

**The Ethereal Chart.**—To use as an ethereal diagram or chart this theoretical aspect of thought, which is the only logical deduction from the facts accepted as such by the natural scientists of to-day, assists in indicating to human consciousness a sense of the indispensable footsteps, whereby  
5 to free itself of itself. These footsteps are the denial of any power or even reality in evil, and the affirmation of eternal truth.

Let it be clearly understood that this explanation of the basic workings of so-called matter is not a presentation of facts, but their expression in physical terms, symbolic of the apparent internal workings of matter, just  
10 as an algebraical formula is used by a mathematician to indicate a law and shorten a so-called mental process.

Were the internal workings of so-called matter as harmless as the algebraical formula, it would be of little importance; but the acceptance of the conditions of matter with all its attendant phenomena, false as  
15 they are, and the individual and universal assent thereto, maintains and ensures its temporal manifestation, and allows of all the discordant conditions under which mankind is suffering. When a man grasps this, he will hasten not only to deny the existence of matter, and all material theories, but he will probe matter to its depths, uncover the false theory upon which  
20 it is built, and find that its very foundations are utterly false, only so-called thoughts or lines of force—mere verbal expressions—which all admit can instantly fade away into the land of forgotten dreams. Thus will all fear of it be lost for ever. This wholly fearless, because intelligent, attitude is essential to gain dominion over evil.

25

## THE NON-REALITY OF MATTER

*“When Bishop Berkeley said there was no matter and proved it, it was no matter what he meant”* (Byron).

Up to recent years the indestructibility of matter was regarded as a dogma, to cast a doubt on which would have been regarded as rank  
30 heresy, while to advance the suspicion that there is, perhaps, no such thing as matter, but that all phenomena are merely due to force, as is accepted by the scientific world to-day, would have made the audacious innovator forfeit any right to be taken seriously. Now the throne of “force” or “energy” is being overturned. They “have returned to the nothingness of  
35 things” (Dr Le Bon).

“To-day it is true, in all its fulness and strength, that the greatest and profoundest students of Psychology, and of the kindred sciences, most of these sciences new, and all of them reconstructed by fuller know-  
40 ledge, are agreed, with practical unanimity, that the old past theories, or rather hypotheses of materialism, of nihilism, of empiricism, have been proven untenable and altogether worthless, and that the so-called physical sciences have never been at all capable of taking sides in the controversy which is now about ended”<sup>1</sup> (J. W. Heysinger, M.D.).

**Scientific Views.**—“*It is only within the last thirty or forty years that*  
45 *there has gradually dawned upon the minds of scientific men the conviction*

<sup>1</sup> *Spirit and Matter before the Bar of Modern Science.*

that there is something besides matter or stuff in the physical universe, something which has at least as much claim as matter to recognition as an objective reality, though, of course, far less directly obvious to our senses as such, and therefore much later in being detected" (Professors Stewart and Tait).

A remarkable change in views has taken place lately. In 1900 Dr. Heydweiler, a German, undertook to satisfy himself, by experimenting, as to whether two ounces of different elements uniting chemically really always give two ounces of compound; an undertaking which to most of his contemporaries appeared just as necessary as to prove that water really becomes ice at the freezing point. Heydweiler found that the result of two weighings never agreed, and the differences were larger than could be accounted for by unavoidable variations of the balances, etc. The experiments lasted for a long time and were repeated with the same results, and the final conclusion to which he, and those working with him, came, was that there is an actual loss of matter in every chemical change. This, when carried to its logical conclusion, means that matter is not a reality. If it is possible to make a certain weight of oxide of iron or other chemical disappear to the senses—as even the most elaborate balances are only aids to our senses—it cannot be held to be any longer impossible to make any other substance disappear, and given sufficient number of changes, the whole of matter must cease its apparent existence.

At the time it seemed quite impossible that these results could be correct, but they have been since confirmed by the experiments of Dr. Le Bon.<sup>1</sup>

It is only comparatively recently that scientific men have recognised that matter is electricity or force, and it was only in the year 1902 that Professor Osborne Reynolds, F.R.S., LL.D., M.I.C.E., Professor of Engineering at Owen's College, Manchester, one of the ablest mathematicians of the day, gave the world the result of twenty years' hard work, showing in the "Rede Lecture"<sup>2</sup> that he had proved mathematically that matter was a non-reality. I have never heard even a suggestion that he has made a mistake in his mathematical proof. Having theoretically proved the non-reality of matter, he postulated an impossible ether in his endeavour to prove what really existed, not recognising that the only reality was God, as perfect Mind and its manifestation. He says: "Matter represents the absence of mass," and again: "Matter is measured by the absence of mass." Professor Rouse Ball writes of this as matter being "a deficiency of the ether."

