

Vol. I.

No. 4.

MAY, 1900.

THE INDEPENDENT THINKER

HENRY FRANK, Editor.

Be NOBLE! and the nobleness that lies
In other men, sleeping, but never dead,
Will rise in majesty to meet thine own;
Then wilt thou see it gleam in many eyes,
Then will pure light around thy path be shed,
And thou wilt nevermore be sad and lone.

LOWELL.

12 MONTHLY ISSUES PER YEAR, - - \$1.00
SINGLE COPIES, 10 CTS.

PUBLISHED BY THE
INDEPENDENT LITERATURE ASSOCIATION,
No. 27 WEST 42ND STREET,
NEW YORK CITY

HENRY FRANK

Lectures every Sunday 11.20 A. M.,

CARNEGIE LYCEUM,

(Theatre Downstairs),

57th Street & 7th Avenue.

He expounds the principles of the

NEW THOUGHT.

He advocates a

SCIENTIFIC RELIGION

showing that there can be no conflict between real religion and real science. If you are sick of the mummery of established religion and the nauseating quackery of faddism and folly, go and hear him.

"His words are tonic and his thoughts give life."

If you have been bewildered and disappointed by expositions of Christian Science, Mental science, mystifying metaphysics and muddy materialism, go and hear Mr. Frank, and you'll find a philosophy to live by, and a religion that cannot be laughed down or refuted.

N. B.—If you are so situated that you cannot in person attend the lectures, do the next best thing:

—SUBSCRIBE FOR—

THE INDEPENDENT THINKER,

and read the revised stenographic reports of these unparalleled discourses.

SEND ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO

The Independent Literature Association,

32 WEST 27TH STREET,

NEW YORK.

The Independent Thinker.

HENRY FRANK, EDITOR.

Vol. I.

MAY, 1900.

No. 4.

How highly gratifying it is to be misinterpreted ! How happy it makes a man to have his utterances perverted ; and because of what he did *not* say, receive the castigations of his imaginary opponents.

Praise is so stintedly given in this world that one is delighted to receive it even when one doesn't deserve it. But dispraise, denunciation and aspersion are so common that one feels most grievously afflicted when one is buried under a denunciatory avalanche without deserving it.

Now that is just my position !

Who that knows me has ever heard me say an unkind thing about woman ? The dear creature ; I have always sought to be the champion of her just cause, even when at times I felt she was somewhat in the wrong.

Well, the point I am struggling to reach in these remarks is simply this : I have been abused, shamefully abused, for utterances attributed to me which I never voiced. And those utterances, alack the day, which I am said to have voiced were in derogation of woman—her intelligence, sincerity and moral excellence.

O would that I were a cynic ! I should then know the delights of Nirvana—for no cynic could have said severer things than the newspapers declare I have said about woman.

That my friends may be able to sympathize with me, I print the following editorial.

From *New York Journal*, March 27, 1900.

WOMAN'S "MORAL WEAKNESS."

"Is woman a menace to civilization?" The Rev. Henry Frank, after asking this question seriously in a lecture delivered before the Brooklyn Philosophical As-

sociation, proceeded to answer it in the affirmative. Mr. Frank spoke of "woman's moral weakness" as if it were a fact. He said: The records of our divorce courts show how indulgent is the best society toward the frailties of its women. Why are these women exempt from the penalties paid by the unfortunates in Baxter Street? Why should there not be the same standard of morals for Hester Street and Fifth Avenue? It is only in our so-called high society that women, after being sent through the divorce court, remarry and are received again in the same circles.

Why does the Rev. Henry Frank hold women responsible for these things? What have they to do with the passing of iniquitous laws, or the differences in the morals of Baxter Street and Fifth Avenue? In what direction do they show a tenth part, or a hundredth part, of the moral weakness of man?

It is the old cowardly cry of Adam in the Garden of Eden: "Had it not been for the woman."

We can assure the Rev. Henry Frank that if the wheels of civilization shall be hampered by no greater load than that of womankind, the machine will run smoothly all the time.

Instead of being a menace, they are the very bulwarks of civilization. The few who figure unfavorably in the daily news either of Hester Street or of Fifth Avenue, are as a drop in the sea to the millions upon millions of good wives and mothers, who teach their boys to grow up to be good men, and may be ministers.

Therefore it smacks something of ingratitude when one of these ministers turns about and berates womankind as a "menace to civilization." Excepting every man's mother, sister, wife and daughter, we are willing to believe it true.

This was bad enough. It would not seem that it could be worse. But there is nothing so bad, its evil qualities cannot be intensified. In proof of which read the following:

From *New York Journal*, March 28, 1900.

MR. FRANK'S GREAT IDEA.

