that particular day he had just tested one person's ability to "guess" the identity of a given

card without seeing it. That meant a long series of test questions in order to find the average score for that person's capacity of "seeing the invisible." The case was a sad disappointment. Of course, the great majority of people will tend to be disappointing in this sense, and a case of boredom, both to themselves and to the experimenter. They just do not reach far enough beyond the average score to be registered as "*significant*"; that is, in the language of science, they are not in possession of proving value. It is the same thing that would probably be happening to you and me, as we have a die thrown on the table. However intensively we keep thinking of the figure of *six*, that side of the die shows a discouraging tendency of *not* turning up any more frequently in the course of 1,000 attempts than each one of the other five.

"Well," you object, "the other day, as I was playing the game of Ludo, I got four sixes in a row."

That probably was due to the somewhat dubious way you did your throwings. You may be somewhat of a "swindler," without knowing anything about it yourself. In the critical ESP researcher's eyes you would not be looked upon as quite reliable. In their laboratory it is not you who are asked to do the casting at all. They have machines taking care of that business. Machines are no cheaters. Here it is important that all sources of "personal fraud" should be screened out.

Of course, even then it might happen that your two sixes in a row could turn up. That would probably fill you with great expectations. But your optimism might be rather short-lived. After a thousand, or just a hundred, throws, for that matter, you would probably come out as the "mediocre

fellow" you really are. The six (or any other figure you might be going in for) would show itself from its most tedious side. Your activity is being *randomized*, as the expert would express himself. And this in spite of all the serious efforts on the part of your willing mind to "press the six forward."

But let it now also be emphatically admitted: This notorious "mediocrity" applies to you and me, but not to Mr. So-and-So, brilliant star of the glorious ESP firmament. Certain persons subjected to the statistical experiments of many laboratories have reached astonishingly significant scores. Not necessarily that they have acquired the fame of an exceptional genius, such as Uri Geller. For he has now travelled over sea and land, demonstrating amazing capacities of just that "superiority of mind over matter." Thanks to "mere concentration of the marvelous non-physical elements" in him, that man can show people how willingly even pieces of iron submit to his "spiritual forces." Without being visibly touched at all by material means, they willingly bend. Think of an object as stubbornly rigid as a piece of genuine steel. It is forced to bend, to bow humbly "to the more than steel-hard will of Uri Geller."

Now, of course, even something as advanced as this still is a far cry from any such thing as the genius of precognition. True enough, numbers of experimental subjects in the ESP laboratories have demonstrated "their significant ability to guess at the identity of the presented 25 Zener cards." Plain figures prove for them a score absolutely exceeding, by far, the *random* figures of the "mediocre ones." And, nevertheless, it has to be admitted

that not one of them, in any instance, demanded to transcend the limits of *time*. No. They were simply asked to tell what is the identity of this card *here* and *now*.

Generally speaking, what I want to impress upon your mind is the dry fact that the busy day of an experiment leader in an ESP lab is filled with routine activities, containing rather few bright spots apt to refresh a weary mind. Just once in awhile does an exceptionally "sensitive" test subject present himself in the "card-guessing game," let alone some genius of Uri Geller's caliber.

So you may understand the weariness and even boredom happening to the patient, but rather human test leader, Mr. Soal, as he wound up his test results from his last "client" that evening. The fellow certainly had nothing "significant" about him. Soal was probably glad when he could finally brush together the test papers, putting them into a folder.

For some reason or other that folder found its way into the satchel he used to take home at night. After having sat down in his study room at home, still "for some reason or other," he pulled out the folder and started looking at one of its pages in a more or less mechanical and haphazard way. Then all of a sudden something strange caught his attention. What in the world could this be? The test answers of that "mediocre fellow" began to take the aspect of something far from mediocre. If the "guesses" were regarded as applying each time to the question immediately *following*, so actually lying in the *future*, then there seemed to be a remarkable significance! In other words, the card lying in front of that fellow, right *then* and *there*, did not at all seem to be what he was concerned about. No-no, his mind must have been rushing forward to something not yet

existing, but bound to exist in a little while; that is, after the mechanically operated shuffling had been undertaken, and after a new "hopeless" randomization had taken place. The weary soul of Mr. Soal, as you may easily imagine, was verily refreshed by this sudden discovery. He went through the whole series from this viewpoint, while his heart kept beating considerably faster than usual. The whole bunch was significant, disquietingly significant! What kind of sorcery was this, anyway? Could it be possible that this man was here manifesting an endowment of an entirely new and amazing kind? This looked like regular prophecy, a virtual look right into the future. As far as Mr. Soal knew, a phenomenon of that magnitude had never been registered before--except within the operation field of religious faith.

"Prophecy," by the way, was just the specific term first to be launched by parapsychologists to describe the new phenomenon they now went ahead investigating with a rushing rapidity. Only later did they settle for the term "precognition." Perhaps they did feel that the word "prophecy" reminded them too much indeed of something disquietingly religious. Elements pertaining to religion proper, as we all know, tend to be rather unpopular in all traditional fields of scientific research.

And how did this matter develop further from now on? Soal had no precise idea about the way it should be handled. All he did know, to begin with, was this: The fellow he had tested had shown an incredible ability to manage something he had never been asked to do. With an almost eerie degree of scientific significance he had contrived to indicate the identity of the card that was destined to lie on the table next. The only thing needed in

order to change the test series of that day, with its absolutely insignificant scorings, into an international sensation, was to regard the entire test row as a precognition experiment, secretly agreed upon. How could any ESP researcher fail to be excited at such an event? I imagine Mr. Soal could hardly sleep that night. For he must have been awfully anxious to follow up his experiments with a golden genius of this kind. Early next morning the man he had tested was summoned to appear for a new series of tests, and this time with the new viewpoint consciously in mind. And he did not disappoint his experimenters. Series after series turned out with a significance of "the other world."

This mysterious beginning, duly announced, inspired ESP institutions all over the world to carry on similar experiments. And everywhere the success was incredible. The surprise--and the optimism--was boundless.

The final result of the precognition adventure is the most spectacular thing experimental ESP research has ever marshaled. Western universities from the Pacific coast of America to the Ural mountains of Soviet Russia have followed up with research programs at a feverish rate, and the reports are remarkably unanimous. The test teams are impressed, overwhelmed.

Of course, the interpretation of those test results need not be equally unanimous in all quarters. But one thing seems indisputable. It would be difficult to imagine any reasonable interpretation that would simply explain away, or reduce to insignificance, the fantastic character of the now evolving data. Responsible evaluators are bound to look upon them as sensational, be it in one direction or in

the other. So I think no one should feel ashamed of using the same adjectives: impressive, overwhelming.

Chapter 26 Precognition Viewed as an "Inherent Human Capacity"

Its Consequences to the Basic Grounds of Christian Realism

Even among otherwise calm and dispassionate scholars, some inevitable implications did soon cause feelings of visible perplexity. Was this just a culmination of that "earthquake experience" started by the Cross Correspondences of the "automatically writing" mediums?

Such scholars keenly remembered, with a heart sufficiently troubled, the epoch when those mysterious specters started surging up from the earth in one continent after the other, creating a weird mixture of the meaningful and the meaningless.

Still, this new thing was worse than any preceding mystery. Well, what is there, then, in the tremendousness of the precognition phenomenon that outdoes everything else in the history of modern thought, in terms of perturbing the minds of serious scholars?

First of all, this: In any case of veritable precognition, the way modern ESP research conceives of the matter, nothing less than the very space-time system of classical science seems turned helter-skelter. Or, rather, it vanishes into thin air. Such inherited concepts as "past," "present," and "future" have suddenly become bankrupt.

And what about religion and ethics? The new revolution in traditional patterns of thought--and evidently, then, in rapid succession, also in corresponding patterns of moral behavior--seems, to many serious thinkers, logically bound to create a chaos the world has never known before.

Gillespie called it a "shattering impact." That is a conservative expression.

Above all, how could we fail to shiver in front of the *ethical* implications? Is this the blessed liberation hoped for during centuries? What hope and what liberty? I am all the time speaking about the fabulous "freedom" man believes he is going to experience at the moment when the "spirit" has become definitively detached from "matter." Some of us may in our dionysian enthusiasm call this freedom, even a freedom knowing no boundaries whatsoever. But for freedom of this unbridled kind there is another term, if you insist on being minutely accurate. That is libertinism.

Speaking about a free will (*liberum arbitrium*) as a *sine qua non* (an indispensable condition) for all personalism, we should know that this volitional freedom, to the thinking of Biblical realism, has its very existence in something as basically monistic as the intimate complementary relationship between something inward and something outward that applies to all fundamental ethics. I am referring to such essentials as, on the one hand, "faith," "principles," and "ideals of truthfulness," and on the other hand, an outward realization of those inward ideals, such as "acts," "deeds of practical valor."

But imagine what happens at the moment when you establish as your great ideal a total disconnection (detachment) of the former (what spiritualists tend to call with great bravado "the purely spiritual") from the latter ("the purely material"). What else could result from such disruptive thinking than a disintegration of life itself?

According to Gillespie's interpretation of the laboratory data of all precognition experiments so far, man, as a

spiritual being, has finally proved his superior ability to transcend the borders of the time-space universe. To him this means overcoming barriers of an exclusively evil limitation. Well, it does sound grand to become so "spiritual" in one's nature that one simply manages to eliminate *time* and its very boundary markers from one's life. You have the vision of time being rolled together like some dirty and in all respects miserable rug. But what else, as well, is bound to be rolled away at the same waving of the magic wand? Of course, everything called concrete acts of practical goodness! For they would have to follow exactly the same pattern. Life's most personal inter-human dealings would have to be rolled up, as it were, in all their assumed "dirtiness" and "miserableness." Can you see them, at an ultimate stretch of your imagination, being cast to the moles as some outdated and useless trash, sinking down without a trace into the nirvana depths of eternal nothingness?

In such a philosophy of life--are we aware of this?--there is no room left any more for specific responsibilities or personal duties. For one rule must always be valid. What you are responsible for, or have a duty to do, is inevitably something tangibly and realistically *taking place*. In the practical reality of a contingent world, the *here and now*, the *then* and *there*, are *conditiones sine qua non* (indispensable conditions). The idea of all wanted distinctions between the past, the present and the future, being torn away like as many useless rags, is the ultimate of all absurdity.

The Bible never spoke about prophecy in terms of timelessness (see *Day of Destiny*, p.121 ff: "*Should man be*

longing for timelessness as a proper way to be more like God?"). But, of course, in this new philosophy of precognition, there never happened to be any trace of prophets or prophecy in the age-old Judeo-Christian sense, that is, in the Biblical sense. Its originators never left us in any bewilderment as to the way they conceived of it. Precognition, to them, is an absolutely transcendent faculty in autonomous man, a faculty of selecting with complete personal freedom, on the dashboard of eternity, any point he might please. In other words, it is a matter of "prophetic faculty" in terms of a purely human endowment; something every human being--simply by virtue of his inherent humanity--must be assumed to possess automatically. Through diligent exercise he may raise this to ineffable levels.

To those beautiful questions my answer can only be a new question: How does this concept harmonize with the Biblical ideals of human spirituality? A comparison between the two views of life will once more result in one sad fact. The illusion is bound to die and change into bitter disillusion sooner or later. Why do I express myself in so pessimistic terms?

Once More the Parapsychologist Feels Like Shaking His Learned Head in Wonderment at "the Imaginary Bugbears" Troubling the Christian's Mind

The average ESP expert must again prepare for a sad disappointment in his encounter with the Christian realist. He once more gets to know something he never knew before. With brows raised in astonishment, he will probably stare at me in incredulity for a long time before he finally

exclaims, "I am dumbfounded. What in the world could a Christian find in this to unsettle his peace of mind? What threats could he discover in it against the fate of true religion? What danger does he fear as inherent in this innocent little prospect of an built-in mechanism of precognition in every human soul? I am greatly astonished," he would say, "to learn that you do not welcome with ovations our new scientific accomplishments. Why should not this new evidence of foreknowledge in man be a token of spirituality on the highest level?"

This could have been anticipated. The average researcher's reaction could hardly come out any differently in a secular milieu of the present era. You must recall what I announced in the very beginning, namely a certain culturally conditioned, but nevertheless quite fateful misconception in the thinking habits of people in our Western civilization. We secularized ("dechristianized") "Christians" keep hauling about with us some weird idea about what is spiritual and what is not. Deepest down in our Hellenized souls, snowed over with layer after layer of the pagan heritage of centuries and millennia, there actually seems to be a sort of secret gloating at the sudden prospect that all everyday realism may quite dramatically come to its cataclysmic end. In my opinion this is the attitude that really ought to cause us the greatest wonderment. Is this the way you and I are really concerned about the reality of time and space, the unbreakable totality of body and mind? *Is* it to you and me just a heavy load on our shoulders, just some prison chains hampering the natural freedom of our spirit? At least I hardly see one tear shed in our environment, not

even a crocodile tear, if it is suddenly announced that the very concreteness of our human lives is facing its total breakdown. On the contrary, the more perfect that collapse might promise to be, the greater the triumph of our "pure spirit" over "sordid matter." That seems to be the essence of the entire gloating.

So why do we now blame scientists, if we ourselves are exactly like that most of the time? How could they be expected to remain the only ones unaffected by that same disruptive stereotype of Western public opinion?

I am simply bound to think of this anomaly in terms of a great general titanic rebellion. It is the classical rebellion of timeless paganism against the humble ideals of rock-bottom Christianity. What is it really that we Western men have here chosen eagerly as our decisive criterion of our own triumphant spirituality? It is nothing less than our "sacred" ability to tear ourselves loose from all undesired "fetters" of dependence on an intervening God. What a destiny-laden revelation of occidental Titanism! That superman concept forms the most glaring contrast to the Christian ideal of *metanoia*, for *metanoia* is just a lowly, creaturely submission to the great Creator-God of Biblical tradition.

It is, once more, the typical pagan scramble for immortality that I am speaking about. It is a "congenitally human" and "automatically possessed" type of immortality, an entirely man-made type of immortality.

*But Now, What Does All this Ridiculously Proud
Scramble for Pure Automatism Have to Do with a Gradual
Collapse of Basic Ethics?*

Here I must evoke the old scientific truth about a long forgotten theory, the axiom of *cause and consequence*. Whether you realize it or not, that is the theory man's precognition dogma endeavors to annihilate. And that theoretical annihilation seems to take place without any visible compunction in the minds of the precognition prophets. The Bible simply assumes, as another axiom, the fact of an essential *freedom of man's will*. But fundamental to that axiom is, in its turn, the doctrine of the fixed relationship between cause and consequence. A given cause is inevitably followed by its corresponding consequences. Now, would you dare to claim that this has nothing to do with elementary ethics? What is the obvious implication of the very word "consequence"? It is "being together" ("con") and one thing following after the other ("sequence"). Who does not know that "sequence" means a definite order of correctly concatenated events? Now, what do you think happens to that realistic pattern of orderliness in the world of reality at the moment when the concept of time is arbitrarily torn down from its throne, causing the concepts of "present" and "future" to be fused together in human minds, and finally to vanish altogether? For instance, the cause/effect relation between what the Bible calls *sin*, and what it calls the inevitable *consequence* of sin, appears to be suddenly suspended.

Would you still contend that the theory of precognition, in an ESP setting, has nothing to do with ethics?

Just here, however, it becomes necessary, for fairness' sake, to make an important remark:

Quantitative Research Experts Impressing Us

*Tremendously with a Sudden and Genuine-Sounding
Concern About the **Ethical Aspects** of the New
Precognition Campaign*

To the anguish I have expressed above I now foresee (in a very human way of foresight) an understandable objection. That objection appears legitimate in the highest degree. Even the ESP experts of the most optimistic school do seem to have feelings of anguish. That seems to be the very reason why they are so eager to finally see a new day dawning, a day in which science and religion may finally go together in an effort to achieve a hitherto unknown degree of spirituality. I promised to show you some particularly serious statements made by Professor Rhine of Duke University. Granted, the survival question never used to be a capital issue with quantitative researchers such as Rhine and Pratt. This was more the preoccupation of the first generation of parapsychologists, grouping themselves around men such as Sidgwick, Myers, James, Hodgson, etc., way back in the days of "the great mediums."

