

DO THE DEAD STILL LIVE?

*Or the Testimony of Science
Respecting a Future Life*

NEW FOUNDATIONS FOR MAN'S GREAT HOPE

With Introduction by BISHOP SAMUEL FALLOWS

BY

DAVID HEAGLE, PH. D., D. D.

Author of "The Tabernacle in the Wilderness," "That Blessed Hope,"
"The Lord God of Elijah," "Moral Education," Translator of
"The Bremen Lectures," etc.

PHILADELPHIA

THE JUDSON PRESS

BOSTON

CHICAGO

ST. LOUIS

NEW YORK

LOS ANGELES

KANSAS CITY

SEATTLE

TORONTO

Copyright, 1920, by
GILBERT N. BRINK, SECRETARY

Published March, 1920

234991

JUN 12 1920

BSS

.H34

WITH AFFECTIONATE REMEMBRANCE OF HER
MANY VIRTUES, THIS BOOK IS ASCRIBED

TO MY WIFE

NOT LONG SINCE TRANSLATED
TO THE HOME ON HIGH

FOREWORD

THE distinctive purpose and other special features of this book are explained in the opening chapter. However, it needs yet to be stated here that, as now presented, the work really consists of two parts. Part first, which occupies much the larger space, contains a series of articles that were originally published in a metropolitan journal; in which shape this part was widely read, calling forth not a few responses indicative of special interest. Those articles, however, have been thoroughly revised, much new matter has been added to them, and in places the text has been entirely changed. Essentially, though, this part of the work remains largely the same.

Part second, which we have named a Supplement, contains, first, quite a number of matters, deemed important, which are naturally related to the subject in general; and, secondly, replies to various objections such as could not well be answered in the main body of the work. Thus, it is believed, the production has been rendered more comprehensive and up-to-date, as an expression of what can and should be said, in these times, upon the great matter of human immortality.

Bishop Samuel Fallows, of Chicago, who is widely known as being himself an earnest investigator and writer upon immortality, has very kindly written a note of introduction, giving some account of the work; for which kindness we are deeply grateful. Also we wish

FOREWORD

here to express our thanks to many other friends who have, in one way or another, kindly advised, or requested a republication of the work—that is, in book form and with the alterations above mentioned.

One mistake this book has earnestly tried to avoid, namely, an overuse of speculation, or a construction of arguments simply upon unprovable hypotheses—a method which naturally leads to uncertainty, and does not promote an earnest and positive faith, such as men should have, in the great hereafter. Our effort has therefore been, in all the fields of our inquiry, first of all to ascertain if possible the pertinent facts, and then to build what argument we could upon these facts. Moreover, since science, philosophy, and religion all have in them important facts bearing upon immortality, we have included in our studies all three of those fields; thus endeavoring to make the general argument as widely supported and as strong as possible.

With these explanations and acknowledgments we again commit the work to the public; only expressing a desire that it may, in this enlarged and much improved shape, be received with as kindly consideration as upon its first appearance, in the form mentioned.

It might be added yet that this work was prepared for the press about the time when the great European war began; but because of that war its publication has been deferred until now. Also the war has caused some important changes to be made in the work.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

By BISHOP SAMUEL FALLOWS

MY attention was first called to Doctor Heagle's production, entitled "Do the Dead Still Live? or, the Testimony of Science Respecting a Future Life," when it was first published as a series of articles in the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, now a considerable time ago. Also I have been conversant, more or less, with the changes which Doctor Heagle has since made in the original form of the work. As now offered, therefore, the production seems to me to be really a whole library of condensed information respecting the important subject discussed. Moreover, it may be affirmed that this subject is one that can never grow old; because men will always die, and therefore will always be interested in the question of what comes after death.

In his discussion of that great question Doctor Heagle has undertaken to present the entire argument in favor of human immortality as such argument can be drawn from all possible sources—that is, from science, philosophy, and religion. Among the special topics therefore discussed by him are the various notions sometimes taken of the idea of immortality: whether a person is to live again only as an influence upon coming generations, as a kind of repetition of himself in his offspring, or as a real living individual—these and other different conceptions of the matter having been taken by scholars. Also the learned author of this book has discussed at consider-

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

able length the historic origin of the belief in a future life—whether it has come from revelation, from experience, or as a matter of intuition; his own view being that dreams, shadows, reflections, and other such experiences will explain at least most of the facts connected with such origin.

Of course, the doctrine advanced by this book is that man is personally immortal, and in defense of that doctrine different kinds of argument are used. The doctrine is defended on scientific grounds, on philosophic grounds, from the important principle of the "conservation of force," also from that of the "conservation of value," and from other considerations.

But it is especially in the fields of science that Doctor Heagle finds most of the facts upon which he builds his general argument. Such facts he gathers particularly from the fields of biology, physics, physiology, and psychology, normal and abnormal. Moreover, not to neglect any possible source of fact bearing upon the subject, Doctor Heagle, although not by any means a spiritualist himself, has carefully and in the true scientific spirit, investigated even the spiritistic phenomena, obtaining from them, as he thinks, some important evidence which at least corroborates other proofs of immortality. His special conclusions with respect to that matter are stated in the book.

But, after all, it is more especially in the realm of religion that our author finds his most convincing proof that man is truly an immortal being. Here indeed, if anywhere, must be discovered the solid rock upon which man may securely build his hope of life everlasting. Furthermore, in order to render "assurance doubly sure,"

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

this book presents a large amount of other data, or facts, all bearing in one way and another upon the general subject.

Nor is it altogether with the "dry light of the understanding" that this book has been composed; the glowing sentiments of the heart are also manifest everywhere in its composition. With clear and attractive language the author presents his thought, thus rendering the book both comprehensible and winsome to all degrees of culture.

I therefore do not hesitate to commend this work very highly to the reading public in general, believing that it is calculated to meet a real need of the times and accomplish much good.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	vii
INTRODUCTION BY BISHOP SAMUEL FALLOWS.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE. PRELIMINARIES	I-II
I. General Purpose of this Discussion	2
II. Reasons Justifying this Work	3-9
1. Wide-spread Unbelief	3
(1) Materialism (Miscalled Science).....	4
Materialistic "Camp-followers"	5
Inconsistency of Belief	6
(2) Intense Business Activity	6
2. New Knowledge to be Used	7
3. Need of Change in Form of Argument.....	8
III. Usefulness and Desirability of the Doctrine.....	9
How this Doctrine Affects the Present Life.....	10
IV. Can the Problem Be Fully solved?.....	11
CHAPTER TWO. THE OLDER ARGUMENTS, FROM PHI- LOSOPHY AND RELIGION	12-19
I. Arguments from Philosophy	12-16
1. From the Universality both of the Idea and the Desire	12
2. From Man's Unlimited Capabilities.....	14
3. From Inequality of Rewards and Punishments..	15
4. From the Peculiar Nature of the Soul.....	16
II. Religious Arguments	16-19
1. From Natural Religion	16
2. From Revealed Religion	17
Testimony of the Bible.....	17
The Resurrection of Christ	18
General Force of these Arguments	19
ADDENDA	19-22
1. Fuller Statement of Evidence of Christ's Resurrec- tion	19-22
2. Strongest Argument from Religion and Philosophy	22

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER THREE. THE ARGUMENT FROM BIOLOGY.....	23-33
Biology a Comparatively New Science	23
I. Peculiar Structure of the Cell.....	24-30
— 1. Life not a Chemical Compound.....	25
— 2. Life not merely a Machine.....	27
3. The Life-principle Defined	28
Vitalism and Mechanism	30
II. Inferences Bearing upon Immortality.....	30-33
1. From the General Nature of the Life-principle..	30
2. From the Method of Propagation.....	30
3. From the Seeming Permanence of the Life-prin- ciple Amid Bodily Changes	31
Other Theories and Facts	32
Conclusion	33
 CHAPTER FOUR. THE ARGUMENT FROM PHYSICS.....	 34-45
Cumulative Nature of General Argument.....	34
Definition of Physics	34
Helps from this Source for Proving Immortality...	35
I. The Indestructibility of Matter and Force.....	35-38
1. Application of the Law to Matter.....	36
2. Application of the Law to Force, or Energy....	37
II. Existence and Peculiar Properties of Ether.....	38-42
1. Inference from the Supersensuous Nature of Ether	40
2. Inference from Resemblance of Ether to Spiritual Essence or Body	40
3. Inference from Ether as a Medium of Commu- nication	41
 FURTHER CONCERNING ETHER	 43-45
 CHAPTER FIVE. THE ARGUMENT FROM PHYSIOLOGY.....	 46-56
Teaching of Materialism Respecting Future Life...	46
I. Materialistic Arguments	46-51
1. From Association of Mind with Brain.....	47
2. From Anatomical Dissection of the Brain or Nervous System	47
This Argument Refuted.	
3. From Localization of Mental Activities.....	48
4. From Comparative Study of Mental Capability and Nervous Tissue	50
5. From Ontogenesis of Consciousness.....	50
Strength of these Arguments	51

CONTENTS

	PAGE
II. Counter-arguments	52-56
1. (Already Given above, in Refutation of Materialistic Argument No. 2, p. 47.)	
2. Association of Mind with Brain,—Holds Good only for this World and Does not Imply Causality.	
3. The Brain's Function Might be Transmissive, not Necessarily Productive	53
CHAPTER SIX. THE ARGUMENT FROM PHYSIOLOGY, CONTINUED	57-66
Other Counter-arguments	57-63
1. Contrariety of Mind to Matter	57
2. The Nervous System a Closed Circle.....	58
3. The Brain's Need of Education.....	60
4. Normal Mental Power not Dependent upon Quantity of Brain	60
5. Intelligence Without a Brain or Nervous System Conclusion	62 63
Arguments More Positive in Nature.....	64-66
1. From Structure of Body Cells.....	64
2. From Haeckel's Peculiar Teaching.....	64
CHAPTER SEVEN. THE ARGUMENT FROM PSYCHOLOGY (Proper)	67-77
Nature of Personality	67
I. Bearing of Personality on a Future Life.....	67-72
— 1. Superiority of Mind to Body.....	69
— 2. Divine Side of Personality	70
— 3. Axiom of the Conservation of Value.....	71
II. Greatness of Man's Capabilities	72-74
III. Miscellaneous Arguments	74-76
Practical Impossibility of Considering Death an Extinction of Being	74
Ineradicability of the Instinct of Immortality....	75
Religious Experience, Testimony of the Dying, etc.	75
The Soul's Capability to Triumph over Death, as Witnessed in Connection with Great "Titanic Disaster"	75
IV. Argument from Moral Character	76, 77
CHAPTER EIGHT. THE ARGUMENT FROM ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY	78-89
Field Covered by this Science.....	78

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. Nature of the Subconscious Mind.....	78-82
1. Proof of its Existence	79
2. Hudson's Argument from Mental Powers.....	81
II. Argument from Telepathy	82, 83
III. Speculations and Facts Concerning a "Sixth Sense"	83-85
IV. Possibility of Help from Mechanical Inventions....	85-87
V. Spiritual Evolution	87-89
 CHAPTER NINE. THE ARGUMENT FROM SPIRITISM SCIENTIFICALLY EXAMINED	90-100
Spiritistic Phenomena not a New Experience.....	90
I. Nature and Classification of Spiritistic Phenomena	91-93
II. Scientific Examination of these Phenomena.....	93-96
1. By the British Society for Psychical Research..	93
2. By Other Organizations and by Individuals.....	95
III. Results of these Different Studies.....	96-98
1. Many of the Phenomena Proved to be Facts...	96
2. No Merely Naturalistic Explanation Suffices Demands of Reason	97
3. Opinions Differ as to Proper Interpretation.....	97
Some of the Investigators Accept the Spiritual Hypothesis	97
Others Oppose this Hypothesis.....	98
Still Others—Perhaps the Larger Number—Wait for More Light	98
IV. Our Personal Attitude	99, 100
1. Personal Disposition	99
2. The Weight of Facts	99
 SPECIAL NOTES	100-102
1. A Distinction to be Made Between "Spiritualism" as Commonly Known and "Spiritism" as Scientifically Examined	100
2. Final Conclusion	102
 CHAPTER TEN. CONCLUSIONS, AND POSSIBILITIES OF FURTHER DISCOVERY	103-114
I. Conclusions	103-109
1. Extensive Sources of Information.....	103
2. The General Argument Cumulative.....	104
3. Strongest Argument Still from Religion.....	105
4. Religion and Science Combined	106
5. The Testimony of Science not Merely Negative.	107

CONTENTS

	PAGE
II. Possibilities of Further Discovery	109-112
1. In the Realm of Spiritism	109
2. In the Natural Sciences.....	110
3. In Abnormal Psychology	111
III. Final Considerations	112-114
1. Unexpected Discoveries in Science	112
2. Another Illustration	112
3. Closing Thought	113
SUPPLEMENT. RELATED MATTERS, AND OBJECTIONS, WITH OPINIONS OF EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS AND SCHOLARS	115-176
PART A. RELATED MATTERS, INCLUDING OPINIONS OF EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS AND SCHOLARS.....	117-154
Topics:	
I. Different Notions of Immortality	117-121
II. Origin of the Idea	122, 123
III. Immortality Among Savages and Prehistoric Peo- ples	124-127
IV. Opinions of Eminent Scholars Respecting Christ's Resurrection	128-130
V. The Permanence of Personality.....	131, 132
VI. John Fiske's Argument from Evolution.....	133, 134
VII. Objections to Spiritism	135, 136
VIII. "Raymond," or Sir Oliver Lodge's Latest Ex- pression of View Respecting a Future Life....	137-143
IX. Eucken and Bergson on Immortality.....	144-147
X. Plato's Doctrine of Immortality	148-151
XI. Other Opinions, Especially of the Great Philoso- phers and Poets	152-154
PART B. VARIOUS OBJECTIONS—OLD AND NEW.....	155-176
I. The Dead too Numerous	155-159
II. If Men Are Immortal, why not Animals and Plants?	159-162
III. Max Verworn's Materialistic Argument.....	162-166
IV. Unanswerable Questions	166-168
V. Limited or Conditional Immortality.....	168-171
VI. Immortality a Selfish Doctrine.....	171-174
VII. The Agnostic's Position	174-176
NOTES TO THE WORK IN GENERAL	177-193
To Chapter I:	
Proper Definition of the Word "Science".....	179
Belief and Unbelief of English Agnostics.....	180

CONTENTS

	PAGE
To Chapter II:	
Great Writers and the Argument from Natural Instinct	181
Annihilation Intolerable to Greek Mind.....	181
To Chapter III:	
Important Works on the Cell.....	182
— Chemists Cannot Produce Organized Matter.....	182
— Great Mystery of Life	182
Various Definitions of Life.....	183
Distinguished Vitalists and Mechanists.....	183
To Chapter V:	
Man not Merely a Psycho-physical Organism.....	184
Bergson on Certainty of Knowledge Respecting Self-existence	186
Longevity and the Mental Powers.....	186
To Chapter VI:	
John Fiske on Relation of Thought to Cell Activity	187
Materialists' Admission of Mind-power in Nature..	188
To Chapter IX:	
Noted Mediums Examined by the British Society for Psychical Research	188
Was Professor William James a Spiritualist?.....	190
To Supplement:	
New View of Matter as Related to Force.....	190
— Aristotle's View of Immortality.....	190
W. R. Alger on Predominance of Great Believers..	191
Spiritism and the Great War—A Historical Note...	191
Bibliography	195-203

"I know that my Redeemer liveth."—*Job*.

"Who hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."—*Paul*.

"Today scientists are interpreting anew the instincts of animals and men. Instincts are nature's prophecies foretelling coming events. In vain we ransack all nature for a single instance in which nature's instincts have deceived insect or bird. Does nature use so great skill for guiding beasts, but become a blunderer in guiding man?"—*Newell Dwight Hillis*.

"My own dim life should teach me this,
That life shall live forever more;
Else earth is darkness at the core,
And dust and ashes all that is."

—*Tennyson*.

"If I am in error in believing that the soul of man is immortal, I err willingly; nor have I any desire, while life lasts, to eradicate this error in which I take delight. But if after death (as some small philosophers think) I shall feel nothing, I have no fear that those departed philosophers will ridicule my error."—*Cicero*.

"No race or nation will ever be great or will long maintain greatness unless it holds fast to the faith in a living God, in a beneficent Providence, and in personal immortality. To man as to nation, every gift of noblest origin is breathed upon by this hope's perpetual breath. Where this faith lives are found courage, manhood, power. Where this faith dies courage, manhood, and power die with it."—*Senator Hoar*.

DO THE DEAD STILL LIVE? OR, THE TESTIMONY OF SCIENCE RESPECTING A FUTURE LIFE

I

PRELIMINARIES

SOME years ago, in accepting an honorary membership in the British Society for Psychical Research, Mr. Gladstone, then prime minister of England, said of the work which was being done by this society, that it was "the most important in the world—*by far the most important.*" This is a statement to which at least most intelligent people would very readily assent; for what in the nature of work could be more important than an earnest scientific attempt, such as has really been made by the society mentioned, to solve if possible the great problem of human immortality? Have all the many millions and billions of human beings that once lived upon this planet become extinct forever, or do they still live in another and different world from this? That is the question. Also a like inquiry might be raised with respect to the present inhabitants of our earth, including those who will people it in the future. Or, to notice a more personal form of the interrogation, what will be the final outcome of our own existence? Is this life only the beginning of another that shall endlessly endure? Or is it true, as the materialists teach, that when the body dies the soul must die, or perish, with it? Surely, these

are questions of the vastest import, and no one can afford to pass them by with indifference.

Also it might be observed, in this connection, that the hope of a future life for man is one very common to the human race. Traces of it can be found among all nations and peoples and in all the ages, even in old prehistoric times. This hope seems to be planted very deeply in human nature, not only in the minds, but also in the hearts and consciences of men. Of all the great expectations indulged in by our human genus probably none is more widely extended, more deeply grounded in the very elements of human nature, or when rightly considered, more highly prized than is this. It is indeed the great expectation of humanity. But now another question arises as to the legitimacy of this hope. Is it founded upon fact? Is there a true objective reality corresponding to it? Or is it, after all, only a vain expectation, a mere matter of the imagination? Is it all a dream, *only a dream?* That is the question; and a very serious one it is, indeed.

I. GENERAL PURPOSE OF THIS DISCUSSION

In the following pages, therefore, it is purposed to discuss, especially from a scientific point of view, the entire argument for human immortality—whether it is true, or not true, that man has another life than this. To be sure, in the execution of this purpose other material than that coming merely from science will be used. We shall employ also for our work any and all helps that can be obtained from what may be termed the older sources of information respecting man's future life—that is, from philosophy and religion. Our main undertaking, however, will be to present the general scientific argument. In other words, we shall endeavor to obtain from all sources—science, philosophy, and religion—whatever facts can be found that have a bearing upon the proof of man's after-life, and we shall use those facts in

the construction of our argument. In that way, it is believed, some new foundations can be laid for sustaining man's great hope of life beyond the grave. Moreover, it might yet be said here, that in order to reach in this busy age the largest class of people, the uneducated as well as the educated, we have chosen to put whatever we might have to say in brief and popular form; hoping thus, of course, to accomplish the widest possible good.

