

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes.
Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit
or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the
copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the
ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the
links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LIV.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W. 1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1922.

**637th ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN THE CONFERENCE HALL,
THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W., on Monday,
January 23rd, 1922, at 4.30 p.m.**

ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D., in the Chair.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following Associates: The Rev. Wilfred H. Isaacs, M.A., F. J. Moon, Esq., Mrs. W. G. Martley, Vincent C. H. Millard, Esq., M.A., Miss Mildred Duff, and Mrs. Agnes S. Whipple.

The Chairman then called on Mr. Sydney T. Klein, F.L.S., F.R.A.S., to read his paper on "The Invisible is the Real, the Visible is only its Shadow." The lecture was illustrated by physical experiments.

"*THE INVISIBLE IS THE REAL, THE VISIBLE IS ONLY ITS SHADOW.*" Illustrated by physical experiments. By SYDNEY T. KLEIN, F.L.S., F.R.A.S., F.R.M.S., &c.

IN other words, the Spiritual is the Real, the physical is only its shadow-form, as depicted on our finite organs of perception.

Let us firstly clearly understand what we mean by Real and Unreal.

To most people the world in which we live seems very real and it is difficult for them to believe otherwise; but the longer we investigate and the more knowledge we thereby gain of our surroundings, the clearer we see that behind all phenomena there is a wonderful incomprehensible "power" which we call the Spiritual, and that that power is quite beyond our senses of perception and therefore of our conception, except in its effects, namely, those appearances which in detail we call phenomena and in the aggregate we call the Universe.

In whatever direction we pursue our investigation we indeed find that *ultimately* it is always the Unknowable which is the cause of the Knowable; the Invisible the cause of the Visible. On the other hand those who have not investigated or looked beyond the horizon of everyday life and who insist that the Visible is real because they live and move and have their being therein, can only look upon the Invisible as shadowy and *unreal*. But a little thought shows this conclusion to be quite untenable, because if the Invisible is unreal and the Visible real it would make the *unreal* actually the cause of the real, which is, of

course, absurd. We have therefore to acknowledge that the Invisible is real and is the cause of the Visible which we call the universe, and it remains for us to see whether the Visible is also real.

I propose to lay before you certain facts to show that though we have become accustomed to accept the reality of our surroundings and have thus concluded that there are two worlds, the Invisible and the Visible, in reality there is only one world. I shall show that the Visible, namely, the world of our everyday life, or what I will call the world of appearances, is only real in the sense that dolls, wooden horses and toys may be said to be real to children; they are useful for their education, but are really only make-believes to help their infant minds to expand and grasp higher truths.

The human race is steadily progressing towards the goal to which the scheme of creation is carrying us; but it is yet in its infancy as shown by the fact that we still require symbolism to help us to maintain and carry forward abstract thoughts to higher levels, even as children require picture books for that purpose. It is well therefore that we commence our investigation in a humble frame of mind, namely, that we first clearly realise our ignorance and the limitations under which only are we able to look out upon our surroundings.

Let us first consider how much many of us are dominated by this world of appearances in our everyday life.

We are each living in a little world created and furnished by our thoughts. The racing man lives in a world furnished with all the paraphernalia of horses, stables and jockeys, with a long list of future racing engagements and preparations for winning races years in advance. The business man is in touch with other business men in all parts of the earth, and is living in a world dominated by thoughts of transactions and financial calculations for present and future money-making. A member of the Stock Exchange is living in a turmoil of thoughts of stocks and shares and their probable value from day to day. The gambler is in a whirl of thoughts of possible luck in his world of chance. A market gardener is planning from year's end to year's end how he can most profitably bring his produce to perfection and how, even in the winter months by means of glass-houses, he can grow fruit and vegetables which nature would only produce during the summer. The physicist is living in a world of atoms, radio-activity, chemical analyses and synthesis, and the tremendous forces of nature which he can let loose and control; he is so engrossed in his experimental research and calculations that he can hardly allow himself the necessary time for sleep. Others are striving for worldly possessions, larger estates, and other means by which they can appear great

to the world; and alas! many others are struggling for a mere pittance for their daily bread. All in different ways are living in a world of physical domination created by their thoughts in this world of appearances. They are worshipping the fetish of the *visible*, as though it were the real, and if at times they are urged to think of the Invisible, the wonderful true *meaning* of our life here, they cannot find time for its consideration and put it off till to-morrow—which never comes.

It was this obsession which made the last war possible. For many years before the final cataclysm in 1914, the human race in almost every country was steadily raising up and worshipping the fetish of outward material power and ignoring the real inner spiritual life to which the scheme of creation is carrying us.

This obsession was more in evidence in Germany than in any other country. The *value* of the Invisible was ignored and with it went all reverence for religious and ethical ideals. Pride of intellect supplanted spiritual discernment with the result that all thoughts and actions became wholly governed by the desire for self-aggrandisement. Ruthless ambition for mastery was taught in their schools as the true aim of life, and was openly advocated by their politicians, irrespective of the rights of weaker nations, culminating in the audacious dream of "Germany above all," with Berlin as the centre of a world-wide domination. The war has been a terrible lesson, but the shock has brought the human race to the point of awakening to a new and better aspect of life. It may even be realised that that shock has been a blessing in disguise, and that without it an even greater upheaval later on would have been necessary to have the same effect.

We will now examine this world of appearance and try to realise how very limited is the outlook we can employ for understanding our surroundings. Let us first examine our sense organs through which, only, can we get knowledge of that outside world. It is only comparatively lately that by the study of embryology we have discovered that all our sense organs have been developed from the same source, namely, from the outside skin. In the embryo of every animal we see that the first vestige of the advent of each sense organ is a wrinkle or enfolding of the external skin, and from this common beginning are, in due course, developed the organs by means of which we become aware of our surroundings.

These organs are all formed on the same plan, namely, for the detection of vibrations or movements in the aether, air or matter, and they are each endowed with bundles of nerves or nerve processes which can be affected sympathetically by the particular pitch of vibrations which that organ is meant to receive. Each organ is therefore limited to a certain range of perception, and though in the last fifty years we have invented instruments to

extend the powers of those organs, we are still looking out upon our surroundings in a very rudimentary manner; we have indeed to acknowledge that the human race is so much in its infancy that our eyes and other organs of perception can hardly be said to be yet opened.

The two organs by which we principally gain knowledge of our surroundings are those of sight and hearing, and I will now demonstrate to you how narrow is the possible range within which they can be used in our attempt to investigate the world of appearances.