And yet, notice: Rhine himself has occasionally expressed a most heartfelt urgency for "pressing on." For what purpose? For the purpose of arriving, as soon as ever possible, at conclusive evidence just regarding human survival! Listen to his words:

"Proof of survival would quench for ever the dreadful error of the materialistic view of man on which Communism and other gross misconceptions about humanity rests. On the other hand, certainty about it could give all human life a new dimension." ("Science Looks At Life," an article in the *American Weekly*, Dec. 8, 1957.)

"Does this sound like a 'capital rebellion against true

spirituality'?" you may ask with sincere indignation against my own sinister accusations. "It is quite a different group of men," you add, "that take care of the rebellion, isn't it? The professed *materialists* of our day must be the true leaders of that fraternity. Don't we have philosophies enough of a pronounced materialistic trend, such as precisely the group mentioned by Rhine, the Communists? Of course, we also do have, at the other end of the political spectrum, our capitalist technocracy, which is hardly tempered by anything but sheer hedonism. So should we not be thankful indeed that some scientists finally show signs of wishing to battle against that awful materialism penetrating our entire culture?"

Well, let us try and answer that quite relevant question of yours by asking a new one:

Would Faith in Precognition as an Inborn Human Ability Quench Forever Our Present Materialistic and Godless Way of Thinking?

Our most optimistic ESP experts have now reached the conviction that a new day is dawning, thanks to the fantastic knowledge scientists are gaining about man's fabulous inner capacities. According to Rhine, man has now "reached what might be called a point of desperate timelessness." (Ibid.)

I understand his anxiety perfectly. He is just one of the increasing number of worried observers who seriously ask whether this globe of today does at all have a tomorrow, quite physically and literally speaking. From his pen, then, there goes out a quite pathetically sincere appeal, like a cry of utter distress on a God-forsaken ocean of dire calamity.

An appeal to whom? Not only to the equally trembling fellow men he happens to see right in front of him. Oh, no! It goes out to spirits as well, to spirits more than to anyone else. Just listen to the way he expresses himself:

"In a word, if there *are* spirits, isn't there something more convincing *they* can do? Does not some of the burden of proof rest on *their* side of the cooperation?" (Ibid.)

At the same time the author's remarkable appeal goes out to any now living man who believes that he is in some kind of "touch with the cooperating world of the spirit agency." Such persons among us are insistently urged to elicit, for the success of the new wave of research now carried out, every possible aid which can be obtained from the quarters of that mysterious world of the beyond.

Now, does this sound just dryly "quantitative"? It does not to me. And I have a far more important question. Has there come, from the parties so insistently adjured--either spirits or living men, any tangible response to Rhine's entreaties?

We shall look at that matter historically and sober-mindedly in all respects.

To begin with, I would like to underline one point of procedure. We must have due respect for the obvious longing, in researchers of this caliber, for something humanly meaningful, right in the whirl of our crisis-haunted world of today. Even team leaders carrying on their routine tasks day by day in the technical laboratories of our *ultra-western* laboratories, are visibly worried--so, not at all as unconcerned as you might assume--about the deepest *spiritual* implications of their statistical figures. Of course, exactly *how* they conceive of that "spirituality" is another

question. To my topic here it is an existential question.

Chapter 27 Conclusions of Nonobjective Science

An Nonobjective Science Draws Theological and Philosophical Conclusions Far Beyond the Realms They Could Reasonably Claim as Their Field of Competence

In one document of his research, "The Reach of the Mind," Rhine brings his present statistical material into direct speculative relation to precisely the question of *immortality*. Here we do, of course, immediately find ourselves right in the midst of religion and philosophy. So, notice carefully one remark he has on that serious subject:

"Now all that immortality means is freedom from the effects of space and time. Death seems to be purely a matter of coming to a halt in the time-space universe. Therefore the conclusion that there is at least some sort of a technical survival would seem to follow as a logical derivation from the ESP research." (p. 213.)

It is not difficult for the enlightened historian of ideas to discover in this statement a new, clear sign of the immense impact--in fact, almost unbelievable impact--that time-honored platonic philosophy of the "pure idea" still manages to exert on modern men, even scientists absorbed in quantitative research. But this is no more than a general trend of Western man's traditional thought pattern. Let us pay careful attention to Rhine's way of expressing himself. Just take the first line of that remarkable passage. Is what here happens to be hurled out such a gem of admirable truth?--"Now all that immortality means is freedom from the effects of space and time."

According to what philosophy, if you please? Well, according to the spiritualist thought forms of Plato's idealism (or rather idea-ism)--yes indeed, perfectly correct. But now what about the *word*, in the Biblical sense of "Logos"? That is, the decisive verdict from Jesus Christ, the Alpha and Omega of all realistic philosophy, the One without whom "nothing was made of all that was made"? Biblical Christianity simply does have a doctrine of man and a doctrine of God (including a doctrine of immortality) distinguishing itself *markedly* from everything that Rhine has here dared to utter. What that great pioneer of ultra-modern precognition research has formulated in the above quotation is nothing but a faithful reflection of the classical Westerner's version of the concept of human survival in terms of a "platonized," would-be Christian concept of immortality. So, unfortunately, it has to do with nothing more than a continued "existence" in some sort of mere vacuum, an entirely "new category of life," desperately abstracted from space and time, that is, from every bit of concrete reality and concrete meaningfulness. I am speaking about the reality, the only reality, that normal men and women, inhabitants of a normal world, can accept and derive satisfaction from.

Here you are getting a foretaste of the "spirituality" fashioned and formulated by classical spiritualist patterns of thought from times immemorial. In it, all normal phenomena of our world are torn to shreds. And what has caused that cruel tearing up of all meaningful totality? The perpetrator is that unfortunate idea of a "super-normal" (or "para-normal") type of reality insolently imposed upon us. My words are not too harsh to match the disruption they

stand for. It is a sham reality that is literally imposed upon us. And then this is presented as the only legal tender supposed to suit the "dignity" of a member of Hellenist culture! We are hardly ever informed what this Hellenism we have been imbibing really stands for.

*What Then is Man's Real World, Seen with a Perennial
Biblical Christianity's Unadulterated Eyes?*

That must, of course, be the world of reality in front of which God, the Creator, was pleased to place Adam, the first human being, at the moment of his creation. The Scriptures do not make any secret of the "prosaic" fact that Adam, from the beginning, had a body. Or rather in the Bible's own most significant expression, it is said: He *was* a body. So evidently he *did* "take place," as a being in time and space. That clearly shows that he was intended to realize his existence, ontologically speaking, in the same time-space world that you and I are confronted with, as *our* only known possibility of existence. I am just speaking about the world any human being, anywhere on this earth, is facing if he (or she) happens to be normally equipped, thus being able to grasp his (or her) environmental reality with the common senses a human being disposes of--in all lowliness. That is the world God created for man's sake. Even today, in our sophisticated environment, a candid little child feels at home in no other world than that. One tiny tot, unexpectedly confronted with the spirit world his parents had happened to get involved with, complained pathetically, "Mommy, I do not want these spirit people, I want people with 'skin on'."

The world that such a still pretty unadulterated little

human creature knows and feels as the meaningful one, you see, is the world he can grasp with his physical human senses--in all lowliness! It is the only world he can confidently reach out for with the familiar concreteness of his real being--in all lowliness.

And is it not also the very world to which God Himself came down--in all lowliness? I mean, according to a Biblical tradition, I do know that pagan philosophy has never been able to hand out forgiveness to that God of the Bible for coming down that low. Imagine a sublime Deity committing the "unworthy act" of exchanging his "solemn Nirvana of spacelessness and timelessness" for something as "sordid" as sheer time-space reality!

Here *lowliness* in the true Christian sense is, of course, nothing but a synonym for *humility*. And pagan philosophies, pagan religions, never put much stock in a quality as "cheap" as that.

So please imagine--if you still can manage it in spite of your present bungled and critically warped condition as a Western gentile--imagine *a God who literally exists*--a God who is not in the least bothered *by His own literal existence*--in time and space!

"What an abominable degree of lowliness!" That would be the verdict of Plato and his increasing multitude of spiritual heirs in the civilized world of today.

But the Bible's conclusion is an entirely different one, quite evidently. Its Creator, the Lord and Origin of all good things, obviously does not know any better world He would rather abandon Himself to than this "lowly one." Anyway, He does not seem to have any hesitation, or secret scruples, about declaring Himself to be the Creator of this world.

And, after all, what does "creation" mean? To create, in the down-to-earth Biblical sense, is precisely to put things, real objects, into time and space. And, dear me, it is no small number of things that incredible Creator has found it meaningful to "put in," is it?

Only heathen anti-philosophy has never wanted to have anything to do with that "mono-mania" of a literal creation on the part of the Bible's God. Hence the anti-philosopher's frantic flight into the zero-world of metaphysical abstraction, a pseudo-world without one trace of meaningful reality.

How infinitely more comforting is the Bible's testimony, the simple and confidence-inspiring story of a Creator and Re-Creator, God of the tender heart. For it is the Bible's constant trend to tell us about a God whom we can intellectually understand and heartily love, just because He is the God that comes down, a God who even shows every sign of feeling at home "down here"--in that frank modesty of a literal world, the same world of which we, you and I, know ourselves to be inhabitants, legal citizens.

It was, according to the most reliable historical report, just to your world and mine, that the God of heaven came down--the first time through His act of creation, the second time through His act of re-creation, the endless wonder of redemption. That is certainly no wonder in the sense of pure-spirit-ism (or I should rather say the *non*-sense of pure-spirit-ism).

And now notice how the realistic message of the Bible goes on. This tremendous and tenderhearted Creator-God, Jesus Christ, did not come down to our tangible and visible world just in order to withdraw forever into an intangible

and invisible one. In fact, the Bible just does not have any report whatsoever of any such spiritualistic type of retreat (retirement). It knows no nirvana of "divine" self-sufficiency or self-centered isolation. According to the Bible, on the contrary, self-sufficiency and heartless isolationism are satanic inventions, and basically opposite to the principles of God. The special treat provided by the Biblical report of the future, and warming the heart of the child of God, is the intimation of the most incredible, the most enrapturing ever known. What God has planned from eternity is to make this humble planet of ours His royal residence for all ages. Imagine changing this tiny speck in His vast time-space universe into the focal point of all creation, and then settling down to spend the rest of eternity with this very "speck" as His majestic center for ever and ever! Here, as always, the Bible is speaking about an endless, but absolutely literal future, not about an eternity in terms of timelessness. This latter concept is unknown to the philosophy of the Scriptures.

A Strange Definition of Death

With this as our background we should now go on analyzing Rhine's concepts of the universe, man, and eternity. How does he define the term "death"? Please take note of his remarkable formulation:

"Death seems to be purely a matter of coming to a halt in the time-space universe."

According to what special anthropology and cosmology is death "purely" that? Obviously, again, according to the platonic vision of death, certainly not according to views of Christian realism. Death is something far more

catastrophically significant than anything either Plato or Rhine has envisioned. I am speaking about death proper in all its destructive realism, not about death eventually overcome and graciously remedied by the active intervention of the Prince of life, Jesus Christ, at the historic event of resurrection. I am speaking about death, barely and squarely. The Bible, with its constantly unflinching historical perspective, calls it "the second death," something from which there is no awakening. In short, death--according to the Gospel's serious conception of man and the world--is, alas, something far less poetic, far less speculative-philosophical. It has to do with coming to a stop barely and squarely. Death is death, period! There was one thing spiritualist philosophers never knew, you see. That time-space universe is the only kind of universe ever existing. The Bible has no room for the myth about a world of timelessness and spacelessness. So, if you and I happen to come to a definitive halt in the only realistic universe, there is no more toehold for our existence anywhere.

With the fatality of real death--the catastrophic end station of which He warned Adam and Eve so seriously--God has drawn man back to a vacuum of which He Himself is the only Master. That is the *toho-waboho*, or utter *chaos* of which the first verses of Holy Writ speak. It is a realm of nonentity in which the counsel of the Almighty and Omniscient One is the only rule. But notice, even this is not a world of meaningless abstractions. A thousand times *no*. Wherever God's counsel and active power have their sovereign right of intervening, there is bound to be something tremendously meaningful, something heartily personal, filled with promise and grace. The pure

abstractions of platonic idealism are a different case altogether. When did *they* reveal themselves as meaningful or gracious?

So let us also admit: The deceased human being is not like one who has never existed. A historic creature once endowed with glowing personalism (the ability of a free choice) can never be as one who never was. Oh no, that one-time person will always have a drama-filled history behind him (or her). And history never vanishes. Therefore, the remarkable thing happens. With God--in His endless and totally meaningful world--the deceased man still exists as a reality of the absolutely irrevocable, a concrete historical ineluctability. To God, the man in the grave has a literal future, a continuation of life, whether short or long, that all depends. For it is in His inscrutable counsel, you see, to wake us all up, "some to everlasting life, others to shame and everlasting contempt." Daniel 12:2. It is in the positive aspect of this foreknowledge He sees Abraham and his children, according to the promise, as still living. We have already referred to Luke 20:38:

"For to Him they are all alive."

Being registered in the book of remembrance of the Eternal One is full guarantee of your once coming to the time when you are to be waked up again. That is "as sure as Amen in the church." On the day of resurrection, at the end of time for this present empire, God will realistically call you back with every bit of identity you stood for at the moment of your death. God be praised. For God to say, "I am Abraham's God, Isaac's God and Jacob's God", is not tantamount to His saying, "I am the God of dead men."

But it is also not tantamount to saying "Death is an

insignificant matter, an immaterial thing, an 'illusion' that will be overcome, when man finally manages to become more spiritual." By no means. The Bible's philosophy is not like that.

But what is it like, then? There is one thing I now feel pretty sure I can state about the Biblical life-and-death philosophy. Parapsychologists today are to a frightening extent ignorant about it. For that good reason they ought to have been quite differently reserved at the moment when they felt urged to draw far-reaching religious conclusions about death from their "research material so far." There is one thing, at least, they certainly ought to know. That thing is the logically derived conclusion drawn by the Bible and the Christian religion. It is not the thing that a Gillespie or a Rhine regard as a "stringently logical conclusion" drawn from that material.

My criticism may seem hard, but please notice: I am not one-sidedly blaming those extremely capable and seriously engaged scholars for an ignorance of matters they ought to know just as well as I do, for instance, about what is truly spiritual and what is not according to Biblical Christianity. How could I be so unfair as to put the main blame on their side, as long as I do know that we professing Christians ourselves, in spite of our professional study of the Bible, seem to keep fumbling around in a similar ignorance. In fact, I have a better opinion about their ability and willingness to become better informed, as a group, about these significant matters than I think we, as a group, are able and willing to change our traditional ideas about death and immortality in a Biblical context. The saddest thing of all is the fact that we simply fail to accept elementary

information ourselves. So how could we convey it to others? The large majority of nominal Christians just do not have a willing ear for certain fatally important truths. We have, on the contrary, what the Bible calls "itching ears." Our curiosity, like Eve's of old, is not in the direction of sober information, but rather in the direction of exciting sensations.

Chapter 28 An Authoritative Verdict Regarding the True Position of the Precognition Doctrine

I am here permitting myself to assume as almost a matter of course something in favor of parapsychologists who have chosen the precognition research as their special field. They will be sincerely interested in extending their factual knowledge regarding a question I am here taking the freedom to ask. How is the theory of precognition, as an indwelling faculty in man, related not only to religion as a general phenomenon in human lives but also to the historic religion above all religions in our Western culture, namely Christianity?

Here it must be frankly and emphatically stated: In Christianity, as well as in Judaism, the ability to immediately foresee and foretell events in the future is dogmatically maintained as a distinctive epithet of the Omnipotent and Omniscient One. In numerous passages of Holy Writ that unique ability is expressly referred to as a conclusive evidence of *divinity*. Let us quote one typical text. This is the Lord of hosts ironically challenging the make-believe gods of pagan idolatry:

"Present your case," says the LORD, "Set forth your arguments," says Jacob's King. "Bring in your idols to tell us what is going to happen. Tell us what the former things were, so that we may consider them and know their final outcome. Or declare to us the things to come, tell us what the future holds, so we may know you are gods." Isaiah 41:21-23.

The same capital reasoning is expressed with conclusive force in several passages in the same book, for instance,

Isaiah 44:7-8,25,28; 45:11-21; 46:9-10; 48:6-7.