I read with regret your criticism of the address of the Rev. Henry Frank, entitled "Are Women a Menace to Civilization?" The reverend gentleman is a personal friend of mine; he has prepared a series of lectures disposing of the remaining problems of the universe with equal eloquence and logic. He has read to me privately the whole course, so that I am in a position to know what I am talking about, and to look upon you with pity and indignation. Unless deterred by the hostile criticism of shallow newspapers he will soon deliver his next address, the subject of which is "Are Children a Menace to the Population of the World?" And as he so eloquently and conclusively has shown the awful danger lurking in the supposed necessary and harmless woman, and the logical necessity for her immediate extirpation—so in this next lecture he shows beautifully but remorselessly the awful power for harm lurking in seemingly innocent and prattling childhood. I have his full permission to anticipate his argument. Is not the population of this country and the entire world constantly being threatened and undermined by the growing power of trusts, politicians and wicked plays? Are not the trust magnates, the greedy politicians

and Olga Nethersoles, men and women? Were they not once children? If children were ruthlessly and Herodically exterminated, would there be any more Thomas Platts and Andrew Carnegies and naughty play actresses? Mr. Frank thinks there would not, and so do I.

OTTO HUN.

Brooklyn, March 27, 1900.

That alters the situation, of course. If we had known of Mr. Frank's grand design we should never have treated it with disrespect. The whole plan, as explained by our correspondent, is fully up to the standard of the first lecture in insight and logical power.—[EDITOR.]

And here follows a letter which the *Journal* did NOT publish, but which I wrote and mailed to the editor :

The amusing criticism in your columns of my recent discourse before the Brooklyn Philosophical Association on "Is Woman a Menace to Civilization?" is as magnificently humorous as anything Mark Twain ever wrote. To begin with, I am commonly known as a champion of Woman's Rights, for which I have frequently pleaded in spite of criticism and abuse. The recently delivered lecture was especially intended as a plea for Woman's Liberty, but was misreported in the daily press, doubtless because of the suggestiveness of the title.

Your editorial was, of course, justifiable, founded as it was upon a disconnected excerpt from my discourse, which in itself was an apparent attack upon womankind.

As to my "friend" Otto Hun, of Brooklyn, who is so well informed about my secret thoughts and which you denominate "A Grand Idea," permit me to invite him to Carnegie Lyceum, Sunday mornings, where I should be pleased to be introduced to him and where he will be able to hear my "real ideas" about woman.

I shall undertake to show him at that place on next Sunday morning, just why Woman is a Menace to Civilization. And he will learn it is because Civilization is a menace to her. The civilization which we "enjoy" stands in the way of her growth, progress, liberty, and intellectual advancement. It is her great purpose to disintegrate and overthrow the traditional foundations on which this present civilization rests, that she may be instrumental in rearing the New Order of which she shall be come the sponsor and presiding spirit. Before controversialists can understand each other they must define the terms about which they dispute.

What do you mean by civilization, Mr. Editor? That is the question. Does the present civilization advance or retard the growth of woman? Is it justifiable? Does woman threaten it? If so, can she be blamed for desiring its downfall? These are the "Grand Ideas," if you please, which I am advancing and to which I invite the attention of the editor of the greatest of modern newspapers and "my friend from Brooklyn"—Otto the Hun, who is a veritable Attila in his crushing sarcasm.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY FRANK,
Metropolitan Independent Church, Carnegie Lyceum.

Nevertheless I have no fault to find with the *Journal*. It is indeed

one of the greatest journalistic triumphs of this or any other age. We can afford to overlook a few minor errors where so much excellence abounds. And by the way, the *Evening Journal*—that spicy afternoon appendage, which “wakes up the animals” in a way the world’s menagerie has never before experienced, kept following up the morning edition, by giving in full my real statements about woman with due prominence and audacity.

But on the principle that a lie will travel a mile, while lazy truth is putting on her shoes—I must quote a few more newspaper comments, to let the readers of THE INDEPENDENT THINKER realize how thoroughly its editor has been thrashed. The following is an editorial

From *The Buffalo Inquirer*, March 29, 1900.

WHY NOT LET WOMAN ALONE?

We have observed that persons with nothing either important or interesting to say, who want to attract attention, blatantly attack marriage or take a fling at “woman.”

The latest of these solemn donkeys, the Rev. Henry Frank, asks, “Is Woman a Menace to Civilization?” and undertakes to answer his question in a lecture before the Brooklyn Philosophical Association.

“Woman’s moral weakness,” said Dr. Frank, “is due to her past condition of slavery. As women became more intellectual they became purer. But where now we should expect to find the ideal morality in so-called high society we find instead a disposition to condone many glaring indulgences.”

This is a fair sample of the thought which these harpers on the woman question exhibit. It makes the healthy, common-sense world tired. Every healthy, normal-minded man knows that just as men, as a rule, are stronger in physique and more fitted for work and fighting than women, so women as a rule are more sensitive, gentle and more moral than men.