"Transcendentalism has been defined as a hole in a sand-bank after the sand-bank had been taken away. It is not transcendentalism, but matter, that modern physical science finds to be a theoretical hole in a theoretical medium"<sup>3</sup> (Arthur Chamberlain). It is merely "a great heap of nothing and nowhere to put it."

That leading scientific worker, Dr. Gustave Le Bon, in his latest book,

<sup>1</sup> "Contrary to the principle laid down as the basis of chemistry by Lavoisier, we do not recover in a chemical combination the total weight of the substances employed to bring about this combination" (*The Evolution of Matter*, Dr. Le Bon).

<sup>2</sup> *Rede Lecture*, 1902.

<sup>3</sup> "The Non-existence of Matter" in *The Christian Science Journal*, November, 1909.

*The Evolution of Forces*,<sup>1</sup> which is practically a text-book of material science, gives, in the calmest way, as if he was enunciating what ought to be known to every student, the fundamental principles of the material world as follows: (1) Matter, hitherto deemed indestructible, slowly vanishes by  
 5 the continuous dissociation of its component atoms; . . . (5) Force and matter are two different forms of one and the same thing; (6) . . . Matter therefore is continuously transformed into energy; . . . (8) Energy is no more indestructible than the matter from which it emanates.

The formulas of mechanics are disappearing. Dr. Le Bon writes:  
 10 "Professors who continue to teach the formulas of mechanics renounce more and more their beliefs in them. This fictitious universe, reduced to points to which forces are applied, seems to them very chimerical. 'There is not a single one of the principles of rational mechanics which is applicable to realities,' recently wrote to me one of the scholars who have  
 15 most deeply sounded the problems of mechanics, the eminent Professor Dweishauwers Dery.

"Quite recently M. Sabatier, Dean of the Faculty of Sciences at Montpellier, propounded in an interesting inaugural lecture with the title, 'Is the Material Universe Eternal?' the question whether it was quite certain  
 20 that there was not a real and progressive loss of energy in the world, and more recently still, in a memoir on the degradation of energy, one of our most far-seeing physicists, M. Bernard Brunhes, expressed himself as follows: 'What is our warrant for the statement that the universe is a limited system? If it be not so, what signify these expressions: the total  
 25 energy of the universe, or, the utilisable energy of the universe? To say that the total energy is preserved, but that the utilisable energy diminishes, is this not formulating meaningless propositions?'"

In answer to a letter in which Dr. Le Bon set forth his ideas on this point, the same physicist wrote to him: "The 'nothing is lost' should  
 30 be deleted from the exposition of the laws of physics, for the science of to-day teaches us that something is lost. It is certainly in the direction of the leakage, of the wearing away of the worlds, and not in the direction of their greater stability, that the science of to-morrow will modify the reigning ideas."

Besides those already mentioned, many deep thinkers are trying  
 35 hard to fit in the old false ideas with the new ones now coming to light. Sir Ray Lankester—and he is quoted by Geddes and Thomson—in *Evolution of Sex*, says: "The bodies of the higher animals which die, may from this point of view be regarded as something temporary and  
 40 non-essential, destined merely to carry for a time, to nurse, and to nourish

<sup>1</sup> This book is one of the International Scientific Series. The translation is edited by Mr. F. Legge, of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, and in it appear many paragraphs which show the radical change that has recently taken place in the scientific world. Dr. Le Bon is a member of the Royal Academy of Belgium, and a  
 45 very advanced worker, one of the ablest of modern scientific men. M. G. Bohn, in *Revue des Idées*, January 16, 1906, writes: "The beginning of Dr. Le Bon's work produces in the reader a deep impression; one feels in it the breath of a thought of genius. . . . Dr. Le Bon has been compared to Darwin. If one were bound to make a comparison, I would rather compare him to Lamarck. Lamarck was the  
 50 first to have a clear idea of the evolution of living beings."

the more important and deathless fission-products of the unicellular egg." In *The Nature of Man*, Metchnikoff says: "Scientific proof exists, therefore, that our bodies contain immortal elements." The reverse of this is true; man, however, is immortal.

The astronomer, Professor Larkin, has said: "Science now imperatively demands a Conscious Power within protoplasm—the only living substance, and Science knows that this power is mental." It is not, however, the apparent power of the human mind, but the power of Mind. Everything is in Mind. Mind is not *in* anything.

Lately, scientific men have recognised that matter is only something falsely conceived of by the human consciousness. Professor Ostwald, of Leipzig University, one of the leading men of the day, says: "Matter is only a thing imagined, which we have constructed for ourselves very imperfectly to represent the constant element in the changing series of phenomena." Huxley writes: "After all, what do we know of this terrible matter, except as a name for the unknown hypothetical cause of states of our own consciousness."