II. REASONS JUSTIFYING THIS WORK

1. WIDE-SPREAD UNBELIEF

What then, it may be asked, are some of the reasons that would seem to justify an undertaking like that which is now before us? One such reason evidently is the vast amount of unbelief existing now in the world, respecting a future life for man. In his little book entitled "The Hope of Immortality," Mr. Charles Fletcher Dole says, "There are doubtless more people today than ever before in the history of the world who are in doubt whether they have any right to hope for immortality." And to much the same effect Dr. Minot J. Savage affirms that "the number of persons in the civilized world today who have more or less questioning about continued personal conscious existence after death, is immeasurably greater than it was a century ago"; and he seems to think that even now the number is increasing.

Both of these views are probably too pessimistic; they do not accord with all the facts in the case. Still the idea needs to be emphasized that in these strange times of ours a wide-reaching defection from the old faith in immortality really exists. People no longer accept the belief so universally and without questioning as was the case in days gone by. On the contrary, more or less of doubt, or of positive disbelief, is characteristic of these days. This state of mind manifests itself in a variety of ways, not only in religion and morals, but in political

matters, in the crimes and disruptions of society, in business affairs, in literature and education, and even in the ideals of life obtaining among men. No small amount of such unbelief is found in the text-books used in our schools, and a plenty of it is expressed even on the streets.

(1) Materialism (miscalled Science)

The causes of this extensive falling off from the old faith are not difficult to find. One such cause is undoubtedly the unusual amount of materialistic or unbelieving doctrine (often miscalled *science*) existing in the world today, especially among that influential class of men known as the scholars. Not that all the great scholars of these times are materialistic or unbelieving in their attitude toward the doctrine of immortality. On the contrary, we hold that the great majority both of the scholars and the scientists are still on the side of the old faith. They still believe in God, freedom, and immortality. Nevertheless, with this important exception, it must be confessed that in these days not a few even of the most eminent men of science—such, e. g., as Metchnikoff, Haeckel, Moleschott, Büchner, Max Verworn, W. Ostwald, Maudsley, Loeb, and others¹—all these have departed far from the old and as yet generally accepted doctrine of man's being truly an immortal being. They do not believe any such doctrine; but in their conception man is but the creature of a day. Born in the morning, at night he perishes, with no possible hope of life beyond the grave. Besides, these materialists, or at least most of them, reject *in toto* the idea of God and of human freedom; and their entire creed is summed up in the words, Matter alone, or matter and force, are the all in all of existence. All things, therefore, according to this

¹The great English agnostics might all be added to this list, since agnosticism is, practically at least, only another form of materialism. See Supplement, Part B, The Agnostic's Position, pp. 174-176; also Note 2, p. 180.

theory, have come from matter and to matter they must return. With such a general conception of the universe, the doctrine of a future life for man is impossible.

Materialistic "Camp-followers." But not all the materialistic scholars of today are by any means of this advanced class. Not a few there are—perhaps the great majority of those claiming to be scholars—who, instead of investigating for themselves the facts of materialism, have accepted their views at second hand. That is to say, instead of being leaders in materialistic doctrine, they are simply followers, or retailers of doctrines they have received from others. The consequence is that, not understanding fully either the claims of materialism or the arguments to be so easily urged against that system of thought, they are, like all superficialists, unusually loud and vociferous in proclaiming their immature views. They are, as another writer has suggested, the *housetop shouters* in favor of unbelief; and, although they have accomplished a vast amount of harm by undermining faith in immortality among the masses, they are not of themselves greatly to be feared; because being, at least in a certain sense, mere "camp-followers," they are not of the kind that does much execution. They have nothing original, or of their own discovery, to offer; but they simply repeat what has been said, perhaps often, by other and more capable men. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that these men—the *small scholars*, as we will call them—mistaking materialism for real science, do what they are doing with a desire to be considered "*scientific*"; all kinds of science, or anything passing under the name of science, being in these days especially popular. And all this we say, not by any means to the discredit of science—in which we most profoundly believe—but rather to the discredit of those who abuse the word science by misapplying it or by giving it much too narrow a meaning.²

² For proper definition of the word "Science," see Note 1, p. 179.

Inconsistency of Belief. There is, however, still another class of these materialistic scholars that should be mentioned. Paradoxical as it may seem, one may hold to the most ultra-materialistic notions and yet in his heart really believe in the future life. To illustrate, some time ago we remember reading an address, delivered by a prominent member of the medical profession, in which address the author, after having stoutly argued nearly all the way through against immortality, using for that purpose various materialistic theories, yet in the end confesses that, like Cicero of old, he preferred rather to err with Plato, believing in man's future life, than to be right with those who opposed this view. Inconsistent, do you say? Surely it is. But this instance of inconsistency is only one of a large number, similar in kind, that could easily be adduced. In fact, materialism is itself exceedingly inconsistent, from beginning to end. For what could be more inconsistent than the idea of all things being derived from matter, when, in and of itself, matter has no capability for producing all things? Or what could be farther from the truth than the notion that matter is the only thing existing, when we know of various other things that exist just as certainly as does matter? Therefore, Max Verworn, Mr. Haeckel, and other materialistic scholars have found it necessary to assume—so they usually confess—a psychic principle in nature, “in order to explain even the simplest processes of chemical and physical forces”;³ all of which, to be sure, shows their inconsistency.

(2) Intense Business Activity

Another cause, however, for the extensive unbelief existing in these times, with regard to immortality, should here be noticed. It is the intense, all-absorbing business activity that characterizes today the life of so many

³ See Note 2, p. 180, also for Belief and Unbelief of English Agnostics.

earnest-minded and determined men. Never before in all the history of our world was there so much human energy and human ambition devoted to mere secular enterprises as is the case now. And never before did the almighty dollar, or material possessions in general, seem to have so strong a grip upon the activities and affections of men as today. Consequently, being all-absorbed in the interests of this life, there are multitudes of men in these days who can find no time, so they say, to consider the things of another world. Their motto usually is, "One world at a time"; and they choose rather to live for the things of passing significance than for those of the great eternity. Such being the state of things, it is not to be wondered at if occasionally there comes forth from this class some one who declares himself to be an infidel, or unbelieving, so far as the future world is concerned. Perhaps Mr. Edison, our great American inventor, belongs to this class. At all events, it has been reported of him in various ways that he claims to be a materialist, that is, with regard at least to his believing in any future world.

Many other illustrations of this same kind, or of men who do not believe in immortality probably because they are so fully occupied with the affairs of this life, could easily be given.

2. NEW KNOWLEDGE TO BE USED

But another special reason which in our judgment justifies a discussion, or a rediscussion, of the topic before us, is the vast amount of new knowledge that has recently been obtained by man. The statement is often made—indeed, so often that it has become a kind of commonplace—that during the last century more discoveries in all kinds of science, and especially in the natural sciences, were made than during all the centuries previous. If that is so, or if we have now such a vast amount of new information, part of which moreover can be used

for proving the doctrine of a future life, then surely we have here a fine opportunity for whomsoever may use it, to lay hold of that new knowledge, and employ it in strengthening the arguments—or rather in building up some new and stronger arguments than we now have—for sustaining the doctrine of human immortality.

And this, by the way, is what was meant by our saying, in an opening paragraph, that, with the information to be obtained now from science, philosophy, and religion, we thought some new foundations can be laid for upholding man's great hope concerning the hereafter. The new knowledge we had particularly in view, was that just mentioned, or the information resulting from the many important discoveries made of late, not only in the realm of general science, but more particularly in psychology, normal and abnormal, and in other studies appertaining especially to man in his relations to this world and the other. Here then is certainly an inviting opportunity for any one who can rightly use it, to lay perhaps some stronger, broader, and deeper foundations upon which to build hope for life beyond the grave, than have as yet been constructed. Or, with this new knowledge at command, for one even to strengthen the old foundations and make them more trustworthy, would surely be a desirable achievement.

3. NEED OF CHANGE IN FORM OF ARGUMENT

Still another reason can be offered, which, in our judgment, helps to justify the kind of work we have undertaken. To the modern man the older pleas for a future life, drawn mostly from religion and philosophy, seem to have lost much of their force. They no longer possess that convincing and constraining power which in time past they had over the great masses of men, causing them not only to believe in immortality, but to put that doctrine into practice. On the contrary, arguments for another world seem nowadays to fall more

upon unwilling ears; and the so-called "modern man" in particular, needs, or at least thinks he needs, a different kind of argument from those based upon philosophy and religion. Science is the great watchword in these times in all departments of human life, and it is the testimony of science that would seem now to be especially needed. In other words, it is such evidence as can be tried in the crucible of experience, and perhaps also of experiment—the same kind of proof that modern natural science is accustomed to demand with regard to its facts.

But now the question arises, whether, with its present attainments, science is in condition to furnish such proof. That is the question, or one of the questions, which this discussion has undertaken to answer. In this place, however, we can only say that, inasmuch as the matter is one of no little importance we shall do the best we can to furnish the kind of proof needed.

III. USEFULNESS AND DESIRABILITY OF THE DOCTRINE

But the objection may be raised that the doctrine here under consideration is very old; it has been discussed, so it may be said, all through the ages, even from the time of Plato or of Job. Moreover, it is a question that from its very nature can never be fully decided one way or the other; and Professor Haeckel even goes so far as to affirm that an abandonment of this old doctrine "would involve no painful loss, but an inestimable benefit for humanity." In other words, the world would be much better off without that doctrine than with it. Now, most surely we have no room here to discuss with any fulness either the desirability or the fact of a future life; but we will only, in the first place, challenge Mr. Haeckel, and others who may believe like him, to listen more attentively to the voices, or instincts, down deep in their own souls, and if they do not hear from that source an affirmative reply to the question whether or not men desire immortality, we will confess our mistake. Or rather we

will affirm that the instincts of materialistic scholars and philosophers are very different from those of people in general. "Skin for skin, all that a man hath will he give for his life," so says the Bible. Or rather so says Satan in the Bible; and if even the devil knows enough about human life to set extreme value upon it, surely men themselves ought not to fail in so doing; and usually they do not.

The story is told of a "colored brother," that at one time, when suffering under the burden of many afflictions in life, he went to the Lord in prayer; and he said, "O Lord, take away my life, for I am tired of it." But then, so the story continues, when in answer to this supplication an angel was sent to take away the Negro's life, he cried out: "Oh, no, not that! You must take me as I meant, not as I said." To be sure, the application of this dubious-looking story does not, first of all, include the idea of a future life, but only of life in this world; still it helps to show how natural it is for men to attach great significance to any kind of life, whether of this world or the other.

HOW THIS DOCTRINE AFFECTS THE PRESENT LIFE

For the rest, we will only stoutly affirm that the doctrine of immortality usually does have a great influence upon men in all conditions of life. It inspires them to undertake and accomplish greater things than could be achieved without it; besides, it humanizes men, purifies their morals, and gives them higher and nobler ideals of life than could be entertained were it not for this doctrine. Doubtless also this doctrine adds not a little to human happiness. "I would not," said Goethe, "be deprived of the happiness of believing in a future life. I even dare say that all those are dead for this life who by no means have hope of another life." And a more distinctively religious writer has affirmed of death unaccompanied by the hope of immortality, that it is "an ending

as appalling to the reason as to the senses, an infinite tragedy, maddening and sickening, a blackness of darkness forever."

IV. CAN THE PROBLEM BE FULLY SOLVED?

And now, finally, let us ask the question whether this problem of man's future life can be completely solved. One thing is certain, which is that even a partial solution of so great a problem is much better than none. Then, secondly, it should be remembered that investigations of this subject are by no means yet at an end. But everywhere, scattered over all the earth, there are not a few earnest scholars even now at work upon this problem. Some there are who tell us that the mystery is already solved; while other scholars, perhaps more in number, assure us that the time is not distant when, so far as the reality of a future life is concerned, it will be fully demonstrated, even by science. What may be the truth or error respecting these matters, we shall try to ascertain in the chapters following.

N.B.

II

THE OLDER ARGUMENTS FROM PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

IN our first chapter it was indicated that in order to make the demonstration of a future life as strong as possible we would use all kinds of genuine arguments, both those to be derived from the more recent, or scientific, sources, and those coming from philosophy and religion, which may be considered the older sources. Accordingly, we shall, in this chapter, undertake to discuss very briefly the different arguments to be obtained from philosophy and religion. And one reason for our so doing, is that such a procedure will help to clear the way for the other or more scientific arguments, which will follow.

I. ARGUMENTS FROM PHILOSOPHY

1. FROM THE UNIVERSALITY BOTH OF THE IDEA AND THE DESIRE

First, then, to consider the proofs coming from philosophy; these are about four in number. And the first one is the easily demonstrable fact that the idea of a future life, as well as the desire for it, both are practically universal among men. Such is the case now, and such it has been in all the ages past. To be sure, this has been denied by some unbelieving scholars; and we are told that, e. g., the Veddahs of Ceylon, some of the Dravidas of India, and certain of the degraded tribes living in Australia, Brazil, and still other countries, have no notion whatever either of a future state or of the existence of any divine being. They are as destitute of such notions, we are assured, as the apes or any of the

12

mere animal orders living perhaps in the same regions with them. These statements, if correct, would militate to some extent against our doctrine; but unfortunately for the parties making such statements, they have been found, in some instances at least, not to accord with the facts. At any rate, the number of human beings who do not in these times, or who never have believed in the idea of an after-life is exceedingly small, so very small, indeed, that it does not affect the general truth of what we have said—that the idea of immortality is virtually universal with men.

Moreover, it may be confidently affirmed that a notion so common among all kinds of human beings and during all the ages must be regarded as an instinct, or an element in the very constitution of human nature; which being the case, it follows that such notion is probably true. For, as Theodore Parker says, "The intuition of immortality is written in the very heart of man, and by a Hand which writes no falsehoods." In other words, human instincts must be looked upon as so many prophecies of matters yet to be realized; and, just as with the instinct of a bird for flying, or of a fish for swimming, whatever element is necessary for accomplishing those acts is invariably furnished in nature, so will nature herself, or the Supreme Being, who is the author of nature, provide for man's instinct of immortality.¹ The great unending future which is thus foreshadowed, will be most certainly and fully realized. Or, in the familiar words of Addison, we may say:

It must be so—Plato, thou reasonest well!—
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?
Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror,
Of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?

¹ See Note 1, p. 181, showing how great writers have been fond of using arguments from natural instinct.

'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis heaven itself, that points out a hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man.

2. FROM MAN'S UNLIMITED CAPABILITIES

Workman

But another and an equally strong argument to be adduced in favor of man's immortality, is the fact that human beings seem to be endowed with infinite capabilities, such as can neither be fully developed in this life nor attain unto all that is possible for them in the way of achievement. As we remember reading in one of Mr. Beecher's sermons, most men during the brief period of this earthly life only get ready for work; and probably not one man in a thousand ever begins to accomplish all the great things to which he aspires, especially during the period of his youth. Or, to consider the matter from a divine point of view, the great Creator of us all has endowed us with unlimited capabilities, which cannot possibly be fully unfolded during our present existence; and even the moral law, as the philosopher Kant used to interpret it, requires of us a perfection of character such as no man ever did, or could, fully attain in this life.

Does, then, God's moral law require of us impossibilities? Or does the great Supreme Jehovah confer upon us faculties and powers which he knew, when he gave them to us, could never, because of lack of opportunity, be fully unfolded or attain unto all that was required of them? If such is the case, then what about the wisdom of God? Or even his justice? Surely God would not confer upon us abilities and desires doomed only to disappointment or insufficiency of achievement. Neither would he throw away, as mere waste material, such extraordinary powers as are possessed by man, especially when, as even philosophy teaches, man must have been made in the divine image and be considered the last and noblest work of creation.

Moreover, to notice again the matter which we con-

sidered in our last chapter—that is, the universal desire on the part of men for immortality—we might say in this connection that no human being can possibly contemplate an eternal loss of being, or the utter annihilation of his personality, without horror or an inward shrinking; and it is reported of Professor Huxley, extraordinary doubter as he was, that once, in a letter to his friend Morley, he said he “would sooner a great deal be in hell” than to suffer complete personal extinction—a preference which, we dare say, not a few other men would accept, if compelled to make the choice. Not to misrepresent Mr. Huxley, however, it should be added that the part of the inferno which he would prefer to extinction was, so he says, “one of the upper circles, where climate and the company was not too trying.” Similar statements have been made by other distinguished men, as, e. g., W. E. Forster, the well-known English statesman.²

3. FROM INEQUALITY OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS

But still another philosophical argument that is often made in support of the idea of man's immortality, is from the conviction widely obtaining among men, that probably nobody during the period of this life receives his full reward either of good or of evil, according to his just deserts. As one of the poets has said, so far as a distribution of rewards and penalties is concerned, “Right is forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne.” Or, as another writer observes: “Vice dressed in satin rides in a carriage, while virtue clad in rags goes afoot. Whole generations [of men] have gone groaning to the grave, scourged by the iniquity of rulers and robbed by the rapacity of those who should have been their protectors and friends. God is, indeed, in his heaven, but all is not well with the world.” For a correction, therefore, of the unequal adjustment of good and

² For the Greek notion of this matter see Note 2, p. 187.

evil as experienced in this world another state of existence would seem to be absolutely necessary; and this is, as we have said, an argument often used, or quite familiar.

4. FROM THE PECULIAR NATURE OF THE SOUL

Once more, a proof that used to be considered especially strong for human immortality, is one drawn from the peculiar nature of the soul, or from its simplicity, its spirituality, its immateriality, and its incorruptibility. Being thus a unique entity, incapable of division or dissolution, it is, of course, not subject to the laws of matter; and therefore, even if the body does perish, the soul need not perish with it. This is, we may remark, a very old argument, used even by Plato; but it is still employed at times, and when properly constructed it is really an argument of some force. However, since it will come up again for consideration in a later part of this work, we will not further notice it here.^a

II. RELIGIOUS ARGUMENTS

1. FROM NATURAL RELIGION

Now we come to such pleas on behalf of man's future existence as can be deduced from the general subject of religion. There are, as theologians are accustomed to represent, two kinds of religion, natural and revealed. Beginning, then, with the proofs which come from "natural religion," it should be observed that even the heathen, or such races of men as are farthest off from Christian teaching and influence, have yet some religions of their own; and usually these peoples not only believe in some sort of divinity, but they have what might be called systems of doctrine connected with such belief. One such doctrine, which nearly always makes its appearance, is the teaching of another state of existence for man.

^a See Supplement, Part A, Topic V, Permanence of Personality.

Wherever, therefore, the idea of God or the gods has obtained among men, there we may be pretty sure of finding also the idea of human immortality. And usually with men who are able to reason the argument runs about as follows: God is a Spirit, and as such he dwells far above all the destructive changes that take place in this life; he is not affected by any of the laws of decay and death such as obtain here. And likewise man; he, having been created in the image of God, is—that is to say, in his soul—a spiritual being; and therefore, simply because God is by his very nature immortal, man must be considered so also.

Or several other arguments can be built upon the peculiar relations existing between God and man; so that, for instance, if it is said that God is good, or God is wise, or God is true, or God is just, on each of these propositions a very good argument can easily be constructed, showing that man must have another or future life.