All men and all women, we suppose, are subject to weakness and failure, but Mr. Frank betrays the habitual disregard of facts which characterizes his type when he refers to “woman’s moral weakness” as something peculiar to women. If Mr. Frank should stop to think, he would be forced to conclude that for every “morally weak woman” there were at least several morally weak men, and so there would be nothing to talk about in that regard.

As to the position accorded divorced women in polite society to-day, which is more like the position accorded divorced men than heretofore, it is obviously a sign of improving civilization, not of degenerating barbarism. It is the barbarian who punishes the woman and ignores the sin of the man.

Christ set the standard of true civilization when he advised the gentleman without sin to be the first to throw a stone at the improper lady whose case was under discussion. Fair play and justice are even more important to civilization than what we call good morals, which too often is only another term for keeping unpleasant facts out of sight. We never need be afraid of retrograding because we grow more

disposed to treat a woman's misconduct on the same terms as those on which we treat a man's.

If Mr. Frank and all the other discussers of "woman" used a little common-sense, they would let woman alone and save their energies for more profitable, if less conspicuous, labors; but it is probable that this is just what they do not care about doing.

It is gratifying, incidentally, to learn from this discussion that a great newspaper, like the *Enquirer*, has reached the same conclusion about the moral rights of woman which I have; but it is discouraging to find that the editor is so obtuse that he cannot understand my line of reasoning, which leads to the same goal he has reached.

But perhaps the most serious blow which has befallen the editor of this magazine, because of this unfortunate perversion of his true opinion of woman, was dealt by that most bewitching queen of the rostrum, Rev. Anna Shaw. I quote the following from the *Philadelphia North American*, April 3d.

REV. ANNA SHAW REBUKES THE REV. MR. FRANK.

REPLIES IN SCORN TO HIS SERMON ON "WHY WOMEN MENACE CIVILIZATION."

Waves of indignation swept over the meeting of the Woman's Sanitary League yesterday, at the Walton. The very feathers in the hats of the members and their guests took on an extra curl with suppressed wrath, and dainty chiffon ruffles quivered with indignation. All this suppressed excitement in that dignified body was due to the statement of the Rev. Henry Frank, made in Carnegie Lyceum, on "Why Women Menace Civilization."

The Rev. Anna Shaw, in tones of fine scorn, read the speech published yesterday, punctuating it with terse criticism.

"When one stops to think that the address was delivered to an audience comprised chiefly of women, one is appalled at the man's impudence, and wonders, too, what sort of women they must have been to sit tamely and listen."

Her listeners bowed gravely and ominously in response. It was evident that the Sanitary League would have left the hall in a body. And the one man in the audience slid down in his seat and tried to see how little space he could occupy.

"One point we must remember," continued Mrs. Shaw; "that women are the mothers of men. In belittling women, man cheapens himself. Water cannot rise higher than its level."

"Physiologists say, too, that the daughters always inherit the traits of the fathers, the sons those of the mother. Dr. Frank is in very deep water when he belittles woman and talks about her 'blind faith, intellectual darkness, native fear,' and declares she 'has espoused the cause of benighted superstition in every age.'"

adding that 'on these, her weaknesses, rests the glorious superstructure of Christianity.' He should remember his mother was a woman.

"But how could we expect to have an intelligent man born of such a mother as this clergyman describes. With all his getting he has failed to obey the admonition to get understanding.

"The time has gone by when a woman will work for any sort of a man in the pulpit. The time has come when she must be recognized by these great Christian bodies. Furthermore, the man who takes the attitude toward the sex that is taken by this man is the greatest menace to society existing in this day and age."

A round of applause greeted this statement, and the solitary man went into total eclipse, by tiptoeing out of the hall.

O Anna, dear Anna, of eloquent tongue,
 'Tis not in my mind or my pen to retort,
 For the praises of Woman so oft have I sung,
 How could you have thought I meant to distort?
 But when woman attacks 'tis for man to retire—
 Hence I flee while I may from the trail of your fire!
 But when again you seek to flay me alive,
 Please warn me the bees have escaped from the hive.

Now, that my readers may know what I really did say about woman, I print below my remarks in full on

"WHY WOMAN IS A MENACE TO CIVILIZATION."

Whether woman is a menace to civilization, or civilization a menace to her, all depends upon the definition of "civilization."

If, by that term, we mean the existing standard of morals, religion and social statics; then, I insist, she is the most potent factor that menaces its integrity.

If the present civilization, which exemplifies the current standards of thought, is divine and essential to human happiness, then woman is its paramount foe—its incarnate Nemesis.

This civilization is built upon three existing standards: First, those of authoritative religion; second, those of current morals; and third, those of the economic status.

Each of these established standards, woman is slowly, persistently, but unconsciously undermining.

FIRST. Traditional religion has taught that woman must be subject in knowledge and spiritual advancement to the whim or authority of man.