"The charge of materialism could only be brought against such a man by those abject materialists who have never had a glimpse of the profounder fact that the universe, as known to us, consists wholly of mind, and that matter is a doubtful and uncertain inference of the human intelligence" (Grant Allen).

Sir William Crookes, speaking before the British Association in 1879, said: "We have actually touched the borderland where matter and force seem to merge into one another—the shadowy realm between the known and unknown . . . here, it seems to me, lie ultimate realities, subtle, far-reaching, wonderful."

The following short list of the more plausible hypotheses accounting for the properties of matter, together with the remarks thereon of W. W. Rouse Ball, may be of interest.

Descartes' Continuous Matter: "There seems to be no way of reconciling such a structure of matter either with the facts of chemical changes or with the results of spectrum analysis."

Popular Atomic Theory: "The difficulties to which it leads appear to be insuperable."

Boscovitch's Hypothesis: "It has been described, perhaps not unjustly, as a mere mathematical fiction."

Elastic Solid Ether: "In spite of the difficulties to which this hypothesis necessarily leads, and of its inherent improbability, it has been discussed."

Vortex Ring and Vortex Atom Hypotheses: <sup>1</sup> "The above theories are now regarded as untenable."

Ether-Squirts Hypothesis "Rests on the assumption of the existence of a world beyond our senses."

The Electron Hypothesis: "Seems very artificial."

<sup>1</sup> As a column of water rotating at a sufficient speed would oppose a blow with a bar of iron as if it were a column of steel, so a vortex whirl of minute particles would give every appearance to the senses of solid matter. The speed of radioactive particles is supposed to be 100,000 times that of a bullet when leaving the muzzle of a rifle.

The Bubble Hypothesis: This is the theory put forward by Professor Osborne Reynolds, and whilst it is not correct it is founded on what he had proved, namely, the non-reality of matter. Consequently we find Professor Rouse Ball writing of it as follows: "This theory is in itself  
5 more plausible than the Electron Hypothesis, but its consequences have not yet been fully worked out."

**Philosophic Views.**—"There are more things in heaven and earth . . . than are dreamt of in your philosophy" (Shakespeare).

For ages philosophers have recognised that the material world is not  
10 all that we have thought it to be. Even a few quotations will show how gleams of scientific truth came to them, though none grasped its practical side, and how to apply it to human experience so as to replace discord with harmony. Aristotle, for instance, whose teachings have been followed by  
15 the civilised world for centuries, not only said that matter was negative, but stated that the source of all motion only moves as an object of love. "It is pure mind with no object but itself: it is thought, with thought as its object—pure self-consciousness with nothing beyond. It is God."<sup>1</sup> Hume correctly threw doubt upon all the so-called sciences.

Herbert Spencer says that what is real is permanent, what is not real  
20 is not permanent. Paul popularly defined the position over 1,800 years ago in the words: "For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (II Cor. 4:18).

The great Immanuel Kant, admittedly a giant amongst philosophers, at the end of the eighteenth century wrote to the effect that against other  
25 criticisms of the doctrine of immortality one may adduce the transcendental hypotheses; all life is essentially only intellectual, and not subject to time-changes, neither beginning with birth nor ending with death. He also said that this world's life is only an appearance, a sensuous image of the pure spiritual life, and the whole world of sense only a picture swimming  
30 before our present knowing faculty like a dream, and *having no reality in itself*. For, he says, if we should see things and ourselves as they are, we should see ourselves in a world of spiritual natures with which our entire real relation neither begins at birth nor ends with the body's death.

John Fiske also, the well-known historian, Professor of Philosophy at  
35 Harvard and St. Louis, who in his earlier days was an agnostic, but whose last work was written to prove that science led irresistibly to the doctrine of immortality, wrote: "The untrained thinker who believes that the group of phenomena constituting the table on which he is writing has an objective existence, independent of consciousness, will probably  
40 find no difficulty in accepting this sort of materialism. If he is devoted to the study of nervous physiology, he will be very likely to adopt some such crude notion, and to proclaim it as zealously as if it were important truth, calculated to promote, in many ways, the welfare of mankind. The science of such a writer is very likely to be sound and valuable, and he will tell us  
45 about Woorara poison and frogs' legs, and acute mania, and it will probably be worthy of serious attention. But with his philosophy it is quite otherwise. When he has proceeded as far in subjective analysis as he has in the

<sup>1</sup> *Harmsworth Encyclopædia.*

study of nerves, our materialist will find that it was demonstrated a century ago, that the group of phenomena constituting the table *has no real existence whatever* in the philosophic sense. For by 'reality' in philosophy is meant 'persistence, irrespective of particular conditions,' and the group of phenomena constituting a table persists only so far as it is held together in cognition. Take away the cognising mind, and the colour, form, position, and hardness of the table—all the attributes, in short, that characterise it as matter—at once disappear. . . . Apart from consciousness, there are no such things as colour, form, position, or hardness, and there is no such thing as matter. This great truth, established by Berkeley, is the very foundation of modern scientific philosophy; and, though it has been misapprehended by many, *no one has ever refuted it*, and it is not likely that anyone ever will." How useless has always been the intellectual grasp of a theory, however correct, without some definite method of putting it into practice.