2. FROM REVEALED RELIGION

Testimony of the Bible

Lastly, then, to consider very briefly the proofs for immortality which can be derived from what is called “revealed religion,” that is, from the Bible. As everybody knows, there are two widely different views obtaining in these times with regard to the character of this Sacred Book. One of these views, which still is held probably by the great majority of Christians, is that the Bible is a divinely inspired book; and being such, it is, of course, infallible and authoritative; and all its teachings must therefore be regarded as true. If such is indeed the case, then it becomes the easiest thing in the world to prove the old orthodox doctrine of human immortality. For that is exactly what the Bible teaches from beginning to end, or in both the Old Testament and the New. No man, then, according to the orthodox notion, need to have

any doubt respecting a life beyond the grave, because such is the teaching of an infallible book. The case is somewhat similar to the peculiar relation existing between the old philosopher Pythagoras and his disciples. It is reported of those disciples that they had such extreme confidence in their master's wisdom that they believed, without questioning, everything he told them; hence the phrase *ipse dixit*, as expressive of such relation. So also with orthodox Christians, their professed regard for the authority of Scripture teaching should lead them to accept as true everything that is really taught in the Bible, and with them the Bible's *ipse dixit* is, or should be, an end of all controversy.

The Resurrection of Christ

But unfortunately there are a great many people living in these times, and not a few scholars among them, who from a study of the evidences for the divine inspiration of the Bible, or from other causes, find it impossible to believe, with regular orthodox Christians, that the Bible is an inspired book. On the contrary, they look upon the Bible as simply a human production, and, like all other of man's literary works, it is characterized more or less by error. But even for this class of persons, whether their number be less or greater, there is one fact recorded in this Sacred Book which should be regarded as sufficient evidence for the truthfulness of the doctrine of human immortality, and that fact is simply the well-known event of Christ's resurrection from the dead. This great, broad fact, so solidly established as it is, not only by the testimony of Scripture, but also from other considerations, is the best foundation of all upon which to build a sure hope of life beyond the grave. No other fact in all ancient history is better attested than is this; and if that is so, it would seem to be quite unreasonable for any one to doubt either the reality of this fact or of the future life as based upon it. Surely, millions of people have

Believe
must

Whow!
N.B.

pic

found comfort and a solution of all their doubts respecting immortality by giving attention, more or less earnest, to this one great fact; and what it has done for so many others, it can and will do for millions more. As a solution, therefore, of all doubts respecting the immortality of man, we recommend an earnest study of this significant fact of Christ's resurrection.

GENERAL FORCE OF THESE ARGUMENTS

To sum up, therefore, the general force of all these arguments, drawn from philosophy and religion, which we have been considering, it can be affirmed, first, that they unquestionably establish in the way of logical inference the exceeding probability of another life for man. And then, secondly, if we confine attention exclusively to the one great fact of Christ's resurrection, we have in this fact, already, what must be considered as really a scientific, or at least a historical, demonstration of man's future life.

In our next chapter we shall begin the discussion of arguments drawn more particularly from what is usually known as science.

ADDENDA

I. FULLER STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

The great historical fact of Christ's resurrection is so important as a basis upon which to rest the doctrine of a future life, that a fuller statement of the evidence supporting this fact, may appropriately be given here. As we conceive of that evidence, it can be divided into some four or five different parts. First, the eye-witnesses—their number being above five hundred at one time; so says the apostle Paul. Also the fact that at least some of these witnesses not only saw the risen Saviour many

times, but heard him speak, received special instructions from him, ate with him, and even handled his body. Surely, facts like these are of much real significance. Then a second line of evidence is the character of these witnesses. If ever men were well qualified to see facts as they really are and to report them honestly and conscientiously, the ten or twelve men, including the apostle Paul, nearly all of whom sealed their testimony with their lives, were of that description. Anybody who has a proper conception of what honest and capable evidence really is, or should be, will be slow to deny a fact like this. Then, thirdly, the tremendous influence of this fact, as it can be seen, upon all subsequent ages; it being not too much to say that a large portion of the world's history, and the history of the Christian church entire, have been greatly affected, if not really produced, by that fact. Fourthly, the important consideration that all the circumstances in the case, such as the certainty of Jesus' death, the empty tomb, the soldiers' story about the disciples' stealing Jesus' body, the fact that Christ remained with his disciples so long after the resurrection, and finally his ascension, with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost—all these circumstances fit so naturally and realistically into the record that it is impossible to regard it as a fabrication. One feels, when reading this story, that it is the very similitude of the truth; for no mere fiction-writer could invent so many details and insert them so naturally into a narrative as is the case here. And last, but not least, as a matter of evidence, comes the testimony, or rather the belief of the entire Christian church in all the ages—a belief that has been wrought not only into creeds, but into sermons, songs, rituals, and other acts of worship—that Christ did actually rise from the dead, and that after having appeared at various times and places to his disciples, he ascended into heaven, leaving behind him the promise that he would so come again, even as he was taken up—this universality of

belief on the part of the Christian church, which must be accounted for in some way, is certainly an extraordinary proof of the Saviour's resurrection.

And just here it should be noticed that, according to the Biblical record, Christ's rising from the dead was not merely his return from the grave as a spirit or in some spectral form, as certain modern rationalistic interpreters of the event would have us believe; but it was a real coming to life again of the body, even of the same physical organism in which he had previously lived and had been known by his disciples. For the proof of this, besides Paul's great argument to the same effect, found in the fifteenth chapter of his First Letter to the Corinthians, we may take the testimony even of Jesus himself, in what he said and did after the resurrection. For, putting the different items of that testimony together as they have been recorded by the evangelists, they all bear witness to the facts that Christ not only appeared many times to his disciples, but that he also walked with them, talked with them, ate a piece of honeycomb in their presence, and on one occasion he actually called their attention to his bodily form, saying: "*Behold my hands and my feet, handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.*" Most certainly, evidence like this ought to be convincing to any man, no matter how rationalistic or skeptical he might be in his views, that the resurrection of Jesus was one of the body, and not merely his appearing as a ghost or in some spectral form.

Returning now to the evidence in general, such as we have for the literal resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, this evidence, it seems to us, is in every way complete. As has often been remarked, no other fact belonging to ancient history is better established than is this. Like a great rock standing out amid the waters of an ocean, so this fact of Christ's resurrection stands out in the great ocean of time, not only as one of the mighti-

est facts in all human history, but also as one of the surest foundations upon which man may build up his hope of a life beyond the grave. To be sure, the waves of unbelief and skepticism have often beat against this rock, but they have not overthrown it; and they never can, so long as the human mind possesses the capability of discerning real facts and of appreciating their significance.

2. STRONGEST ARGUMENT FROM RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

But a still stronger argument in favor of man's future life may be made by connecting this fact of Christ's resurrection with another fact of perhaps equal importance, which is the supramundane character of God in its relation to man's having been created in the divine image. Put these two facts together—the one about man's having been created in the image of God, and the other the great historical fact of Christ's resurrection—and they furnish, so it seems to us, the strongest possible argument that can be made from the two older sources of information respecting human immortality; which are, as we have already indicated, philosophy and religion.

III

THE ARGUMENT FROM BIOLOGY

COMPARED with most other of the now accepted sciences, biology must be considered a new branch of systematized learning. It began its history—that is, in its present form—in 1839, with some investigations and discoveries made by the German physiologist Schwann, who was a professor in different European universities. Availing himself of an important achievement already made by Schleiden, another German professor, who had succeeded in establishing what is known as the cell theory of organisms—making it applicable, however, only to vegetable life—Schwann was able, by a further prosecution of the same line of investigations, so to enlarge that theory as to make it include also animal life in all its forms. Hence the doctrine now obtaining among physicists in general, and also taught in perhaps most higher institutions of learning, is that the cell is the unit of all vital organization, and that, whether it is plants or animals, they are all built on the same principle—out of living cells. Long before all such achievement, however, both plants and animals had been studied in a more superficial and general way, and many important facts had been learned regarding them; but it was not until the date mentioned that this study became an established science.

Now, as we conceive of this new science, it is available for proving the doctrine we have in hand, viz., that of human immortality, in four or five of its peculiar facts; most of these facts, however, being directly connected with what may be called the general principle of life. As all scientists now teach, this principle, whatever may be

its peculiar nature, is embodied in the structure of what we have already mentioned as the cell, and therefore this structure needs to be here especially considered.

I. PECULIAR STRUCTURE OF THE CELL

What is a cell? To define it briefly, a cell is, as the very meaning of the word indicates, a little box, or vesicle, so small usually as to be invisible to the naked eye, and yet in some instances, as in the bark of various trees, it can thus be seen. But when put under the microscope it is, of course, greatly enlarged, and then it is found to be a regular structure, having dimensions and various parts. The most important features of it are, first, a nucleus, and sometimes a nucleolus; and then, surrounding this, is a certain viscid, more or less transparent substance containing granules, which is usually called protoplasm. Besides, it ordinarily has, encompassing all the other parts, an envelope, or membrane, sometimes named the "cell-wall." It is so small that it would take some two thousand of them to make an inch in length, and it is estimated that in the human body there are millions and billions of such cells. Or, according to another estimate, it is said that the adult human body contains vastly more of such little vesicles than the entire population of our earth, reckoned even from the beginning until now.

But small and insignificant as a cell may appear to be, it is after all a wonderfully important matter. For not only are all human bodies constructed from such little cells, but all other forms of life, whether vegetable or animal, are likewise so constructed. An exceedingly singular fact, however, is that, when millions of cells are put together in the formation of any particular animal or plant, they do not combine and form a united body, but they seem to exist every one by itself; forming thus rather a colony, or a democracy, than a monarchical form of government. Still, with all their independency

of existence they seem to be in some way joined together, and are all governed more or less by a central power. But now, what gives to the cell its special interest as connected with our study, is that, being the unit of life, and therefore the characteristic feature of all organisms, whether highly complex or very simple, an understanding of it will give us—so far as it can be understood—a comprehension of the mystery of life itself. In other words, the principle of life is contained in the cell; and therefore if we obtain a full understanding of the cell, we shall be able to know also something about the nature of that principle.¹

1. LIFE NOT A CHEMICAL COMPOUND

Hence we now take up the question regarding the life-principle; what is it? It certainly is not a mere chemical compound. For proof of such assertion we have only to revert to a consideration of the cell, and noticing its structure we can easily perceive that, while it is composed of matter and force—or of matter and *energy*, as the more scientific term now used is—it after all has something far more important connected with it than either matter or energy. For matter and energy might exist, as they do everywhere in nature, and yet by themselves alone contain not a particle of life. Life, therefore, would seem to be a kind of entity by itself. It is always a *plus element*, when considered in its relation to matter and energy. That is to say, it is something very different in nature from those elements. Indeed, a cell might die, or lose its life-principle, and still it would have both matter and energy; which is proof positive that these two elements do not constitute the whole of a cell. In our view, therefore, life is, as said, a kind of extra element, or something that, while existing in close connection with other elements, is after all neither the one nor the other, nor both combined.

¹ See, on the cell, Note 1, p. 182.

Where would this + element be without chemicals?

And if this view is correct, then of course the life-principle cannot be considered a chemical compound. All the tests of matter and energy, such as extension, weight, pressure, etc., do not apply to it. Neither do the characteristics of life, or of an organism, such as spontaneous movement, irritability, nutrition, and propagation, apply to any proper conception of mere matter or energy. As said, therefore, life cannot possibly be a chemical compound. And another proof of this doctrine is the fact that of all the numerous efforts made during the last fifty or a hundred years to discover a formula such as would produce life by a combination of oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, etc., none have succeeded. But they have all utterly and most surely failed, often to the great discomfiture of the persons engaged in making them. Of a truth, the experimenters are not all dead yet; but here and there a man can be found—perhaps some expert chemist or a professor of natural science—who thinks the impossible can be achieved; and so they are still at work on the problem. But it needs no gift of prophecy for one to be able to foretell what must necessarily be the result—a continuance of failure.²

The case reminds us of a conversation we once had with a friend about that impossible achievement in nature which is termed "perpetual motion." This friend assured us that an acquaintance of his had just invented a machine that would demonstrate to a certainty the possibility of such motion, or that in physics there can be an effect without an adequate cause. But then, when we requested him to tell us more particularly about that wonderful machine, whether it really did work or not, he replied, "Well, it almost works"; and that word "almost" put an end to the entire project. Just so it is, or has been, with all these attempts at discovering the principle of life in some mere compound of physical elements. It cannot be done, or at all events, it never has been done,

² See Note 2, p. 182.

and very probably the reason is that such an achievement is really impossible, or contrary to nature. You cannot make water run up-hill, and neither can you produce a real principle of life out of something that is by nature so contrary to it as is matter or force.

2. LIFE NOT MERELY A MACHINE

But, if the principle of life cannot be regarded as a chemical compound, then it is equally certain that it cannot be conceived of as a mere machine, as some other of the naturalistic scientists would have us believe. Life is not, and cannot possibly be regarded as merely a machine, for several reasons. One is that a machine is always made out of material of the same kind with itself, that is, from unorganized or dead matter. But not so with life, or organized being; whatever organization there may be, it needs, first of all, to have the material entering into it changed in its very nature, or made living. And then, secondly, machines always need an outside agent to construct them; no machine could possibly make itself, or reproduce itself if destroyed. But again, not so with life. That always produces, or rather reproduces, itself from something of the same kind preceding it. "Life can come only from life"—that is the dictum held to be true nowadays among all kinds of scholars. Moreover, when any living thing is destroyed or dies, a new one can be produced from the seed or root of the old. And once again, a marked difference between a mere machine and a thing of life is that machines, even after they are made, always need an external agent to operate them. But not so with life; that carries within itself a power that not only operates the machinery, but repairs or reconstructs it, if broken or in any way injured.

Carrying out this same idea, Mr. John Burroughs, a clever writer who has given much earnest study to the different theories of life, observes as follows: *

* See North American Review, Vol. 196, p. 765.

*ability
of life to
reproduce
does not
prove
immortality*

If a living body is a machine, then we behold a new kind of machine, with new kinds of mechanical principles—a machine that repairs itself, that reproduces itself, a clock that winds itself up, an engine that stokes itself, a gun that aims itself, a machine that divides and makes two, two machines that divide and make four, a million or more unite and make a man or a tree—a machine that is nine-tenths water, a machine that feeds on other machines; in fact, a machine that does all sorts of unmechanical things, and that no combination of mechanical and chemical principles can reproduce—a *vital* machine. The idea of the vital, as something different from and opposed to the mechanical, must come in.

That is to say, if the human body or any living organism is a mere machine, then we have in such a construction some ten different items that separate it broadly, and in its very nature, from all other kinds of mere machinery—or in other words, a construction that could not possibly be made, or if made, could not answer the purposes of its construction. For such reasons, therefore, we hold that the life-principle is by no means simply a machine.

3. THE LIFE-PRINCIPLE DEFINED

But now the question recurs respecting the true nature of the life-principle. If it cannot be properly conceived of as being either a machine or a chemical compound, then what is it? Can it be defined at all? Yes, Herbert Spencer has given us even a famous definition. According to him life is—so he terms it—“*the definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with external coexistences and sequences.*” Surely that is a definition, both real and certain. Yet, owing to its cumbersome, or highly technical form of expression, most people regard it as incomprehensible; or they pass it by as having no meaning in it, which is really not the case. But the special criticism we have to offer regarding this definition, is that it is rather a description of the peculiar processes of

life and of the conditions under which it acts, than that it tells us anything about the real nature of this principle itself. A far better definition would be simply to affirm that life is a mystery.⁴ It is, indeed, one of the deepest and most unfathomable mysteries that we know anything about, as connected with our world. Still it is not absolutely inscrutable. There are at least some things that can be said respecting it, even with confidence. One is, that life is a constructive principle. It constructs all forms of organisms that exist in our world, whether vegetable or animal. Then, secondly, life is a preservative principle; it holds together in the same general form all the changing particles of matter that constitute an organism, doing that from birth to death. The materials change, but not the type, or form. And lastly, this principle controls, or has controlled, all the activities of each and every organism that ever has existed on the earth. Or, putting all these descriptive elements together, we have, as a complete definition of life, that it is a constructive, a preservative, and a governing principle, connected with all organisms; and as such it is, of course, a very important matter.⁵ Moreover, we might say that this definition does not differ materially from the one given by Sir Oliver Lodge. He tells us that

Life is not matter, nor is it energy; it is a guiding and directing principle, and when considered as incorporated in any particular organism, it and all that appertains to it may well be called the soul, or constructive and controlling element in that organism.

There are therefore distinctive characteristics of the principle of life that make it in its nature very peculiar. One is that it is purposive in its nature; secondly, it is intelligent; thirdly, it is self-active or spontaneous; and lastly, it is, in its lowest form, entirely unconscious of what it does. Such being its peculiar nature, this prin-

⁴ On life as being a great mystery, see Note 3, p. 182.

⁵ For other definitions of life see Note 4, p. 183.

principle of course differs very widely from any mere mechanical or physical force.

Also it might be observed yet, in this connection, that there are two widely different conceptions of life obtaining among scholars. One of them is called the vitalistic conception; and that is the view we have taken above. The other notion is denominated the mechanical conception, or that life is simply the product of matter; and this is the view held by all materialists.⁶

II. INFERENCES BEARING UPON IMMORTALITY

1. FROM THE GENERAL NATURE OF THE LIFE-PRINCIPLE

But now, to notice some of the inferences which bear upon the doctrine of a future life for man, and which can be derived from the facts and arguments presented by us, it can be observed that one such inference comes from the general nature of the life-principle as we have found it to be. That is to say, if the life-principle is truly a kind of entity existing by itself as well as in connection with the material elements of the body, then it does not follow that simply because the body—as composed of mere material elements—perishes, the life-principle must necessarily perish with it. On the contrary, this principle, having only a partial connection with those material elements, may continue to exist even after they are dissolved, or separated one from another. This is, to be sure, only a negative conclusion; still it has some bearing upon the important doctrine before us.

2. FROM THE METHOD OF PROPAGATION

Another inference, likewise bearing upon the same great doctrine, can easily be drawn from the peculiar method by which the principle of life propagates itself from one individual to another. To illustrate: Every human life begins with a single cell, part of it being de-

⁶ See Note 5, p. 183, for names of eminent vitalists and mechanists.

rived from father and part from mother. Then this cell, as a nucleus around which all the rest of the body is eventually built, divides itself into two parts or halves, each half becoming a complete new cell, and then these new cells again divide; which process is repeated again and again, until by the vast multiplication of cells which thus occurs the entire adult body is formed, each new addition being derived from an older one by a process of division. And so the propagation goes on, not only in one individual, but from one individual to another, all down through the centuries. Hundreds, or perhaps thousands, of generations, we may say, have already perished; but any number of new generations have taken their places, and others will come. The generative principle never perishes, or even grows old. It is today as fresh and as capable of reproduction as ever; and no one can tell how long it may endure. Tennyson sang so beautifully of the brook, that "Men may come and men may go," but it "goes on forever"; and so we may say of this wonderful stream of human life, it has come from the far-off past, and is still flowing on, and will continue to flow so long as our race endures.

3. FROM THE SEEMING PERMANENCE OF THE LIFE-PRINCIPLE AMID BODILY CHANGES

Still another conclusion, of like import, can be obtained from the apparent permanence of the life-principle amid all the changes taking place around it in the material elements of the body. Scientific calculation long ago determined the fact that every few years the human body undergoes a complete change in all the particles of matter composing it; so that if a person should live to be fifty or sixty years old, he would already have possessed quite a number of bodies. Then, the curious question arises, Which one of these various bodies was really his own? Or the question might be—since the materialists affirm that the soul must perish with the body—With which one,

then, of these bodies must the soul perish; with the first, the last, or perhaps with none at all? The question is like that of the Sadducees concerning the woman who had had seven husbands, "Whose wife then is she, for they all had her?"