Woman, religiously, has ever been a slave. She durst not think, she durst not speak; she must only fear and tremble. Since the teachings of St. Paul regarding the dutiful obedience of women to their husbands and their ministers began to be expounded, woman has regarded freedom of thought as sacrilegious and the utterance of doubt as blasphemous. She has been the staunch supporter of the Creed, and with unabated bigotry has espoused the cause of benighted superstition in every age. She alone sustains the traditional teachings of the Church.

When woman shall come to disbelieve and reject the tenets of Christianity, then its very foundations will have been undermined, and its glorious superstructure crumble into dust.

Woman's blind faith, her intellectual darkness and native fear, coupled with her gentleness and sacred love—these are the bulwarks of traditional Christianity—destroy these, and its foundations are forever shattered.

If this be so, then what greater menace to Christianity (which is one of the three props of current civilization) can be discovered than the rapid intellectual advancement and social freedom of the modern woman. She has learned to think and, therefore, she has ceased to fear. She has learned to scorn blind faith and welcome science, however it may rend her heart-strings or disrupt her peace of mind.

The new woman spurns the creed of tradition, and insists that the Silent Sphinx shall solve the riddle of life, despite priests, churches, Bibles and canticles.

Here, then, is woman a menace to existing civilization.

SECOND: As to current morals. If the existing moral standards are essential to civilization, then, again, woman's growing intelligence is seriously threatening it.

Tradition has established a dual standard of morals: one for each sex, each different from the other; one for the rich and one for the poor; mutually dissimilar. Because of the double sexual standard of morals, woman has become her own greatest enemy. She shudders at the blotch of sin upon her sister's bosom, and runs from her crying "unclean, unclean." But her brother who sins; who comes to her with the smirch of debauchery and the villainy of dishonor upon his heart, she welcomes, admires, adores.

To sin is man's privilege—but woman's doom. Who is responsible for this existing traditional standard? Woman, woman, herself! She it is who drives her own sister into prostitution and social ostracism, by

willingly honoring the man who is her traducer, villifier and destroyer. This is the standard of woman's morals; and this standard is essential to our existing civilization.

It is this standard, however, which the modern advancement of woman is threatening; and with it, the fall of modern civilization.

Woman is beginning to see that she need no longer be terrorized by the old traditions and the rebuke of so-called respectability.

The dawn of a better day is beginning to break upon her vision. She now cries a halt to man. She exclaims—"Sin in me is no viler than sin in you. If I am punished for my sins, so shall you be; and if you are condoned and respected, I, too, shall be; despite my sins."

This new attitude of woman—this new moral standard—one only for both sexes—will destroy all existing codes and reduce traditional civilization to dust and ashes.

It is woman who is awakening; who disarms the injustice of the ages, and the false assumptions and unwarranted judgments of the past. She insists that the old code, the old traditions, the old moral standards, must go, and the new standard take its place. What can threaten existing civilization more seriously than such an attitude?

Therefore I insist, as a second premise, that woman, indeed, as a moral factor, is a most direful menace to the existing mode of social conditions.

THIRD: As to economic standards. Tradition says woman is by nature set apart for a household drudge, a domestic slave and a child bearer. She must keep out of the world of industry, of traffic, of commercial intricacy and financial problems. She must give her babe suck, please her husband, cook his victuals, wash his clothes, smile and be sweet, that her liege lord may conquer in the great battle of life.

This is the economic basis on which existing civilization rests. What says the new woman? "Fudge and fiddle-sticks! I will go out into the world of traffic," she declares; and there she goes, to the dismay of man and the terror of established standards.

Everywhere she has rapidly driven man out of the trades, out of business, out of the bread-winner's occupation. So true is this, that doctors, ministers and philosophers are crying out that if this state of affairs is not altered, civilization will go, and with it, social liberty and moral advancement.

Some industries, woman already monopolizes to such an extent, that more than one-half of all the situations are hers; while men by the

millions, are falling into the ranks of the tramp, the pauper and the degraded outcast. And this social revolution, modern woman, the woman of freedom, has brought about.

Here, then, is she an efficient and sinister menace to civilization. But my conclusion to all the above is Amen and Hallelujah !!

The existing civilization, so far as it rests upon the aforesaid but-tresses, *should* be disintegrated and destroyed ; that on these ruins may be reared a new and nobler structure.

The old traditions in religion, morals and economics, are dead forever to the thinking world ; and the modern woman is a thinking animal.

Therefore, this modern, thinking woman is the most potent factor of destruction which confronts our effete and moribund civilization.

All hail to the New Woman, the New Morals, the New Civilization, the New Social Order !

The New Woman will for a while fill the divorce courts. This is merely her method of bringing on the truer and the better family : the family whose moral tie shall be Love, and whose legal tie shall be *nil*.

I conclude, therefore, that woman is indeed a menace to civilization ; to such civilization as we have ; whose coffin is already built, and whose dirge is falling on the rising dawn.