What we call hearing is the apprehension of vibrations in matter, mostly in the form of the air we breathe; and when these vibrations strike the ear in regular succession, beyond a certain number in a second, they produce the effect of what may be called a solid or continuous sound, namely, a musical note. If a number of these notes are sounded together, we call it a noise. Below sixteen vibrations in a second the ear can hear them as separate beats but beyond that number the sound is continuous. If I had no regard for your feelings I could have arranged to illustrate this by loud explosions or pistol shots fired in quick succession, and up to fifteen explosions in a second you would have heard them separately, and the noise would have been so terrific that I should no doubt have quickly lost you all as an audience; but if you could have endured the pain you would have had a great surprise when the rate had reached sixteen explosions in a second; as if by magic the harsh noise would suddenly have disappeared and in its place, though the explosions were still going on, you would have heard a wonderful deep musical sound like that given out by the longest pipe of an organ. I have however arranged the experiment in a gentler fashion and its demonstration will be pleasant instead of painful.

I have here a large metal disc, which can be revolved at a high speed, and I have had holes drilled regularly on it in concentric circles ranging from sixteen up to five hundred in the different circles. We will arrange for a puff of air to be forced through each hole singly as it is brought round by the revolution of the disc, and when the puffs occur at a lower rate than sixteen in a second you can hear them as puffs, but beyond that number you will hear them as a musical sound and each of the circles will give a special note according to the number of holes therein. On the same disc I have also drilled in concentric circles a sequence of holes, in the exact ratio necessary for combining harmonies, and you can hear that from puffs of air from a single nozzle can be produced the principal chords of the musical clef.

As already stated, the lowest musical note the ear can hear is formed by sixteen vibrations in a second, the octave above

this is formed by thirty-two vibrations, and the next octave by sixty-four vibrations, namely, by doubling the number for each octave, and so on until we reach about the tenth octave, where the pulsations are close on twenty thousand in a second, when the sound passes beyond the range of human audition, although we can show that the air is still vibrating and we can count the number of beats and thence ascertain the pitch for another three octaves.

We now have to traverse *numerically* only about thirty-one octaves, which contain all the pulsations in the æther which we use in wireless telegraphy and also those we appreciate as radiant heat, and we then arrive at the rate of frequencies which, when they strike the eye, gives us the impression of light. The lowest rate gives us the colour red, followed by orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo and violet. Colour in light is identical with pitch in music, they both depend upon the rate of pulsation that strike our organs of sight and hearing.

If I had time I could have shown by means of the photo-chromoscope that the colours red, green and violet are produced by three rates of frequencies which are in exactly the same ratio to each other as those of the first, third and fifth which compose the major triad in music; and that those three colours when combined produce pure white light. The whole range of sight therefore only covers a little over half an octave, and above and below this there is darkness for us; and yet it is by means of this about half an octave that we have to see all our surroundings. What a world of knowledge is therefore lost to us by the narrowness of the slit through which we are able to look. We can perhaps understand our limitation in sight better if we think what a world of sound would be lost to us if our range of hearing only covered half an octave. It is true that we have invented instruments which enable us to examine pulsations extending slightly beyond visible light, and have indeed lately made a stride by the discovery of the Rontgen Rays which are situated twelve octaves above the violet light rays, but taking the total range of our perception, we find that after all we are limited to what may be called a few inches only on the long line of infinite extent, reaching from the finite up to the infinite.

Having thus realised the narrowness of our outlook and that knowledge of the world of appearances is so entirely dependent upon vibration or movement in the æther, air or matter, and that without those vibrations we should have no knowledge of our surroundings, we will carry our subject another step forward by considering how that narrowness of outlook and our ignorance surrounds us with illusions.

One of the greatest illusions we have is what we call *solidity* or continuity of sensation. If you hold a cannon-ball in your

hand, perception by the sense of touch tells you that it is continuous or what is called solid and hard; but it is not so in reality except as a concept limited by our finite senses. A fair analogy would be to liken it to a swarm of bees, for we know that it is composed of an immense number of independent atoms or molecules, which are darting about and circling round each other at an enormous speed but never touching; they are also vibrating at a definite enormous rate which we can, at will, increase by heat or reduce by cold. If we heat the cannon-ball we increase this vibration so that the cohesion of the atoms decreases so much that the iron becomes liquid, and further heating produces volatilization, where the property of what we call solidity disappears. Let this vapour now be cooled and, passing again through a fluid state, the cannon-ball takes on the appearance of solidity. If our touch perception were sensitive enough we should feel the vibration of the atoms and should not have the sensation of a solid. We have a similar case of limitation in our other senses. As I have already shown you, we can hear pulsations only up to fifteen in a second, beyond that number they give the sensation of a musical or continuous sound. In our sense of sight we can see pulsations or intermittent flashes up to only six in a second, beyond that number they give the sensation of a continuous light; a gas jet, if extinguished and re-lit six times a second, can be seen to flicker, but beyond that rate it is to our sense of sight a steady flame; the same effect may be shown by the red glow of the top of a match; when stationary or moving slowly it is a point of light, but, moved quickly, it becomes a continuous line of light. Even apart from our senses we find motion giving the characteristics of solidity. A wheel, with only a few thin spokes, if rotated quickly enough, becomes quite impenetrable by any substance, however small, thrown at it. A thin jet of water only half an inch in diameter, if discharged at great pressure, equivalent to a column of water of 500 metres, cannot be cut through even with an axe, it resists as though it were made of the hardest steel. A thin cord hanging from a vertical axis, and being revolved very quickly, becomes rigid, and if struck with a hammer, it resists and resounds like a rod of wood. A thin chain and even a loop of string, if revolved at a great speed over a vertical pulley, becomes rigid and, if allowed to escape from the pulley, will run along the ground as a hoop.

Again we appear to have no sense of *direction* when travelling through space, except by noting passing objects. If we are in a train with the blinds down we cannot tell in which direction we are going, and even if we have that knowledge, and the train by going in and out of a terminus has, without our knowledge, changed its engine so that we, without moving, are occupying a back instead of a front seat, we are not conscious of this

change; and even if we now look out of the window it requires quite an effort to realise that we are not going back to our starting point. In the course of everyday life we are hurried about in trains and motor cars and feel sometimes that we would like to escape for a time from the rush of continual movement; we say we will lie down on a sofa; but we are still being rushed through space a thousand times faster than an express train, though we have no knowledge of this, or the direction in which we are being carried. If the sofa is placed due east and west and we lie down at noon, we are being carried along at 60,000 miles an hour, the rate of the earth moving on its orbit round the sun. We are at first being carried, say, feet foremost, but in six hours time, without changing our position, we should be travelling sideways, and in a further six hours we should still be carried along, at the same enormous rate, but the direction would then be head foremost, and yet we should be quite oblivious of any change of direction.