OTHER THEORIES AND FACTS

Various other theories and facts that have some bearing upon the notion of a future life have been advanced by different scholars. For instance, Herbert Spencer, Professor Loeb, of Columbia University, and still others, have broached the view that if only our environment was perfectly adapted to all the needs and conditions of the body, then we might live even in this world, perhaps forever, or for an indefinitely long period. Or, if this expectation would seem to be too great, then there are other scholars who tell us that hygienic conditions have much to do with prolonging life; and that if we would only give more and better attention to what we eat and drink, and wear, the kind of sleep we have, the atmosphere we breathe, and so forth, we might reasonably expect to live, if not so long as did the old antediluvian patriarchs, then for a much longer period than is the average length of human life at present. Perhaps we might live even as long as did "old, old man" Parr, that English peasant, who is reported to have died at the advanced age of one hundred and fifty-two years; and even then it was not old age, but indigestion caused by high living to which he was not accustomed, that killed him. To be sure, these theories do not have much important bearing upon a future life, still they move in that direction, and therefore we have mentioned them. But there is still one other theory of this peculiar kind to which we desire to call attention. There is a class of scholars that might be called extreme vitalists who take the view that the foundation of our universe is not some material form of existence, or some mere physical force,

but that such foundation is the life-principle itself. Or in other words, that all this great universe is alive, and that there is really no such thing as dead matter; all forms of existence being living and not dead. Some such view was held, for instance, by the great German philosopher and scholar, Leibnitz, and also in a weaker form, by our own great American scholar, Professor Agassiz, of Harvard University; both of whom taught the doctrine that both plants and animals might live in another world, as well as human beings.

But, as said, these peculiar theories do not especially concern our argument; so we pass them by.

CONCLUSION

But now it may be asked, what have we really learned from this study of biology that will help us to prove the doctrine we have in hand? Only two things. First, we have learned that, so far as we have been able to explore this science, it contains no fact that positively forbids man to hope for life beyond the grave. And then, secondly, we have found, especially in those facts which seem to indicate a permanence of the life-principle amid the various changes taking place in the body, that there is some evidence pointing in a more positive way toward the great hereafter as not an unreasonable expectation for man.

Thus even biology furnishes some help for prosecuting our argument.

IV

THE ARGUMENT FROM PHYSICS

AS one after another the different sciences yet to be investigated come before us, we think it will be found that the evidence for demonstrating the reality of a future life will continually increase, not only in amount, but also in strength or importance. If such proves to be the fact, then the evidence we have already obtained from the science of biology may be regarded as the first round on the ladder of our general argument. Then, too, as we advance step by step on this ladder the strength of our argument should increase until, the topmost round being reached, we should have a good degree of certainty regarding the matter in hand. And then, moreover—such being the inviting prospect as to the outcome of our work—we should of course be encouraged to go forward with it, being assured that in the end we shall at least know better than we do now whether there is really any future life for man.

Believing that such will be the result, we now take up the special topic to be considered in this chapter, which is the argument for immortality that can be obtained from physics. To begin with, we ask the question, What is physics? As usually defined, this science is made to include quite a number of special branches belonging to the general study of inorganic nature, such as heat, light, sound, electricity, mechanics, etc.; but as we shall use the term here it will include only two things: first, that peculiar property of both matter and force by which they are rendered indestructible; and secondly, that peculiar element in nature, recently discovered or made better known, which is called ether. Both of these facts will,

34

we think, help us not a little in furthering our argument. Indeed, if what has just been said about the cumulative nature of our argument in general is correct, then we should have in this chapter more evidence for the existence of a future life than was furnished in our last. Be that as it may, we certainly shall find some assistance from our present study for the work we have in hand. And, to call attention a little more fully to the novel character of the two matters referred to, it might be observed that they are both really new discoveries. At least such is the case with the exceedingly important scientific doctrine of the indestructibility both of matter and force; and with regard to the other matter, the existence of ether as an element in nature—that, too, has only recently become established as a matter of science, although known to some extent even in old Greek and Roman times. Both of these matters will, as already said, afford us not a little help in the prosecution of our argument.

I. THE INDESTRUCTIBILITY OF MATTER AND FORCE

We will begin, then, with the first-named item, viz., the indestructibility both of matter and force. Nothing in this great universe of ours is ever really lost. A house, for instance, may be burned up with fire, and thus it may seem to be entirely destroyed, but such is really not the case. It still exists as ashes, smoke, and other gases. So also a stone may be broken to pieces, or ground to powder; or it may even, under the action of sufficient heat, be reduced to a fluid, or turned into vapor. Still all the elements of matter originally composing it continue to exist. Not one of them is destroyed. And the same is true of gold, or silver, or any of the metals; they may all be very greatly changed in form or outward appearance, but not in the atoms composing them, not in their substance. So far, therefore, as all kinds of matter are concerned they would

seem to be under the inexorable law of imperishability, or, as it is termed in science, of "conservation."

The same, moreover, is true of force, or energy. As has recently been discovered respecting this entity, no matter how greatly any special force may be changed, it does not lose its existence, but it continues on, preserving under another form the same amount of energy that it had before. Thus heat may be changed into steam, and steam into electricity; and electricity, becoming motion, may propel an engine or carry forward a railroad train, or put into operation almost any amount of industrial machinery. The original energy is, therefore, by no means lost; and this conversion of one force into another, or rather, the law by which such changes occur, is what in scientific phrase is called the "law of the correlation and conservation of force." On a par with evolution, and the mechanical unity of the universe, this law is considered to be one of the greatest discoveries of the nineteenth century; if, indeed, it may not be regarded as the greatest discovery of all made during that remarkable period.

1. APPLICATION OF THE LAW TO MATTER

But now the question may be asked, How can it be shown that this twofold doctrine of the "conservation of force" and of the "indestructibility of matter" has any bearing upon the future existence of man, or helps to prove the doctrine of immortality? That question can be easily answered. We have only to show, in the first place, that the human soul is a real entity, or a substantial form of being, and not a mere shadowy something having no actual existence. Too much already has the argument for human immortality suffered from an erroneous view of what the soul really is in its nature. It is not a mere insubstantial something, or an abstraction having no concrete reality connected with it; but it is just as real, just as actual, and just as sub-

*Soul is only
the most mysterious
phenomenon connected
with mental
life.*

stantial in its being as is matter. To be sure, it is not a material entity, but a spiritual one, and being such, it is, as said, both substantial and real. Such being therefore the nature of the soul as compared with matter, we may now affirm respecting it, that, if matter is indestructible, so also is the soul; the imperishability of the one proves also the imperishability of the other.

*Stuff remains
but indi-
viduality
in god.*

2. APPLICATION OF THE LAW TO FORCE OR ENERGY

Or if it is desired to make application of this law, not to matter, but to force, then the same inference as to the eternity of the soul holds good. For to assert that force is by virtue of its very nature indestructible, is only another way of saying that the same is true of the soul. Because the soul also is a force. It is a genuine force we may affirm, first of all, because it is capable of acting. It acts of itself, or spontaneously, which is more than is done by any other kind of force found in this world. And then, secondly, it not only acts spontaneously, but it causes other agencies to act. It uses, or can use, all the powers of nature for accomplishing its purposes. And just because it does use these powers, it may be considered the greatest and only real achiever of all known forces. Besides, it is only because we know from experience what it is to exert force in our wills, or souls, that we understand anything about the real nature of force or energy. Because we have a certain amount of will-power that we can exert in our own being, we also know something about force or energy as existing in others, or in objects around us.

But if such is the real nature of the soul—that is to say, if it is a real power, acting itself and causing other agencies to act—then certainly the law of conservation which applies to any natural force and makes it eternal, should apply likewise to the mind and make this mind-force also eternal in its being. Nay, more; if any of the mere forces of nature, which can only act but cannot

direct their own acts, must be considered eternal, then much more must the mind be so considered, because this is really a doubly acting force—acting not only itself, but causing other forces to act. In other words, this is the great chief energy of all energies, and therefore if any power is to be considered eternal in its being, surely this mind-power must be so considered.

II. EXISTENCE AND PECULIAR PROPERTIES OF ETHER

But now we are still to notice that other one of the two matters, connected with the science of physics, from which we have affirmed that help could be obtained for furthering our argument. It is the peculiar nature and existence of ether. What is ether? As has already been said, it is a newly discovered element in nature. However, as to the newness of this discovery, it is really not so novel as many people suppose; for away back, even among the old Greek and Roman philosophers this element was known to exist, and especially did the Greek philosophers regard it as a kind of "fifth element" in nature. This element moreover they believed occupied the space above the moon, or those regions where the gods were supposed to dwell; and they had some other notions respecting it. But in these more recent times—that is, during the last fifty or seventy-five years—the general conception of that element has undergone no little change. As conceived of nowadays by physicists, or by scholars in general, there are two different views held respecting this element. Both views take the notion that ether is a universal element, filling all space, perhaps even space outside of the material universe; and they both teach, also, that ether is invisible, highly elastic, perhaps imponderable, and always quivering with vibratory waves of intense velocity. But the points in which they disagree, are as to the nature of the elasticity, and particularly as to the matter of density. One of these views, for instance, holds that ether is exceedingly tenu-

ous—so tenuous, indeed, as not to resist the motion of even solid bodies passing through it; while the other view, which has been held by such eminent scholars as Dr. William Crookes and Sir Oliver Lodge, teaches that this same substance is exceedingly dense, “denser,” they tell us, “than is even gold or lead,” or any other of the metals known to exist.¹ Now, how these two views so radically different can be reconciled with each other, or made to agree, is more than we know; and more, we think, than anybody knows. Still, as said, there are some points of agreement between them; and the prevailing view among scholars in general is that ether is exceedingly tenuous, and, as we have already remarked, not only fills universal space, but even pervades all solid bodies.

But the question may be asked, Upon what grounds do scholars accept the existence of such an element? Mostly upon the ground that this element is necessary for explaining the transmission of light, radiant heat, electricity, magnetic influence, etc., from one point of the universe to another, or rather for explaining the vibratory action which carries these influences through space. In other words, it is only the old “wave theory” for the transmission of certain natural forces that has come back to rule. And then another ground upon which this theory of the existence of ether rests, is that such an element can be made to serve as an original background or primordial source from which the atoms themselves, and perhaps the germs of all forces, may be supposed to take their rise. The theory is certainly a very interesting one, and somewhat curious; besides, it rests upon what would seem to be the strongest kind of logical necessity. At most, therefore, ether as now known, must be regarded as merely a hypothetical element; what it may prove to be in the future, is of course not known.

¹ For fuller exposition of this view see pp. 43, 44.

1. INFERENCE FROM THE SUPERSENSUOUS NATURE OF ETHER

And now as to the inferences bearing upon the doctrine of immortality which can be drawn from this subject, we may say that one such inference is to be derived from the fact that ether is really a supersensuous element. That is to say, it can neither be seen, heard, tasted, felt, nor apprehended by any of the senses. Still, it is believed, or rather is positively known, to exist. It is a regularly accepted scientific fact, resting upon as secure a basis as does the law of evolution, the nebular hypothesis, and most other of the merely scientific theories which are so widely received in these times. But now, just as scientists everywhere unhesitatingly accept ether as a fact, even though they cannot see it or have any direct knowledge of it by the senses, so we can all believe in the existence of a spiritual world, even though it does not manifest itself to us directly or in the way of sense-experience. It is a great supersensuous fact, and we know of its existence, not by the senses, but by the exercise of our reasoning powers, just as we do in the case of ether. The existence therefore of the great unseen ethereal world makes it possible for us to believe also in another unseen world, which we denominate spiritual; although the difference between spiritual and material seems in these times, and especially in scientific circles, to be fast fading away.² At least, therefore, the element called ether helps to make the spiritual world more real to us than it otherwise would appear.

2. INFERENCE FROM RESEMBLANCE OF ETHER TO SPIRITUAL ESSENCE OR BODY

Then another inference which can be drawn from this same element, is that we have here something that can be considered as at least in some measure illustrative of

² On *New View of Matter* see Note 1, p. 190.

the kind of bodies with which spirits seem to be clothed in another world. For, as appears to be taught by the Bible as well as by good philosophy, even spirits do have a body of some kind. "For we know," says the apostle Paul, "that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." And he says that he himself earnestly desired "to be clothed upon with that house which is from above." Also he says, in another place, that there is not only a "natural body" but also a "spiritual body." By all of which expressions we understand the apostle to teach not only that spirits in the other world really do have bodies, but also that these bodies in their nature are somewhat like the semi-material, tenuous, impalpable substance which we have been considering. And the truth of the assertion is borne out also, we think, by all those records of the appearing of spirits, whether of men or angels, which are found in the Scriptures both of the Old Testament and of the New. Of course, we do not teach that spirits have material bodies; but such bodies as they do have would seem to be very well represented, or symbolized, by the substance we call ether.

Furthermore there are quite a number of mysterious facts occurring, or believed to occur, occasionally in human experience, such as the appearing of ghosts, phantoms, the existence of "astral bodies," "spiritual materializations," "auras," etc., all of which can be easily explained by connecting them, one way and another, with this same fluidic or semimaterial element.

3. INFERENCE FROM ETHER AS A MEDIUM OF COMMUNICATION

And once more, the author of a book, called "The Great Psychological Crime" (by which he means hypnotism), undertakes to show that between that other or more spiritual world and this material world of ours

there exists a real medium of communication such as he thinks is furnished by ether, and that by means of vibrations taking place in this ethereal element it is possible to pass over from this world even to the other; and in that way, he says, he has himself not infrequently had the experience of making the passage. Of course all this was done in the spirit, and, we may add, even while the spirit was still in the body. But whether the author mentioned (who seems to be a very intelligent man) is really describing an actual experience, or is only telling about some unwarranted delusion of his imagination, is a question more or less fatal to his theory. However, we may say that even such an eminent authority in science as Sir William Crookes, of England, would seem to hold a somewhat similar view, or that, by means of vibrations taking place in some element connecting this world with the other, it is possible for communications to pass between the two worlds.

But what shall we say to this whole theory? Only one thing; which is that, if any material means of communication between this world and the other has ever been discovered, or shall yet be discovered, we know of only one element in all the universe that could fittingly serve even as a symbol of such medium. That element is, of course, the one we have just been considering, viz., ether. Possibly, moreover, some further discoveries may yet be made in this line, which will help to bridge the great chasm between this world and the other. Who can tell what is possible, or not possible, with science? Once it was thought there was no active connection between mind and body; but that fact is now the commonest teaching of science, and so it may yet be established that there exists between this world and the spiritual realm some semimaterial means of communication. Who can prove the contrary, or that no such means exists?

FURTHER CONCERNING ETHER

Probably no scientist has given more attention to the study of ether than Sir Oliver Lodge. He has much to say concerning that subject in his presidential address delivered some years ago before the British Association for the Advancement of Science; and from that address we quote as follows:

I am not alone in feeling the fascination of this portentous entity [that is, ether]. Its curiously elusive and intangible character, combined with its universal and unifying permanence, its apparently infinite extent, its definite and perfect properties, make the ether the most interesting, as it is the most fundamental ingredient in the natural cosmos. . . It is possible for people to deny its existence, because it is unrelated to any of our senses, except sight—and to that only in an indirect and not easily recognized fashion. . . It does not appeal to sense, and we know no means of getting hold of it. The only thing we know metrical [i. e., measurable] about it is the velocity with which it can transmit transverse waves [of light, radiant heat, electricity, etc.].

As to the nature and properties of ether the same authority tells us that it is "not matter, but is material" in its nature; also that it is

the universal connecting medium which binds the universe together, and makes it a coherent whole instead of a chaotic collection of independent isolated fragments. It is the vehicle of transmission of all manner of force from gravitation down to cohesion and chemical affinity; it is therefore the storehouse of potential energy. Matter moves, but ether is strained [jarred]. . . The ether itself does not move, . . . in the sense of locomotion, though it is probably in a violent state of rotation and turbulent motion in its smallest parts; and to that motion its exceeding rigidity is due. As to its density, it must be far greater than that of any kind of matter, millions of times denser than lead or platinum. Yet matter moves through it with perfect freedom, without any friction or viscosity. There is nothing paradoxical in this. Viscosity is not a function of density; the two are not necessarily connected.

Also Prof. Ernst Haeckel, the famous materialist, has given much thought and study to the general subject of ether; and from him—condensing his language—we extract as follows:

1. Ether fills all space not occupied by ponderable matter, even the space between the atoms of ponderable matter.

2. It has probably no chemical quality, and is not composed of atoms.

3. Its structure is peculiar—being not atomistic, but continuous, or dynamic.

4. Its consistency, or form of being, is neither gaseous nor solid, but resembles an “extremely attenuated, elastic, and light jelly.”

5. It is imponderable in the sense that we have no means of experimentally determining its weight. Very probably though it has weight; and, according to discoveries made by some physicists from the energy of its light-waves, ether is some fifteen trillion times lighter than atmospheric air—which hypothesis would give to a sphere of it as large as our earth a weight of at least two hundred and fifty pounds.

6. Just as gas may, by lowering its temperature, be converted into a fluid, and ultimately into a solid, so (according to Vogt’s theory of condensation) ether may pass into a gaseous state.

7. Five different stages may therefore be recognized between ether and a solid state of matter: (1) the etheric; (2) the gaseous; (3) the fluidic; (4) the viscous; (5) the solid.

8. Ether is boundless and immeasurable, eternally in motion (vibration, strain, condensation, etc.); and this specific movement, in reciprocal action with mass-movement (or gravitation), is the ultimate cause of phenomena.⁸

⁸ From “Riddle of the Universe,” pp. 227, 228.

Thus, it will be observed, there are some differences of opinion as held by the two representative scholars from whom we have quoted; but the facts they give, so far as they are facts, are probably about all that is known at present regarding the subject.

V

THE ARGUMENT FROM PHYSIOLOGY

THIS argument must be derived wholly from the relation existing between mind and body, or more particularly between mind and brain; this latter being considered as a part of the nervous system. The doctrine of materialism is that the mind, or soul, really has no existence, but is simply a product or function of brain activity. Just as the liver produces bile or a clock keeps time, so, we are told by materialists, the brain is the producing cause of all mental phenomena. According to this theory, then, the mind is simply an abstraction. It is not an entity by itself, and can never exist independently, or apart from the body. It is so intimately connected with the body, even as a part of it, that when the body dies, or perishes, the soul must perish with it; and there is in nature no provision against such calamity. If this is really so, then, to be sure, all hope respecting a future life for man must at once be abandoned, for how is it possible to affirm immortality for a soul that does not exist?

I. MATERIALISTIC ARGUMENTS

But the question may be asked, Upon what foundation does this peculiar materialistic doctrine rest? Has it really been proved true? What are some of the arguments by which it is supported? Perhaps, after all, these arguments are not so very strong; perhaps, also, counter-arguments can be advanced against them. Our first task is, therefore, to ascertain what these materialistic arguments really are.