" Ring out a slowly dying Cause,
And ancient forms of social strife,
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws."

I am pleased, *apropos* of this discussion, to call the attention of the readers of THE INDEPENDENT THINKER to the Sunday edition (April 22) of the Philadelphia *Times*, where a full-page article with reference to my real attitude toward women appears, which also contains a clear and truthful account of the origin and growth of the Metropolitan Independent Church.

TWO NEW BOOKS, by Henry Frank.

(TO APPEAR IN THE EARLY FALL.)

"The Doom of Dogma and the Dawn of Truth."

250 Pages, Cloth Binding, \$1.50

"MEDITATIONS AT THE SHRINE OF SILENCE."

100 pages. Ornamental Illustrations, superb edition, \$1.25.

NOTICE.—In order to determine the size of the first edition advance orders are requested. Send all orders direct to Henry Frank, 32 West 27th Street, N. Y. City. Those who order before the books are issued will receive the "Doom" for \$1.25 and "Meditations" for \$1.00. No money need be sent till the books are issued.

"WHAT IS MATTER? NATURE ANALYZED."*

We approach to-day the crucial problem of all knowledge. From time immemorial, since men have seriously pondered the conditions of the universe, it has been asked, Is this that we see—the phenomenal world—all that is? or is there, back of the phenomenal, an invisible, absolute universe which is the mould out of which visible nature is produced? The question from time immemorial has been, Is matter all or is spirit all? Is there matter and spirit, or is there but matter and no spirit, or but spirit and no matter?

If you have studied philosophy, you know that this question has scarcely ever been answered the same way at any two periods of the world's thought.

It seems to be impossible for some people to realize anything beyond the tangible or discernible. And, on the other hand, there are those so constituted that they seem to live largely in the dream-world, and to see, beyond things material and discernible, into the commonly undiscerned, invisible universe. Usually, we call these latter the idealists, the poets, the dreamers, and the former we term the materialists, the physicists, the naturalists.

Perhaps you have observed that it has been the purport of my efforts—you might almost say the crux of my philosophy—to demonstrate the uselessness of the conflict between these various notions or conceptions of nature. I have ever sought to put the foot of my philosophy firmly upon the rigid ground of fact, upon the terra firma and the terra cognita of experience. My theory is that the plan of soaring to the skies, and standing on the edge of a star, to review the universe, is so difficult, uncertain and impossible, that it is a good deal safer, while we still inhabit this planet, to keep well within the confines of this sphere, and then reason from this sphere up to yonder star, instead of trying to think what that star may be and then reason down from the star to the sphere in which we live.

Now, that is the difference between what is known as the inductive method and the deductive method of reasoning. I have never seen the force of the philosophy of materialism; I have never seen the force of the philosophy of spiritualism; that is of that materialism or that spiritualism which ignores in toto the arguments, theories and conclusions of the

* Third lecture in course "The Creed of Christian Science Compared with the Creed of Christianity." Delivered in Carnegie Lyceum. Stenographically reported by J. E. Keese. Revised by the Editor.

other. Kindly understand when I use these terms, and particularly that of "spiritualism," I use them in their broad sense. I do not refer to what is usually known as Spiritualism, which is to-day a specific religious cult. It is very difficult to find another word to set over against materialism; but what I mean, in my present use of the word, is the opposite of materialism. I am making no reference to the claim of communication between spirits of this earth and those in another life.

I cannot understand why there should be any conflict between these two schools of philosophy. But, before I ask you to appreciate or accept the position which I maintain, let me briefly review for you the arguments on either side.

Some quarter of a century ago, the theories of materialism were so popularly admitted it was thought at that time to be the final philosophy. In the works of Huxley, Spencer, Bastian and Haeckel, who seemed to have so thoroughly and finally analyzed the last essence of nature, and found it to be nothing but bald material substance, we supposed that we had reached a conclusive philosophy and that their scientific theory was incontrovertible. We concluded, with them, that the atom, so-called, was the unit of the universe, and that beyond the atom, behind its manifest presence, it was impossible to proceed.

When these great scientists propounded this philosophy, with that masterful accumulation of natural facts which they presented, it occurred to the best thinkers of the age that their conclusions were not only stupendous but insurmountable. They were complete and could not be gainsaid.

And yet, after awhile, we began to turn the pages of history, and we found that the same arguments had been presented in preceding ages. We found that a Dalton was not unique in this century because of his atomic theory, for he had been preceded by a Democritus many, many centuries ago. We found that Tyndall, who was indeed the prose-poet of modern science, and Huxley, whom we shall call the psalm-singer of the modern physicists, really were not *sui generis* in their presentation of these theories; for they had been anticipated by that Miltonian poet of ancient Rome, Lucretius, who embodied in his sublime passages all the philosophy which these modern physicists have given to us concerning the world. In short, we learned, as the proverbial writer of antiquity reminded us, that there is nothing new under the Sun.