And this categorical way of identifying the true God, presenting an infallible test of divinity, repeats itself in the New Testament. Here is Jesus Christ presenting reliable proof that He is very God:

"I am telling you now before it happens, so that when it does happen, you will believe that I AM." John 13:19.

The great I AM, the eternally self-existing One, here maintains His unique quality of being God by simply foreseeing--and foretelling--happenings in the future as if they were in the present, happenings that no man could have any idea about before they actually took place.

In another book of the Biblical canon the apostle Peter emphatically denies the possibility that true precognitive faculty (prophecy) can be a matter of human competence:

For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, for men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit. II Peter 1:21.

And now, what does modern parapsychology proclaim regarding the same topic? It states, with the force of intensive conviction, that both the foreknowledge and the foretelling--so, short and sweet: *prophecy*--can perfectly well take place as a product of human will and human ability. So what about the role of the Holy Spirit and divine inspiration? Those elements are *not* indispensable factors, if parapsychology's position is true. We can get along admirably without them. Simple human genius is all that is needed today in order to realize the great phenomenon.

The Sensation Above All Sensations: The Titan Above All Titans--The Occidental Superman Humanist--Makes

His Ultimate Challenge Known

Can it be denied that there seems to be the hush of the unprecedented, and of an absolutely dumbfounding boldness, in what is here taking place in this last century? After the Bible has tried for centuries to teach Western man that precognitive faculty is reserved for God alone, a loud proclamation goes out from highly respected human truth-seekers. "On the contrary, *Man* is exactly the one having within his natural grasp the sovereign ability to foreknow and foretell the future; that is, of shuffling past, present and future around as he pleases. And the conclusive evidence of this is produced by man-made scientific laboratories. So where are the gods who would dare to speak against the final verdict of these laboratories?"

My question, then, in front of this bold challenge, is a simple one which I do hope it is permitted to ask in all candor. The sensational in all this can hardly be denied by anybody. But is it a sensation of unprecedented human knowledge? Or is it a sensation of unprecedented human audacity?

Let me once more try to be entirely fair, first granting our remarkable scientists the opportunity of applying a brake to what they might call a naive author's "unbridled pathos." They will probably object that I am here dramatizing the matter beyond all reasonable measure. In fact, they may say that it has never entered into the head of one single member of the precognition teams that the test subject they are experimenting upon is an omniscient God, or even a prophet in the Bible's sense of the term. And the test conductors themselves have never insisted on making any campaign of the kind that would impress miracle

hunters of the popular layman kind.

It would not surprise me if Rhine, for instance, would be modest enough to decline any attempt to compare even the most sensational achievements of the most glorious stars in the precognition laboratories to the prophetic capacities of Almighty Providence in terms of an emulation with religious prophecy.

This may sound like rather humble and down-to-earth realism. And still we should watch out that we be not deluded even by phrases of an ever-so-sincere piety actually observed in many of these scholars, a piety that might put many a professing Christian to shame. Over this, however, one should never forget the way the ESP results of the present day of triumph from California in the west to Ukraine in the east have been published, just by the leading scholars of this research field! Those fellows do not hide under a bushel the light they think they have brought into focus for the glory of human genius. Oh no, what those enthusiasts feel convinced that they have provided ample evidence for, in human beings, is evaluated to be of a nature that just cannot fail to revolutionize the profoundest of all previous thinking! Both philosophically and religiously it is destined to constitute a "re-evaluation of all values." What one had never dreamt of as practically feasible, except vaguely behind the mystery veil of eternal Deity, nothing less than that is now being realized on a global scale by *men*! Who dreamt that what seemed hidden under seven seals, deep down in the unsearchable bosom of a mysterious future, could one day be conjured up with such playful ease by this latest specimen of Homo sapiens?

Oh no, don't let anyone minimize the seriousness of this

matter. If what is here claimed is really true, then it is nothing to be trifled with. Don't let any person--whether priest or scientist or profane philistine--come and tell us a tale as vain as that.

My mind is made up about the significance of this matter. What is here said to happen in full daylight is a veritable mockery, not only against elementary human reason, but even--and that is my greatest worry--against everything called plain faith in the Word of Scripture, the testimony we have had confidence in as the great infallible revelation straight from God.

A Life and Death Battle Between the Ascending Pride of Secular Humanism and the Descending Humility of Faith in Jesus Christ

I see no possibility of reducing the seriousness of what seems bound to keep brooding over the controversy facing us here, as we have our historic encounter with an entirely new category of science. A compromise here would to me mean abandoning my very faith in Christianity as a tangible reality. For if what parapsychology here states, with an air of invincible self-sufficiency, is really true, then the testimony of Biblical Christianity is left by the wayside as mere prattle, an inferior type of intellectual force completely outdone by secular humanism.

In such a critical situation I must, of course, remind myself that one-sidedness is always a dangerous evil. A true scholar must always have an open mind, taking in all realities presenting themselves, however difficult it may appear to him to fit the details into a view of totality. In the present case I must, on the one hand, have the courage to

face every bit of demonstrable facts streaming onto me from the incontrovertible data of the precognition tests. On the other hand, I must not abandon my integrity toward a religion I have found to be dependable in all fields in which I have had a chance to put it to the test. According to the clear testimony of that religion, *God* only has natural immortality. *God* only has an inherent capacity of knowing the secrets the future holds. He is the only one who can tackle that future *as if* it were past or present, which, by the way, it *is not*, for future is future, until the moment it naturally and in an orderly manner turns into present, and then into past. To creaturely beings the day of tomorrow is an infinite bundle of unknown factors. To God, on the contrary, everything lies spread out like an open book.

A Famous Psalm Causing Great Controversy

"Lord, you have been our dwelling place throughout all generations. Before the mountains were born, or you brought forth the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting you are God. You turn men back to dust, saying, 'Return to dust, O sons of men.' For *a thousand years in your sight are like a day that has just gone by, or like a watch in the night*. You sweep men away in the sleep of death. They are like the new grass of the morning--though in the morning it springs up new, by evening it is dry and withered." Psalm 90:1-6.

Is this prayer of Moses, the Man of God, just another case of non-realistic dream talk? What is meant by saying that in God's sight "a thousand years are like a day that has just gone by"? Does it mean that the mathematics of exact quantities is suddenly annihilated, so that a thousand years

are magically transformed into one day? Where in the Bible do you find any foundation for imagining that God gives Himself up to any such hocus pocus? Is He among those daydreaming anti-realists who keep longing for the day when *one equals one thousand*? Does God count among His favorite hobbies the practice of smashing the entire multiplication table, if that may happen to serve His divine purposes? I for my part do not know any scripture that must be interpreted in that way.

Well, then, what could be the meaning of such "juggling practices" in the way the Eternal One treats the concepts of time as, for instance, precisely the inspired text of the 90th Psalm?

The point He has in mind must be positive and constructive, not negative and destructive.

About God, the Bible simply states, again and again, that He is the only Self-existent One. He has been there through all ages of the past. And He is the only One who possesses "*omni-cognition*." By that new-coined term I mean a knowledge so exhaustive and all-comprehensive that it must be a matter of course for His mind alone to wander up and down the avenues of time, without any hurdles He might have any trouble with. He alone enjoys the perfect overview. But how should this cause Him to turn out to be a destructive rebel against reality and its unbending laws? Please remember that those laws are nothing but a direct expression of His indwelling essence from everlasting to everlasting.

As soon as we become aware of something as essential as this about God, what He is and what He is not, we finally begin to realize something essential about man,

what he is and what he is not.

Do you now see what a catastrophic milepost an implicit believer in the philosophy of the Bible would seem to arrive at if he came to the conclusion that his intellectual integrity pressed him to accept, in unconditional surrender, not only the irrefutable data of the precognition tests, but also the *interpretation* currently given to them by theorists among the leading ESP researchers today?

Here it is two entirely divergent *interpretations* of the same material that must be seen to have a head-on collision with each other. So let us first sum up the radically humanistic formulation given to the laboratory data:

The now accumulated data of our precognition experiments--together with so many other cases of compelling evidence--prove the existence of an absolutely discarnate spirituality in human beings. Accordingly, the most obvious dualism, and not at all psycho-physical unity, must be the essential truth about man.

Does it strike you, in view of this shattering verdict qualifying Biblical realism as a treacherous sham philosophy, why a conscientious Christian, having the courage of his deepest faith, is bound to look for

Another Alternative of Intelligent Interpretation of the Fabulous Precognition Scores?

"What interpretation, then, if you please?" may be your curious inquiry.

My choice is very limited. And I am not sorry about that limitation. It is roomy enough. I have just one way out. Let

me launch out into its deep waters, and see if I remain floating. My sole chance is--I am sorry to tell you, dear friends in the precognition research business--that the entire precognition spectacle rests on a gigantic arrangement of simple *fraud*, an active worldwide deception, to state it unceremoniously.

Chapter 29 A Case of Fraud Unparalleled in History

Fraud! I seem to hear you exclaiming in amazement, almost in a fit of horror. Fraud? On the part of whom?! Should there be fraud shamefully committed by *parapsychologists*? What accusation is this against those honest explorers of the unknown, taking no end of pains just for the purpose of *avoiding* fraud? From morning to night they were busy taking every possible precaution to screen out the slightest possibility of error insinuating itself into the context of their experiments. Every reasonable observer has had to admit the minute accuracy with which they used to watch the faultless integrity of their captivating precognition scores. Who would have the crudeness to suggest suspicions in that direction?

Or would someone perhaps have the cheek to suggest fraud on the part of the experiment *subjects*, those humble "guinea pigs" so patiently helping to produce those scores that have amazed the world?

Be reassured. I am not referring to either of those two groups of well-intentioned dupes. And still my cruel-sounding charge might prove absolutely valid. The theoretical alternative of fraud, you see, is not necessarily limited to fraud "organized by parapsychologist," or "fraud on the part of laboratory assistants," or any other kind of conscious *human* fraud. Why does not our search for negative forces go farther out than that? Why should we be so impermeable to the idea of possible fraud organized by agents to whom neither ESP researchers nor their faithful assistants pay the least attention? Is this attitude of their

present impermeability a scientifically safe attitude? Is it the safe attitude of the ideally responsible organizer of "supervised tests"?

It is a serious case of neglect, on the part of a highly responsible scientist, to be superficially one-sided. I am speaking about one-sidedness also in one's suspicion. A flair of *multilateral* suspicion may save a land and its people from disaster. The lack of it may prove fateful in an important research program.

What am I aiming at? Well, what I am here tentatively referring to might perhaps be described as

*"Paranormal Fraud"--A Strangely Disregarded
Category of Fraud.*

Why do you smile at my unexpected suggestion for an extension of our scientific vocabulary? I should have a right to assume that the adjective "paranormal," as such, is not unknown to people who have taken the trouble to follow my argument this far, although you may take umbrage at it in this particular context. But tell me, please: Should not a generation that seems to believe so firmly in the definite existence of paranormal phenomena, here and there and everywhere, be deemed mature some day, also, for accepting without blank prejudice the tentative idea that some of those phenomena, in their turn, might be accounted for simply as the result of something one might suggest as "paranormal deception"--and this with a claim of scientific credibility exactly as dignified as anything our statistical research otherwise startles us with? Why do the members of this otherwise so precocious generation suddenly become all that lost, all that helplessly one-sided and

handicapped? I might as well say: all that unjustly partial! How could that harmonize with our customary abandonment to a certain rather uncritical faith in the supernatural we otherwise give ourselves up to so generously and so excitedly?

True, there does exist another name for that specific case of fraud I am confronting you with. Hopefully that designation will not impress you as too straightforward and unseemly bold:

Demonic Fraud

I am sure no one can accuse me of bringing in this viewpoint as a bolt from the blue. And yet to many it may appear like a shock. To those I can only retort: Is it *more* shocking than the precognition scores of the laboratories, viewed *apart* from this explanation? In my opinion--as you well know by now--nothing could be more shocking than that. A propounder of new alternative viewpoints must be justified in shocking his public sometimes. The shock, if it is one, is long overdue. The historical fact is, as far as my knowledge reaches, that the current interpretation--the allegedly non-shocking one--has for years and years now remained pretty much unchallenged, strangely enough. In that respect it looks as if theological fundamentalism among us should be dead and buried a long time ago.

Does the Demon Fraud Hypothesis Explain Details That So Far Impressed Even the Experts as Rather Inexplicable?

Would it seem intelligent, or in any sense worthy of scholarly research, to turn down offhand this "new" working hypothesis? Would it not be far more scientific to

accept it tentatively, as a worthwhile basis for further investigation? With what argument could such a proposal be reasonably rejected? Could it be this one: "We do not like a hypothesis being of such a 'materialistic' nature that it makes provision for traditional science to strengthen its position as a science of body-soul unity."

I know the increasing mood of scholarly circles almost everywhere today. A philosophy of rock-bottom realism does not tend to make you *persona grata*. On the contrary, you may be pretty sure it makes you *persona non grata*. Modernist theology, with its increasingly subjectivistic tendencies, has now for a long time fondled the idea of the grand irrational leap into utter absurdity. No wonder that such extreme existentialists, far from blaming on the ESP researchers their anti-realism and anti-Biblicism, rather welcome this with gladness. One thing is pretty sure. From modern theological sources our ESP researchers have not had to suffer any opposition showing real "teeth." And almost equally toothless--or absolutely silent--do those sciences appear which one might expect to fight back. In a way, I can understand that silence and that toothlessness. Hence I can also, to some extent, sympathize with those silent and toothless ones. For--poor creatures!--what should they say--and whom should they bite? With the current views nominal Christians have today, what rational counter-arguments could they find to oppose those that ESP researchers keep brandishing like sparkling swords in the empty air in the form of their blessed statistical "facts"? Poor, poor world of 1987.

The Typical Scientist Chooses His Favorite Alternative

If only common sense could be counted on as the prevailing tendency within scientific circles, then evidently the Christian form of spirituality with all its simplicity and fervor would be the alternative opted for, much rather than that of pagan spiritualism with its hectic flight right into the irrationality of dualist fancy mongers. But if you imagine that the typical scholar necessarily makes any choice under the influence of sheer common sense, then you certainly do not know much about the main characteristic of this human type.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that spiritualism is what our modern scientist--or the average rationalist of any epoch, for that matter--happened to love above all things. By no means. But, on the other hand, just that pagan-idealistic vision of man as a "pure soul" (spiritualism) has not either, at any time, been what he *hated* above all things. By no means. Let me rather keep you posted, in case you are not yet informed. Exactly *what* is it this typical scientist shies away from with such instinctive disgust? It is *true spirituality*, wherever that rare ingredient is found.

I apologize for the crass, categorical form my statement has had to adopt. Of course, I am not here speaking about any one individual scientist. I am only frankly expressing something I have observed, and duly ascertained, as a general trend throughout the history of Western science. Scientists in our culture do resent, very visibly, *spirituality, as such*. But in that respect they obviously do not deviate one single inch from the general pattern adopted by humanists by and large. They do not diverge one inch from your pattern and mine, as the common sinful men we are.

But I am here speaking quite particularly about the peculiar Western pagans you and I happen to be. We do have a natural aversion against true spirituality, as exemplified by Biblical Christianity.

Just permit me to put up a little paradigm of tendencies characterizing, side by side, pagan spiritualism and Christian spirituality. So you may find out for yourself on which side you shall have to look for the typical speculative thinker, as he has developed in a Hellenist milieu.

Pagan spiritualism	Christian realism
distinguishes itself as mainly being:	distinguishes itself as mainly being:
1. philosophical	1. deeply religious
2. dualistic	2. monistic
3. metaphysical	3. empirical
4. passively ruminating	4. actively engaged in the practical tasks of the immediate environment
5. cold as ice and hard as iron	5. humanly warm and responsive
6. independent, proud, self-sufficient	6. dependent, humble, self-erasing, self-forgetting
7. intellectualistic and logically abstracting, with a certain contempt for bodies and all outward things.	7. practical and childlike, with a candidly realistic appreciation of bodies and all concrete things as respectable realities.