1. FROM ASSOCIATION OF MIND WITH BRAIN

One of them is a familiar fact in human experience. It is that, so far as our knowledge extends, mind and brain always go together. They are never found existing separately. That is to say, universal human experience coming from all ages, seems to render it certain that mind cannot exist apart from association with the brain. At all events, so far as our human experience goes, such is really the fact; and it makes no difference where or under what circumstances any human mind is found, or it might be even the intelligence of an animal—wherever intelligence of any sort is discovered, there you will discover also, so the materialists tell us, a brain or a nervous system of some kind associated with it. The conclusion is obvious; which is that, if such a state of things really exists, then when the body dies and the mind thus becomes separated from the brain, it must perish, because it has lost its necessary support. This is an argument not infrequently used by materialists, and they would seem to regard it as one of importance. But we will consider it more fully later.¹

2. FROM ANATOMICAL DISSECTION OF THE BRAIN OR NERVOUS SYSTEM

Another argument somewhat in the same line, only stronger perhaps, which is used by the materialists to prove their theory, is that no anatomical dissection of the brain has ever found any such entity existing as is called the mind, or sometimes the soul. All efforts in that direction have utterly failed; and therefore it is concluded that, because no mind is found, none really exists. This argument, however, is so very weak and peculiar that we will examine it right here. Of course, no anatomical dissection of the brain has ever yet been

¹ For a different and stronger statement of this argument, see Note 1, pp. 184-186.

able to find the mind, simply for the reason that the mind, or soul, is not a matter of anatomy. It is not some material entity which can be seen, handled, searched for, and found with a knife or any other material instrument; but if it is discovered at all, it must be in a very different way. Being purely spiritual in its nature, the mind can be apprehended only by a spiritual process. That is to say, it must discover itself, or exercise its own capability of self-consciousness, a process which in the study of psychology is known as introspection.² And if some of these materialistic philosophers who seem to be so desirous of finding something that might disprove their own immortality, would only make use of this process, they might be surprised to learn that they themselves have souls. This argument therefore we consider to be already answered.

3. FROM LOCALIZATION OF MENTAL ACTIVITIES

But there is another argument, right in this same connection, which the materialists put forward often, and which is considered to be especially strong. It is what may be called the localization of mental activities in different parts of the brain. Modern science has succeeded in finding the very places in the human brain where at least many of the intellectual processes can be located. For instance, consciousness, which is of course a universal attribute of the mind, belongs really everywhere in the brain, but it seems to be located particularly in the cortex of the two cerebral hemispheres. Then the emotional nature, or the powers of sensation, are usually placed in what is called the "sensorium," at the base of the brain. The visual capabilities, together with some of the animal propensities, lie in the occiput, or rear brain. And the powers of abstract thought, or reasoning, are commonly made to find their home in the frontal lobes.

² See Note 2, p. 186, for Bergson on Certainty of Knowledge Respecting Self-existence.

Or to give a more detailed analysis of these activities, science has located the motor powers in the cortex, or along the fissure of Rolando; the sense of touch also is located in the cortex, or in the two vertical lobes; the sense of sight, in the occipital lobe; the sense of hearing, on each side, in the temporal lobes; and the sense of smell, in the frontal lobes, underneath. What is called the "speech-center" has been localized in the third frontal convolution, and only on one side of the brain, according to whether a person is right- or left-handed; and the same is true of the "writing-center," which also lies on one side of the brain, farther back, in the motor section above the third convolution. And as for the rest of the brain, what is known as the great "thought or association centers," in which most of our real thinking is done—these have been located here, or in this large middle section. In front we have the frontal center of association; on top the parietal center of association; below this comes the principal part of the brain, and here we find the great occipito-temporal center of association; still lower down lies the Insula of Reil, and here is located the Insular center of association. Thus all the great activities of the mind find their places in some part of the brain; and this, we may say, is about as far as the scientific analysis has yet gone. Still, even with this incomplete achievement, it may be questioned whether among all the discoveries made by science during the last century or two there is any that excels this in point of far-reaching significance.

But now the special use which materialists have been able to make of these new facts, in the way of helping out their theory, is as follows: All these special centers of brain and mind activity may be destroyed one after the other, either by a surgeon's knife, or by accident, or by disease; and as fast as that is done it is found that the mental processes disappear. Hence the inference is drawn that, if the brain is destroyed entirely, as will be its ex-

perience at death, all mental phenomena, or the very existence of the mind, must necessarily cease.

This is, it must be acknowledged, really a strong argument, and as compared with the others brought forward by materialists, it is undoubtedly their most powerful weapon. Perhaps it may be called the very citadel, or the Gibraltar, of the entire materialistic position.

4. FROM COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MENTAL CAPABILITY AND NERVOUS TISSUE

However, there are still one or two of these materialistic arguments which must be noticed. One of them is drawn from what may be called a comparative study of nervous tissue and of intelligence as existing in animals and men. It is declared that the amount of intelligence, or of psychic ability, that is possessed by any animal or man is always in proportion to the amount of brain matter, or of nervous tissue, that has been developed. And this is a rule, we are told, that applies to all orders of animal life, from the very lowest up to man. But we have to say regarding this statement, that it is true to some extent, but not altogether true.³

5. FROM ONTOGENESIS OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Then another contention of this same order is what Haeckel calls the "ontogenesis of consciousness"; which is the doctrine that in all the periods of life, even from birth to death, the mind keeps pace with the body in all changes occurring. For instance, during the period of infancy, when the body is in every way feeble and has just begun to grow, the condition of the mind is the same. That also is in an undeveloped state, and has as yet little or no strength. Then also during the period of youth, when the body grows rapidly, and like a plant is coming to fulness of bloom, the same again is the condition of the mind. For this is the flowering period, when the mind

³ Ants and spiders, e. g., have a very small brain, but much intelligence.

puts forth its energies in all directions, and clothes itself with beauty and strength. So also during the important period of full manhood the same parallel of changes occurs, relating mind to body. And then, finally, during the period of old age, when digestion is weak and nutrition becomes slow, when the footsteps begin to falter and the arms grow easily weary; when the "golden bowl" is almost broken and the "silver cord" is almost loosed, then also the intellectual powers decline. Then memory becomes weak, imagination takes a less lofty flight, judgment becomes unreliable, the perceptive powers fail more or less, the emotions decay or become indifferent, and even the will loses much of its force and decision. Then man, according to the materialistic theory, not only goes to his long home, but the same fate awaits both body and soul, which is complete and everlasting extinction. Can we believe in any such theory? Or is even this representation of the condition of things in old age altogether correct? *

STRENGTH OF THESE ARGUMENTS

Now, putting all of these arguments together, it must be confessed that they look quite formidable. There is certainly connected with them no small amount of strength, for they claim to be founded upon even scientific facts, and have much of what may be called scientific authority associated with them. Such arguments are, therefore, not to be despised, or answered by a mere shrug of the shoulders, or by silent contempt. A far better way is to do what we purpose to do right here—frankly to acknowledge their full force, and then by discovering if possible also their weaknesses, in that way to overthrow them. But can such a purpose be carried into effect? Let us see. There are some counter-arguments which we believe can be put forward.

* See Note 3, p. 186, on Longevity and the Mental Powers.

II. COUNTER-ARGUMENTS

1. IN REFUTATION OF ARGUMENT FROM DISSECTION

One such argument, as it will be remembered, we have already adduced. It was our reply to the materialistic notion that simply because no surgeon's knife has ever yet been able to discover the existence of a mind, therefore no mind really exists. To this we answered by saying that no mere anatomical dissection of the brain is the best way to arrive at a discovery of the mind, but that the mind can really be discovered by another process, more spiritual in its nature, called *introspection*.

2. THAT ASSOCIATION OF MIND WITH BRAIN IS TEMPORARY,
AND DOES NOT IMPLY CAUSALITY

But now let us take up some of the more formal counter-arguments which can be advanced against these materialistic claims. As will be recalled, one of those claims is, that because mind and brain are customarily found together, therefore the brain is so necessary to the mind's existence that it could not do without it. The answer we will make to this contention is that, even if it were true that the mind is so exceedingly dependent upon the brain, still this relation holds good only so far as our present life is concerned. What might take place in another and very different world we, of course, do not know—at least, not as a matter of science. The Bible tells us that, over in that other or more spiritual world, there exist any number of beings—beings called angels—who most surely do exercise consciousness and all the attributes belonging to mind, and yet they by no means depend upon the possession of a brain or nervous system in order either to exist or perform such mental acts. So also, according to the Bible, God, or the Supreme Intelligence of the universe, dwells particularly in the spiritual world; and most assuredly he is not dependent for the exercise of his

all-embracing consciousness or of his infinite power, upon any material body whatever, much less than upon any brain or nervous system. Such being therefore the condition of things both with God and the angels, the question may be asked, why could not man do the same, especially when at death, becoming separated from the body, he too, as a pure spirit, shall pass over into that other world, in order to dwell there forever?

But now descending from that other or more spiritual world, and considering only the condition of things surrounding us in this life, it does not follow that merely because two things have for a certain period of time been found associated with each other, therefore one of them must be regarded as causing the other's existence. If that were so, it would follow that merely because a blind man is usually seen accompanied by his dog, therefore the dog must in some way have been caused by the man, or *vice versa*. Or to take a more elevated illustration, because two fixed stars have from time immemorial been seen away off at some place in the heavens, very near to each other, therefore one of them must have produced the other—a conclusion to which, of course, no astronomer would assent.⁵

3. THE BRAIN'S FUNCTION MIGHT BE TRANSMISSIVE, NOT NECESSARILY PRODUCTIVE

Prof. William James has given us a very good illustration, showing how it is possible for the mind to be very intimately associated with the brain, and yet not be dependent on it for existence. According to his teaching there are three kinds of function, well known to us, as connected with objects in the physical world. These functions are either productive, permissive, or transmissive in nature. The first variety is well understood; the second Doctor James illustrates by the "trigger

⁵ See Note 1, p. 184, for Man not Merely a Psychophysical Organism.

of a crossbow," which removes the obstacle and thus permits the bow to fly back to its natural shape; and the last one, or the transmissive function, he explains by comparing its action to that of a "colored glass," or of a "prism," or of a "refracting lens," each of which objects does not create the light, but allows the light to pass through it, the same being modified by the passage. Just so it is with the brain, regarded as an instrument. Or to give Professor James' peculiar idea more correctly and fully, he begins his exposition, we may say, by presupposing the existence of a spiritual world behind and above the material universe in which we are living. For most part this material universe is so opaque and impervious to the streams of spiritual life existing above, that little or no knowledge respecting that life, and no part of the life itself, is received here below. Still there are places in this obstructive medium that are thinner and more transparent, and through these it is possible for that higher or spiritual life to descend, or make itself known here on earth. And right here comes in the service of the brain, or of all the human brains existing in our world. These it is that form those thinner or more transparent places; so it is possible, after all, for that other or spiritual world to make itself known, or to appear here below. Or to revert to the figure of a prism, used by Doctor James, just as that instrument limits the amount of light which is to pass through it and determines its peculiar path and form, so our human brains—that is, the brains of all men existing in this world—both limit the amount of spiritual life which is to be received from above and determine the special or more individual forms in which it is to appear here below. All human minds, or personalities, in this world are therefore simply transformations of the more universal life existing above.

Such, in briefest statement and as we understand it, is Professor James' peculiar notion; and although this

view of matters has sometimes been criticized as leaning strongly toward pantheism, yet, all of its features taken together, it furnishes, so we think, a very apt illustration showing how it is possible for the human brain to exercise a transmissive function just as well as one of a productive nature. Moreover, it might be said yet, that not a few other writers upon the subject of immortality have shown their appreciation of this view, given us by Professor James, by adopting it to accomplish the same purpose as was that intended by its author.

Various other illustrations, somewhat more instrument-like in nature, have also been used for this purpose. For instance, the air passing through the pipes of an organ and thus producing sound, or music, shows, even excellently well, how it is possible to effect a transmissive function. So also the wind filling the sails of a vessel, and thus through those sails propelling the ship forward, is another good comparison. Even the old Greeks and Romans had a pretty correct idea of the relation existing between soul and body. For in speaking of that relation they often compared it to that of a rower rowing his boat and thus giving to it forward motion; or to that of a harper using his harp to express his musical conceptions. A peculiarly strong modern illustration, sometimes used, is the Atlantic cable, connecting Europe and America. Just so, it is said, the brain, or the entire nervous system, connects the inner world of mind with the outer world of matter. But now supposing that from some cause this connecting link is broken or destroyed, most surely that would not signify that either of the two worlds mentioned must cease to exist. On the contrary, it only signifies that the link, or cable, binding the two worlds together, has in some way disappeared or ceased to act, while of course the worlds themselves continue to exist as before.

Any one or all of these illustrations can be used to good effect in overthrowing the strong materialistic ob-

jection to the doctrine of immortality, that the mind is so dependent upon the brain that when the brain dies the mind must also die, or perish, with it; or in other words, that the only function of the brain is a productive one—which is, as we have seen, not true.

VI

THE ARGUMENT FROM PHYSIOLOGY (CONTINUED)

OTHER COUNTER-ARGUMENTS

1. CONTRARIETY OF MIND TO MATTER

STILL another counter-argument can easily be constructed from the contrariety in nature of mind to matter. Mind, for instance, can think, as well as feel, purpose, choose, and carry out resolutions. But matter can do none of these things. Who ever heard of a stone's being conscious, or of its exercising thought, or emotion, or any act of mind? Who ever saw a steam-engine that was able, first, to plan its own work, and then consciously go forward in the execution of it? Who is able with a tape line to measure the mind and tell its dimensions this way and that? Or who can weigh consciousness in a balance and estimate its number of ounces or pounds? Or who ever thought of cutting the mind to pieces or of bottling it up and thus carrying it from place to place? Even electricity can, by means of a wire, be transferred from one locality to another; but not so with mind, not so with personality. The only way that mind can be transmitted from one point to another is by the owner's carrying it, or by means of mind itself. There is a law in nature that every effect must have adequate cause. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*. Nothing can be produced except by something that is able to produce it. Consequently it is absolutely impossible to conceive of molecular motion, or of chemical affinity as being transformed into thought, or emotion, or any other act of consciousness. This is the view now held by all first-class metaphysicians and

even by scholars in general, the world over; and no scholar who values his reputation for thorough acquaintance with the properties of mind and matter would think of affirming differently. Accordingly the popular conception obtaining, at least among all theistic scholars, nowadays is, not that matter produces mind or mind matter, but rather that the relation existing between these two entities is one of parallel activity. In other words, the processes of mind form one set of activities and the processes of matter form another set of activities, and these two streams of energy flow on side by side, influencing each other to some extent, but never coming into causal relation, so that one produces the other.¹

As already affirmed, therefore, we will repeat that the common view held nowadays by at least most scholars is the one we have described; and to prove the correctness of such statement, let us quote from one or two eminent authorities. John Stuart Mill, for instance, says that "The relation of thought to the brain is no metaphysical necessity, but simply a constant coexistence within the limits of observation." So also Prof. John Tyndall remarks that "The continuity between molecular processes and the phenomena of consciousness is the rock upon which materialism must inevitably split whenever it pretends to be a complete philosophy of the human mind." And even Herbert Spencer declares that the conscious soul is no product of material particles, but a divine influence, a manifestation of the same divine energy which is manifested everywhere throughout the universe.

2. THE NERVOUS SYSTEM A CLOSED CIRCLE

Various other counter-arguments can be brought forward to offset this materialistic assumption that the mind is only an abstraction, and, in that sense, the product of brain activity. Mr. John Fiske, for instance, teaches that

¹ See Note 1, p. 187, for what John Fiske says on this subject.

the nervous system, acting together with the rest of the body, forms a "closed circle." His language is as follows:

The natural history of the mass of activities that are perpetually being concentrated within our bodies, to be presently once more disintegrated and diffused, shows us a closed circle which is entirely physical, and in which one segment belongs to the nervous system. As for our conscious life, that forms no part of the closed circle, but stands entirely outside of it, concentric with the segment which belongs to the nervous system.

As we understand these words, then, they teach the idea that into the closed circle formed by "the great mass of physical activities" continually entering our bodies, and by the nervous system, the mind, or our "conscious life," does not enter as a factor, but stands entirely outside; it being associated with the nervous system, which, according to the figure used, forms a segment of the general circle. The same kind of illustration, however, might be framed out of the nervous system, considered by itself. For, as the science of psychology teaches, all nervous action forms a real circuit. First, the sensory impulses come in along the afferent nerves, and then, being translated by the central ganglia into motor action, they go out again, in that form, along the efferent nerves; and thus the movement is continually repeated. Which-ever one of these general conceptions, however, may be used in the making of a circuit, that circuit really exists, and the doctrine intended to be taught by it is true. All nervous action moves in a circuit; and it is also true that the conscious life, or the soul, forms no part of such circuit. The figure employed is much the same as that of an electric current, which conveys messages over a telegraph-wire. The operator, or communicator, stands entirely outside. He himself forms no part of the current; but he simply uses it for accomplishing his own purposes, and when that end is achieved, his connection with the current ceases. Exactly so it is with the soul. It is in-

deed connected with the nervous system, or we may say, with the entire body, but only in an external way. It uses both of those structures only as a means for accomplishing its purposes, but it forms no part of them.

3. THE BRAIN'S NEED OF EDUCATION

But an equally strong argument, and one somewhat in the same line, is made by Dr. William Hanna Thomson, in his book entitled "Brain and Personality." In that book he undertakes to show that in and of itself, or naturally, the brain is incapable of real human thought or of exercising any of the higher functions which belong to mind, or consciousness. He illustrates his notion by quite a number of facts. So, e. g., the faculty of speech, which with right-handed people is located in the left brain—this, Doctor Thomson teaches, is wholly an acquired faculty. The brain has, in and of itself, no power of speech, but has to be taught it by some outside agent, just as the hand needs to be taught to do its work, or as a vine needs to be trained before it will assume a certain shape. What makes the brain, therefore, capable of speech is not its original endowment of mere brain-substance, but its education. And so with the capability of writing, of using numbers, of reasoning, or of performing any of the higher mental acts. Doctor Thomson insists that the power to do these things does not belong naturally to the brain, but must be acquired by education, and then, of course, the educator can be none other than the mind itself. In this way he undertakes to show not only that the mind is an outside entity and forms no part of the nervous system, but also that in every way it is vastly superior to that system.

4. NORMAL MENTAL POWER NOT DEPENDENT UPON QUANTITY OF BRAIN

Moreover, this same author makes much of the fact that in its structure the brain is a double organ, having

a right and a left hemisphere. And he tells us that the cases are not infrequent where one or the other of these hemispheres becomes badly damaged, or almost wholly destroyed, and still the patient's mental ability is not largely diminished on that account. Also medical history furnished many such instances. E. g., it is reported of a distinguished French physician, named Bichat, who in his time was considered to be one of the foremost anatomists, that as was revealed by his autopsy, one lobe of his brain had, seemingly for a long time, been largely shriveled up and thus rendered useless. So also Doctor Cruveillier tells of an "eminently intelligent citizen," the left lobe of whose brain was found after death to be almost entirely wasted, and its place filled with a watery substance; and yet, strange to say, this patient had not lost much of his general mental power. Still another case is reported by Doctor Bailey, of Columbia University, who tells us of

a man, aged fifty-seven years, the entire right side of whose brain was destroyed of its gray-matter cells, while a large cyst containing a straw-colored fluid occupied the frontal lobes of the same side.

Yet Doctor Bailey says of this man, that during three years of daily observation upon him, "nothing whatever was discovered to indicate that his character or mental capacity was in the slightest affected." Most certainly such facts teach that the mind is not dependent upon any special amount of brain-substance in order to accomplish its natural office work, but that, even with half, or part of a brain, it can perform its full normal labor. The case is very much like that of a skilled violinist, who, when some of the strings of his instrument are broken, is not deterred on that account from going forward with his music; but he keeps right on playing just as before, or at least much in the same strain. Instances of such skilful performance are not very rare among violinists.