I have shown elsewhere* under present conditions our conceptions of the immense and minute in the extension of Space, and the quick and slow in duration of Time, are pure illusions, they are based entirely on *relativity*. If at this moment we and all our surroundings were reduced to half their size and moving twice as quickly we could have no knowledge of any change; even if our Solar system were reduced to the size of one of the myriads of atoms in a needle point, so that the whole visible universe was reduced to the size of that point, each star taking the place of one of those atoms, and time were reduced in the same proportion, so that our earth would be revolving round the sun at approximately the rate that light travels, the condition which we know is actually taking place inside every atom to which I shall refer later, we could still have no knowledge of any change, our life would go on as usual. If the change were made in the direction of expansion in space and slowing down in time, so that each atom in that needle point became as large as our Solar system and the steel point as large as the visible universe, each atom taking the place of a star and motion reduced in the same proportion, it is still inconceivable that we could be conscious of any change having taken place, though the length of our needle, which was at first, say, an inch, would now be so great that light, travelling 186,000 miles per second, would take 500,000 years to traverse its length; and the stature of each one of us would be so great that light would require 36,000,000 years to travel from head to foot; and that 36,000,000 years would have to be multiplied 163,000,000 times, making 5,868 millions of millions of years to represent the time that an ordinary *sneeze* would take under such conditions.

* Science and the Infinite, pp. 13-16.

And yet we have only gone towards the infinitely great as far as we at first went towards the infinitely small, and it is still absolutely inconceivable that we could be conscious of any change; our everyday life would go on as usual, we should be quite oblivious of the fact that every second of time, with all its incidents and thoughts had been lengthened to 5,868 millions of millions of years. We thus see that immensity and minuteness in extension of space, and quickness and slowness in duration of time are figments only of our finiteness of outlook.

There are hundreds of other examples I could give you of illusions in the world of appearances, but I must be content with only a few more of common experience.'

The Sun and Stars are seen revolving round the earth, and it was only a few hundred years ago that this was discovered to be an illusion caused by the earth itself revolving on its axis, but for a long time the explanation was declared to be a sacrilegious invention, as it was contrary to Scripture, and those who dared to say it was an illusion were threatened with death.

The Moon is also seen to rise in the east and set in the west, and it is a common belief even now that the Moon is revolving round the earth in that direction, but this is quite an illusion because the Moon is really moving in the opposite direction, namely, from west to east; the illusion is caused by the fact that the earth is also revolving from west to east but twenty-nine times faster than the Moon takes to complete her orbit.

We think that the leaves of a tree are green, but they are not really so, they only absorb the red and the violet, the other primary colours contained in Sunlight, and reflect the green. If we had a leaf showing absolutely pure green colour, it would appear perfectly black in any light which did not contain green.

I have given these examples to show how we are surrounded by illusion through ignorance caused by our narrow outlook and our taking for granted that things in this world of appearances are what they seem rather than what they are.

To many it must be a puzzle to explain the phenomenon of what is called "up and down" in our consciousness. It is a fact that in our sense of sight all objects are inverted on the retina; for instance, the image of a tree is depicted there with its roots pointing upwards and its branches pointing downwards, namely, towards our feet, yet we see it right side up. It is however possible to arrange so that an image of an object is formed on the retina in its natural position and in that case we *see* it upside down. If a small hole is pricked in a card and held close in front of the eye so that a pencil of light passing through that hole impinges upon the retina, and a pin with its head uppermost is placed between the hole and the eye, the image of the head of that pin is thrown on the retina without being inverted, namely,

it is pointing what we call upwards, but our consciousness, which has learnt to deal only with inverted images, makes us see that pin with its head pointing to what we call downwards.

There are many who still persistently cling to the fallacy that "seeing is believing," they soon get tired of thinking otherwise and long to get back to their dolls, wooden horses and toys, though in every decade the truth is being driven home to them more and more that they are contenting themselves with make-believes. To such I would like to propound the question, "Can we really be said to have even seen matter?" Let us turn towards a common object in this room; we catch in our eyes the multitudinous impulses which are reflected from its surface under circumstances very similar to those in which a cricketer "fields" a ball; he puts his open hand in the way of the moving ball and catches it, and, knowing the distance of the batsman, he may perhaps recognise by the hard impact of the ball that he has strong muscles, but by no stretch of the imagination can he be said to *see* the batsman by that impact, nor can he gain the slightest knowledge as to his character or appearance. So it is with objective intuition, though in this case we are fielding myriads of impacts; we direct our open eyes towards an object and catch thereby rills of light reflected from it at different angles; by combining all these directions we have learnt to recognise form and come to the conclusion that we are looking at, say, a chair. The eye catches rills coming in greater quantity from certain parts and we say that those parts are *polished*; the eye catches rills of higher or lower frequencies and we call that colour; we also recognise that this chair prevents the eye from catching light rills reflected from other objects in the room and we say it is not transparent. These are the conditions under which we are said to *see* our surroundings and upon which is based the fallacy of "seeing is believing."

If we now take another step forward and analyse this phenomenon "Vibration," upon which, as we have seen, rests our very belief in the reality of our surroundings, we shall be able to realise that the whole outside world is really only a pseudo-conception caused by ignorance and the finiteness of our outlook. It has been sensed as real by our limited physical organs of perception but has no reality or value for us apart from those senses. The explanation is, as already pointed out, that all human sense organs depend entirely upon *vibration* or movement in the æther, air or matter for their excitation; without that form of incitation there would be no knowledge of the outside world, no perception and therefore no knowledge of physical existence. The cause of this absolute dependence upon movements for gaining knowledge of our surroundings is that all our sense organs are confined to working under the two modes

of perception or limitations called Time and Space, making *Motion* the only possible basis of objectivity, because motion is the combination of these two modes; the very sensing of motion is the perception of the *time* taken to traverse a certain *space*; and we cannot imagine motion unless it contains both of these modes in however small a quantity. We may have the greatest imaginable space traversed in a moment of time, or the smallest imaginable space traversed in what may be called, for want of a better word, an eternity; but we still have to postulate motion. This, of course, follows from the fact that when we are looking outwards, as we are doing when looking at the world of appearances, our thoughts require both these modes for forming concepts.

Let us now take another step forward and examine these two factors of vibration under which our senses act. If we try to analyse our conception of Time and Space we seem forced to postulate that they are both infinitely divisible and infinitely extensible, they are both what we call continuous and not discrete; both duration in time and extension in space can be reduced to a mathematical point. All parts of time are time, and all parts of space are space; there are no holes, as it were, in space which are not space, nor intervals in time which are not time, they are both complete units. Space cannot be limited except by space, and time cannot be limited except by time. So far they are alike, but on the other hand space is comprised of three dimensions, namely length, breadth and depth, whereas time has the appearance to us as comprising only one dimension, namely length.

Our conception of time is an inconceivable intangible something which gives us the impression of movement without anything that moves it. Space is an omnipresent intangible nothing, outside which nothing that has existence can be even thought to exist.