Professor Max Müller has said: "To speak of matter and substance as something existing by itself and presented to the senses is mere mythology. . . . And yet we are asked by materialists to believe that the perceiving subject, or the mind, is really the result of a long-continued development of the object, or of matter. This is a logical somersault which it seems almost impossible to perform, and yet it has been performed again and again in the history of philosophy." <sup>1</sup> Grant Allen writes: "The universe, as known to us, consists wholly of mind, and matter is a doubtful and uncertain inference of the human intelligence." The poet-philosopher, Walt Whitman, writes: "Afar down I see the huge first Nothing, I know I was there."

Hundreds of years ago the Indian philosophers looked upon the material world as Maya, or illusion, thinking, however, that when this illusion disappeared, they would find themselves merged in the one great Being whom we Westerners call God. They thought that we should lose our individuality; not recognising, as Jesus told us, that "the kingdom of God is within" (Luke 17:21), within reach of our own individual consciousness at the present moment, and that therefore our individuality can never be lost. That old idea is changing. All men are getting nearer the truth. The following was the definition of our future given by Archdeacon Wilberforce to a Brahmin in India, with which definition the Brahmin quite agreed: "Conscious identification with universal Life without the loss of my own sense of individuality." Principle is always individual in its intelligent self-expression.

**This Suppositional Opposite World a Dream.**—"I felt with amazement we are all plunged into a languid dream. Our hearts fat, and our eyes heavy, and our ears closed, lest we should see with our eyes and understand with our hearts, and be healed" (Ruskin).<sup>2</sup>

It was very difficult to understand how the material world, which seemed so very real, could be a non-reality, until I learned to look upon it as a suppositional opposite world. For instance, if, as is happily quite

<sup>1</sup> *Three Introductory Lectures on The Simplicity of Thought.*

<sup>2</sup> See Isa. 6:10.

impossible, someone in heaven should say, How fortunate that we are not in a world where there are sin, sickness, and trouble, he would be talking of a suppositional opposite world. Yet such is the world which we have ignorantly believed real, at best a dream from which we have to wake up.  
 5 There is not a single proof that can be advanced that this material so-called state of consciousness is not just as much a dream as the worst nightmare that anyone ever had. As Zophar said: "He shall fly away as a dream, and shall not be found" (Job. 20:8).

10 "Health, peace, salvation universal,  
 Is it a dream?  
 Nay, but the lack of it a dream,  
 And failing it, life's love and wealth a dream,  
 And all the world a dream" (*Walt Whitman*).

"We are such stuff as dreams are made on and our little life is rounded  
 15 with a sleep" (Shakespeare). "And surely it is not a melancholy conceit to think we are all asleep in this world, and that the conceits of this life are as mere dreams" (Sir Thomas Browne). "For we are born at all adventure: and we shall be hereafter as though we had never been" (Wisdom of Solomon 2:2). "Human life is a dream and a journey in a  
 20 strange land" (Marcus Aurelius).

**Cause Must be Good.**—God, being cause, must be good; for evil is negative, and cannot therefore be an original creator. If two causes, one good and the other evil, originally existed, one must have destroyed the other long ago. The very nature of evil is self-destructive.

25 One of the proofs of the non-reality of matter is the evil that appears to exist. If matter were real then the evil would be real, and God, good, must have made it, as God created everything. If God created it, good alone is responsible for the evil. This is impossible. Evil could not emerge from good. If it is an unreality, God cannot even know of it.

30 How is it possible that there should be a God who is Love itself, who could possibly fail to relieve the human race, if He were conscious of the trouble? God's consciousness, the Christ, is seen as spiritual perfect man, self-consciousness or understanding of good, which therefore cannot be conscious of evil. Even a human being cannot be conscious of evil whilst  
 35 he is conscious of even relative human "good."

### THE SO-CALLED EVOLUTION OF THE MATERIAL WORLD

"The law of evolution applicable to living beings is also applicable to simple bodies; chemical species are no more invariable than are living species"  
 40 (Dr. Le Bon).

From what has been already said, you will see that the so-called material world is simply a world of false sense, apparently originating in material thoughts or lines of force, matter being a manifestation of these thoughts. Material man and all lesser phenomena are but the illegitimate offspring  
 45 originating in a false mentality.

Consequently, spiritual evolution, or the continual grouping together of the perfect ideas in heaven throughout eternity is the only true evolution, and what is now put before you is merely an accurate statement of the