5. INTELLIGENCE WITHOUT A BRAIN OR NERVOUS SYSTEM

But our whole story is not yet told. Not only is the mind not dependent upon any special amount of brain in order to accomplish its full office work, but it would seem, from various facts connected with actual life, that it is possible for a low form of mentality to exist, even where neither a brain nor a nervous system is found. Frogs, e. g., can be decapitated, and yet, even in that condition, without any brain at all, they will not only live, but act in some respects very much as they did before. For such a frog, to use Doctor Thomson's description, will, if put upon a plate, "jump up and assume a perfectly natural, if not a somewhat impertinent attitude." And then, if some acid is dropped on one of its sides, it will use both its fore and hind feet in order to remove it; until, if the pain becomes unbearable, then the animal, in its efforts for relief, will "lose its balance," and at last, as Doctor Thomson says, "make a natural dive for the floor." So also pigeons, if their cerebral lobes are removed, will still exhibit various signs of intelligence; only, of course, they no longer possess the power of acting voluntarily or of knowing the real meaning of things.

But we can descend still much lower down on the scale of animal life. We can go down even to the protozoa, which are the earliest of all forms of animal existence, and there we find a very small animal called the amœba. It is so exceedingly small as to be almost invisible to the naked eye. It is simply a unicellular animal, a mere bit of protoplasm, with scarcely any organization; and what is most peculiar about it is, that it has neither a brain nor a nervous system. Still even this seemingly so poorly furnished animal possesses not only life, but a certain amount of intelligence, even such as belongs to men. For it can move about from place to place, select its own food, avoid enemies to some extent, digest and assimilate its

food, and propagate its kind; all of which acts show that it really does possess a certain low form of instinct or intelligence. Also it might be demonstrated that this little animal has an humble form of will and purpose, as likewise of feeling. Of course, it has no consciousness, nor conscience, nor rationality, nor anything of that kind. But a certain amount of instinctive intelligence it surely has; and now what we desire, in this connection, especially to emphasize is the fact already mentioned, that this diminutive animal, possessed as it is of real intelligence, has after all neither a brain nor a nervous system, *nothing of the kind!* And this one simple fact, so it seems to us, really overthrows the entire materialistic theory, that in order to the possession of intelligence by any animal, no matter how small or humble it might be, a brain or, at least, a nervous system of some kind, is necessary.

PARTIAL CONCLUSION

To sum up, then, the results of our studies in these last two chapters, it must be confessed that our real achievements have been rather in the way of removing obstructions than of making positive advance. Of all the sciences at all helpful to materialists, physiology has supplied them with their most formidable weapons; and upon this field also they have made their most determined stand. Hence it was necessary for us, in order to make further advance, to lay hold of these obstructions and remove them if possible. But this, we believe, has now been accomplished; and therefore, from this point on we can anticipate a much easier task with the work still before us. When Commodore Perry made his report concerning the Battle of Lake Erie, he said, "We have met the enemy, and they are ours." So we believe we can say concerning these formidable-looking materialistic arguments; we have met them, and they are now all removed.

ARGUMENTS MORE POSITIVE IN NATURE

1. FROM STRUCTURE OF BODY CELLS

But now, having given so much attention to what may be considered negative arguments, coming from physiology, for the immortality of man, we desire yet to notice one or two others, of a more positive nature. One such argument can be obtained from the peculiar structure of a cell, or more in general from that of all the cells composing the human body. When in another chapter we were studying the peculiarity of cells, we found them not only composed of matter and energy, but having in them something different in its nature, viz., a principle of life, or rather we may say, of life associated with mind—that is, a psychic element. And this peculiar psychic element we found to be absolutely essential to the structure of a cell. It needs such an element so as to be able to perform both its own peculiar offices, as a unit in the body, and its offices also with regard to the other units, or the entire physical system. In other words, with this conception of a cell—which, according to all vitalists, is the true one—the human body, being composed of a vast number of cells, must be looked upon as including within itself a great, or common principle of life, or of psychic energy; and it is owing to this psychic element in the human body that man has been able to accomplish all the great and wonderful things achieved by him already in this world of ours. Or to state the matter somewhat differently, the human body contains within itself a real soul, or intellectual principle; which makes it something very different in its entirety from a mere material structure. And if man has a real soul, then of course his immortality naturally follows.

2. FROM HAECKEL'S PECULIAR TEACHING

And by the way, it is interesting to know that even so stout a materialist as Prof. Ernst Haeckel seems to

agree with us in these views we have taken with regard to the composition of cells. For in his so well-known book, entitled "The Riddle of the Universe," he positively teaches that all cells, in whatever organism they may be found, have a psychic principle in them, or a soul of some kind; and in at least one or two places in that book he even goes so far as to claim that in every one of the countless atoms forming the material universe there is also contained a soul, or a psychic principle, although one of a low or unconscious order; ² both of these teachings being necessary to account for the intelligence manifested everywhere by nature in her processes. But if this is so, that all the atoms have souls in them, then why should the same lofty possession be denied to man? Of course Haeckel would teach that the psychic element in the human body—forming, so to speak, the soul—is something very different in kind from the low order of intelligence existing in the atoms. Still, all this being admitted as true, there is yet a certain likeness between the psychic element contained—according to Haeckel—in an atom and that which belongs to the cells composing the human body. And all this moreover being regarded as a fact, one can very readily reason up from the low order of intelligence contained in an atom even to the possession of a real human soul—consequently, also to the attribute of immortality as belonging to such soul.³

But this peculiar teaching of Haeckel's about the atoms having souls in them, really overthrows his entire materialistic doctrine, that matter is the only really existing thing in all the universe, or that it is the producing cause of all other things that exist. For how could matter be the cause of other existing things, such as life, intelli-

² *Opus cit.*, pp. 179, 225. See also Wallace's "World of Life," pp. 333, 337.

³ In his book, "Modern Light on Immortality," Henry Frank has attempted to do this very thing or something like it. However, his reasoning is unsatisfactory, since he connects the immortality of the soul with that of a material, although invisible, body; making both this and the soul immortal.

gence, and free agency, when in and of itself matter has no capability for producing such things? ⁴

But, waiving this criticism, we now have, so it seems to us, two arguments, coming from (or connected with) the realm of physiology—one of them being based upon Haeckel's peculiar teaching that all the atoms have souls in them, and the other being obtained from the structure of the cells composing the human body—both of which arguments seem to be really positive in their nature, and both having a bearing upon the proof of human immortality. However, it must be confessed that the convincing force of either, or both of these arguments, is not particularly great.

⁴ See Note 2, p. 188, for Materialists' Admission of Mind Power in Nature.

VII

THE ARGUMENT FROM PSYCHOLOGY (PROPER)

AS with our last study so with psychology, it is so extensive a subject that the argument to be derived from it will have to be divided into two parts. Part first will deal especially with facts belonging to personality, or more fully, to mind in general; and this we will call psychology proper. Part second will consider particularly certain abnormal features of the mind, and of course all this comes under the head of what is usually known as abnormal psychology. Both of these lines of study should not only be very interesting to us, but should also furnish important help for carrying forward our general argument.

NATURE OF PERSONALITY

The first topic, therefore, to be considered by us is the peculiar nature of mind, or personality. What is personality? As usually defined by the dictionaries and other authorities, this term may mean two or three things. It may, for instance, be understood in a wider sense, in which case it signifies much the same as the human mind in general. Or it may be understood in a narrower sense, when it is nearly equivalent to personal identity, or individuality of being. As defined by Sir Oliver Lodge in terms of its own attributes, this peculiar entity includes three things, viz., "a memory, a consciousness, and a will." But we shall venture to add a fourth element, namely, conscience, or moral sentiment; and then our definition would be as follows: Personality is, first of all, simply consciousness, which really embraces all the

other attributes of the mind, or it is the widest-reaching of all the attributes. Secondly, personality is also free-will, which is undoubtedly the most fundamental of the attributes. Thirdly, this peculiarity of the mind also embraces memory, which is the one attribute binding together all our experiences, and making a unity of them; thus also putting us in relation to the past, the present, and the future. And finally, personality is conscience, or moral sentiment, which may be regarded as the glory of all the attributes, or rather, of human nature. Of course much more could be said on this subject, but the definition we have given is sufficient for our purpose here.

I. BEARING OF PERSONALITY ON A FUTURE LIFE

Now the question may be asked as to how this conception of personality may be so used as to help our argument for the immortality of man. The answer is quite easy. All we have to do is, first, to notice that there are two sides to this matter of human personality. On one side man connects himself, by virtue of his exalted nature, with Divinity; and therefore, because God is immortal or must exist forever, so also should man exist. Then, on the other side, man connects himself with all the lower orders of being surrounding him; not only with plants and animals, but also with the very forces of nature. Moreover, while there is something of all these forces, and also of animal life, in man, yet he is superior to them all. Consequently we read in the Bible that when God created man he not only made him male and female, but gave him a certain dominancy over nature, saying to him, that he should multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it; also that he should "rule over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." And this commission, we understand, was not given to man as a special favor or an act of grace, but because

of the natural excellence of his being. For, of all created things, man unquestionably stands at the head. He is really the lord of creation, and, as such, he has not only a divine right but also the necessary capabilities for ruling over all other creatures—not only over all plants and animals, but even over the forces and materials of nature, and therefore over his own body.

1. SUPERIORITY OF MIND TO BODY

But this is an argument that can be carried much farther; and it is possible to show that, by virtue of his own personality, man is not only different from his body, but is in every way superior to it. Man is surely not body, but soul or spirit; and hence in speaking of the body we never say that it possesses the mind, but rather, "This is my body." So fully dependent is the body upon the soul that it could not even live, or exist, without the animating presence of the latter. Besides, all the activities of the body are more or less under the control of the mind; so much so that the mind can literally wear out the body, as it often does, in its service. Then, too, the mind can make the body either well or ill at its pleasure, which is a peculiar fact connected with mental activity that has only recently been fully discovered, or rather appreciated to an adequate degree, so as to be put to service, as it now is very widely, in the interest of physical healing.

Such being therefore the great superiority of the mind over the body and over all its powers, it would seem that the body might even perish, and still the mind, or personality, not greatly suffer or become extinct. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." That is what the Bible teaches; and the fact that the human spirit is in its nature something very different from dust, proves that this teaching is in accord with the truth, and should be so regarded.

2. DIVINE SIDE OF PERSONALITY

But now to return for an instant to what was said respecting the other or divine side of personality, our argument can be considerably enlarged. We can either say that, having been created in the divine image, man is exalted to a certain participancy even of the divine nature; and therefore, because God lives eternally, or is immortal, man should be considered so also. Or we can say that God is our Father, even our heavenly Father; and hence, because we either have or may have a consciousness of such peculiar relationship to him, we may very appropriately call ourselves the children of God, even as Jesus did, who considered himself in the very highest sense a Son of the Supreme Being. Therefore, if God is really our Father, and we are his children, we are, it may be affirmed, even by right of birth, immortal beings, just as God is immortal. To be sure, this is putting the matter upon pretty high religious grounds, even those of Christian experience; but since this experience is possible to all men, no one should find fault with this argument. It is, in our judgment, perfectly valid, or legitimate; as much so as is the other just mentioned, about our having been created in the image of God, and therefore being in our very nature immortal. The only difference between this last argument and the other, is that it is somewhat more peculiarly Christian in character, and is also, in our opinion, the stronger of the two.

But with two such cogent arguments built upon man's actual or possible relation to the Divine Being, surely man has no reason coming from that source to doubt his own immortality; being, as we have seen, really immortal for two reasons, first, because of his similarity in nature to God, and secondly, because of his occupying such a peculiar relation to God as that he can even claim for himself a divine sonship.

3. AXIOM OF THE CONSERVATION OF VALUE

But this idea of personality suggests still another line of reasoning, drawn not from theology but even from some of the most advanced science of the day. It is what, in scientific phrase, is termed the "axiom of the conservation of value"; and what, it may be inquired, is this peculiar axiom? As defined by the scholars it is certainly something not so very new. That is to say, it is only the old idea under a new name—that things which are "good and true" should be preserved, whereas things false and evil should be destroyed, or remedied in some way. Or to connect this axiom with the important and now so widely accepted doctrine of evolution, it may be affirmed that, if this doctrine is true, then the tendency of our universe is ever onward; and any one step gained by nature is always used for gaining another and a more important step; and thus it is that continued progress is rendered possible. *Nulla vestigia retrorsum*, "no steps backward"—that was Cæsar's motto; and this idea seems to be also characteristic of nature's course. For all her history, so far as we know it, has been a history of advance and not of retreat. Death, therefore, according to this view, cannot be an extinction of being, but it must be rather—that is, if evolution is true—the beginning of a new and higher order of existence. In other words, man must be immortal; his immortality being secured to him even by a law of nature.

Or, the argument may be differently stated, as follows: Nature always works to some good purpose, and she also works wisely. Hence she is by no means willing to destroy the highest and noblest of all her creatures—which, of course, is man. And after having through countless ages and with infinite labor and sacrifice—as we are taught by evolution—finally produced man, nature is not so foolish, neither is she so cruel, as now to turn upon man and utterly destroy him. Such a conception

of nature would be to put her in the rank of some of those cruel old heathen gods of whom we are told, in ancient myth, that they literally devoured their own offspring. Also such a conception would be to attribute to nature an enormity of folly, of which she could not be guilty; making all her past labors, as well as her sacrifices, to be utterly vain and useless. But nature does not work in that way; all her history of the past shows that she has worked wisely. Wisdom and design are among the most conspicuous features of her labor; and therefore what she has done in the past, that she may be expected to do in the future. Accordingly most judicious scholars of the day would, we are confident, agree with Charles Darwin when he says that "It is an intolerable thought that man and all other sentient beings are doomed to complete annihilation, after such long-continued and slow progress" as was made by nature in producing them. Or, as another philosophical thinker has expressed the matter, "It is impossible to believe without intellectual confusion that a system whose visible goal is the evolution of personality, ends in the extinction of personality." That would be both unwise and cruel in the highest degree; and if nature is such a foolish monster as to destroy all her children after having produced them, or if she has no regard for man as a reasonable being, then she is herself most unreasonable, and this great universe in which we are living is by no means a fit habitation for so high an order of being as is man.

II. GREATNESS OF MAN'S CAPABILITIES

Another argument somewhat in the same line for the soul's immortality can easily be constructed from what may be called the extraordinary capabilities of man, or more especially, from his powers of doing and knowing. What wonderful achievements he has already accomplished! How he has changed the entire face of our earth from being merely a rude, uninhabited wilderness,

to a condition of things where civilization, with the arts and sciences, is everywhere spread! What mighty cities he has builded! What extensive railroads and other means of communication he has established! What prodigious industries he has not only erected and scattered almost everywhere in the world, but is even now operating! He has literally harnessed the lightning and subdued many of the powers of nature. He is even now riding upon the wings of the wind, and is picking up messages out of the atmosphere. And there are ten thousand other things, most wonderful in nature, which man has accomplished in the past, and is still accomplishing.

And so also with his capability of knowing? What vast accumulations of knowledge man has already obtained! What secrets of the universe, what laws of nature, he has already explored! What wonderful histories of the far-off past and prophecies respecting the far-off future he has already mapped out! True, he has not yet been able to count all the stars of heaven, but he has told us something about the immensity of their number, their vast distance from us, and also about their magnitude and composition. He has calculated eclipses hundreds of years before they came to pass. Thus he has not only told us of things infinitely great; he has likewise told us of things infinitely small, uncovering for us universes, many of the objects in which are so exceedingly diminutive that they cannot be seen with the naked eye. Theodore Parker once said that "the greatest of all the worlds is the one at the small end of the telescope"; and that is even so. For knowledge, conscience, memory, all the powers of reasoning and apprehending—each of these is infinitely greater than any of the material worlds, or all of them put together.

Such being the case, what shall we say of the doctrine which, while teaching that nature is so careful of all her forces, and even of the atoms, that nothing whatever of a

material character is lost, even from eternity to eternity, yet also teaches that man, the highest product of nature—man, who is so extraordinarily gifted with powers—must perish forever! Or, what shall we say of nature herself, or even of a Creator who allows to solar systems and to nebulæ billions of years in which to run their round of existence, and yet cuts down the age of man to only threescore and ten, and usually to a smaller number! Surely, such things ought not to be; but the only way to reconcile these doings of nature with our ideas of what is right and reasonable, is simply to allow to man his due, or his God-given right of immortality.

III. MISCELLANEOUS ARGUMENTS

And just here, if we had the space, it would be very interesting to us as well as strengthening to our argument in general, to consider various pleas for immortality, which are more or less miscellaneous in nature, such, e. g., as the impossibility of really making ourselves believe that our deceased friends are extinct, or that death means a complete annihilation of being. Here, for instance, is a sentence from a materialistic unbeliever in immortality. It is taken from Professor Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe." It reads: "The best we can desire after a courageous life spent in doing good, etc., is the eternal peace of the grave." Why does Mr. Haeckel use such language? Why, if according to his materialistic theory death means to each and all of us an eternal extinction of being, both of body and soul—why does he not say so? Or how could we have any peace in the grave when, being ourselves extinct, we should know nothing at all, either about the grave or anything else? The truth is that with materialists, just as with other people, the heart rebels against acknowledging any such doctrine as annihilation; and therefore when people of that class come to face death as a real experience, they do just as others do. They undertake to cover up the horrors of death and of

the grave with some euphemistic or more agreeable expressions; and so instead of considering death as an absolute extinction of personal being, they call it a "rest," a "sleep," a condition of "peace," etc. All this is well enough; but the point we wish to emphasize, is the practical impossibility of carrying the materialistic theory through. No human heart will suffer that to be done, under all circumstances.

So also a very good argument for immortality might be drawn from the fact that the instinct of a future life lies so deeply imbedded in the human mind that it is really ineradicable, and never can be satisfied until immortality itself shall become a real experience. Likewise all kinds of religious experience, and particularly the testimonies of the dying, can, and should, be used in support of the doctrine we are considering.

THE "TITANIC" DISASTER

One other fact of this nature. It is that in the human soul there exists a power capable of triumphing even over death itself. A striking illustration of such capability took place in connection with that great ship disaster which occurred on the Atlantic Ocean some years ago, known as the sinking of the "Titanic," an enormous steamer, carrying at the time some two thousand people, the great majority of whom were lost. It is reported that during the occurrence of this terrible disaster the ship's heroic band played an inspiring sacred hymn—it might have been "Nearer, My God, to Thee," or some other equally appropriate. Then, while the great vessel was sinking beneath the waters, what extraordinary deeds of self-sacrifice and devotion to duty were exhibited, both by the crew and a large share of the passengers! "Be British! Be British!" is what Captain Smith cried out to his men, and almost every one of them stood fast at his post. Also it is known that most of the male passengers upon that ill-fated vessel stood aside, and allowed many

of the women and children to be saved in the life-boats. After that nearly all the crew, with some six hundred or more of those brave self-sacrificing men, went down in the waters and perished. Let us hope that while the bodies of all these genuine heroes thus sank unto death, their souls went directly home to God, or at least survived the experience of what we call death. At all events, there is surely given us here an extraordinary exhibition not only of the power of sacred song to make men heroic, self-sacrificing, and dutiful, but also of that peculiar disposition, which certainly is in man, to triumph over all kinds of disasters, even over death. You may destroy the ship upon which men are riding, you may even drown their bodies in the depths of the ocean; but you cannot destroy the soul, you cannot deprive man of his hope of another, or even of a better world than this.