Nevertheless, there was such a marvellous accumulation of facts which modern scientists had gathered since the days of Empedocles and

Lucretius, they were able to enforce their philosophy so rigidly and incontestably, that for many years we were conquered by the plausibility of the argument.

I will here epitomize that argument: We see Nature. We do not see anything that we cannot see. That only that we see is the actual, or as some call it, the factual. Therefore, whoever undertakes to get behind the actual and to imagine that he sees something that he does not see, is a dreamer, confusing in his thoughts and absolutely untrustworthy in his conclusions. In short, they stuck closely to what they called reality, naturalness, certitude; and so, after analyzing all material substances, they decided that there was an atom at the base of everything. They went into the world of dynamics; they studied heat, light, electricity and all the cosmic forces; and they concluded that all of these were material, because they could count the very vibrations in the atmosphere that these cosmic forces generated. Therefore, everything was material. There was no escaping from it. And so, they argued, Man himself is absolutely material and physical; and the very thoughts which he conceives as his are nothing but the excretions of his brain; it is the gray matter that is doing the thinking, and not the soul essence within and behind the gray matter, as had been formerly assumed. It all looked very plausible, and, as I say, seemingly incontrovertible.

After awhile, however, somebody was bold enough to put this question: "Noble physicists, you propound the philosophy of the materialistic reality of nature; the philosophy that that only which is discerned and material is real; but you have not yet paused long enough to tell us what you mean by the material. What is matter?"

Then these physicists were forced to pause and question their own conclusions; even Huxley was at last compelled to throw up his hands, and, beneath the shade of the immortal Berkeley, exclaim, "It is a truth. We have no ultimate knowledge of matter."*

And, in truth, if we but pursue the philosophy of materialism to its

* Thus Huxley in his review of the Philosophy of Bishop Berkeley (*Metaphysics of Sensation*, p. 281), says: "If the materialist affirms that the universe and all its phenomena are resolvable into matter and motion, Berkeley replies, true; but what you call matter and motion are known to us only as *forms of consciousness*; their being is to be conceived or known; and the existence of a state of consciousness apart from a thinking mind, is a contradiction in terms. I conceive that this reasoning is irrefutable. And, therefore, if I were obliged to choose between absolute materialism and absolute idealism, I should *feel compelled to accept the latter alternative*."

logical analysis, we will fetch up eventually in the philosophy of spiritualism.†

Here then we see philosophers of every school freely acknowledge our universal ignorance of ultimate matter. It is substance, but what that substance is we do not know, says Locke ; and Berkeley, admitting the fact, insists that, as it is knowledge beyond the pale of physical or mental consciousness, it must be material or spiritual substance and amenable only to the laws of the spiritual world.

It must be agreed by all, as Huxley admits, that the argument of the Idealists, or Spiritualists, is irrefragible.

Let us for a moment examine matter and see what it is. I do not propose to flaunt a challenge in the face of the physicists, and demand that they define matter for us ; because we know they cannot do it ; they never have done it, and they never will.

Shall I tell you why ? Because we can analyze and apprehend with mechanical instruments, or with our physical senses, only that which is amenable to our sense perceptions. Whatever is not thus amenable can neither be discerned nor analyzed by our eyes or by any instrument that may ever be invented.

To illustrate : You ask me to analyze the invisible ray of light with my eye. I cannot do it, because my eye is so made that it can see only what it sees. My eye is not so made that it can see the invisible. It was made for the visible, not for the invisible. Therefore, although I may sometimes imagine that I see things with my physical eye, I really never with that eye see anything that is not subject to the perceptions of my visual organs.

† As says Berkeley ; " You see, Hylas, the water of yonder fountain, how it is forced upwards in a round column to a certain height, at which it breaks and falls back into the basin from whence it rose ; its ascent as well as its descent proceeding from the same uniform law or principle of gravitation. Just so, the same principles which, at first view, lead to skepticism pursued to a certain point, bring men back to common sense."

In the same tenor, Locke, in his " Human Understanding," Book II., chap. xxiii., § 2, remarks : " If any one will examine himself concerning his notion of pure substance in general, he will find he has no other idea of it at all, but only a supposition of he knows not what support of such qualities, which are capable of producing simple ideas in us, which qualities are commonly called accidents. . . . The idea, then, we have, to which we give the general name substance, being nothing but the supposed but unknown support of those qualities we find existing, which we imagine cannot exist *sine re substantia*, without something to support them, we call that support *substantia*, which, according to the true import of the words, is, in plain English, standing under or upholding."