We arbitrarily divide each of these two modes of perception into two parts, which parts are separated from each other, in either case, by a point which has, apparently as its centre, our very consciousness of living. In the case of Space we call the point the *Here* and on one side of it we have extension towards the infinitely great and on the other intension towards the infinitely small. In the case of time, we call the middle point the *Now*, and on one side of this we have the duration of time towards the future, and on the other, what we call the duration of time towards the past. In the case of space we have the *here* and the *overthere*, equivalent in time to the present and the *future*; but though time and space are as it were twin sisters, upon whose combined action depends our very consciousness of existence, we do not treat them both equally.

It is a remarkable fact that the human race on this particular world has in some inexplicable way come to look upon the future as non-existent until we arrive at it and are able to perceive with our senses what is happening there. This is all the more inexplicable when we realise that in traversing space we have to *move* to get anywhere, but in traversing time we have nothing equivalent to movement. This way of looking upon the future as non-existent is probably another sign that our race is still in its infancy and that we have hitherto looked upon time not only as a reality but as actually moving or extending along a line from what we call the past to future eternity; whereas, under our present outlook, we have no consciousness of the existence of time except as intervals between successive thoughts. Our consciousness of the existence of time is based upon our repeating the *present* by saying to ourselves the words Now-Now-Now; but there is nothing that can be called movement in this any more than when we stand still and repeat the words Here-Here Here relating to space.

Our present conception of the future may at any time be rectified by either a slight rearrangement of the slender network of nerves or microscopical filaments attached to the cells in the grey cortical layer, or even by a single bridge thrown across from one convolution to another in the brain; a very slight alteration would open up to our consciousness the present existence of the future. The prime perceptible difference between our brain and that of the apes and other animals is the larger number of enfoldments or convolutions that are developed in the human. Each new line of thought, or sequence of thoughts, requires and is provided with a new wrinkle or microscopical convolution, and it probably only requires the attention of the race to be focussed for a time on the subject to evolve the slight alteration or bridge necessary to enable us to realise that the future, as also the past, does actually exist and is included in the Now. It may make this a little clearer to consider that if we maintain that, in traversing the duration of time, the future does not exist until we arrive there, we should also maintain that, in traversing the extension of space, our destination, say Rome, does not exist until we arrive there and can see it with our eyes.

That is as far as I can take you, in this present paper, towards the appreciation of this curious illusion of time, but I would like to say here that I could take you much further and that, from my own personal experience, it is not impossible to grasp the realisation referred to. In another place* I have indeed shown logically that it is quite conceivable that, at a not far distant date, the books which are *now* being written in the future, say even 5,000 years hence, may actually be in our hands, so

* Science and Infinite.

that we can read them, in a similar manner to that which enables us *now* to handle and read those which were written 5,000 years ago.

The more we study the subject of time and space the more clearly we see that they are only the temporal finite modes under which our senses act on the physical plane. They are temporal and therefore not real, in the sense that they are not eternal; the only Reality is the Eternal *Now* of time and *Here* of space.

Let me put before you another aspect to show that time and space are not realities except in the sense that they are limitations to our outlook.

The whole of the physical universe is what may be called the manifestation or materialisation of the Thought or Will of God. He is not subject to time limitation and that *Thought* must therefore have the aspect of being what we should call instantaneous. It is only the finiteness of our outlook under time and space limitations which necessitates our looking at Creation as though it were a long line of events, in sequence, extending from past to future eternity. Under these conditions we appear to be in a similar position to that of a being whose senses are limited to one dimensional space, namely to a line. We can only gain knowledge of what is in front and behind us in time, we know nothing of what is to the right or left. We appear to be limited to looking lengthwise in time, whereas an Omniscient and Omnipresent Being looks at time, as it were, crosswise and sees it as a whole. A small light, when at rest, appears as a point of light, but when we apply quick motion, the product of time and space, to it we get the appearance of a line of light, and this continuous line formed by motion of a point is, I think, analogous to the physical universe appearing to our finite senses as continuous in time duration and space extension, though really comprised in the Now and Here. We have a similar limitation in reading a book, we can only deal with it as a long line of words in succession, a long sequence of thoughts, whereas the whole book is lying complete before us.

A consideration of our limitation in space may also be useful to show how impossible it is for us to see by our senses the Reality or by our thoughts to know the Spiritual. Our senses and thoughts are limited to a space of three dimensions, and we can therefore only see or know that part of the Absolute which is or can be represented to us in three dimensions. A being whose senses were limited to a universe of one dimension, namely, a *line*, could have no knowledge of another being who was in a universe of two dimensions, namely, a *flat surface*, except so far as the two-dimensional being could be represented within his line of sensation. So also the two-dimensional being, on a plane, could have no true knowledge of a being like ourselves in a

universe of three dimensions. To his thoughts limited within two dimensions, a being like ourselves would be unthinkable, except so far as our nature could be made manifest on his plane.

So can it be seen that we, limited by our finite senses to time and space, and our consciousness dependent upon that limited basis of thought, can only know that aspect of the Reality or Spiritual which can be manifest within that range, namely, as Motion or what we call physical phenomena.

Again the Spiritual is the cause of all causation in the Universe, and what we call the forces of nature are only our limited aspects of Spiritual activity. Matter is one of these aspects, it is composed of atoms all of which are built up of exactly the same bricks. Each element has in its atom a certain number of these cosmic bricks, which number gives that element its special characteristics. These bricks are only units of electricity which, by vibrating at an enormous rate, send out impulses which affect our senses. Matter is therefore electricity, namely, one of the forces of nature, and is one of our finite aspects of the Spiritual. Each atom is somewhat similar to our Solar system. The cosmic bricks, namely, units of negative electricity, of which it is composed, are revolving at an enormous rate round the centre which is composed of units of positive electricity. If Spiritual activity were withdrawn, these bricks would have no *motion*, they would not come under our observation in time and space; matter would then cease to have any properties which could be detected by our sense organs and would cease to exist as an objective.

We see therefore that the whole world of appearances is only our limited aspect of the Spiritual; it is not real except in the sense that dolls, wooden horses and toys represent living beings to children, or as the shadow on the floor represents a table. If therefore we confine our thoughts to the outward forms as is done by many in the use of Intellection, we can never get to understand the Reality, the Spiritual, which underlies and transcends all phenomena. To do this we have to look inwards instead of outwards, to employ Introspection, or what St. Paul calls Spiritual discernment, to enable us to grasp the meaning of our life and surroundings here. St. Paul says that the unrighteous, namely, those who have no knowledge and therefore no love of God, shall be without excuse because "the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity (Romans i. 18-20 r.v.).