IV. ARGUMENT FROM MORAL CHARACTER

But now finally, the very best, if not the strongest, psychological argument that can be urged in support of a future life for man, is one connected with moral character. As even the old heathen philosopher, Socrates, taught, many centuries ago, "No evil can befall the just or good man." And it does not matter through what experiences this good man may pass, even though it is death itself, he can suffer no harm, because the very universe, with all its powers, is pledged to care for, and not to destroy, the man who is morally good. In other words, as not only Matthew Arnold but all the past experience of our race teaches, the universe itself is built upon moral principles, or "makes for righteousness"; consequently any man who is morally good has the promise of nature's protection and help. Or as the Bible teaches, "All things work together for good to them that love God." If therefore any man has down deep in his heart a real love for moral excellence, if he purposes to do good and not evil, he has the promise, both of religion

and science, that ultimately he will receive good. Such a man cannot suffer death, or become extinct; for that would be to experience even perhaps the greatest of all evils, and would be contrary to the teaching not only of the old Greek philosopher, but even of nature—that is, if nature has any true regard for moral principles. “This is life eternal,” says the Greatest of all Teachers, “That they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou has sent.” To know and do the will of God—that is life eternal. Here then is a secret, such as all men ought to know. It is that genuine moral character, or knowing and doing the will of God, secures for us the only life beyond the grave that is worth having. Whosoever has such a character can never suffer death or harm.

VIII

THE ARGUMENT FROM ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

THE name, abnormal psychology, is usually employed to cover quite a number of topics, such as hypnotism, somnambulism, clairvoyance, clairaudience, mind-reading, telepathy, the subconscious mind, multiple personality, and so forth. All of these subjects may be considered as in a certain sense new studies, and of late they have had special attention given them. Now, of course, in this brief chapter it is not purposed to discuss particularly each and all of these subjects, but it is only those which have some important bearing upon an after-life for man that will receive our special attention. Some one has said that, as the fifteenth century distinguished itself by discovering a new material world—that is, our great American continent—so the twentieth century promises to distinguish itself by discovering and investigating a new world of mind, namely, all that collection of mental powers which passes under the name of abnormal psychology. To be sure, not all of the facts belonging to this branch of science have been brought to light in the present century. Many of them have been known even from time immemorial, but it is particularly the merit of this later day that it has not only investigated the various topics more thoroughly than was ever done before, but it has really discovered many new facts connected with them, or more especially with some of them.

I. NATURE OF THE SUBCONSCIOUS MIND

The first one, then, of these special subjects as mentioned above, to which we will now give attention, is a
78

curious division of the human mind, which goes under the general name of subconsciousness. Other appellations given to it are the subconscious mind, or the unconscious mind, the subliminal mind, the subjective mind, secondary consciousness, and perhaps some others. But all these names are intended to represent much the same thing; or if there are some differences of meaning connected with them, they are of small account. What, then, are we to understand to be the real significance of this term, subconscious mind? Various definitions have been given to it, such as the mind outside the focus of attention, the mind of forgotten memories, etc.; but the real idea had in view by most scholars who have given special attention to the subject, is that of a mind detached in some way from the regular normal consciousness, or of an intelligence acting in some extent independently. That is to say, we really have two minds—a conscious and an unconscious one. But it must not be understood by this statement that we have two personalities. We have two divisions of the same mind, but only one personality. The case is much like that of a man dwelling in two apartments of the same house, an upper apartment and a lower apartment. So the mind, or personality, really dwells in two divisions of consciousness, an upper and a lower one, but it is the same mind, whether dwelling in one or the other. Or the human intellect might be compared to a great ship, or even to an iceberg, the larger part of which is submerged in the water, while only a smaller portion stands out above the surface in the sunlight.

1. PROOF OF ITS EXISTENCE

With this understanding, therefore, of what the subconscious mind really is in its nature, the question may be asked, how is it possible to prove the existence of such a detached or lower division of the mind? To be sure, not all psychologists are as yet agreed that such a

division really exists. Some of them even strenuously oppose the idea of such existence, and they endeavor to bring forward various arguments in support of their view. Still it can be said, on the other side, that today the great bulk of educated opinion is strongly in favor of man's really having a subconscious mind; and this view is a growing one. Proofs of such existence can be given in abundance. One is that all animals possess a certain kind of intelligence. We call it instinct; and as instinct has been defined it is "purposive action without the actor's being conscious of the purpose." All animal intelligence must be considered, therefore, as more or less unconscious. And just so it is with all the organic or vegetative activities of a physical organism—the human body, for example. Modern psychology is accustomed to look upon these activities as having connected with them a certain low form of mentality. The very performance of a function requires such a notion. Hence the stomach, for instance, knows how to digest its food just as well as the mind knows how to perform its peculiar office work. Or the lungs, the heart, or any of the vital organs—all these do not act in absolute ignorance of the kind of work they are doing, but they seem to be guided by a certain degree of real intelligence, although an intelligence of low order.

Other evidences to the same effect, or proofs going to show that the subconscious mind is by no means a mere fancy or delusion but a real entity possessed by all human beings, are such facts as the resuscitation of forgotten memories, the peculiarities of dreams, work accomplished during sleep, the phenomena of hypnotism, somnambulism, and the like. Also we may add the extraordinary work of various kinds produced by what is known as genius.

Various other proofs, some of them amounting even to an ocular demonstration, might be offered; but our space will not permit.

2. HUDSON'S ARGUMENT FROM MENTAL POWERS

Let us now notice Mr. Thompson Jay Hudson's argument for a future life, drawn from some of the facts connected with this subconscious division of the mind. He tells us that there are four or five such facts of peculiar interest, and that they all bear strongly upon the notion that man is truly, even in his endowments, an immortal being. Such facts, as given by Mr. Hudson, are, first of all, what he terms a "potentially perfect memory," or a faculty of recollection that really forgets nothing. This he thinks is not only useless so far as our present life is concerned, but is often a positive disadvantage. Then next he indicates an intuitive preception of the very essence of things, or of the principles and laws of nature, such as is supposed to belong to great geniuses. Next he names an unerring judgment, or method of reasoning, such as belongs to the instinct of animals, all of which seem to be guided, when obedient to their inborn tendencies, in the way of truth, or to make few or no mistakes. And lastly, besides affirming that the subconscious mind is the seat of our affectional emotions, he points out two very extraordinary powers, which he thinks are possessed by man, and which powers might be raised even to infinity, or to equality with divine attributes—these powers being *telekinesis*, or the ability to move objects without physical contact, and *telepathy*, or the ability to communicate thought independently of sense-perception. These powers raised to infinity, Mr. Hudson thinks, would be almost equivalent to the divine attributes of omnipotence and omnipresence.

Now this is the argument. All these peculiar powers belonging to man are, so Mr. Hudson affirms, more or less unfitted for the needs of our present life, and therefore, if they are to be of any real and full service to us, it must be in another and very different world. Or to use his own language—"There can exist no faculty,"

he says, "without a function"; and inasmuch as the functions of the various powers we have named cannot be performed in this life, they must be performed in another. It is somewhat like the case of a fœtus while still in its mother's womb. It has various organs, such as hands, feet, eyes, and ears, all of which are not only useless to it in that prenatal period, but they are more or less of a disadvantage, a kind of incumbrance to its life. But after the child is born, then of course all the natural functions of these extra organs find place for exercise, which shows that in their original state such extra and useless members must be regarded as prophecies or anticipations of another condition of things still to be experienced. Just so, Mr. Hudson and others have argued, those peculiar powers of the subconscious mind which we have mentioned as being unused and useless in our present life, must be looked upon as really prophecies of things to come, or of experiences to be had in a future world. This argument we esteem a very good one; being, in its general nature, much like several others we have already met, in this series of studies.

II. ARGUMENT FROM TELEPATHY

The next argument coming from the science of abnormal psychology which can be made in the interest of the doctrine before us, is one connected with what is known as telepathy. This peculiar power of the mind is one that has only recently been established. We say *established*, although there are certain scientists who still have their doubts about it. But Sir Oliver Lodge tells us that it is one of the meritorious achievements of the British Society for Psychical Research that it has really proved the existence of this peculiar power in man, and that the evidence for it is "overwhelming," also that the facts supporting such view are "too numerous to be doubted." We take it therefore that telepathy is at least a fact practically established by science; and such being the

case, we have here, it seems to us, a strong proof that can be used in sustaining the doctrine of the soul's immortality. For if it is really true that man has the ability to communicate with man here on earth independently of sense perception, then what hinders his communicating also with discarnate spirits in the other world? Or, to state the matter somewhat differently, it is only a very easy logical step from the proof of telepathy as serviceable for communication in this world to its proof also as serviceable for communication between this world and the other.

And this, by the way, may be one of the reasons why some so-called scientists are so much opposed to recognizing telepathy as an established fact. It is because they are afraid of the "bogy of spiritism." But put away that bogy, or have a better understanding of the relation existing between this world and the other, and there would seem to be no reason why all scientists should not now accept telepathy as an established fact.

III. SPECULATIONS AND FACTS CONCERNING A "SIXTH SENSE"

From times long past men have speculated more or less about the development in the human mind, or in some capability belonging to it, of what is sometimes called a "sixth sense," or a new power of apprehension. Just what, though, this sixth sense really is in its nature, is a matter about which opinions are divided. Sometimes it is understood to be a real physical sense, very much like those we now have, only of a higher and more capable description. Oftener, however, the kind of sense had in view is one of a spiritual nature, or a capability of understanding spiritual matters. The apostle Paul tells us that "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." Also he says that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the

Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Moreover, elsewhere in Scripture we are taught that there is such a thing as a "new birth," or spiritual regeneration, brought about in men by direct action of the Divine Spirit; and one result of this experience is a new, or changed, consciousness, so that divine and spiritual realities are much better understood than is possible to man in his natural estate.

In other words, this experience of regeneration really confers upon man a new power of apprehension, so that he can now attain a higher and more satisfactory knowledge of the unseen spiritual world than was possible before; and all this is only ordinary Christian experience. Besides, the Scriptures speak of a much higher or more peculiar gift that seems to have been conferred especially upon the apostles and prophets—a kind of "open vision" by which things eternal and spiritual became to them almost as clear and real as the material world is to us. Such an experience is described by Paul, e. g., when he tells about his once having been caught up in spirit even to the third heaven, where he heard "unspeakable words," such as it was "not lawful for a man to utter," and where he must have had also other extraordinary experiences. The Bible not infrequently records other or similar experiences had by apostles and prophets.

And had we here the space, we might tell of the claims of spiritualists regarding the trance condition of some of their mediums. Or we might go back in history and consider the remarkable ecstatic experiences claimed to have been had by some of the old Neo-platonic philosophers and other mystics of one kind and another. Or we might still consider some of the efforts which even now are being made by various classes of scientists to extend the borders of knowledge by the use of instruments and in other ways; so that we shall have both a wider, clearer,

and more satisfactory knowledge of things in time and things in eternity than we now have; and if such ends are really achieved there is no telling what new discoveries may yet be made regarding things unseen and spiritual. Shakespeare assures us that there are more things in heaven and earth than are even dreamed of in our philosophy, and modern science seems to be making good that declaration. We repeat, therefore, that there is no telling what mysteries of the other world the future may yet reveal to us, even as matters of science.

IV. POSSIBILITY OF HELP FROM MECHANICAL INVENTIONS

Or to enlarge upon what has just been said about the efforts of scientists to extend the boundaries of knowledge in various ways by the use of instruments; what wonderful advances have been made in that way! In the whole realm of the natural sciences, e. g., how extraordinary have been the gains made by a use of the telescope, the microscope, spectrum analysis, X-rays, and scores of other like inventions! So also in the region of mind, or of the spirit, perhaps even more important, if not so numerous, discoveries have been effected by instruments of one kind and another. Go with me, if you will, into any modern, well-furnished psychological laboratory, and there you will see any number of curious instruments. Here, for example, is one called the ergograph, the purpose of which is to determine the effect of thought, emotion, will, and attention upon the whole working capability of the muscles. Then here is another smaller instrument called the sphygmograph, which, when bound to the wrist, will tell the effect of thought and emotion upon the beating of the pulse, or upon the action of the blood. Again, here is another or a larger machine, termed the pneumograph, which, when applied to the lungs, will determine for us the variations in their breathing under the influence of this or that kind of

thought or emotion. Still another of these mechanical devices will open for us even the secret working of the nervous system, and tell how perhaps some long-forgotten thought or emotion—it may have been some serious trauma or injury to the mind—now shows itself in the glands of the skin; and this instrument is termed a galvanoscope. And once more, here is another delicately constructed piece of machinery called a chronoscope, the purpose of which is to determine the different lengths of time required in different individuals for the mind to react upon external impressions, or to act in associating one thought with another; doing both of these things so expertly that the time is determined even in thousandths of a second.

And all of these instruments, and there are many more, have enabled men to make marvelous advances in the whole realm both of mental and moral science. In this way it has been determined, and with certainty, that the mind exerts a powerful influence upon the body, and likewise that the body affects in many ways the mind. So also in every department of the human mind—in sensation, perception, memory, imagination, judgment, emotion, will, and even in the highest reasoning capabilities—some new truth, or truths, have been discovered by a use of these psychological instruments. With these devices in his hand a skilful modern psychologist can tell whether any particular mind is sound or diseased, also what are a person's strongest faculties, and to what avocation he is best adapted. Moreover, even in detecting crime and in curing various diseases, whether physical, mental, or moral in nature, this "new science," as it is called, of physiological psychology, has already rendered itself practically useful, and larger results in many ways are predicted of it.

But now the question presents itself whether, since the use of mechanical instruments has proved so effectual in adding to our knowledge both in the great realm of

mind and of physical nature, they could not be used also, to advantage, in making discovery with regard to things belonging to another world. There is a border-land of very interesting phenomena, such as apparitions, ghosts, phantoms, auras, and the like—matters which are claimed by various scholars to be truly genuine—that might perhaps be investigated, and thus be made better known to us, if we only had the proper instruments to apply to them. Some optimistic scholars indeed tell us that such instruments will yet be invented; and there are others who even go so far as to say that, with the mechanical appliances now at command, some of the obscure phenomena above mentioned have already been solved; which solution, if really effected, would seem to prove positively that man has another life than this. But whether all this is fact or mere representation, we are not in condition to decide. We prefer rather to take a negative, or at least a neutral attitude toward all such matters. Still it should be remembered that, with the proper instruments, men have been able to accomplish wonderful things in the past; and who shall say that invention and discovery shall not yet be able to accomplish still more wonderful things—even, perhaps, demonstrating scientifically the existence of another or spiritual world. But all this, of course, is to be understood not as positive affirmation, but only as a suggestion of what science and invention may yet do for us in their spheres of investigation and demonstration.

V. SPIRITUAL EVOLUTION

But now, as belonging to the stricter field of psychology, there is still one item that should be considered here. It is what may be termed the spiritual evolution of man, or his complete unfolding according to moral ideals. From the very first, nature, in all her mighty and wide-reaching operations, has had man in view; and now that he has been produced and is himself upon the stage of

action, her special purpose with regard to him is to perfect his character, both as an individual and as a race or species. Moreover, inasmuch as man is a voluntary being capable of action, it is his duty as well as privilege to cooperate with nature in the production of this higher and better manhood. Or, to name the two special virtues that it should be the object of man's ambition to attain, they are the same as those forming the fundamental attributes of God, viz., righteousness and benevolence. When man shall have really attained unto those two great virtues he will also have reached the goal or destiny of his being. Just how far off we are now from that attainment it is, of course, impossible to determine. But the whole history of our race seems to have been a movement forward, in a moral direction, and the world is still moving. Perhaps then we can appropriately say with Tennyson:

Not in vain the distance beacons. Forward, forward let us range,
Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of
change.

Thro' the shadow of the globe we sweep into the younger day;
Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay.

But it should be remembered that when the goal of man is reached and he shall have become perfectly righteous and perfectly benevolent in character, then a state of things will have been brought about which is morally the same as that described in the Bible as the kingdom of God perfected and spread over all the earth; which kingdom, as the Bible also represents, it is the special work of Christ to establish. But Messiah's kingdom, according to revelation, is to last forever, hence all the subjects of that kingdom must be immortal; another proof of which is that, as is taught in Scripture, the saints are to reign with Christ forever. It becomes, therefore, a very easy task to prove a future life for

man, or at least for all who will have it; provided only they become members of God's great kingdom now being established everywhere in the world. And this conclusion, it may be added, is about the same in idea as the one reached at the end of our last chapter.

IX

THE ARGUMENT FROM SPIRITISM SCIENTIFICALLY EXAMINED

SPIRITISTIC phenomena are by no means a new experience in human history. Something of the kind can be found in the annals of our race away back through the ages, almost at the beginning. Accordingly we read in the book of Genesis of certain angels appearing to the old patriarch Abraham, as he sat at the door of his tent in the plains of Mamre. At first they were mistaken for men, but afterwards their true character as messengers of Jehovah, or visitors from another world, seems to have become apparent. So also angels appeared to Lot, Hagar, Jacob, Gideon, and David; and all down through the times both of the Old Testament and the New there are records of the appearing either of angels or of discarnate human spirits. Besides, the strict laws promulgated by Moses against sorcery, witchcraft, necromancy, and other matters of the kind, prove incontrovertibly that away back in those olden times various forms of what we now call "spiritistic phenomena" took place. Likewise among the Greeks and Romans, and indeed among all the ancient nations—in their "mysteries," "oracles," apparitions of the gods, etc.—perhaps every feature of modern spiritualism can be found. And then too in our own times and among most of the Oriental people, such as the Chinese, the Japanese, the Hindus, etc., and even among the Red Indians of America, and other savages, superstitions exist which connect themselves with the phenomena under consideration.

Thus some kind of spiritism seems to have spread literally over all the earth, and also to reach back through the

90

centuries, as we have said, almost to the beginning; such phenomena forming a large chapter in the history of our race.

What we call "modern spiritualism," however, began its history only some seventy years ago, or in 1848. It was in connection with certain mysterious noises, or "rappings," that took place in the presence of two little girls by the name of Fox, dwelling in a little town called Hydeville, near Rochester, N. Y. The beginning was indeed humble, but similar rappings, and other forms of what are now termed spiritism, soon broke out in different parts of the country, and spread rapidly everywhere, even to most countries of Europe, and in fact throughout the whole civilized world. Hence today spiritistic phenomena are well known everywhere, and spiritualism, as a system of thought and organization, has become a world-wide movement. It numbers its adherents even by the million, and has all kinds of institutions and propagating means at its command; so that what the end may be, no one can yet tell.

I. NATURE AND CLASSIFICATION OF SPIRITISTIC PHENOMENA

But the inquiry arises as to the peculiar nature of these phenomena. What are they? And how can they be classified? They are so familiar that no special definition would seem to be needed. But they are all claimed to be either the work of spirits or at least to be very mysterious in nature, unlike any of the ordinary phenomena, such as take place in accordance with natural law. Hence they are termed spiritistic phenomena, because they are supposed to be the work of supernatural beings, or spirits.