And now to your personal judgment: What about the special researcher we have to do with in this book? On

which side of the fence would you expect to find him, considered as a general type? Would you dare to place him on the right side, that is, what I usually call the other-centered ("alterocentric") side? If so, then I am afraid you have a far too favorable opinion about him, at least in religious respects. Don't worry, *a priori*, about any exaggerated religiousness in that species, my friend! You will hardly run the risk of being disturbed by any embarrassing degree of religiousness in your encounter with that scientist as a general human type. He will rather impress you as "refreshingly secular." And now you probably know already what "religion" it is I have dubbed "*the religion for the not-properly-religious*." It is about spiritualism I have had the recklessness of formulating that characteristic.

There is one thing we should know, then. Even a downright anti-religious scientist rarely seems to feel overly disturbed by the theory of an automatic survival of the human soul, according to the current spiritualist pattern, that is, "soul" in the sense of some kind of bodiless essence. I permit myself to put such "souls" between quotation marks to prevent them from causing misleading notions about reality. The element of automatism (automatic functioning) of that "immortal soul" is a guarantee, as it were, that nothing supernatural, no miracle of any kind, is actually required. And automatism is also quite logically assumed to mean *impersonalism*. And notice: what such more or less irreligious persons in the natural science departments would tend to react perceptibly *against*, is a phenomenon as deeply religious as personalism. Above all they would tend to resent the remarkably disturbing idea of

a *personal God*, a personally *interfering* God. You see, that pronouncedly personal interference constitutes the quintessence of all spirituality, in the Christian sense. And the very climax of that divine interference is reached in the mysterious (*not mystical*, please avoid confusion) phenomenon Christianity calls *incarnation*. Incarnation, of course, stands for the diametrically opposite of spiritualist *dis-carnation* (the process of dis-embodiment). Incarnation means that the spirit permeates matter completely and has its existence in that matter, not abstracted from it, as pagan idealism suggests.

Now you may object to this with something apparently quite intelligent and legitimate: Is not matter something the natural scientist is highly familiar with?

Granted. But that does not necessarily mean that he possesses the *respect* Biblical philosophy excels in, when it comes to a top-realistic combination, or a virtual fusing together, of true spirit and true "bodiliness". I am speaking about what a realist terminology qualifies as a total *interpenetration* of the two aspects. This means that the two elements pervade each other so completely that the result is a wonder for which we have the name: a living creature. A separation is unthinkable, an absurd manipulation of speculative anti-philosophy.

Of course, such speculation is an irrefutable historical fact. I regret to admit it. And I also regret to admit the following: The Gospel's specific Christlike category of spirituality never failed to appear directly repulsive to both the materialistic and the spiritualistic variety of paganism. You may wonder why this happens to be the case. The fact is, however, the non-religious mind (your mind and mine as

natural human beings) instinctively shrinks back in front of a practical spirituality of the Christian kind. You and I are evidently not born realists. Just don't delude yourself about that. We were born as absurdity enthusiasts. We must be redeemed from our inborn perverse anti-realism that constitutes our natural heritage. The price of that redemption ("buying back") has been enormous.

Well, what do you expect, then, of the average scholarly researcher in a world as profoundly secularized ("dechristianized") as ours? He has, like the rest of us, a definitely non-religious heart.

Chapter 30 So What About Modern Spiritism as a "Religion"?

How do matters stand as regards spiritism's degree of religiousness? This is bound to be a most relevant question. For to most of us this is the only religion ever known. Here I should point out that I am speaking about modern *spiritism*. And then I must be willing to make all reasonable concessions. Spiritism must be counted as a *relatively "religious"* subdivision of spiritualism, that is, spiritualism as a general "timeless" philosophy. The comparative history of ideas demands that we admit that much. For here, indisputably, the appeal made is a more or less personal one. Actually, modern spiritism deals in an endless variety of personal affairs. The survival that spiritist séances promise suggests something meaningfully personal on the highest level of humanity. I mean to the extent that normal body-mind creatures here on earth are at all able to imagine personal relationships on a level of *bodilessness*! Pure spirit has evidently always made the impression of some serious handicap, when it came to the art of feigning deep personalism in an entirely convincing manner.

But the greatest handicap I could ever think of makes itself felt whenever the need of true peace of mind becomes paramount. Spiritism has a constant trend of indulging in a definitely egocentric type of excitement, sometimes even a dangerously closed-up atmosphere of super-tension. It would be a burlesque comedy to accuse Plato of old of a similar indulgence. Modern spiritualism, however, is a stimulant of the truly nerve-shaking kind. Now, from times immemorial, men in all lands seem to have considered

entrancing ecstasy as a reliable sign of "religiousness" and "spirituality." But that myth, at least, certainly was not the great classical master spiritualist's invention.

Nevertheless, the effect of that capital modern error of super-excitement is not less fatal, for that matter. This, I am afraid, is the increasingly popular mistake of the present day, encouraging a veritable psychosis, even in certain forms of Pentecostalism, quite unworthy of the name. What could be more fatal in its effects than the immortal-soulism that depicts the God of Christianity as the great Master Persecutor of sinners, tormenting them through ages without end? Have I not been right in seriously warning against contemplating a God image of such holocaust sadism? Have I not been right in pointing out that such contemplation will gradually condition the believers to be raging persecutors themselves of all who do not share their spiritualist views (that is, their views of immortal-soulism)?

Modern spiritualism goes to the opposite extreme. It seems to have a wholesale statement about men, sinners or no sinners, very similar to the one I quoted from an official profession of faith of Christian Science: "Man, the idea and image of God, is immortal, perfect, wholly good, untouched and untainted by evil, because man expresses God." (*Science and Health, with key to the Scriptures*, by Mary Baker Eddy, pp. 123.) How could optimists of that caliber expect any punishment whatsoever to happen to a human being of their caliber?

So, the prevailing mood will tend to be, on the one hand: "I for my part am among the 'elect' from eternity. Nothing evil could ever happen to me." On the other hand: "Those

who do not possess the inner light *I* am blessed with, from eternity--well, let the devil and his eternal flames take care of them."

Such are the waves of an egocentric and absolutely inconsistent emotionality in spiritualist thought forms.

What, Then, is the Price Modern Man Has Had to Pay For That Supertension He Could Indulge in, Satisfying the Emotional Needs of His Self-Sufficient Ego, Culminating in That Super-Humanist Myth of Precognition as His Final Triumph?

I have already summarily mentioned the ethical consequences. How could we skip the question of basic ethics? That would be fatal in the lives of those who need to count the costs. We have sufficiently considered the crushing blow directed against all realistic principles of time-honored natural science. But the ravaging effects on human *ethics* are even worse. For how could it be possible at all to abolish completely the border lines of elementary well-ordered sequences in the time concept (past, present and future) without simultaneously abolishing a concept as basic for all ethical thinking as that of cause and effect? The causal law would simply be doomed to collapse, together with all other essential values in life, if time as a tangible reality, a dimension of otherwise indestructible reality, could be annihilated. Well, nothing less than this would have to be the implication, *if* that automatic precognition theory happened to be true. I must once more remind you that the imperturbable law of *cause and consequence* in the material realm has an exact counterpart in the ethical. Biblical philosophy proclaims this

categorically, in terms of the freedom of the will that God has granted to man. Without that freedom no personalism can exist at all. For freedom and personality are synonymous concepts. And without this, all talk about spirituality would become meaningless, as Christianity looks upon meaning in life. In other words, the theory of a purely automatic precognition faculty in man, on the barren level of Platonic idealism (that is, simple dualism), reduces man's destiny to a pure vacuum. It abandons you and me to the ultimate moral dissolution.

How could responsible scientists deliver our lives up to this trauma, this nightmare, without an incredible degree of light-mindedness? The perspectives could only be ghostlike and eerie.

*My Alternative of "Paranormal Fraud" in More Detail
as a Hypothesis, Regarded from a Laboratory Angle*

Let me marshal the courage to be more specific in our treatment of the bold theory about "demonic deception," completely ousting every bit of the current myth of human precognition. In fact, this is nothing more than the traditional historical perspective of Christian realism, opened up for specific discussion in a laboratory context. The new thing permitted to enter here is a calm consideration of the natural consequences that could be expected in case of a veritable interference from outside into the basic known realities of a genuine laboratory situation.

In other words, my proposed new alternative presents the postulate of a definitely preterhuman element (an element outside man), interfering realistically and with

decisive effect in that matter at hand. Christian faith quite generally favors such a viewpoint. For the Bible constantly reminds us that all historical happening is liable to the possibility--or even the probability--of personal forces, including non-human forces, intervening concretely, to make human lives and human activities what they happen to be in a given case, and more so today than at any previous time.

So in our special context, as well, there must be room for the salient question: "Could evil spirits, as the Bible describes their nature and their activity, their inherent creaturely abilities and personal autonomy, be assumed to possess the ability to play a veritable role as fraud producers, such as has here been postulated?"

Here I shall certainly have to prepare myself for a crushing blow you may have been plotting against me for some time already, in order to give my demon fraud hypothesis its decisive *coup de grâce*.

*Why Should Demons Be More Competent to Produce
Fraudulent Delusions of Precognition than Human Beings
Happen to Be?*

You would take your point of departure in some characteristics I have already made myself regarding the Bible's description of the demon world. Are not the demons also creaturely beings, and therefore excluded from any participation in any faculty of regular foreknowledge?

Your statement is perfectly correct. I do not claim for one moment, however, that the demons, according to the Bible, possess the divine attribute of a general knowledge of future events any more than men do. But tell me, would

that extreme *degree* of foreknowledge (or that divine *kind* of foreknowledge) be needed in order to help men have a better score in their precognition tests, even a score of the kind evaluated as significant in statistical science? Not necessarily. Their natural knowledge of certain things unknown to man as a more limited creature could be sufficient. The very fact that such demonic intervention is not suspected at all--and therefore just not taken into account at all--would suffice perfectly to cause an absolutely unwarranted sensation of triumphant human accomplishment in the minds of deluded human observers. This is the delusion coming again and again to self-assured human beings who exclude from their minds the hard-core facts of the *preterhuman*.

In fact, the whole viewpoint has been falsified. So how could it be avoided that the conclusions drawn also turn out to be fatally false? The lab scores registered and accredited entirely to Mr. So-and-So, a living human person in the examinee doc of the psi lab, actually belong to a far more knowledgeable examinee who does not at all materially betray his presence there. How could this fail to lead a whole world astray in a destiny-laden way--namely right into the inroads of hopelessly confusing pagan-platonic thought forms of spiritualist automatism?

The practical result is a spiritual deviation of believing that the final conclusive evidence has been established for human precognition being an indisputable fact. "Dualism is the great fact of human life. So eternal deathlessness would be an equally obvious fact."

What a hazard! And all this deception for the simple reason that cautious measures had not been taken in order

to follow the indispensable rule of all true science, that is, including all possible alternatives, and excluding all possible manner of fraud.

I can see no logical counter-argument to this stern demand in favor of *scientific meticulousness*. The solution I am proposing is the only one I can think of in order to avoid meaninglessness and hopeless chaos in both science and religion, in front of the problems we have to face regarding the present issue.

Of course, I do realize that the viewpoint I have had to adopt as the only sensible one may appear to reduce man to what many people would feel to be a rather pitiable position, that is, the modest position God's Word continually calls our attention to: We are no longer the fabulous superstars which the premature glorious interpretations of ESP researchers flatteringly told us that we could claim to be.

Alas, the disillusion we have to swallow is a particularly bitter one. Not only are we doomed to descend from the glorious throne of superman self-sufficiency we had been placed upon. But we even have to see ourselves degraded to the ignominious role--if that is still counted as an ignominy--of being classed among simple spiritist mediums. From free human beings we have turned into automatons, miserable well-deprived ones whom *others*--and not necessarily "mom's best children"--keep working through all the time. Did I say "others"? That sounds rather "other-centered," doesn't it? Well, it depends who the "other ones" are. If they happen to be a consortium of non-human agents having deception as their specialty, then that is a pretty poor type of other-centeredness!

*A Total Re-Evaluation of Details Is Bound to be Made in
The Light of the Third Alternative*

I hope many parapsychologists will react intensively against the role they have here been assigned by beings they had not reckoned with. For such a mediumistic lackey service imposed upon free men is, of course, an unworthy thing happening to noble representatives of the human race.

Chapter 31 Why Not Act Now *As If* My Postulate Were a Valid One?

But now, what about the hypothesis itself suggesting that such unworthiness *has* been going on for years and years in the outwardly dignified workshops of scholarly men? Is that hypothesis, as such, unworthy of consideration for a more rigid and all-sided evaluation of the results hitherto achieved? If he abides with his solemnly pronounced principles, an ESP researcher such as Driesch would say, "Try it out for safety's sake!" A counter-hypothesis, like the one here suggested, cannot be pushed aside just like that. No, both theoretically and practically it deserves a respectable place in a conscientious research about precognition.

Let us now, at least for the interesting experiment of thought involved, postulate that the demon intervention thesis has been accepted--temporarily and quite tentatively, of course. What then about further perspectives opening up regarding practical details?

It goes almost without saying that a research alternative or hypothesis involving viewpoints as peculiar as this one would immediately place the interpreter of the registered laboratory data in front of an entirely new set of situations not previously troubling his mind at all. For a whole set of possibilities, previously ignored, would suddenly enter into focus.

*The Current Impressively Elaborate Techniques of
Randomization--Are They Elaborate Enough?*

The curious category of fraud I have here boldly turned

the searchlight against, is one our present precognition teams evidently have not paid the slightest attention to. So--very naturally also--they have not made the slightest effort to take any precautions for the purpose of guarding themselves against falsifications of that kind. In other words, they have given free rein to possible falsifiers of that category.

Let me admit frankly. For quite a while I have had a hard time seeing *what* precautions simple human beings like you and me *could* have taken, however much we might want to. So I am not so much blaming the investigating teams on that score. For even if they had had their attention directed toward such a potential intervention, on the part of creatures on so different a level of existence, what would a "station of police control" have in store that could match the situation here anticipated? Who would come up with a safe counter-offensive, or a defensive measure, that would exclude the dreaded deception? I mean, what remedy--apart from cutting out the experiments altogether? From a conservative Christian point of view it would appear rather presumptuous and, therefore, a pretty dubious matter--nay, an entirely hopeless matter--to think oneself of a sufficient size to play at hide-and-seek with devils and demons!

One Simple Instance: The Shuffling of the Zener Cards

In this connection I come to think of some conscientious efforts that have been made for years just in order to ward off the possibility of fraud (any disturbing element of possible intervention, whether conscious or unconscious). I am, of course, here speaking of fraud on the part of *human beings*. For instance, when the cards were shuffled, one did

not even let any involved person decide at what card the deck was to be divided into two parts. The supervisors preferred to have even that decided by something rather chosen at random, something no individual present could be imagined to have the faintest idea about. For instance, the supervisor sought information from the latest available weather map registering the present temperature in Tokyo. That random figure was chosen to decide one part of the shuffling. Now, would it make any difference to the score of the "precognitive guesser" if he *did* at least know that figure for the parting of the deck? Maybe. Who can tell? At least those who made the rules for a randomization of the cards must have feared that even a little piece of information like that could improve the guesser's chance a tiny little bit.

It is almost as if we see in front of us the picture of a sneaking cheater, raising his head inquisitively to see if he could get an ever so little flair of some secret leaking out and thus providing for him a one thousandth part of a point to improve his score figure. Now, however, the worry is excluded. For who among these test subjects could be assumed to have the slightest notion of the temperature in Tokyo on that particular day?

You shake your head. Could detailed knowledge of that kind be supposed to be of any material help to any partaker in that curious game of guessing?

Well, *if* it does, then suddenly the completely changed situation I have suggested would also affect the precaution needs quite noticeably. What change of the situation am I speaking about?

Please remember: the entirely new alternative (my so-

called third alternative) places us all in front of an entirely new situation. The test controllers (supervisors) have suddenly become aware of an entirely new "public" they must finally come to grips with--that is, possibilities of fraud, active cheaters whom they had never taken into consideration before. You know whom I am speaking about, namely, an invisible crowd of highly qualified master cheaters! It is no longer the "normal" (human) type of cheaters. It is a non-human "paranormal" type. A formidable legion of hitherto unexpected fellow players in the game have suddenly entered upon the scene.