We with our limitations are thus forced to postulate two aspects of the universe; one of these is what is called the visible, finite or physical, which carries the appearance of reality to our finite senses, though it has no existence for us apart from those senses; and the other is that which transcends our utmost con-

ception, which we call the invisible, infinite or spiritual. We cannot conceive beyond the finite so long as we are conscious of living under present conditions. With every act of perception by our senses, or conception by our intellect we have therefore not only knowledge of the visible or finite, as far as Intellection can carry us, but we become at the same moment aware, by intuition, of the invisible, infinite beyond. So by the use of Introspection, as soon as we have gained a knowledge of our finite physical self with a clear comprehension of its limited modes of thought, we at once become aware of the Infinite Spiritual part of us transcending it. The spiritual part of us is our real personality, of which the physical self is only the outward manifestation or shadow on our plane of consciousness.

Let me suggest two psychological experiments which will prove to anybody, who will earnestly try them, how inadequate the intellect is for dealing with any subject beyond its narrow finite horizon :

Try persistently, say, for five minutes, to grasp the idea of the infinite extension of space; you won't be able to grasp it, but I want you to try the experiment. The longer you persist and try to master it, in the endeavour to get *there* in thought, the more impossible it becomes, until you have to give it up and acknowledge that it is absolutely inconceivable that space can extend without limit; but having done this you find that it is quite as inconceivable, and perhaps even more so, to think that space could be limited; there would always be the question what is beyond, and yet the Intellect insists that one of these two alternatives must be true, though it cannot conceive how either can be possible.

Again try persistently to master the idea of time duration. In our experiment on space, when we had reached a point where we began to gasp with bewilderment, we had a feeling of relief at the thought that after all we could, at the worst, stop our flight on our journey outwards into the vasty deep; we could as it were ignore the terrifying idea of unending extension; but in the experiment on time our consciousness cannot apply that anæsthetic to its bewildered brain; time for us is irresistibly rushing on and carrying us with it; we are helpless, we cannot call a halt and say we will go no further. Our bewildered mind may try to force the thought that surely there must be an end sometime; but the intellect, which is quite incapable of dealing with such a question, tells us that Time can never cease.

To those who are dominated by the world of appearances and look *outwardly* upon time and space and therefore believe them to be realities, such experiments, if persisted in for any length of time, would tend dangerously towards insanity; but relief comes immediately when, by looking *inwardly*, we realise that

both these appalling infinities of time and space are mere illusions, caused by the finite outlook of our *self*-consciousness. When, by looking inwardly we have cancelled that finite *self* and have become God-conscious, we are able to realise our oneness with the Great Spirit, and that our real spiritual being, the holy son of God growing up within us, always has been, is now and ever shall be in the Eternal *Now* comprising all time and the Here comprising all space, where there cannot have been a beginning and can be no end.

When we have realised that our real personality is our *inner* spiritual being, we have only to turn our thoughts in the right direction, namely, inwardly instead of outwardly, to have the power of employing spiritual discernment for sweeping away all those other inconceivables with which the misuse of Intellection has for so long surrounded us.

We have thus seen that the whole world of appearances can only be looked upon as the temporal condition under which the race is being gradually educated, and by means of which we are being prepared for an existence far transcending anything that we can even imagine in our present state of knowledge.

It is only in the last fifty years that we have entered a new era of Religion and Philosophy; we hear no more of the old fear that the study of scientific facts leads to atheism or irreligion; we have learnt to realise that Religion and Science are only provisional, they are both progressive in their outlook and are meant to go hand in hand towards elucidating the Riddle of the Universe; but the Scientist, on the one hand, must always remember that he is only looking outwardly at the shadow forms of that Invisible Power which is the cause of all causation, and that the real goal to which all knowledge is meant to lead us is the *vision* of that Reality.

The teachers of religion, on the other hand, must realise the value of scientific investigation. It can indeed only deal with the visible shadow forms, but these are shadows of the Reality, and the study of nature is one and perhaps the most important of the channels through which we are meant to gain a knowledge of nature's God. It is therefore clearly a duty that the teacher of religion should, by the help of Scientists, seek to become better acquainted than he usually is with the wonders with which God has surrounded us. St. Paul, in the passage quoted above, has pointed out the value of the world of appearances for gaining a knowledge of God, but he has also warned us against looking upon the visible as being itself the reality. His words are, "For the things which are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are Eternal."

I have shown elsewhere* that before we can gain a vision of the

* Science and Infinite, chapter on "The Vision."

Reality we must realise that everything on the physical plane is only a shadow form or symbol of that which is on the Transcendental, and we must thus look upon Nature. Every leaf and blade of grass is as it were a letter or word conveying some portion of that wonderful "Thought" of God which we call Creation; as every word in a book conveys a portion of the thought contained therein.

Under finite physical conditions we are looking outwardly, namely objectively on, say, a forest tree, we say the trunk is brown and hard, the bark rough, the leaves green and the branches spreading out into space, that the branches wave about and creak, and the leaves rustle in the breeze; but these are only movements under the illusions of time and space. When we have escaped from this limited outlook and are able to look inwardly, namely subjectively, these outward forms will cease to have any value for us, we shall then understand the *meaning* of that tree in the scheme of creation. It is sad to see how many there are in this age of enlightenment who still confine their thoughts entirely to the outward material forms of everyday life, and have no thought of or desire to know the real meaning of their sojourn here; they are indeed like children who cannot read; they confine their attention to the printed letters and words and think that these outward visible forms are all that the book contains; they have no knowledge of the truth underlying these symbols. This is, I think, to a great extent, the result of the great advance in Intellectualism experienced during the last fifty years, which has tended to stereotype thought into Scientific formulae and hard and fast dogmas, and these in their turn have, among the thoughtless, succeeded in strangling initiative and quenching desire for advancement in a knowledge of the true inner meaning of our surroundings. It is an age obsessed by controversy, dominated and camouflaged by intellectual gymnastics. We need to take a leaf out of the daily log of primitive man, or from little children, of whom we are told is the Kingdom of Heaven, and learn again to develop the power of *wondering* at and loving the beautiful in nature.

The old pictorial Hebrew description of the creation contains a fundamental truth sadly overlooked by those who, in fear that the Great Architect of the Universe should be thought to have made a serious structural error in an important part of the building, introduced Adam and Eve and the apple to account for the paradoxical existence of evil in a world created by a Being who was absolutely Perfect, Omniscient, Omnipotent, and All-loving.

"When God looked upon everything that He had made, behold it was very good."

From the infinite outlook of the Spiritual, the whole Universe, being the expression of His thought, must be absolutely perfect.

It is only the narrow finite range of our outlook through ignorance caused by race-infancy and our limited modes of perception which, by the assertion of Self, the cause of all imperfections and the antithesis of that purity or singleness of heart by which we see God, blinds us with the illusions of evil, ugly and false, which we read into our surroundings.

How then can we free ourselves from this obsession and obtain a glimpse of the real world, of which this world of appearances is only the outward shadow-form under the limitations of Time and Space?