But, some one says, there is such a thing as the ultra-violet ray and the infra-red ray. Very good. But, in order to have discovered that, it was necessary for us to make artificial eyes, as it were—to manufacture mechanical instruments and apparatus which were so delicately susceptible to the vibratory force of the *invisible* ray, they permitted the human eye to discern through them what to the naked eye was invisible. Therefore that which was invisible has risen into the realm of the visible. Nevertheless, to the eye of flesh, the unassisted eye of man, that which can be seen only by the artificial instrument is invisible. Therefore, the eye as it exists in the human body, never sees the invisible.

But does that prove that the invisible does not exist? The most that it proves, is that it does not exist for my eye; nothing more. Somebody's eye may be able to see it. It is only my eye that is so constituted that it does not see it.

Now, we know there are many eyes so constituted (they are known as magnifying eyes), that objects appear to them to possess far greater size than they do to us. We know also that there are animals which are able to see things that you and I never see, and which hear things that you and I never hear. Because the susceptibility of the human individual, as built up by the forces of nature, is limited to a very small portion of the activities of the universe. Man, puffed up and big with the consciousness of his matchless knowledge, if he but contemplate the universe in which he dwells, will speedily realize that he is most contemptibly ignorant; because there is such a vast mass of facts in the universe, daily happening within his own environment, of which he is utterly unaware; while the few facts he does realize out of the immense number, are almost infinitesimal compared with those of which he knows nothing.

Now, that being so, we reach a safe conclusion. What is it? That man is daily living within the realm of the invisible world which, by the processes of science, may be transmuted into visibility. What does that mean? It means that what has been commonly understood as matter, is not after all the matter that is susceptible only to the perception of our physical organs, but it is the invisible substance of material nature which exists and functions on another plane than that which we ordinarily know, which, though essentially invisible, nevertheless actually exists.

Now, let us trace that a little further. I claim that, in the last analysis, all nature becomes invisible, both to the human eye and to artificial instruments of perception. Let us see. If you take a solid sub-

stance, and break it up again and again and again, into what are called molecules, and if you dissolve these molecules and separate them into ultimate atoms, you have the last analysis of all known substance. But bear in mind, the atom is the invisible unit of the universe. It is not only the invisible unit of the universe, but it is the eternally invisible unit of the universe. Because, the minute you catch an atom, that minute it escapes you. If you find an atom, it ceases to be an atom. For an atom is the last conceivable, indivisible unit of substance. Now, the very instant you discern something you can make still less, that instant you have lost the atom; it has slipped from you. Thus all the substantial universe dissolves into nothingness—that which is nothingness to the human senses.

In the last analysis, then, what is nature? Why, all of nature, that you or I perceive, is but the phantasmagoria of fleeting effects. Effects on whom? Effects in what? Effects in the, as it is called, percipient subject who stands in the presence of these forces which play upon him. We can illustrate this very simply and readily.

The rising and the setting of the sun are the commonest experience of the race. I say, the sun rises in the morning and sets in the evening. When he ascends in the morning he is flushed of countenance and very glorious, as he sends his warm splendor streaming down upon the night-delivered earth; at eve, he is still more magnificent in his multi-colored display, although less radiant in the manifestation of his warmth.

Now, what have I been speaking of? You say I have been speaking of the Sun. I utterly deny it. I am not speaking to you of the Sun. I am speaking to you absolutely of myself—absolutely. Why? Because everything that I have told you about the Sun is simply that which is bound up within my own interior experience. I say the Sun rises in the morning and sets in the evening. How do I know that? Because I perceive within myself certain effects each morning which I call the rising of the Sun. That is all. Does the Sun rise to a blind man? Could a blind man ever know the experience of the Sunrise, if he were totally blind and had been so from his birth? The Sun certainly rises to the blind man, as much as it does to the seeing man; and yet, to the blind man, a Sunrise is inconceivable, or, rather, it is not an actual experience. The only way he can ever know anything about it is by your telling him what happens within yourself when that occurs which you call the rising of the Sun.

In this we have a simple illustration of a grand generalization. I want you to realize that what we call this natural universe, this physical en-

vironment, is nothing more than that which we perceive as certain effects within our own interior consciousness. That is all.

I have said, that is all that is. Do not misunderstand me ; because, right at this point, arises the crucial problem. Did I say, that is all that is? Then I erred. I do say that that is all that is or ever can be *to me*. That is as far as I can advance in my knowledge of material phenomena.

But it is, in my judgment, the most absurd folly to assert that there is no such thing as matter, and there is no question that this statement, boldly and unconditionally made, has aroused a great deal of misapprehension, incredulity and deserved ridicule.

The trouble has nearly all arisen from the fact that it is exceedingly difficult for people without philosophic minds to state philosophic principles. But, in our age, the idealistic philosophy has become so commonplace the ordinary hod-carrier, setting like a modern Socrates upon the curb-stone, while pausing for fifteen minutes from his menial toil, will deliver a matchless and grandiloquent discourse on this most abstruse philosophy and regard you foolishly if you cannot understand him. Indeed, so wide-spread is the intuitive wisdom of this age that every boy is born a poet, and every girl a metaphysician and philosopher. It is absolutely impossible, it would seem to meet anybody who is not thoroughly equipped with all the mental furniture that once embellished the brain of a Socrates, a Plato, or a Bacon, and indeed who could not put those giant thinkers to shame because of their comparative ignorance.