Only now a hitherto ignored question also enters upon the agenda of the control personnel. What kind of information service can one assume that there is available to this "new" group of possible fraud perpetrators? Could they, for instance, be assumed to have just as scanty a notion of the temperature in Tokyo as the examined precognition candidates have?

This ought to remind you disquietingly about the "ESP test arranger," Croesus of Lydia. He did take it for granted that the oracle in Delphi could not have any normal access to factual information about the secret things *he* was busying himself with, far, far away in his "laboratory" in the royal castle of Sardis. Did he have a logical right to take this for granted? He himself did think so. And even the history writer, Herodotus, seems to think along the same line. Therefore, they were also, both of them, so boundlessly impressed by what really happened.

*Parapsychology, a Science Without Any Knowledge
about the God of the Bible--and with a Scant Knowledge*

Even About Man, the Incurable Self-Deluder

It fills me with regret--and sometimes with direct anguish--that I should not have any happier interpretation to launch than the tragic one I have called the third alternative. For that can hardly be a pleasant one to hear about among members of certain scientific guilds. It is not either an occasion for particular pleasure to our generation as a whole--or to myself as a poor human being, even a Western specimen of the species. But I have laid upon the table all I have got. If anybody has a more humanly edifying version--which at the same time takes care of all the facts that have to be taken into account--then I should like very much to hear about it.

Some of my readers will perhaps feel: "What a melodramatic expression of pessimism about the cultural heritage of the Western world!" Could it really be true that the precognition issue, and the entire science of the occult, merit being taken that seriously?

Well, if you by the somewhat ironical word "melodrama" mean an exaggeratedly dramatic "hanging out" of certain men who failed to be cautious enough in their scientific evaluation of a spiritualism in the process of making its devastating march forward along a broad front, then I am afraid your irony is misplaced. For this has been an attitude bordering on the light-minded.

I admit that there has been failure on my part, as well. But then that is in a direction you hardly realize: I have failed miserably in my task of showing you, with words sufficiently simple and efficient, a major tragedy in our time. I just have not succeeded in pointing out the way I ought to, with the full spectrum of destiny-laden

implications, the sinister contours of a drama now taking place. I have come miserably short in my effort to demonstrate essential aspects of this tragic happening in the glaring light that reality would demand. My words just do not measure up to the dimensions those events are adopting in our world today.

At any rate, I cannot conclude this part of my book, dealing with precognition and its position in present-day research, without coming back to the last sentence I quoted from Isaiah 41. To me this is the resounding voice of heaven crying down to earth, planet in rebellion,--a shout re-echoing down through the millennia, and reaching its climax just at the time when a particularly rebellious procession of self-appointed god-men have accelerated the pace of their march forward, a historically unique procession. Only God's majestic voice remains the same:

"Declare to us the things to come, tell us what the future holds, so we may know you are gods." Isaiah 41:22, 23.

The defying challenge is exactly the same pointed one as in the days of yore. For this is still the Lord of hosts, hurling out the same solemn question: What is holy and divine? What is profane and self-sufficiently human? Is there any marked distinction between the Creator and the created?

Into the category of those created ones, the demons (the fallen angels) also, of course, must be relegated. True, the above challenge of Isaiah 41 is, in the first place, God's jeering scorn against the idols and against the ridiculous ignominy of idolatry, even right in the midst of a hypocritical Israel. Those "gods" are no gods at all. They have no knowledge whatever, least of all knowledge of the

future (boastful precognitive faculties)!

Well, you may say, there is one thing that could hardly ever happen to us culturally well-advanced men of the present era: We would never think of anything as foolish as worshipping idols, images of stone or carved wood. The chapters of Isaiah deal with idols and ancient idolatry. They may hit ancient Israel pretty hard. But they do not hit you and me. We just are not that unintelligent and downright foolish.

Evidently you are not aware of the way the Bible looks upon idolatry. Then perhaps the apostle Paul can put you straight. He helped many of his contemporaries get rid of their ignorance and their fateful misunderstandings: having idols in one's life simply means putting something else--in fact, anything in the world--in the place of the living God. Thus, any kind or degree of materialism immediately becomes idolatry. And that is not all. The relationship is a good deal more far-reaching and saturated with excitement than that. Please read at once the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 10:

"Do I mean then that the sacrifice offered to an idol is anything, or that an idol is anything? No, but the sacrifices of pagans are offered to *demons*, not to God, and I do not want you to be participants with demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons too." I Cor. 10:19-21 (emphasis supplied).

Does it begin to dawn on our minds what it is we are having the sensational experience of getting involved in? It is once more pure spiritism; it is simply demon worship, the final end of all humanistic self-sufficiency and egocentric pride. There is no way of getting around this,

apart from God's way marked out clearly by the Word. Barren humanism, such as it reveals itself in the bragging pride of precognition philosophy, or any other case of super-self-sufficient human research, is apt to lead mankind right down the precipice of actual *Satan worship*. For you and me there just does not exist any hideout you can sneak into for "another alternative."

Who Tells There is a Spark of Divinity in Man?

The searching question that God, through his prophet Isaiah, directs to humankind, with its superabundance of humanistic self-worship today, could also be paraphrased as follows:

"Do you really imagine that you are gods? What is this fantastic anthropology you have imbibed by the middle eighties of the 20th century? What is man, really? When was the evidence given that man can foresee the future, overcome all hurdles of a creature, regarding time and space?"

Now, ancient Platonism--that is a historic certainty--did cling, convulsively, to the idea that the human soul has an inborn spark of divinity in it. Is not that a pretty vain postulate to build one's anthropology upon? So why should not we, ultra-occidental heirs of Plato, entertain an inspiring hope in our deepest beings that this "divine spark" may some day flare up to become a fireworks spectacle of something exactly as advanced as inborn precognition? What better symbol could ever be found for a final explosion (a micro-cosmos big bang) into the glory of absolute divinity?

The master demon himself, "the old serpent," originally

Lucifer, the Son of the Morning, gradually came to distinguish himself as a generator of mental explosions of exactly that self-deifying kind. But do we recognize the arch-titan's ego cry, roared into the depths of a listening universe:

"I will ascend to the heaven. I will raise my throne above the stars of God. I will sit enthroned on the mount of assembly, on the utmost height of the sacred mountain. I will ascend above the tops of the clouds. I will make myself like the Most High." Isaiah 14:13, 14.

Notice what personal pronoun repeats itself five times. I - I - I - I - I! What monotonous tone is that? In my ears it does not sound much different from what I experience coming from Duke University, the center of American ESP research. This is just ultra-occidental humanism's boasting stentorian voice, broadcasting superman's latest triumphs.

In the book of Isaiah, Holy Writ has proclaimed, with its own clarion voice, an entirely opposite message. Man and all other creaturely beings are categorically put in their right place. This is the Lord of hosts Himself, letting His message resound like thunderbolts. It is the same thunder echoing and re-echoing down through all known ages of human history. Just in the book of Isaiah it takes the formulation of ironical defiance, which ought to shake the lives of proud titans, even in the end-time century, with a crushing effect:

"Present your case, says the Lord. Set forth your arguments, says Jacob's King. Bring in your idols to tell us what is going to happen.... So we may know you are gods." (Isa. 41:21-23)

And then the unheard of thing does happen, just in this

20th century of the Christian era, the most insolent of all eras. Man gives tit-for-tat in behalf of the idols he is constantly carrying around in his bosom. The answer comes in a way that has never happened before. The titan has the unbelievable cheekiness of accepting the defiance without flinching. He seems to be looking the divine Challenger straight in the eye, his visor daringly open. Tauntingly he says his say with the rare nerve of 20th century self-assertion in Western research centers. A science of evidently unprecedented self-assurance has made its entry among men. Its purposive activity is happening in broad daylight. It publishes its findings in respectable scholarly journals. The interpretation of the findings is performed with the calm deliberation and the natural toughness that only an exceedingly titanic haughtiness can marshal:

"Here you are," says man, throwing his documents on the table. "This is our latest conclusive evidence. Now everyone can see for himself. Prophecy is simply part and parcel of the deepest essence, built within every one of us. So, Israel's God is finally going to get the answer His own formulation has evidently been bargaining for: We *are* gods. True, we do not customarily formulate it in that unpolished way. We are far more academically aristocratic in our formulations, more modestly objective also. But that solemn 'Lord of hosts' with all His Hebraic pathos, should rather be getting it presented in the uncouth way He seems to want it. So, briefly stated, if the ability to look into the future without help from any external source is a divine attribute, then *we are gods*."

Part III

Chapter 32 A Dumbfounding Look into the Reality of a Rather Uncanny World

At last, I insist on overwhelming you with arguments you just cannot flee away from. It is essential to corroborate one's theories with practical data, making them invincible. In a world invaded by spiritism and utter delusion, this is particularly important. So I would just like to share with you some experiences one of my most sober-minded colleagues has had in his life in his dramatic fight against spiritism. His name is Roy Allan Anderson. He still has that commanding authority in his voice that will help to convince you. And it is real events he is speaking about. You might even be anxious afterwards to visit him for closer details.

As a preacher of the gospel of salvation from all evil forces through Jesus Christ, Roy happened to have many a scuffle with, for instance, one man, or rather with the secret forces fighting behind this man. Those forces "behind the scenes" were putting up a pretty tough show--not for the purpose of saving the man's life, but visibly in order to prevent his salvation. This is the battle swinging back and forth that Roy Allan Anderson describes in the introduction to his captivating story.

By and large, I shall render that story in the first person, just the way Pastor Anderson formulates it. Afterwards, I am going to analyze the report in the light of what we have already, theoretically, arrived at. What the storyteller describes is the drama-filled encounter he had with a fellow man who had permitted himself to tamper with the occult. Quite early in his life he had sought familiar company with

the spirits. How dreadfully far he had advanced along this path into the unknown wilderness, at the time when our story takes its beginning, is a fact of which you will have an eerie grasp very soon. Just listen to the wild words he hurls at the pastor.

"I'm through with God!" he shouted as I stepped into his office. "I don't want you here. In fact, I don't want to see you again--ever! I'm through!"

Strange words from a friend, especially when we had been so close. I had always been welcomed into his office, but not that morning. What had gone wrong? What had changed his attitude?

I soon discovered the reason. He had just returned from a spiritualistic séance, the first he had attended for many years. To him it was unfortunate that I arrived just at that moment. He was still reveling in the aftereffects of his conversation with an important apparition, a "Pharaoh" of ancient Egypt. The atmosphere was tense. This was a showdown, and we both knew it!

The first time I met this city official and his family was at a large evangelistic meeting. I was in New Zealand at that time, and at that meeting I had spoken on "The Bible as the Word of God." This man and his wife and three daughters made themselves known to me, and invited me to visit them at their hilltop home. I was happy to go. They were very friendly, and before long they looked upon me as "one of the family."

Not only the father and the mother, but also the three girls, studied the Bible eagerly with me. From the very first, however, I noticed something unusual about that father; he never seemed completely at ease when

we touched the question of death and the resurrection. Later I learned that he had been a member of an important spiritualistic circle and for years had practiced clairvoyance, even serving as a medium. But that was twenty-five years before. Since then he had never attended a spiritualistic meeting or a séance.

He was an important figure in that city. He had never been a Christian; and when I met him, he seemed to be entirely irreligious. When I got closer to him, I learned he had a constant companion--a "familiar spirit," as the Bible terms it. Leviticus 19:31. It claimed to be a female spirit, and while not visible to anyone else, yet that power was there continually, I later learned. She called herself "Nancy," and was as real to him as any member of his family. She was tall, with long, flowing tresses.

He rarely made a decision without consulting that spirit, and remarkably, he got his answers. If he needed a direct Yes or No, he would quietly appeal to this spirit entity and his hand would be lifted six or eight inches from the desk and the number of thumps would indicate the decision. When once that power took control neither he nor anyone else could hold that arm still. He was no weakling; on the contrary, he stood about six feet four in height. He was well-built, and weighed 225 pounds. In his younger days he had been a champion heavyweight boxer. Apart from those rather simple responses from "Nancy," spiritualism apparently played no part in his life.

"Familiar Spirit" Turns Enemy

During those twenty-five years he encountered no problem with the spirits, but when once he began to study the Bible, things changed rapidly. Of course, he was well acquainted with unseen powers; but he came to know that such powers are not all from God. Some are definitely evil. Learning what the Bible says on this subject, he decided to have nothing more to do with spirits.

Once having made his decision, he began to encounter real opposition. The first came from the spirit "Nancy." When she failed to turn him against the Bible, a whole group of spirits united to withstand him. Still he and his family continued to study the Word of God. Sometimes we studied together late into the night.

Before long the spirits began to oppose me personally, first by argument, then by physical force. One night as we finished our study of the twelfth chapter of Revelation, the spirits said to him: "What you have been discussing here tonight is all wrong. We have the key to the whole situation, and we give you this as the symbol." With those words a large key, nearly eight inches long, fell to the floor from apparently nowhere. All were startled. Then one of the girls reached over and picked it up. No one had ever seen it before.

On another occasion, an apparition appeared in the form of the family's pet dog, a champion fox terrier, which had recently died. For years the husband and father had bred champions. And when that sharp-nosed little creature jumped up on his lap in the accustomed way, the family was, of course, deeply impressed. But

by that time they all knew something of the deceptive power of the spirit world. What seemed almost overwhelming evidence of survival after death, they knew was just another effort by evil spirits to deceive. Apparitions in the form of animals are not uncommon, as we shall notice later.

Many strange things happened during the next few months, for the battle was growing more intense. Sometimes as I left that home the spirits would say: "We will get rid of Anderson tonight on his way home." And they often tried! More than once I have felt the stranglehold of unseen hands clutching my throat and forcing me to the ground. There is no question in one's mind concerning the existence of invisible powers when he is faced with such experiences as these.

I knew I was wrestling "not against flesh and blood," as the apostle Paul said, but "against wicked spirits in high places." Ephesians 6:12, margin. How wicked these spirits really are I came to realize when, for example, that father, moved by one of them, grasped his seventeen-year-old daughter by the throat and with fingers of steel began choking her to death. Usually he was the embodiment of kindness. But on this occasion he flew into a rage because she had said the Bible was indeed the Word of God and the only safe guide. Sensing her danger, I stepped forward and in the name of Jesus Christ commanded him to release her. His grip relaxed immediately.

The Piano Played of Its Own Accord

For months I studied the Bible with that New

Zealand family. In fact, I lived with the family for three months while my wife and little son were visiting loved ones in Australia. It gave me an eerie feeling to hear, as I did many times, that father pass my door in the middle of the night and go down the stairway to the living room. I knew why he was going. It was to hold a private séance. And when he got there, the piano would usually start playing of its own accord. He was no musician; he did not know one note from another, but the piano played by itself. It was always the same song, about Polly who died and was now looking down from heaven.

The months I spent as a guest in that home were pleasurable in most ways, but also a real strain. To battle with evil powers for the soul of a man, and sense the struggle becoming more intense with every passing week, is something one would not willingly choose. We worshiped together each day, and it was a joy to see those dear folk taking hold of God's Word.

After my wife and little son returned from Australia and we were back in our own home again, I was awakened one morning about five o'clock by a voice which spoke as clearly and distinctly as any I have ever heard. The words were those of our Lord Himself: "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting."

At once I recognized this as a call from God. I awakened my wife, and we prayed earnestly. We both were convinced that God wanted me to visit this man in his office. His work in that city was akin to that of a magistrate and was particularly concerned with pensions. He was a well-respected citizen, and his

office was in the heart of the business section.

The "White Wings of Egypt"

Before going to see him, I stopped at the office of a doctor friend, in whose prayers I had occasion to have real confidence. We had prayed through many situations before. So, while his patients waited, I related to him the happenings of that morning. Together we sought God's help for whatever lay ahead.

When I arrived at this man's office, so familiar to me, he blurted out: "Anderson, what are you doing here? I don't want to see you again--ever!" He had a look of hatred in his eyes. As already mentioned, he was a massively built man, and as a police officer and a detective he had been trained to brook no argument from anyone. Now he was demon-possessed, and he looked it!

"I'm through with God," he shouted.

"But God is not through with you," I replied.

"Why should I bother with God? I have the highest honor that can ever come to a man," he said.

"What is that?" I asked.

"I have the 'White Wings of Egypt,'" he said sneeringly. "And no harm can ever come to me. The spirits have assured me that I can go anywhere, and my life is perfectly safe."