In conclusion, I should like to answer that question, and to suggest, on the lines laid down in this paper, a way by which it is possible for anybody, of whatever form of earnest religious belief, to realise the presence within him of what I have referred to as his real spiritual personality, provided he has learnt to look inwardly instead of outwardly, at the reality instead of the shadow, namely at the *meaning* instead of the outward form of his surroundings.

Let me recapitulate. I have shown that the Invisible or Spiritual is the real and that the Visible or Physical is only its shadow-form as depicted on our finite senses under the limitations of time and space. We have therefore to postulate two aspects of the universe. The Spiritual which is immanent and transcendental, and the physical which constitutes our world of appearances. Every phenomenon in nature has therefore these two aspects, the Spiritual and the Physical.

If we analyse the human being we see these two aspects. The Spiritual, an emanation from the Great Spirit, is the holy Son of God growing up within each one of us and constitutes our real personality. The physical self is the shadow or presentation of that real personality, on the limited plane of our consciousness, it has the same life in common with all plants and animals, and probably, as I have shown elsewhere, with even inorganic matter and is a part of the world of appearances.

It is a fundamental truth that before we can become conscious of the real meaning and value of anything, we must be able to realise the connection which it has with our *being*. It therefore follows that the way to solve the problem before us is to understand the relation in which each of us stands to that wonderful power behind all causation in the world of appearances. In other words, the only way to know and realise the Spiritual is to feel our oneness with it; and in order to feel our oneness with the Spiritual under our present conditions of race-infancy and therefore ignorance, we have first to realise the oneness of the physical self, which is the outward shadow-form of our real Spiritual self, with the physical universe, which is the outward shadow-form of the Great Spirit.

This is indeed similar to the method suggested by St. Paul for gaining a knowledge of the Divinity of God, and I wish I had time to give practical examples, from my own personal experience, how it may be done; but my paper has already grown beyond what I intended and I must for the present be content with having pointed out the pathway by which it is possible for anyone, who will earnestly set himself to the task, to realise the presence of the Spiritual Son of God which is growing up within or in intimate connection with the earthly frame of each one of us, and which I have referred to as our real personality.

DISCUSSION.

After a hearty vote of thanks to the learned lecturer had been carried by acclamation on the proposition of Dr. A. T. SCHOFIELD, the Chairman, the Doctor proceeded briefly to criticize the paper:—

On page 54, par. 3, we are told the spiritual is quite beyond our senses of perception, therefore of our conception.

I question if this is so altogether, I quite agree that God, by whom I presume the "spiritual power" is meant, cannot be comprehended by the finite, but I suggest that He can certainly be apprehended, and more fully if the precepts and concept be quickened by the Holy Spirit.

On page 65, par. 3, is a thought worth crystallizing. In time "*we appear to be in a similar position to that of a being whose senses are limited to one dimensional space, namely to a line.*"

I now come to what certainly requires a little altering and amplifying on pp. 68 and 71 "the Holy Son of God," and "the Spiritual Son of God" growing up within us. Inasmuch as the phrase "Son of God" is certainly borrowed from Scripture, the writer will agree with me that it should not be used in a non-Scriptural sense. The phrase never occurs of any man in the O.T., and but once of a nation "I have called my son out of Egypt." In the N.T. its first occurrence, referring to men, is in Romans viii. 14, "*For as many as are led by the Spirit of God these are the sons of God.*" A statement that by no means refers to humanity at large. Next in Galatians iv. 5, we read that Christ "might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons," Evidently a special privilege of those redeemed by Christ; and thirdly we read A.V. in 1 John iii. 1, "*Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God.*" In the N.T. therefore this title belongs to those led of the Spirit, redeemed by Christ, and beloved of the Father. I think this should be clearly expressed in the paper.

May I be allowed in conclusion to point out a fallacy that is common to-day with regard to evil, and that is the denial of its existence and of its reality.

I would like to say first that a "minus" sign, is by no means the negation of a "plus" sign; any more than evil is merely

a negation of good. No doubt it may be urged that darkness is not an entity like light; and that when it is illuminated it is non-existent. But such is not the case with regard to evil which is an actual entity as much as good, and alas by no means disappears when the light shines, but is often in direct and bitter conflict with it. The treating of sin as an illusion is a fatal error that is denied throughout the whole of Scripture.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said:—Mr. Klein's paper has a destructive and a constructive aspect. From the standpoint of idealism his destructive criticism appears conclusive. In his constructive contribution—a Pantheistic Mysticism—he attempts to escape from the results of his destructive work, not by argument, but by simply uttering the words "Intuition," "Introspection," "Inner" and "Inwardly" as though they were potent magic formulae. How does he determine the boundary between "inner" and "outer," and why does he attribute to the area of consciousness lying on one side of the line a validity lacking in that on the other side?

I suggest that Mr. Klein's work is vitiated by an inability (characteristic of oriental thinkers) to distinguish between analogy and argument, metaphor and reality. Thus in this paper he regards the physical universe as a shadow cast upon our senses, and at the same time speaks of these senses as themselves a shadow upon "the plane of our consciousness." But is not this a shadow upon a shadow—an illusion on the part of an illusion? Again evil is described as an illusion; but such an illusion would itself be evil, and require explanation. The solution is purely verbal, the problem is unsolved.

The Rev. J. J. B. COLES said: Has not the lecturer in his interesting paper confounded the Divine life in the Christian with the ordinary spirit of the Natural Man?

Mr. Klein quotes from Gen. i. 31, but this must be taken in connection with Gen. vi., 5.

"Know thyself" (by introspection) was the foundation principle of all ancient philosophies, whereas Christianity pointed to Christ, His sufferings and His glories and not to self-occupation and introspection.

Mr. H. O. WELLER remarked of the paper that its Philosophy is non-Christian—a mixture of Buddhism and Christian Science; it does not bring us "into direct touch with the latest advances" in knowledge and especially it most certainly does not in the smallest degree "combat the unbelief now prevalent." In a paper subsequently submitted he wrote "I will content myself with suggesting that the primary test of any system of philosophical speculation advanced before such a society as ours is that the incarnation, the life, and the death of our Lord Jesus Christ should be stated in terms of it."

Now, in the author's system we are asked to accept "this curious

illusion of time" coupled with his doctrine of the present existence of the future (with its inevitable corollary the present existence of the past); and we are clearly left with a God who not only cheats us by an "illusion of evil" into thinking that sin is real, but who proceeds to play on our disordered nerves with the obviously absurd demand, "God requireth that which is past."

In this system, where "Space is an omnipresent intangible nothing, outside which nothing that has existence can be even thought to exist," in this "new era of Religion and Philosophy" where "Religion and Science are only provisional," what terms are to be used in speaking of the Word who was God, in the beginning with God, becoming flesh and dwelling among us? In what terms, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world"?