And it is because this sort of thing has become so commonplace in our day, that a certain recklessly assertive philosophy was seized upon by the masses and readily accepted despite crudities. Now this philosophy asserts that all that exists is spirit, mind. That there is no such thing as matter. That there is no such thing as a phenomenal or objective universe. Everything that is is within. There is only spirit ; only mind ; only thought ; only the internal energies which constitute individual consciousness. Such bold assertions, I desire to say, are utterly unsound, unscientific, unphilosophic, self-contradictory, ridiculous and untrue. Nor is this said vindictively or dogmatically. I never mean to be dogmatic ; I only mean to be earnest. I will show you why I think the position that I have outlined is untenable and untrue.

(To be concluded in June number.)

THE FIELD OF PROGRESS

is a monthly publication that takes health-vibrations to its readers. It is a

Panacea in Your Home

if you follow its easy directions. It is the most independent

NEW THOUGHT JOURNAL

published. It teaches a new method of Independent thinking. Would you have more health, happiness and financial success, read this journal and put it to the test. One dollar a year. Send 3 two-cent stamps for sample copy. **WRITE TO-DAY.**

The NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUSIC,

No. 179 East 64th Street,
NEW YORK CITY.

WM. M. SEMNACHER,
DIRECTOR.

ERNST BAUER,
INSTRUCTOR OF VIOLIN AND ENSEMBLE
PLAYING.

Thorough Instruction in all
Branches of Music, from the beginning to the Highest Artistic Perfection.

The Natural Method Insures
Thorough and Rapid Progress.

A GREAT MAGAZINE, THE IDEAL REVIEW

Edited by LEANDER EDMUND WHIPPLE, Assisted by competent associates.

Four Magazines in One

FOR

The Home, the Thinker, the Scholar and the Metaphysician.

Special Departments are

a.—Important Essays.

b.—The Home Circle—Thoughts for Everybody.

c.—Art, Literature, Philosophy and Science.

d.—Editorial—Comment and Critique.

Devoted to Science, Psychology, Art, Literature, Philosophy and Metaphysics. THE IDEAL REVIEW marks an important era in literature. No matter how many other periodicals you take, THE IDEAL REVIEW is of incalculable value to you, whatever your station in life. IT IS THE ONE LIVE ISSUE ON ALL ADVANCED-THOUGHT SUBJECTS.

Issued Monthly.

\$2.50 a Year,

25 Cents a Number.

We want active agents at once in all parts of the world and in every community. Special inducements are offered. Send for terms and illustrated premium list. Address

The Metaphysical Publishing Co.,
465 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Sample Copy sent for 10 cents in stamps.



"Astronomy" is excellent, but it must come down into life to have its full value, and not remain there in globes and spaces."—EMERSON.

Announcement.

THE SPHINX is a thoroughly first-class publication that cannot fail to interest cultured and thoughtful people, and is the only Magazine in America devoted entirely to teaching and demonstrating the truths of Astrology, a knowledge of which was possessed by the Ancients, and especially by the Egyptians.

THE SPHINX PUBLISHING CO.,
Boston, Mass.

The Dr. C. O. SAHLER Sanitarium, KINGSTON, N. Y.

For the treatment of all forms of Nervous Diseases, Mental Delusions, all kinds of Headaches, Pains and Rheumatic Affections, Hay Fever, Asthma, Fears, Hatred, Paresis, Epilepsy, Hysteria, Melancholia, Monomania, Irritableness, Insomnia, Somnambulism, St. Vitus, Loss of Voice, Deafness, Writers' Cramp, Self-Consciousness, Bashfulness, Urinary and Female Diseases, Constipation and Rectal Diseases. Special attention given to Functional Sexual Disorders, by the latest and most successful treatment—Psychological Therapeutics.

Dr. Sahler for the past five years has given special attention to this wonderful subject. To meet the increasing demand made for his professional services he recently incorporated the Sanitarium under the statutes of the State of New York, remodeling the original building inside, and erecting a large addition to the same, equipping it with all the modern improvements, baths, etc. The Sanitarium can be reached by either the Kingston City or Colonial Trolley Roads, which connect with all railroad trains and Hudson River boats. Office hours for the public: 10:30 A. M. to 12 M.; 1:30 P. M. to 4 P. M.; 7 to 9 P. M.

For inquirers New York City business headquarters: Room 171,
29 Broadway. 11 A. M. to 12 M.

Address all communications to

The Dr. C. O. SAHLER Sanitarium,
61 WALL ST., KINGSTON, N. Y.