Then with a fiendish chuckle he told how he had gone to a spirit medium early that morning. He related how he had commanded the medium to bring up for him one of the ancient "Pharaohs," calling him by name. The medium became alarmed and begged to be

excused, for she said: "You evidently belong to a higher circle of spirits from those I know, and the one you are calling is very high. Please, don't use me--go to someone else."

For the moment he became the old police officer, and demanded obedience. She was soon in a trance. When the "Pharaoh" apparition appeared, he claimed to have a special message for him. "You must stop studying the Bible," the "Pharaoh" ordered. "I have greater truth than that old obsolete book."

During that séance this man also communed with another spirit purporting to be his first wife, who had died more than twenty years earlier. To prove her identity this apparition rubbed a handkerchief across his hands, laden with perfume--the same perfume he had given his bride on the night of their wedding. And I can testify that when I met him a few minutes later his hands exuded perfume in such quantity that the office was filled with the odor. Of course some doubter will say he had the perfume in his office all the time. But none who have had experience with unseen powers will find cause for doubt.

When that spirit interview came to a close, the "Pharaoh" conferred on him the covering of the "White Wings of Egypt," saying, "This is a special honor. The highest honor we can ever give to a human being and it comes to you with the blessing of all ancient Egypt."

When that man came back to his office, he was elated. His whole countenance was changed. Just then I arrived and walked straight in, as usual.

But things were not as usual. He was belligerent and

wanted nothing to do with me or with God. Here was a desperate situation and it presented a real challenge. There sat my friend, the one in whose home I had spent months in happy fellowship as we studied the Word of God together. Now he was far from God, blaspheming His name, and defiantly ordering me out of his office. Repeatedly he shouted: "I'm through with God."

What could I do? Should I leave as he had ordered me, or should I defy the spirits? I moved closer to him and, putting my hand on his shoulder, took an old Bible from the shelf in his office. It was the one he used when individuals were required to give information under oath.

An Astounding Answer

I moved slowly, for I was lifting my heart silently to God in prayer. I fingered the pages for a moment, and then in a strange way that Bible seemed to open naturally at the thirtieth chapter of Isaiah. I began to read aloud: "Woe to the rebellious children, said the Lord, that take counsel, but not of Me; and that cover with a covering, but not of My Spirit, that they may add sin to sin: that walk to go down into Egypt, and have not asked at My mouth; to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt! Therefore shall the strength of Pharaoh be your shame, and the trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion." Isaiah 30:1-3.

He jumped up, grabbed the Bible out of my hand, and shouted: "That's not there--you're making it up!"

"It *is* there," I replied. "Read it yourself."

He took the Bible in his trembling hands and reread those verses aloud. Then he slumped back into his chair as if struck.

Kindly but firmly I said, "Dad,"--for that's what I called him--"the road you have taken is the road to confusion and ultimate destruction, and you know it. You are putting your trust in the 'shadow of Egypt.' You are boasting of a covering, the 'White Wings of Egypt.' You know this is not of God's Spirit; it is the spirit of the devil. In doing this you are adding sin to sin."

He was silent. While he looked wistfully into my face, I read these words in the next chapter. "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; ... but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord!" Isaiah 31:1.

He looked very solemn. He stepped from his desk and walked over to the door, locking it so that we would not be interrupted. Then, looking into my eyes, he said: "What shall I do?"

I said: "Let us pray to God for forgiveness and deliverance."

We did. We offered up earnest prayers that day in his office, and I saw that man claim the victory. It was marvelous to witness his turning from darkness to light. But I was confident the great deceiver would not give up without a struggle. During the next few days some of us who were close friends of this man fasted and prayed that full deliverance might come to him.

Spirits' Last Desperate Attempt

Some weeks later, following a wonderful day of

worship, I felt impressed to go and see this man, for he had absented himself from church that day. I took a friend with me, a courageous man who had been decorated for gallantry as an airman in the war. Before going up to the house we prayed, and then I phoned to say we were coming. The wife met us at the door and led us into the living room. As soon as I entered, I sensed that things were anything but reassuring, for there sat our friend in silent communion with the spirits. I had seen him on other occasions sitting on the davenport talking to his spirit friend, "Nancy," He spoke no words. It was thought communion.

We waited a few minutes; then, beginning our conversation in a casual strain at first, I tried to open up the question we wanted to discuss with him. That very day the church had decided to ask his wife to serve as a deaconess. As soon as I mentioned that, his attitude changed. He became adamant, and for an hour and a half he opposed everything we suggested. Seeing we were getting nowhere, I rose to leave. In doing so, however, I said: "I have never left this home without having prayer, and I do not intend to tonight. Let us kneel together."

This took him somewhat off guard. Naturally he was in no mood to pray, but out of respect he cooperated. He had the same leering smirk that I had seen at other times when he had been communing with spirits. In our family worships this man always knelt at a certain place in that room, using the piano stool for support. I suggested that he do so again. He did, but reluctantly.

Then I asked the friend I had brought to pray. Scarcely had he begun when I sensed something was wrong. My friend seemed hardly able to speak. I knew what it was, for I, myself, was passing through the same experience. We were being "pressured" by an unseen power. It is a harrowing experience to feel every inch of one's body under pressure, which becomes stronger every moment. We could scarcely breathe, much less speak.

Then the door opened of its own accord and in came a huge apparition, appearing as a knight in shining armor and holding aloft an upturned Turkish scimitar. At the sight, my friend, this powerfully built former police officer and leader of a detective squad, sprang from his place. Throwing one arm around his wife's neck and the other around mine, he clung to us, trembling like a frightened child!

The situation was desperate, for this spirit threatened to kill him. Summoning all the strength I could, I challenged, "In the name of Jesus Christ, I command the devils to leave this house at once."

What followed was terrific! Never before or since have I heard anything like it. Hell seemed to be let loose! Windows rattled, doors slammed, and the whole house shook as if by an earthquake. We heard shrieking and yelling. The house rocked, but we remained on our knees until at last the uproar ceased. The calm that followed was as impressive as the tumult before.

As we rose from our knees, we looked at each other in amazement. That man's look of terror was gone, but he was still shaking. Now he knew that God was there,

in the very place which had been rattled by the powers of hell. He also knew that the power of Jesus Christ is far greater than that of Satan.

Power in the Name

To call upon the name of Jesus for protection and then feel the viselike grip of the enemy relax is tremendous. More than a year passed, however, before my friend was really free. I know that spiritualists will say that those opposing powers were "bad spirits," but that the "good spirits" can be trusted, for they protect and never harm. That is exactly what this man himself believed when first we met. For remember: he, too, had been a leading spiritualist. But he soon discovered, as thousands of others have, that even the so-called "good spirits" of the occult are deceivers. They will use their powers against the very ones who once paid them homage. (*Secrets of the Spirit World*, Roy Allan Anderson, Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1966, pp. 1-9)

What are we to make of all of this? Are these things just the product of excited minds? Or mere fancy? Who are these beings which at times appear? This is our quest in the following chapters.

Chapter 33 A Striking Illustration for a Valid Interpretation of Occult Phenomena in This Last Generation

I have rendered this much of Roy Allan Anderson's account introducing his booklet, *Secrets of the Spirit World*, just because it throws such a glaring light upon details of the interpretation philosophy we have already discussed both theoretically and practically.

I have made a bold attack against the interpretation that present-day spiritualism gives of phenomena both in the séance rooms of active mediums and in the laboratories of famous universities. Parapsychological research, unfortunately, has manifested a most regrettable one-sidedness in its treatment of the spiritist's contentions. They have allowed themselves to be overly impressed by outward appearances.

True, there were some researchers, among the old stock I have mentioned, who entertained serious hesitations about the spiritualist dogma, pretending that deceased human spirits manifest themselves.

Those hesitations were highly justified, not only because the spiritualist interpretation quite generally annihilates every vision of totality (namely monism as a fundamental principle of all previous realistic science), but also--and this ought to have a more convincing effect than any theoretical consideration--simply because of the most dubious conduct, ethically as well as intellectually, observers have had to note down regarding those "deceased ones," again and again.

*An "Apologetical" Argument in Favor of the
Verisimilitude of Such Mischievous Behavior in the
"Human" Spirits on the Other Side of the Grave*

I have taken a logical stance to the argument spiritualists, ever so often, try to advance in order to reestablish their shaky standpoint. Essentially, this is the same argument our friend, the police inspector, availed himself of in order to save the logics of his adopted theory: "You must distinguish, of course, between good and evil individuals among the deceased, as well as among the living. Individuals have different slants everywhere."

The spirits he himself had to do with, for instance, his dear female counselor "Nancy," were, of course, exclusively good-natured--nothing to fear from those quarters!

Just how "far" that "goodness" of his familiar spirit "Nancy" could be stretched, this appeared quite clearly at the very moment that her "protégé" himself entered into an informative program of his own, a program of *Biblical* information about human nature and human destiny. Was there any reaction on "her" part against his "willful" determination to seek new sources of counsel and spiritual orientation? I am, of course, referring to his sudden "fad," consisting in turning to the Word of God for this anthropological knowledge. The fellow had actually already gotten "dangerously" close to discovering the "strange" conclusion of Biblical philosophy, implying that body and soul are just two sides of the same reality, and can never, either logically or practically, be separated. In other words, the man was at the very "brink" of discovering that

death is death, period!

His new philosophical insight was about to become just a bit too realistic to suit "Nancy's" purposes. If death is identical with itself, then it is not identical with its very opposite, namely life. One of the first rules of basic logic is that A is *not* not-A. Since "she" is not willing to share with him these fundamental principles, for the first time in his life he has a serious misgiving that the characteristic of the spirits is to be regular cheats. He was in the process of getting to know a hitherto unknown world, a world of demonic darkness. He began to take the natural consequence of this insight, turning elsewhere for instruction and advice. And just at that moment something happened. Then, and only then, did he get into trouble of all kinds with his "good-natured spirit."

This is not an isolated phenomenon. Oh no, the rule never fails. A world of infamous devilry is put in operation with the obvious intention of neutralizing--or brutally knocking down--the dawning knowledge of a new philosophy, a philosophy of rock-bottom reality, conducted by the Editor in Chief of Holy Writ, the Rock of Ages, Jesus Christ.

Is That Open Enmity Against the Scriptures a Consistent Attitude on the Part of Spiritualism?

By no means. Such rigid uniformity would appear as poor diplomacy in spirit circles. Contemporary Christendom is not all that irreconcilable to spiritualism. So it would be a foolish strategy on the part of spiritualism to have a head-on collision with an ally as benign as that. The real life and death battle spiritism is having with the Bible

and Christianity is a reality that is being camouflaged at all costs. The present rule in certain circles is, on the contrary, that spiritism actually poses as very Christianity. The forces of darkness register a greater success than ever before, just in their untiring efforts of erasing from modern man's consciousness every contour of a distinction between those two world religions.

But What, Then, is the True Attitude of Most Prominent Spiritualists Today toward Basic Christianity?

People should get to know what the most outstanding leaders of contemporary spiritualism do express as their opinion about Christianity proper. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930), apparently, did not have any qualms in expressing his frank opinion on the topic. He said that the doctrines of spiritualism and the basic teachings of the Christian Church have no chance whatever of arriving at mutual harmony.

Since I do not find the liberal theologians of our own churches to be anywhere as frank about what they dislike in conservative Christianity, I find a source of exquisite information about our own deepest position in what straightforward spiritualists have uttered:

"The organized Spiritualist does not accept vicarious atonement nor original sin, and believes that a man reaps what he sows, with no one but himself to pull out the weeds." *Wanderings of a Spiritualist*, pp. 24, 25.

Here you have the pagan-humanistic Self-Sufficiency pattern in a nutshell. It is what Plato calls *Autarkeia*, the great self-containment ideal, for gods and men. In the periodical *Cosmopolitan* for January 1918 that same

looming giant among contemporary spiritualists, Conan Doyle, establishes as a sort of foundation of faith for ultra-modern spiritism the following principles:

"One can see no justice in the *vicarious sacrifice*, nor in the God who could be placated by such means. Above all, many cannot understand such expressions as the 'redemption from sin,' 'cleansed by the blood of the lamb,' and so forth. Never was there any evidence of a fall. But if there was no fall, then what became of the atonement, of the redemption, or original sin, or a large part of Christian mystical philosophy?" (*Cosmopolitan*, January 1918, p. 69)

This is traditional pagan humanism, no better, no worse. We recognize that this is down-rating a category of justice that the Bible's fundamental Christian faith calls the ***righteousness of the Lamb***.

Do you feel so dead certain, however, that the leading professors of religion in your own church's universities have ideas diverging from those expressed by the frank spiritualist, Arthur Conan Doyle? I could prove to many that they are sadly mistaken. For I have gotten to know facts of even some of my closest colleagues that have sometimes scared me out of my wits. I have asked myself: How long am I going to keep quiet about these facts, just having my attention diverted from the darkest aspects of my own environment, by rather heaping blame on avowed and outspoken spiritualists? I feel that this matter has now taken dimensions that force me to make the anti-realism growing up like mushrooms in my own garden, a topic for more general discussion.

*Scandal of Scandals Among Us Human Beings, An Idea
Amazing Us with Its Enormity: the Idea of the Lamb*

I am now first going to show you something exactly that instinctive about the aversion against the ideas of "Lamb righteousness," as a frank spiritualist expresses it. Here, then, it is given the crass formulation of an avowed anti-Christian. Very frank indeed.

Some of these straightforward free thinkers start out, it is true, by saying some quite nice things about Jesus of Nazareth and His role in world history. But they invariably end up rejecting Him as an incurable dreamer, and therefore, in the ultimate effect, an arch-deceiver. Here is the characteristic given by Sir Oliver Lodge (1851-1940), well-known British scientist and spiritualist at the same time:

"I believe the Christ is a great and wonderful personality. He was sent to be man's example for all time ... and to prove the individual continuity of life after death. But he did not come to save men from the results of their sins." *Claud's Book*, p.41.

Again, it is the idea about the atoning death of the innocent Lamb that offends the "free" thought of the "free thinker." That idea becomes the scandal of scandals. Natural man, after the catastrophic event of the fall, has constantly taken offense whenever confronted by that idea. And I shall show you clearly that it is not exclusively avowed free thinkers that are scandalized. You may observe the reaction clearly all the way down from the day of Cain, right in the midst of "Christian" families. The solemn instructions about the Lamb were immediately felt as a jumble of childish nonsense--nay, as the perversion above

all perversions. Imagine the *ineffable idea of an innocent One, dying in the place of the guilty one!* To Biblical theology, of course, this is the only way out; in fact, the *Way* above all ways.

But what I now have the duty to inform you about is something you would hardly believe about modern theologians, maybe your own favorite theologian in some prestigious "division of religion" of your own favorite university.

Well, you object stubbornly, I am sure you won't find anything in my super-fundamentalist Christian denomination having any resemblance with what was pronounced by Conan Doyle, the outstanding British spiritualist:

"One can see no justice in the vicarious sacrifice, nor in the God who could be placated by such means."

Well, I am afraid that this kind of theological reasoning--and, in fact, *general human feeling*--is not as rare as you seem to think.

The apostle Paul writes in a most interestingly revealing way about this unique idea God has had of communicating His righteousness to sinful men. Quoting Isaiah 64:4, he speaks just about something incredible that God "has prepared" before any man had the faintest idea about it. It is something so fantastic that, according to the Gospel prophet Isaiah,

"since ancient times no one has heard, no ear has perceived, no eye has seen."

What was this unheard-of thing that "never entered into the mind of men" (I Corinthians 2:9)? Sometimes we think of it as the material beauties God has prepared for re-

created men in the Paradise Regained. And that is certainly an application of the text wonderfully appropriate. But you will easily discover that the main thing here alluded to, as unheard of and fantastic, is *the plan of salvation!* The text in Isaiah stresses God as the unique One. He is the almost unbelievably *creative* One. For He actually managed to find a way of re-creating sinful man. In the Bible, you see, that man is realistically described as a *dead* man. And such a one is not easily made alive again.