Col. HARRY BIDDULPH, C.M.G., writes:—With much of the general theme of Mr. Klein's paper one is in agreement, but with important reservations; that the visible is but an exponent of the Invisible, probably most of us will assent to; in Heb. xi., 3, we read, "through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear"; or in other words, the visible was made of the invisible. Matter appears to be the expression of energy under varying conditions, and the investigation of radioactive matter, and of the ultimate composition of the atom, seems to confirm this view. This however does not imply that the Visible is unreal, or only "make believe," as the lecturer appears to imply on page 55. *Within its limits* the Visible is real and true. It is no "make believe" when a murderer, grasping a visible and material knife, plunges it into the visible and material body of a fellow man, and sends his invisible spirit unsummoned to His Maker. The visible and the invisible, spirit, soul and body, are mysteriously linked together. In the future world too, there will be much that is material and visible, described under the phrase, "a new heaven and a new earth," which precludes the idea of an existence and state consisting of invisible forces only: in fact the Deity Himself has taken into eternal union with Himself man's body in the person of Jesus Christ.

One must enter also a decided protest against the phrase on page 68, "our real spiritual being, the holy son of God growing up within us." The holy son of God is one, the Lord Christ Jesus, none other can claim that title.

Further on page 69, the story in Genesis ii. and iii., seems to be referred to as having had introduced into it without authority, "Adam and Eve and the apple to account for the paradoxical existence of evil, etc."

It is true, as the lecturer reminds us, that "when God looked upon everything that He had made, behold it was very good." The term "perfect" is carefully avoided; that which is merely

"very good" is capable of betterment or of degradation; and alas creation became degraded,* as described in Genesis iii., by the introduction of sin, and sin is not merely a negation of what is good but the fruit of an active agency and power, hostile to God, both in the created and spiritual worlds.

The concluding pages of Mr. Klein's paper, while claiming to have proved what he has not really done, completely ignore the true Son of God, Our Lord Jesus Christ. His assertion that the true Son of God is growing up in each one of us is without proof and ill accords with our criminal records.

The lecturer quotes St. Paul twice but forgets that he also wrote "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing" (Romans vii., 18).

Mr. W. HOSTE writes:—Mr. Klein has kindly bombarded us with etherial and aerial vibrations but as he, we, and all our visible surroundings are *ex-hypothesi* unreal and shadowy, it is a little difficult to criticise.

Mr. Klein tries to explain "how it is all done," that appearances are deceptive, &c., but has he proved that the thing done is unreal?

I cannot follow our lecturer on page 54 when he says "those who insist that the visible is real, can only look upon the invisible as shadowy and unreal." One does not see the sequitur. The visible is certainly the more important, but why should it alone be real? We have all known men, stockbrokers, scientists, market-gardeners, etc., successful on the visible plane, but none the less profoundly convinced of the transcendent reality of the invisible. On page 66 Mr. Klein quotes Rom. i., 18, 20, as showing that in the visible works of Creation "the invisible things of God are clearly seen," but if the former are unreal, how could the latter be real? I remember once crossing a desert in Tunis to the holy city of Kairowan and seeing a beautiful white city on the horizon, with trees and lakes. Had an Arab told me he was the architect I should have had an high idea of his art and skill, but afterwards when the whole thing faded away and proved a mirage, I should have considered him a fraud. If the visible creation were only shadow, how could it prove the eternal power and Godhead of the Creator?

Paul does not say the visible things are unreal but *temporal*. What he refers to would seem from the context to be the present life with its trials and temptations and vicissitudes rather than material things.

Then again, "visible" and "invisible" are relative terms; but as the universe increases in visibility, it must decrease in reality, as

* In Heb. xii., 23, we read that it is in the heavenly Jerusalem there are the spirits of just men made perfect.

our lecturer tells us the visible is unreal. To him to whom all is visible, all would then be unreal.

Mr. Klein seems to ignore two great basal facts, the fact of evil, which he terms "an illusion," and the fact of Christ. He quotes the last verse of Gen. i., seemingly to prove that what succeeded that in Chap. iii. is only the evasion of a difficulty? Certainly God's work is perfect but in a universe of free moral agents imperfection can enter, and has actually done so, otherwise why blame the Germans, if as an expression of the thought of God they are "absolutely perfect," page 69. Are the Torquemadas, the Abdul d' Ahmets, the Landrus, "the expression of the thought of God"? The very suggestion is blasphemous. God made man upright, as the Wise Man tells us, but man has sought out many inventions. If we ask what practical effect on life and conduct such themes can have, we are brought face to face with the infinitely small.

Lt.-Col. MACKINLAY writes:—I am grateful to Mr. Klein for his paper which will, I trust, provoke a good discussion: it brings before us in a forceful way some of the many ambiguities and limitations by which we are surrounded; at the same time I must confess, there seems to be in it a certain want of accuracy and balance.

Some things, not accepted by all, are taken for granted without any proof, as for instance that the human race is still in its infancy (pp. 55, 57, 64, 70). Notwithstanding the fact that the civilisation of past milleniums was considerable, and in some ways, as in sculpture, at times exceeded ours; while there are millions of savages on the earth at the present moment far below many of the peoples of antiquity.

I doubt if the statements at the bottom of page 60 and at the top of page 61 will bear investigation, when all the conditions are carefully examined.

I cannot think the use of the word *spiritual* in the paper is very definite or consistent with its general usage. On pages 54 and 66 it may be taken to mean the laws of nature, which are not at once apparent; but on page 70 the word seems to be employed in its more ordinary usage. It is of great help in any careful paper to define the exact meanings attached to any keywords employed.

The recognition of the properties of radium, the constitution of matter, the principles of relativity, and many other modern methods of research have opened out new vistas of thought; but it hardly seems wise to indulge in rash generalities, as for instance that because a point in space exists before it is reached, that therefore an event in time (pp. 64 and 65) *may* exist before it has come! It is easy to imagine the impossible, but is it a matter of practical utility to do so?

There is very much more to discuss in this interesting and ingenious paper, but I have not space.

AUTHOR'S REPLY--

"I regret to see that so many of those who have contributed to the discussion have ignored the few words with which I prefaced the reading and demonstration. I pointed out that the subject was too great to be fully covered in the time allotted to our meetings, and that it must be taken as a sequel to the last paper I read before the Institute on 'Our Real Spiritual Personality' (Transactions vol. 44), which was also illustrated by physical experiments. In the present demonstration I exhibited what may be called a 'material soul,' analogous in the *material* to the soul or physical ego of the *organic* world. I put this material soul through a *viva voce* examination on the different traits of character which I had found it possessed, and by means of certain invisible *sympathetic* influences, I was able to induce it to describe, both audibly and optically, eight or nine of those traits, some of which were acknowledged to be very beautiful. It was the most illuminating of all my experiments; it demonstrated so clearly the wonderful influence this sympathetic action has on the material plane, and is surely a window through which we may understand how the All-loving, of whose activity matter, as I have shown, is only one of our finite aspects, influences our souls on the spiritual plane when we open our hearts to that influence.