And now what about the method followed in order to realize that re-creation? This is the most unheard-of of all. To man, as we know him today, it is a baffling surprise. And, watch out now, it is not necessarily always a *pleasant* surprise, far from it. Oh no, you should rather be in the group to which Paul counts himself as belonging, in order to find it enjoyable. In fact, you *must* be in Paul's company in order to have an experience of that wonder under any circumstances. But if you do meet those conditions, then you can enjoy the great unique thing already now. In the continuation of that passage about "what no man has conceived," you see, Paul speaks clearly about living men and women in his own day. And certainly those had not yet been brought back to the literal and tangible Paradise of God. Still it says:

"But God has revealed it to *us* [already] by His Spirit."

What has He revealed? The incredible plan of salvation, the unique way in which it is possible for men to be made righteous, saved from their sins, so as to render them actual partakers of God's own perfect righteousness.

And now what is the very grit of that methodological secret? It is the *idea of the Lamb!*

We can understand why Paul thought it necessary for the Holy Spirit Himself to intervene in order to bring this idea home to the limited intellect of ordinary men. The thing is too amazing for anything less than that level of communication. Just look at average men in any part of the earth, and at any epoch of history. Among them there has proved to be one peculiar reaction to the release of such news about God's way of salvation. "What a strange idea, this one about the innocent Lamb of God, taking upon Himself the sin of the world!"

"What a scandalous idea." That is man's immediate response. "What a disgustingly unpalatable way of restoring righteousness! What an absurd plan on the part of God."

So I can quite well understand the spiritist Conan Doyle's reaction. I can also understand his fellow believer, Converse E. Nickerson, prominent minister in the ranks of modern spiritualism. He writes as you could expect it of any humanist whose natural great ideal is self-sufficiency and self-salvation. "Within the compass of consciousness dwells all our hope of eternal life. Such a life cannot be bought with the idle tenets of a religion, based on an appeasement figured in a blood atonement of an innocent man. Crafty theologians of the early day which immediately followed the closing life of the master of Nazareth--called the Christ--seized upon the dramatic setting of Calvary to proclaim Jesus the 'atoning sacrifice' whose shed blood would blot out all our iniquities." *The Summit of Spiritual Understanding*, p. 4.

I shall say spiritualism knows its foe number one. That is Jesus Christ. Small wonder, then, that spiritists loath like

the pest that capital document witnessing about Him, the Bible, the Book from heaven, adhering to an opposite philosophy, that of stern realism.

That spiritualist writer could not write differently, could he? For like all other spiritualists he agrees with Conan Doyle:

"Never was there any evidence of a fall. But if there was no fall, then what became of the atonement, of the redemption from sin, or a large part of Christian mystical philosophy?" *Cosmopolitan*, January 1918, p. 69.

Strange that just toward the end of the First World War, a man should be particularly inspired to write about the non-existence of a fall. But, of course, spiritualists are not the only ones that believe in that non-existence. I wonder how many nominal Christians share their belief in this respect. At least an increasing number of our most popular teachers reveal themselves as faithful disciples of *Peter Abelard* (1079-1142), the greatest Eros humanist among the church fathers in the late middle ages. He invented something we shall have to pay much attention to very soon. It bears the strange name "*the moral influence theory*." I have had to put up a serious fight with some of my closest colleagues in theology and ethics, precisely on this topic. Does that mean that I understand them less than I understand regular spiritualists? No, not necessarily.

Chapter 34 Can Your Aversion and Mine, Against the Idea of the Lamb, Find a Plausible Explanation?

I do not say a justifiable reason or a realistic trend of thought. I am speaking about an understandable development in a specific historic environment, in one specific direction. Well, the explanation is to be found in the prevailing fundamental motif of your culture and mine. I have named this motif *autarkeia*, the urge of supreme *self-sufficiency*. The age-old designation of it in everyday life is *pride*. And now you will probably not dare to deny that pride, simple human haughtiness, is one of the most capriciously subjective emotions the world has ever known. When did it ever happen that people, suffering from a superabundance of that mental illness, distinguished themselves as particularly bent on finding logical foundations for their lives?

And now you may expect me to beat down, mercilessly, on the camp of pagans from the sublime heights of the Christian. That is by no means what I feel inspired to do. On the contrary, I have decided to keep my mouth shut for a long time about the anti-realism of our world's *non-Christian* circles. My sound self-criticism forces me to direct my present attack against the very fortress we Christians boast of as our own. You should know without fail that something mystical--even a mysticism of undreamed-of dimensions--has caused us Christians to adopt an attitude exactly as negative as declared pagans have, to the story of the Lamb in the Christian sense.

The "Wisdom" in Making "A Low Profile"

I know that my straightforwardness may cause me considerable trouble. Or perhaps the word "trouble" here is an understatement that only gives evidence of my incredible *naiveté*. As I speak with my associates these days, I hear them repeating, time and time again, certain phrases that seem to be the jargon of the day. They say, "Well, I for my part have made up my mind to make as low a profile as possible." My Norwegian friends have a similar expression: "Today I see to it that I keep 'very low in the terrain' (the landscape)."

I know that what I am going to say exposes me to a certain perilous position. I may not be sufficiently "low in the terrain." And then I never can tell what may happen to me, humanly speaking. Maybe the same thing that happened to Martin Luther King. He certainly did not always "keep a low profile." But maybe he just had his serious doubts about that "lowness." Maybe it is not at all a synonym for "lowliness," but rather for downright "baseness." And Christians should not be base, should they? No, neither in their thinking nor in their doing. So I am taking the chance.

A Fantastic "New" Dogma: The Moral Influence Theory

Believe me or not, the question some of our most learned and most well-established theologians in the Christian circle I belong to ask (of themselves and of their faithfully listening disciples) is this one: Was it actually strictly necessary that Jesus should *die* in order to save you and me? The answer they themselves give is a pretty

unambiguous *no*. "The good Lord could never be all that stingy, or downright unreasonable, in His thinking. Of course, He could have forgiven us our trespasses without all this disgusting, blood-dripping drama that human beings have put on the stage. What satisfaction could the infinitely loving Father, in His high heavens, derive from such barbarism, a meaningless spectacle that would not benefit any party in the business at hand."

In other words, where sin is already a regrettable fact, it could make no sense, they claim, that the "Redeemer" should literally *die* and go all the way down to the cruel pangs of that death as an inevitable necessity.

So why did the cruel thing still happen? Why did Jesus seem to "insist" on going that far down, and "pretend" to look upon it as a "*must*"?

Well, some will say, there could be one purpose only, a very extraordinary one. The shaking drama was destined to arouse in some onlookers a more complete understanding of Satan's wickedness and the total injustice of his shrewd accusations against God.

The ones described as "needing" this horrid spectacle, in order to be fully convinced about Christ's perfect innocence, include a quite varied and quite numerous host of creatures heartily invited to benefit from the show!

Usually the propounders of that "moral influence theory" mention, as "necessary beneficiaries," even a certain "neutral" group of distant spectators in this universe. Many angels had bravely guarded themselves against Lucifer's sophisticated and quite unfair accusations against God, once at the dawn of history, when he developed his plan of rebellion against his "Rival" Jesus

Christ. That was at the time when the Ruler of the universe was falsely accused of being unfair in His way of treating creatures endowed with freedom of thought. Now, after the crucifixion, they got to see for themselves how far the devil would permit himself to go in his blind hatred against the Son of God. This became the demonstration of satanic violence that decided that issue in the minds of those doubt-haunted onlookers.

Of course, there is much that strikes us as true and very meaningful in this exposé. And I can easily grasp the idea of something enormously beneficial in terms of the "moral influence" exerted on a host of spectators to the drama of Christ's crucifixion. But still, one serious question seems bound to remain, unabridged and ineluctable. That is the question suggested about those "superfluous" depths of suffering and about the literal death to which the Savior allegedly descended.

The historian of ideas will easily establish one interesting fact here. I cannot pass by that fact in utter silence. It was thanks to the dubious merits of an illustrious medieval theologian, *Peter Abelard*, that the theory of the excellent moral influence exerted by Jesus--thanks to His allegedly "superabundant" death--started to catch public attention among Christian theologians. And I can assure you that its moral implications do make themselves felt among that man's spiritual heirs even in the theological thinking of our present day.

Who, Then, Was Peter Abelard?

Was he a naive blockhead of the late Middle Ages? Oh no. *Naiveté* and medieval retardation of mind certainly

were not characteristics we could ascribe to that fellow. On the contrary, he distinguished himself as one of the brightest heads of all the scholastic bandwagon. The poor fellow schoolmen he mercilessly drove into a corner, in disputation after disputation, got to swallow more than they could ever enjoy of Peter's icy wits. But what, then, were the qualities particularly distinguishing that exceptional personality? I would say it was no small amount of *humanistic self-assurance*. At least that was true for the superb period of his life up to one sad turning point. I am referring to the moment when it was found out that this man, whom the church had doomed, like so many others with the same aspirations of a theological career, to a life of rigid celibacy, actually had for years and years indulged in a secret cohabitation with a woman whose name has become almost just as famous--or infamous--for a romantic liberalism otherwise little known by that age of history, even in a French environment. That was the incredible Héloïse, a truly exceptional woman, whom another humanistic Francophone libertine, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), has made still more famous--or still more infamous--in the France of modern times. I am referring to his book, *La nouvelle Héloïse*.

It should be mentioned that a cruel and most unfortunate accident happened to the poor man just about this time. His "father-in-law" went to an extreme step in his sudden anger at the disgraceful relationship Peter had carried on with his daughter. He had some husky fellows take hold of the culprit. They simply *castrated* him then and there.

It should also be mentioned in all fairness to Peter's memory, that after having suffered this disgraceful

misfortune, he revealed a humble and repentant attitude--in fact, a far more humble and repentant attitude than that of Héloïse, as far as we can judge from the famous correspondence between the two.

I do not either want to hint for one moment that Peter Abelard, even in his palmy days of exceptional prosperity, was necessarily *more* haughty or *more* humanistically self-sufficient, in *his* behavior, than you and I--or any boisterous and overbearing theological disputant you might like to compare him with in our own day and our own environment.

But what, then, is the unheard-of revolutionizing thing that here keeps intruding, seeking regular status right in the midst of our Christian congregations, perverting our central doctrines of justification and atonement?

*An Enormous Overturn of the Bible's Peculiar Notion of
What Has Come to be Called Justice*

Does it surprise you that I stake so much on making crystal clear to you one elementary fact: It is *pride* that drives us into our cardinal faithlessness toward Biblical realism. It would not be too much, under these circumstances, if we take a moment to have a good look, a thoroughly critical look, at a general concept for which we do, after all, have some basic respect in our lives.

We call it *justice* or *righteousness*. What we should investigate quite closely is your attitude and mine, as the born humanists we happen to be, and pride ourselves in being, *toward this grand thing we designate as justice*.

In one way it has to be admitted: Average human beings seem to have an impeccably positive attitude toward this

priceless value, at least as a general principle. And that general appearance is not necessarily delusive. The humanistic man--that is, you and I, as we idealistically comport ourselves in a public context--says, and apparently without any feint, "Of course I am 100 percent on the side of sturdy justice." Or as a certain pope once expressed himself with great emphasis, "I love justice and hate injustice." Do you imagine that you would find even one single politician of the somewhat normal stock, even today, who would openly express himself in favor of sheer *injustice*? Oh no, even the most crafty scoundrels among us would hardly give ourselves away with an openheartedness as insolent as that, would we?

And, nevertheless, here comes the remarkable thing. The tough pagan, deep down in you and me, goes on saying something so clearly hostile to all elementary Bible spirit that it must rather be relegated into the realm of anti-Christian rebellion. This pagan says, "There is one form of justice I cannot take!"

What form is that, if you please?

"Well," you say--and your voice may be trembling with anger as you say it, "it is the kind of justice insinuating, shamelessly, that the innocent one must suffer in the place of the guilty one. What a deadly idea!"

So this is where the thumb goes down, definitely and without mercy. Here is the category of justice we are not going to have anything to do with. No thanks, not in a civilized and decent country. Never, never! The verdict is clear and concise--whether it is pronounced among hardboiled materialists of the sternest atheistic Marxist caliber, or whomsoever you might otherwise prefer to

mention in the realm of more bourgeois-oriented ideologies. The imperturbable answer is, and remains, "*Nyet!*"

But tell me, then, my dear brother--What is, in the final analysis, that "disgusting form of righteousness" you and I insist on waging an implacable war against? It is simply the pattern of righteousness, the very means of justification, the God of the Bible has now for thousands of years offered to men, obviously as the only workable alternative, the only legal tender He has ever known, when it comes to a realistic way of salvation for sinners. And then you and I fling right into His face our insolent "*Nyet!*" to the offer. And yet we do not at all count ourselves among any radical group of idealistic human ethicists, and, least of all, among any revolutionary gang of rebellious atheists, do we?

What is the Gist of Our Disruptive Reasonings?

Along what peculiar lines is our thinking moving? Permit me to try to analyze calmly my own way of thinking in this conspicuous case. Evidently, all the time I do have a faint notion at least, that something or other must be wrong in my life. Somewhere along the line I must have bumped into something I can identify in one realistic way only. The word for it is *unrighteousness*. But what is that one thing I just cannot manage to accept as a possible way *out* of my unrighteousness? I cannot for the life of me bear the eventuality that ***another one*** shall carry the guilt in my stead. Who is that ***other one***? It is the ***innocent One***, briefly, the ***Lamb***, if I dare to take that strangely detestable Biblical name into my mouth again.

Why can't I bear that?

Well, we all seem to say in unison, isn't that the abominable miscarriage of justice that we Norwegians characterize as "*Executing the baker in the place of the smith*"? The ironical poet Johan Herman Wessel has done a thorough job teaching every Norseman how to express this in the perfect classical way.

I know it. And I know exactly how heavily pregnant with deep contempt that phrase of the ultimate "miscarriage" has grown in our language. It is a most genuine contempt of something meaningless, something vitiating in a most shameful way of the most despicable kind in the entire judicial system of any shamelessly backward country. Imagine what a macabre confusion of the roles in the lives of decent citizens: Since we have a blessed abundance of bakers in town, but just one smith, how could we think of having *him* executed, however clearly the verdict has been given that he is the murderer? Let one of the many bakers rather take his place as the guilty one.

Can you, toward this background, understand that curious feeling of a certain shame filling the hearts of even enlightened Christians when called upon to witness frankly and freely about what the Gospel says, perfectly unabashed, regarding Jesus Christ, namely that He actually--*and quite necessarily--died in your stead*? He *had* to do it in order to save us, nothing less than that!

This awareness of our own shortcomings as Christians should make us sympathetic and understanding toward non-Christians. For they must, of course, be particularly tempted to look upon Christ's vicarious death as a meaningless substitute. I can see the "point" they think they

have for regarding as a "dubious trick" this way of equipping man with a robe of righteousness he never earned for himself, something absolutely unworthy for ethically enlightened men--nay, a downright scandal!

What we see, then, is a chaotic condition of open rejection "*en bloc*" among men of what the Bible propounds as the Alpha and Omega of the doctrine of salvation, that is, the idea of the righteousness of the *Lamb*.

Is it still true that the realistic death of the Lamb is indispensable for imputing righteousness to man? I mean death with its full implications of total hopelessness, causing the Son of Man to cry out realistically: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Is this still, according to the Bible, the only reasonable and perfectly ethical way of restoring justice and meaningfulness? If so, then the theologians of the "moral influence theory" are fatefully wrong. And their rejection of the indispensable substitutionary death of the Lamb must be exactly like Cain's rejection. Now Cain, however, has gone down into the records of history as the first man stubbornly rejecting the Lamb. He rejected what God had claimed to be the only way back into full *satisfaction*. His followers stand out as the really unreasonable ones. They just *must*, according to the philosophy of heaven.

Cain--The "Only Truly Humane" Humanist

Most Bible readers today look upon Cain as a classical scoundrel, the first brother murderer in this world. But before his hate against his brother, and his hate against "the idea of the Lamb," came to full open fruition, he may have been looked upon in a very different way.

I sometimes divert myself assuming that Cain also had a little sister, a sweet and femininely tenderhearted little girl who looked up to her big brother Cain with genuine admiration. This is not too fanciful an assumption, is it? Now some day Cain might point this sensitive little girl to Abel's altar, saying: "Look, sweetheart, do you see what nasty things brother Abel is doing? There is, as you see, a dead little lamb on his altar. Look at the blood running down from its neck into its white wool, making it crimson red. Who do you think committed the violent act of cutting the throat of that innocent little creature? It was Abel. I feel so sorry for that lamb. Not for anything in the world would I have killed a cute little being like that. Now have a look at *my* altar. Don't you think it is a lot more decent, a lot more humane, to cut carrots and cabbages and burn those as a token of thankfulness to God?"

Do you think that little girl would have a lot of bad things to say about that bit of humanism she was here being acquainted with for the first time?

It is spiritualists of all philosophical nuances that emerge today, as well, as the finest representatives of that same decent-looking humanism. It is the same self-sufficient pride of the free thinker, thinking that he must find another way out. What way? The most illusory one ever machinated, I am afraid. It is the self-deception above all self-deceptions:

"My human case isn't all that bad, after all, is it? Real death would not be an indispensable consequence. This must be an exaggerated conclusion to draw. Goodness is the automatically functioning repairer of all things that may appear evil in the world. The spirit of

forgiveness manages the entire business. There is an inherent principle of self-correction lying latent in all living beings. God is still alive! His grace is sufficient for forgiveness of all sins. Grace is the invisible force pervading the whole world, and putting all things straight in the end, 'automatically'."

This pantheist notion of the automatic restoration and eternal bliss is where extreme materialism and extreme spiritualism have happened to have their cryptic encounter from times immemorial. I have called it the shameful matrimony of two opposite monsters bearing a bastard ogre: *pantheism*.

The Fantastic Delusion of Automatism

This is where also spiritualists and *evolutionists* have *their* incredible encounter. Death suddenly ceases to be the great tragedy. There *is* no death. "The morning of resurrection is given to even the smallest sprout of life, only forms are lost." That was how Norway's most famous poet, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnsson, formulated it in his first childish enthusiasm over Darwin's sensational message. The magic solution for both spiritists and evolutionary scientists is the same. It is the dogma of the automatic gradual ascent, higher and ever higher, from millennium to millennium. Man, and nature as a whole, has that divine spark which provides such a wonderful buoyancy, the self-evident climb all the way up to ultimate perfection.

Now, what "realism" does that daydream optimism constitute? Its triumphant automatic progression in this universe (also called, ironically, "the best of all possible worlds") was honored as well nigh an axiom. This

spiritualistic dogma is exactly as unscientific as our modern blind faith in evolution as a similar heavenly ascension *per aspera ad astra*. Man does have just sufficient sense to realize that the "rough thing" is there (the *aspera*). But since you and I, like all nature, have that "divine spark" in us as an automatically functioning equipment, we are supposed to rise, automatically, toward the *stars (astra)*. A beautiful dream. But what reality is there in it?

Automatism Equals Impersonalism

We can only stand open-mouthed in front of so massive a block of pseudo-scientific formulations as those we have come across in the science of the occult. One might imagine there does not exist the remotest notion, among otherwise apparently outstanding scholars, about what automatism really stands for. In my book *Day of Destiny* I have, to the best of my ability, tried to give an easily understandable image of that automatism. (See the last chapter of that book, "Sign of a Free God—Sabbath versus Automatism"; or let me even refer to pages 51 ff. where I have included a basic little section on *laws*. The title of that section might arouse your attention, as a reader thirsty for new realistic viewpoints: "Does God's Contingent Intervention in Man's Life Mean That His Laws of Universal Validity Are Actually 'Eluded'?") Here I must come back to what I brought out on those pages:

It is the ethical perspective I feel I can never bypass. And how, then, could I be just as light-minded as the average spiritualist, just skipping the whole question of laws? You will recall that I was speaking about natural laws as well as moral laws. The distinction here applied is often

very artificial and downright delusive. All laws of the universe are, according to the Bible, *God's* laws. And here there is one thing most of us fail to realize: All these laws are simply an expression ("a transcript") of God's very *character*. How old are they, then? Well, if they are just an expression of a certain character (the New Testament calls that character *Agape*), then the laws must, of course, be *just as old as the character they express*. In other words, they are from everlasting, just like God Himself. Could a sudden abrogation of any such laws ever take place? Of course not. What sense would it make to speak about an "abrogation of God's character," or a sudden essential *change* in God's character? His character is eternally the same. It *is* Agape. Thus I am not afraid of saying that "*God is eternally bound by His own laws.*"

Some may already a long time ago have accused me of blasphemy for such a statement. I have found it more reasonable to say that God's laws (including His natural laws, since they too are all His), *simply cannot be broken*. Many among us have tried quite hard to do this. But, in reality, not for one moment did we have any success in ***breaking*** God's laws. It was rather the laws that broke you and me. A lacking respect, on your part, for the danger connected with a high tension electrical tower will break *you* down, not the tower or the laws of electricity, will it?

Chapter 35 The True Function of God's Laws

Now, one thing all these laws speak about very audibly to the one who has got to know them, is the possibility of a *transgression*. That is sure enough. And the special word the Bible has for that transgression is *sin*. Etymologically, that little word is closely connected with a series of words having to do with *disruption*. There is always a *tearing asunder* involved. Of course, not a tearing asunder of the law. No-no, it is a tearing asunder of the sinner.

The one who has thus been torn, desperately needs, of course, to be *made whole again*. And there is just One perfectly able to make whole again a creature who has been that torn (lacerated). A German Bible would call Him "der Heiland." This is the remarkable German word for Savior. *Heil* means whole. So the Heiland is precisely the One who *makes whole* again. The English word "healing" has the same origin. That process, you see, demands nothing less than a creative intervention. It is the marvel of being brought back to life. What sin leads down to is death.

And now is the time to remember a serious warning made by simple realism: Death is *not* a misnomer. It is a terrible reality.

And what about God? Too many people among us seem to look upon Him as some sort of a market juggler. (*Saltimbanque* is the French word for that kind of people who suddenly mount any public rostrum, shouting boastful words about the excellency of the tricks they are just about to perform.) In fact, are we not all sometimes inclined to consider God as a sort of sorcerer? With just one turn of a magic wand, or one single brush-stroke, he will erase any

part of reality he might think inappropriate!

What a debasing view of God, and of His ethical principles. Imagine a juggler like that as a true leader of a spiritual world. And who are the alleged objects of His juggling? It is you and me. It is a host of human destinies. This is a question of *being* or *not being* for entire worlds.

What does this remind you of? To me it evokes the bedlam of that poltergeist pandemonium which William James found so absolutely unworthy in spiritualist necromancy.

Of course, it was not this kind of "freedom" I was referring to when I spoke about the "Contingent Intervention of a Free God."

Spiritualists in all ages, and of all shades, the main stewards of the occult during thousands of years, were simply bound to reject every sternly realistic idea of an unbroken totality which intelligent men must take for granted--in death as well as in life. So don't ask for the valid reason why spiritualists have thrown overboard the "idea of *Lamb righteousness*."

But Now, What About the "Realistic Reasons" Inspiring the Inventors of the "Moral Influence Theory"?

We have spoken plainly about death as the self-evident "wages of sin." That is the inevitable negative consequence that must be reaped as the automatic follow-up of transgression of the divine law. But then what would a strictly realistic salvation from death and final destruction have to involve? The basically sound and inevitable "philosophy of the Lamb" must necessarily imply that the Savior, the God-Man Jesus Christ, had to "accept the whole

package." That is, He must agree to go through the entire spectrum of abysmal negativity which death inexorably stands for. Jesus' suffering in Gethsemane and his death on the cross of Calvary just could not be reduced to anything less than the historical reality our Bible tells us about. Man's only Savior, Jesus Christ, the sinless Lamb, that was "made sin for us," and so was realistically laid on the altar of the victim, had to die quite realistically if He was at all to take our sin and our eternal destruction away. That is, He had to arrive at the point where he was entirely *separated from the Father*, the God who is the only One it is absolutely essential to be *together with*. This means that His hope of further togetherness and fatherly love turned into that very cry of utter despair: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This is the essence, the total reality of the second death, the death from which there is no hope of awakening. Christ's experience was, and had to be, an experience of total separation, utter despair. The logical implication of "redemption" is a realistic fact of "buying back" (*red-emere* in Latin). And if we do not know that buying demands its price, then we are not even as grounded in our elementary logic as a little child facing the necessities of everyday business.

But what, then, could be imagined to inspire that unrealistic piece of heresy proclaiming that "Jesus could have forgiven our sins without the historical drama of His literal death"? It can have just one source of inspiration: spiritualist daydreaming.

Of course, it is not flattering to my proud ego to admit that I was actually so depraved in my whole being that God Himself had to resort to such extremes of a downward

movement as to "go to Hell." The term "hell" in the Bible means exactly what I have tried to describe. It is that realistic and most cruel separation from God and from real life, with no hope, forever and ever, of a reunion.

So, as the spiritualist daydreamer I happen to be, according to my cultural heritage, I start to look unrealistically for reasons for a somewhat brighter view of my position. It is quite a strain, you see, to feel that much indebted to another person, even if *that person* is *God*. Man seems to say, "There should be some limit even to thankfulness, shouldn't there? It is good to be thankful, but not all that thankful."

Notice: Thankfulness is very often felt as an intolerable burden to bear. Having someone go to the extreme of dying in my stead, and knowing that this is the price it takes, in my hopeless case, to save me--well, do you think that is necessarily such a pleasant idea to dwell upon? Oh no, my pride can hardly take that. So it feels better to have the whole matter reduced, in a way. I comfort myself: It was not just because of *my* wickedness that Jesus had to go to so endless a sacrifice. It was, of course, rather "those other guys" who desperately needed to see such extreme tokens of His love. Even the angels needed this.

That latter inference from words of the Spirit of Prophecy is distorted to mean that the angels needed that entire spectacle of satanic wickedness in order to strengthen their sense of justice. They--not I--were the ones languishing--nearly dying, it might seem--for this blessed "moral influence" fortifying and stabilizing *their* wavering hearts!

In short, then: "Those extremes of a death agony, known

by victims of the second death exclusively, and suffered by the historic Man, Jesus of Nazareth, on Calvary Hill--all this may be true enough, realistic enough, of course, but it is a reality for others, poor creatures, not for *me*! Of course not. To me the Lord might have said right away, winking understandingly with one of his eyes: 'Dear child, you are forgiven.' And, Presto! The magic transformation from dire injustice to perfect justice would have been a present reality. In fact, what decent meaningfulness could there be in that crimson current of blood from the throat of the innocent Lamb of God? Would not such exaggerations in bloodiness only mar the true picture of decent humanity? What more would it achieve than causing sensitive people to have fits of nausea?"

My dear reader, do you realize how humanistically sentimental (how spiritualistically romantic), rather than Rock-bottom realistic), you and I tend to be in our incurable self-sufficient humanism? Only at the moment when a truly realistic--that is, truly Christian--pattern of thought gets hold of us, only then do we finally have a new day dawning. We gradually come to understand how absurd--how ridiculously superficial--our common thinking has been.

How could we ever have the light-mindedness of speaking in full seriousness about justice and the justification of sinful creatures the way we have done? How could our fantasy dare to make this a realm of sheer hocus-pocus, the proper field of simple market jugglers? A realistic change of sinful hearts just could not happen without the indispensable reality which sensible theology all the way down from Anselm's day (1033-1109) has

described as full *satisfaction*. This simply was the absolute demand of elementary justice, in heaven and on earth, that had to be *satisfied*. Full stop.

Have we never asked ourselves the question that Anselm asked: "*Cur Deus Homo?*" ("Why was it so indispensable for God to make Himself Man?") He *had* to die. And how could He manage that feat of dying in the capacity of God? Impossible! For God is just the Immortal One. That means the One (the only One) who *cannot die*. So, for the purpose of dying, Jesus simply had to take upon Himself the nature of being fully Man at the same time.

Of course, it may remain forever "beyond comprehension" to you and me to understand that God could go to that incredible length of actually *dying in our place*. But one thing we should understand, at least. Nothing *less* than that could ever have made it. We must pull our wits together. Otherwise we might risk making the whole business of divine atonement into a farce, a cheap comedy. The God of the Bible was never known to be a comedian, was He? It is spiritualism, the great source of inspiration for all occult phenomena in our world, that surged up as the great adept of all kinds of burlesque comedy playing.

*The Occult--"The Hidden"--Soon Doomed to Go into
Hiding (Its Last Hideout)*

By way of conclusion, I would like to tell you a true story of recent date in my own environment. I have told you already that this is not necessarily an environment in which people growing up are safe against the disturbingly disruptive effects of our world's spiritualist heritage. It was

in a Christian family quite close to us that this happened. There was a little girl in that family who knew quite well that she was supposed to go to bed at a certain hour, much earlier than the other members of the family.

One night she was already in bed at the usual time. Her mommy had read for her a good bedtime story, tucked the blankets comfortably around her, prayed the usual evening prayer, and wished her a good night's rest. Then the mother had withdrawn to the living room, thinking all was peaceful and in perfect order in the bedroom.

But suddenly the doors opened, and back into the living room, slowly and anxiously, came the little girl.

"My dear child, what is the matter," said mommy. "Oh, mommy, I can't bear staying in the darkness of that bedroom," complained the child. "Why not," said mother. "You know *God* is in your room, don't you? He protects you from all evil, in the night as well as in the daytime. Go back now, darling, and don't worry."

The little girl, by and by, seemed reassured and went back to her bedroom. After a while, however, they could hear someone speaking fairly loud and quite distinctly, although in a rather broken and breathless voice. And here is what that anxious little child said:

"God, are you there, right in this room? If you are, please don't stir. I would be scared stiff."

Isn't this reaction thought provoking? Isn't it ominous? So even God tends to be looked upon as some kind of eerie spook. Where does that image of God stem from? At the moment when the reality of God begins to be a matter that actually *matters* in a down-to-earth context, the live vision of Him turns into a rather spiritualistic and esoteric one.

How tragic!

Another thing scares me even more. Actually the words pronounced by that little child remind me most of something we grown-ups seem to express very often, at least in our actions. What we seem to be saying is something like this. "God, I do not feel too sure that You exist, but *if* You do, *please do not interfere too disturbingly in my life*. This life is mine. It is the only one I know about with certainty. So let me enjoy it the only way I know about."

Could you think of anything more self-contained and barrenly humanistic? This is the self-centeredness that takes two different forms. There *are* no other forms *possible* in the life of a born humanist. And a humanist, that is, of the average human type.

A road can have no more than two ditches, you see. *Fortunately*, we must say, with some strange kind of gratitude. The road of Christian realism (of which I have amused myself making graphic images in my book, *The Mystic Omega of End-Time Crisis*) has also, fortunately, had to be content with having just *two* ditches. One of them is *spiritualism* and the other is its diametrical opposite, *materialism*. But if you go down far enough, you may have something ten times worse still, that is a fusion of the two extremes. It is what happens in the super-ditch philosophy of *pantheism*! The exceptional genius, specializing in disruptions, will go down there.

Pantheism is the end station along the dismal trail of all spiritualism. Even the occult comes to its ultimate end there. Human beings have been created in the image of God--that is, with the tremendous privilege of being

persons, beings with the glorious endowment of a free choice. In such lives there is even the freedom of choosing *not* to have a perfectly integrated existence through endless aeons, planned and cared for by a personal God.

Such a choice is total disintegration. This is the tragic event, the only one you could ever expect to occur in a dead universe. That is the pan-emptiness our great masters in pantheist thinking have managed to dream up, as the only heaven of eternal bliss. I am speaking about the godforsaken *material world* which age-old pantheism has always equated with *God Himself*. That is--understandably enough--the only God that pagan philosophy has ever known. And notice: What, then, is the blasphemous act pantheist thinkers, from times immemorial, have committed by thinking doggedly along such poor lines? It is simply reducing God to a miserable good-for-nothing, a nonentity. The living Creator of all good and meaningful things has, by audacious human beings, been transformed into the automaton above all automatons. What a sacrilege!

It is at this stage of the development that the abomination above all abominations takes place. It is the bottom level of all godless philosophy of hocus-pocus disintegration. The catastrophic point has been reached. Holiness itself is being flung without respect into the disintegration machine. No distinction whatsoever is observed any longer between the *holy* and the *profane*. One day, the mysterious writing by the Invisible Writer goes across the wall: *Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin*. Even the most loquacious occultists turn speechless. Even occultism itself has become homeless. It has forfeited its last chance of survival.