"We now come to the subject of the paradoxical existence of evil in a world that has been created by a Being who is absolutely Perfect, Omniscient, Omnipotent, and All-loving. Let me first say, as explained in my former paper, that I have never denied that evil has the appearance of reality under our present limited conditions of existence; it has, indeed, to be dealt with by us as a reality, but it can be shown that its appearance of reality is caused by the absence of the Spiritual, in a somewhat similar sense that the appearance as realities of shadow, ignorance and cold are caused by the absence of light, knowledge, and heat, and because, under present conditions of time and space limitations, all our conceptions are necessarily based on 'relativity.' I have dealt with this subject fully elsewhere ('From the Watch Tower' chapter on 'The devil and all his works an illusion'), but one of the contributors to the discussion provides me with a good example of this as the result of his confining his horizon to the World of Appearances. Col. Biddulph says: '*Within its limits* the visible is real and true.' Quite so, that is exactly what I have been urging in my paper. A child within its limits thinks a doll or wooden horse real and true. A child who can only read words of three letters or who confines its reading to a few lines, within those limits can only have a very absurd and erroneous idea of the real thought contained

in a book. We shall only understand the whole problem of evil when we can cease looking at it objectively and can use the infinite spiritual outlook. The organic law of Reincarnation formulated by the Brahmans and the theory of Evolution as expounded by Darwin are both plausible and helpful attempts to enable our finite minds under the limitations of time, to explain physical and spiritual growth in this world of "becoming," but to the spiritual outlook which is not limited by time, such explanations can have no value because to the Infinite there can be no such thing as succession of events. The same contributor makes the statement that 'in the future world there will be much that is material and visible.' I think I have shown clearly that matter is only our limited and therefore ignorant aspect of spiritual activity; does he imagine that we shall have our imperfect physical sense organs to see and hear with when we wake up from our present state of dreaming? Doesn't he know that the rills in the æther are absolutely dark and the waves in the air are silent? It is only when they fall on our sense organs that they become light and sound. Surely everything that is objective to us here will be subjective, when time and space have ceased to limit our outlook and our consciousness is opened to spiritual discernment. Matter, the limited aspect which we call the visible, will then have disappeared for us, and only the spiritual, which we call the invisible, will be known to be real.

"We now come to the phrase: 'The Holy Son of God growing up within us.' May I suggest to Dr. Schofield and the other protestors that the quotations given from the Old and New Testament hardly seem to be applicable. Why are not Christ's own words quoted? He was the Son of God and He is therefore surely the best authority for what constitutes a Son of God. We unfortunately have not the exact words spoken by Christ, and in some cases, perhaps, not even the exact meaning (He spoke in Aramaic, which was translated into Greek and thence into English), but He was very emphatic in His teaching that God was not only our Father, but that the Kingdom in which that God dwelt was actually within each one of us. He urged us to realise that Kingdom within us and likened it to a grain of mustard seed which would ever grow and increase. I might well, therefore, have stated that God Himself was growing up within each one of us. Christ taught us to pray 'Our Father,' and the last words He said to Mary in the garden after His resurrection were: 'Go unto my brethren and say to them that I ascend to my Father and their Father, to my God and their God.' St. John also narrates that when the Jews came out to stone Christ for blasphemy He pointed out to them that it was written in their own law that 'Ye are Gods,' and asked them how therefore He blasphemed when He called himself the Son of God. We are surely an internal, not an external creation of the All-loving. The knowledge of God, the realisation of the Christ,

the Son of God growing up within, is what constitutes our true spiritual life. Heaven and Hell are not localities but are states of consciousness within us. Heaven the real is when we are in loving and knowing communion with the All loving; Hell the unreal when that consciousness is absent.

"It is difficult to treat seriously Mr. Leslie's statement that I have used the words Introspection, Intuition and looking inwards as though they were potent, magical formulæ. True introspection can only be employed when *self* has been eliminated from self-consciousness and God consciousness has been attained.

Mr. Weller thinks my paper 'non-Christian, a mixture of Buddhism and Christian Science, does not bring us into touch with the latest advances, does not combat the unbelief now prevalent, shows that God cheats us by illusions, and last of all, plays on our disordered nerves with the obviously absurd demand that God requireth that which is past! I am quite contented to leave it to others to say whether there is a single sentence of truth in such statements. My paper was not written to prove Christianity or any other religion; there is something to be learnt from every form of serious religion, but in this paper and the others I have given to the Institute, my object has always been not so much to teach as to help others to think to their advantage. It is not God who cheats us, but it is we who by not opening our consciousness to that which is real, cheat ourselves into some very foolish beliefs.

"If Mr. Hoste will refer again to page 54 he will see that I specially limited my remarks to those who have 'not investigated or looked beyond the horizon of everyday life,' and on page 55 I again state that I am only referring to 'those who are dominated by the world of appearances in everyday life.' There are, thank God, many others who, as Mr. Hoste points out, are convinced of the reality of the invisible, but there is, alas, plenty of room for improvement in all of us in that direction. I have also travelled over many deserts and seen many extraordinary mirages, and I had these in mind when writing my paper. Mr. Hoste had only to investigate by either approaching or looking through a field-glass, and he would at once have seen that the appearance was an illusion and could not have been taken in by any would-be teacher, however dogmatically he might lay down the law. I have not stated or suggested that 'as the Universe increases in visibility it decreases in reality,' though that may be the conclusion of those who cannot free themselves from the narrow limitations of material perspective and thus become able to use the unlimited horizon of spiritual discernment.

Col. Mackinlay cannot see that the human race is still in its infancy, and I am afraid I cannot convince him if the examples I have given do not show him that we have hardly yet mastered even our A.B.C., and are only just beginning to get into touch

with the outside fringe of true knowledge of the Reality. I can only tell him that I have never yet met any true investigator who has not freely acknowledged that he who knows most, knows most how little he knows. Col. Mackinlay says I ought to have started by defining what I mean by 'The Spiritual!' but I did this in the very first line of my paper; I defined it there as the *Real*. It is the only Reality, it is what most people understand as God; everything else is only our finite aspect of that Spiritual activity. If he wishes for a fuller definition I will try to give what I have learnt to look upon as its significance and our connection therewith:—

"It is the Infinite, Eternal, Reality of Being of the All-loving. That Reality of Being is Absolute Love, of which the highest form of what we call love is the feeblest echo. It comprises Infinite Wisdom, Power and Purpose, and as we realise our oneness with that Divine Love, we find the Kingdom of Heaven within, become God conscious, and enter into the Bliss of God; we at last become, as it were, a drop in the ocean of Infinite Love, and are endowed with Wisdom and Power to help to carry out His purpose on the physical plane as that Will is being done in Heaven."