Of course, it is also known that these spiritistic phenomena exist in many forms; hence their classification would seem to be possible. Now the simplest, as well as the widest-reaching and most generally accepted, of all

the classifications is perhaps one which divides these phenomena into two groups, viz., such phenomena as manifest power or force, and such phenomena as manifest more particularly intelligence. But a more minute, as well as perhaps a more serviceable classification would be as follows: There are four classes, the divisions being made in accordance with the double notion of whether the phenomena represent power or intelligence, and of whether they are of a supernatural or natural origin. Thus classified, these phenomena can be arranged, as said, under four different heads. Class first would include merely such phenomena as represent power, without any special intelligence; and under this head would naturally come at least some of the old "Rochester rappings," the tipping of tables, moving objects by loose laying on of hands, the prestidigitator's tricks, perhaps a "levitation" of one's own body, etc. Class second would embrace such phenomena as represent intelligence, or perhaps intelligence coupled with force; and not a few phenomena come under this head, such as playing upon musical instruments, finding objects that are hidden or lost, untying knotted ropes, slate-writing, "fortune-telling," and the like. And then as belonging to class three, we might name such phenomena expressive of power as seem to border more particularly upon the supernatural. These would be the lifting of heavy weights without physical contact, thrusting the hand without injury into a bed of red-hot coals, which was one of D. D. Home's famous performances, the appearing of strange lights, also loud, unaccountable sounds, apparitions, phantasms, auras, etc. And lastly, under the fourth head would come what may be considered the highest, or most truly supernatural phenomena of all, such matters, e. g., as spirit materialization, spirit photography, spirit handwriting, communication with the dead, foretelling future events, "retrocognition," and still others.

Now, of course, we do not endorse the verity of all these phenomena; neither do we claim that the divisions we have given of them are in all respects correct. We only claim that the phenomena mentioned are in accordance with the teachings of spiritualists themselves, and, so far as the correctness of our divisions is concerned, it is sufficiently so for any purposes for which we shall use them here. Doctor Crookes classifies the spiritistic phenomena, or rather those coming under his own observation, in some thirteen different groups, but our division is sufficiently minute for present purposes.

II. SCIENTIFIC EXAMINATION OF THESE PHENOMENA

I. BY THE BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

Even from ancient times some critical study has been given to these spiritistic phenomena, but it was not until the organization of the British Society for Psychical Research that such phenomena began to receive anything like a thoroughgoing scientific examination. This society was organized in 1882, and therefore has existed now for some thirty-seven years. Among its early members were quite a number of the foremost scientists of England, such men as Henry Sidgwick, who was the Society's first president; Arthur J. Balfour, once prime minister of England, who was also one of the Society's presidents; Prof. W. F. Barrett, of the Royal College of Science for Ireland; Professor Stewart, of Owens College, Manchester; Hensleigh Wedgwood, Charles Darwin's brother-in-law; Dr. William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, F. W. H. Meyers, Edmund Gurney, Frank Podmore, Andrew Lang, and still others. Besides, quite a number of eminent scholars belonging to other countries became members of this body. In point of talent, therefore, it was truly well supplied; and, as is of course known, it still exists.

As to the special work undertaken by this society—

that is outlined, in a general way, in the original prospectus issued by it. According to this there were three classes of subjects to which attention would be given, viz., "the mesmeric, the psychical, and the spiritistic." Afterwards, however, when the society came to organize its committees and to assign to each its work, those general subjects were divided into more special ones—such as telepathy, hypnosis, Reichenbach's magnetic phenomena, trance conditions, automatic writing and speaking, apparitions, direct spirit communications, etc. Or, as Doctor Hyslop has described this society's work, the intention was to have it cover "all that large group of phenomena which lies outside the boundaries of orthodox science." But it was, and still is, the special endeavor of this organization to give its attention principally to a thorough investigation of spiritism; and all other subjects examined were to be regarded rather as accessories to this, than as being themselves special topics of study.

And now as to the particular kinds and amount of attention actually given to the study of spiritism by the British Society for Psychical Research, it is not necessary for us here to describe such matters in full. We shall only say that the strictest scientific methods were used, and that the society spared no effort or expense so far as was in its power to make its examinations of all kinds of spiritistic phenomena most thorough and complete. Mr. Gladstone once said of the work being done by this society, that it was "the most important in the world, by far the most important"; which idea, or the importance of its work, this society seems to have always practically borne in mind. Besides, therefore, giving a vast amount of study to all kinds of related subjects—especially to telepathy, phantoms, and automatic writing and speaking—this organization has really devoted some thirty-seven years of earnest work, more or less directly, to this one topic of the spiritistic phenomena. It has in-

vestigated all kinds of mediums and all kinds of the phenomena mentioned. Some of its mediums were visited, or sent for, in distant countries, and the work of them all was most thoroughly investigated; such investigations lasting, with some, for quite a number of years.¹ Also it sent its special agent, Dr. Richard Hodgson, away off to India, as well as to our own country, in order to ascertain more fully the truth respecting various spiritistic matters. It has sought help from all sources, so as to gain fuller information regarding the whole topic of spiritism. And finally, it has published all, or at least the more important, of its proceedings in some twenty-nine large and very interesting volumes; which volumes form today far the largest, and undoubtedly the best, treasury of reliable spiritistic information that can be found anywhere in the world.

2. BY OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND BY INDIVIDUALS

Moreover, in America, France, Italy, Germany, and other countries very important work has been done in the way of supplementing the labors of this English society, or, more properly speaking, perhaps, of cooperating with that society in the same kind of labor. In this country we have a society of our own, called now the American Society for Psychical Research, which, although going at different times under other names, has been doing good work in the same line as the English society. In its membership have been included such eminent names as Prof. William James, of Harvard University; Dr. Morton Prince, Boris Sidis, Dr. I. K. Funk, Prof. James Hyslop, Hereward Carrington, and others. So also the French have what they call a "Psychological Institute," located in Paris; the Italians have at least one such institute, located at Milan, and the Germans have, or have had various institutions of the kind. All these

¹ For some account of most Noted Mediums Examined by British S. P. R., see Note 1, p. 188.

foreign organizations have not only done some special work of their own, but they have cooperated handsomely with the English society. Besides all the work thus done in an organized way, there has been no small amount of important labor accomplished by individuals, in the interest, one way and another, of gaining a better and fuller understanding of spiritism. The names of some of the eminent scholars who have thus wrought are Dr. William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Alfred Russell Wallace, of England; Professor Richet, Doctor Maxwell, and the astronomer Flammarion, of France; Max Dessoir and Baron von Schrenck-Noetzing, of Germany; Professor Flournoy, of Switzerland; Prof. William James, Dr. G. Stanley Hall, Hereward Carrington, and Dr. I. K. Funk, of America. To be sure, most of these scholars, while engaged in their private investigations, were at the same time members of some psychological society; but such membership did not interfere with their more private or personal work.

III. RESULTS OF THESE DIFFERENT STUDIES

And now as to the results which can be gathered up from all these various studies in the phenomena of spiritism, they have been, as we conceive, about three in number.

1. MANY OF THE PHENOMENA PROVED TO BE FACTS

First, while many of the phenomena examined were proved to be unreal or frauds, on the other hand, a goodly proportion of them were demonstrated to be genuine. In other words, there are facts connected with the subject of spiritism such as cannot be denied. Of course, there has been much chicanery, and open, shameless imposture practised at times, with regard to this subject—perhaps more than respecting almost any other that could be named. Still, with all this falsity, there is a good residuum of truth connected even with

spiritism. If the work done by the various societies and individuals we have mentioned has demonstrated anything at all, it is that quite a large proportion of these phenomena are and have been real.

2. NO MERELY NATURALISTIC EXPLANATION SUFFICES DEMANDS OF REASON

Then, a second result of these studies is, so we judge, the fact that no merely naturalistic interpretation of such phenomena—that is, an interpretation which would refer them to mere natural causes—suffices the demands of reason; nor would such an interpretation be accepted as satisfactory by any large class of competent, unprejudiced scholars. To be sure, some of these phenomena might have been thus explained, but by no means all. Moreover, the explanations of them usually offered have been of such a nature that, while their authors were fully satisfied with them, or even greatly pleased, other people did not give them much consideration; and oftentimes too it has required vastly more faith to accept these interpretations than to recognize the truth of the spiritistic hypothesis. Such explanations, therefore, really explain nothing.

3. OPINIONS DIFFER AS TO PROPER INTERPRETATION

And lastly, as a result of all these studies, viewed from the standpoint of the scientists who made them, we might say that, while perhaps all these scholars were convinced that at least a good share of the phenomena under consideration were genuine, they were divided in opinion as to what interpretation should be given of them. A goodly number of these scholars, perhaps those who gave most study to the subject, have taken the view that the only satisfactory explanation of such phenomena is the one furnished by the spiritistic hypothesis; and very naturally these scientists have declared themselves spiritualists. Among these might be named such men as

Dr. William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, Alfred Russel Wallace, F. W. H. Myers, of England; Dr. Maxwell and the astronomer Flammarion, of France; Lombroso, of Italy; and Doctor Hodgson, Professor Hyslop, and others, of our own country.

But there is another class of these eminent scholars who have taken a different view. They hold that the spiritistic hypothesis is untrue, and that all the various phenomena called spiritistic can be better explained on the ground of natural causes; and some of these men are, or have been, even strenuously opposed to the whole subject of spiritism. They have written strongly against it, and would doubtless put the whole thing out of existence if they could. Such men, e. g., are, or have been, Dr. G. Stanley Hall, of our country; Frank Podmore and Andrew Lang, of England, and various others.

And, then, there is a third class of these scholars, who have neither fully accepted the spiritistic theory nor opposed it; but they occupy a kind of middle ground—recognizing the undeniable facts connected with spiritism, but being uncertain as to what interpretation should be given them. That is to say, their position is one of suspended judgment. Of all the classes this is undoubtedly the largest. Moreover, it is usual with members of this class to take the view that the “best all-round interpretation” of the spiritistic facts is the one held by spiritualists themselves.” This has been reported to be the position taken by Prof. William James (now for some time deceased);² also Doctor Funk held to that view, and still others now hold it, or have done so in the past. Furthermore it might be said of this same class, that usually its members are, or have been, very hopeful of largely increased knowledge to be obtained soon with respect to the whole matter of spiritism and the existence of another world.

² On the subject of Professor James' spiritism see Note 2, page 190.

IV. OUR PERSONAL ATTITUDE

1. PERSONAL DISPOSITION

And now finally, with these various conclusions arrived at by the different scholars who gave special study to the phenomena we are considering, what shall be our own attitude toward these same matters? Of course, that will depend largely upon our personal disposition. If we have no prejudice against the general subject of spiritism, and if we are disposed to believe even in supernatural matters upon the testimony of others, and particularly of great men of science, then we shall have no special difficulty in accepting the spiritistic hypothesis, at least so far as it gives evidence of a future life. But if, on the other hand, spiritism is exceedingly distasteful to us, so much so that we could hardly believe in it upon any evidence, and if also we are inclined to discredit the value of testimony, even though it be of some of the foremost scholars in the world, then the chances are many to one that we shall not only reject spiritism as a whole, but all of its phenomena will have little significance to us. We should then try to interpret them on naturalistic grounds, or perhaps, assign them even to the devil!

2. THE WEIGHT OF FACTS

Two things, however, are true. First, since most people nowadays do really believe in an after-life, it would seem to be very desirable on the part of such people that they obtain all information possible respecting that future estate; and nothing could be more foolish for this class than to put away any evidence in support of such doctrine, even though it does not come to them in the regular orthodox or approved way. Then the second true thing is, that it does no good to fight against facts. Some one has said,

In vain we may call all these things fudge;
A fact is a fact and will not budge.

So at least the now fully demonstrated facts connected with spiritism cannot be overthrown. They must be accepted as facts established more or less by science; and, such being the case, what we now need is, not some new attempts to explain away these facts, and thus make the whole subject darker and more obscure than it is, but what we need is more real light on the subject. "*More light*"—these were the last words uttered by the great poet Goethe, at the time of his death. They shall also be the last words of this essay. Hence we say, with regard especially to the interpretation of these spiritistic phenomena, GIVE US MORE LIGHT.

SPECIAL NOTES

1. A DISTINCTION TO BE MADE

Perhaps it should be said here that a distinction must be made between "spiritualism" as commonly known, and "spiritism" as it has been examined by the eminent scientists whose names we have given above. The one is usually a matter accepted upon very imperfect evidence, and often accompanied by the grossest fraud; whereas the other, or scientific spiritism, attempts first of all to eliminate from its methods all possibility of fraud; and then as to its conclusions, these it receives only after the most rigorous examination both of them and of the facts upon which they rest. Moreover, such distinguished scientists as those mentioned, always keep their minds open to a change of view if the evidence requires it; but the ordinary, unsophisticated spiritualist, making a religion of his views, is rather inclined to hold fast to them, irrespective of any and all evidence to the contrary. A broad distinction should therefore, in our judgment, be made between these two kinds of spiritistic doctrine; and doubtless it is from a lack of such distinction that even scholarly men often, in their preju-

dices, commit the mistake of underestimating the results really achieved by the studies recently given to the phenomena under consideration. For instance, we have seen books on immortality, written of late and by men of superior mental culture, in which either the whole subject of the spiritistic phenomena, as examined by the British Society and its coadjutors, is ignored, or the position is taken that no definite and important results were achieved by such labors.

Now, in our conception, all this is a mistake; or rather it is a mistake, coupled with prejudice such as ought not to exist on the part of educated men. For, in the first place, no full discussion of man's future life is in these times practicable without some recognition of the spiritistic phenomena as they have been scientifically examined. And then, secondly, it is not true that no definite and important results have come from the labors we have indicated. On the contrary, as we have seen above, at least two or three very important results have been thus achieved. First, it has been proved, even beyond a doubt, that a good share of the spiritistic phenomena are genuine facts. So true is this that Mr. Thompson Jay Hudson affirms that "the man who today denies the reality of spiritualism is not entitled to be called a skeptic; he is simply ignorant." That is, he does not know the real facts in the case. Then secondly, it has also been proved, so we think, that no merely naturalistic interpretation of these phenomena satisfies the demands of reason; one evidence of which is that the great scientific world is as yet far from accepting any of these so-called solutions. And once more, if we are not mistaken, it has been proved true, or could easily be so proved, that the great need of these times, with regard to spiritism, is not some additional vain attempts to explain away, from mere natural causes, these peculiar phenomena, but it is as expressed above, *more real light upon the subject*. Furthermore, it might be said that quite a num-

ber of related topics, such as hypnotism, somnambulism, telepathy, apparitions, and the like, have been put upon a scientific basis, or established as at least practically true, by the special studies mentioned as having been recently made.

2. FINAL CONCLUSION

And so our final conclusion with regard to spiritism is this: So long as the phenomena of spiritualism cannot be satisfactorily explained from merely natural causes, and they certainly have not been so explained as yet, these phenomena must be regarded as at least favoring the view of an after-life for man. This is as far as we are able to go in the matter. Or in other words, we believe that these spiritistic phenomena do furnish some proof of an after-life for man; but we do not believe that the proof thus furnished is, by itself alone, sufficient to meet all the demands of reason, or to establish the fact that man really has an after-life. For that some other proof is necessary than that coming merely from spiritism. This, as said, is as far as we are able to go in accepting the spiritistic doctrine.

X

CONCLUSIONS, AND POSSIBILITIES OF FURTHER DISCOVERY

THE old Romans had a proverb, *respice finem*, which, being translated into English, signifies that it is always well to consider the end, or the termination, of things. So with regard to the studies we have been making in various sciences, philosophy, and religion, respecting the great doctrine of a future life for man, the important consideration is, To what end do these studies lead us? In other words, What are the conclusions to be drawn from them? We have already, with each separate study, indicated what we thought to be the proper inferences belonging to that study; and now the question is, What are the great final conclusions to be drawn from all these studies?

I. CONCLUSIONS

1. EXTENSIVE SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Not to delay our answer to this question, we shall say at once, that one such conclusion is, that the sources of information respecting the subject we have in hand are quite extensive. For, as we have seen, it is not only the older sources—philosophy and religion—that yield knowledge with regard to human immortality, but quite a number of the sciences do the same. Accordingly, after investigating those older sources, we also looked into the sciences of biology, physics, physiology; psychology, proper and abnormal, and even into the spiritistic phenomena; and we have found that all of these studies contain really some important information bearing upon the immortality of man.

The sum of all such knowledge should therefore be considerable; and whatever it really is, or we have found it to be, we have endeavored to use it all for the furtherance of our argument. Whether therefore this argument is strong or otherwise, it certainly owes something to quite a number of the sciences, as well as to the other sources mentioned. And this, by the way, is one of the claims made for our discussion, that it is distinguished, perhaps from all others heretofore made in the same line, by its wide-reaching attempt to gather information from all sources, and especially from the sciences, the contribution of each science being considered separately.

2. THE GENERAL ARGUMENT CUMULATIVE

Then another important conclusion we are able to draw from the studies we have made, is that, especially so far as the sciences are concerned, there is a more or less regular progression in the strength of the arguments from them. We began with biology, because that is the fundamental organic science, and the human soul is, at least in this world, very intimately connected with an organism, or more particularly, with the life-principle; and from this science we drew several important conclusions, all of them bearing upon the possibility of life surviving a dissolution of the body. Then on the basis of such possibility we proceeded with a study of physics, where we found in the doctrine of the indestructibility both of matter and force, and in the newly discovered element of ether, not only a strengthening of the argument as to possibility, but also a kind of connecting medium between this world and the other, such as would seem to serve for making that other world more real than it otherwise appears. This is surely an advance upon mere possibility. Then in the argument drawn from physiology, about all we could do here was to clear the ground from certain formidable-looking obstructions which mate-

rialism has erected on this field. But this we considered a very important achievement, because it was something necessary to our further advance. Then next, in our studies given to both normal and abnormal psychology, we found that both of these investigations helped our argument forward, without any obstructions to be overcome. And lastly, in our scientific examination of the various phenomena called spiritistic, we entered upon a region of positive facts, all bearing, even in the way of experience, upon the hope of an after-life for man. Thus passing, as we did, from one science to another away up to the region of demonstrated facts, our general argument, whether weak or strong, is certainly more or less cumulative in nature. It begins with simple possibility, and ends with testimony from experience, or what in truth might be called positive evidence.

3. STRONGEST ARGUMENT STILL FROM RELIGION

Still another conclusion is that, although the different sciences furnish some important evidences for a future life, yet the strongest argument for man's immortality comes from religion. As Doctor Salmond has said of the Christian hope, there is a certainty in it that can come from no other source. Because, as he says, Christianity "has found a new basis for the hope of immortality in the fact of Christ's resurrection," and also it has found "a new center" for such hope "in the personal experience of a new life which is prophetic of our own immortality." In other words, because Christ has risen from the dead, therefore we may have the hope of so doing; and such being the case, it is possible for us to have the consciousness of such a personal relation to Christ as will be even now a kind of inward conviction that, after this life is ended, we shall inherit another, much better than this. Consequently it has always been characteristic of earnest-minded Christians to be especially confident of the future life; and, as is often said of them and by

them, death has really no terrors for such persons. Witness, for instance, the triumphant attitude with which so many of the old Christian martyrs approached death, accounting it often a privilege, as well as a great honor, to die for their faith even at the stake, or on the rack, or in any other of the most cruel ways. Or witness, if you think better, the triumphant bearing of many Christians even in these times, when the end of life comes; such death-bed scenes as that of Mr. Moody, e. g., who said, as the end of life approached, "Earth is receding, heaven is drawing near"; or of Bishop Haven, who testified that to him the broad river of death, as it usually is esteemed to be, was "only a narrow rill." Indeed, such scenes are not uncommon with Christians; and this is surely a strong testimony in favor of the Christian hope, which all men may have, if they will.

4. RELIGION AND SCIENCE COMBINED

But now, to indicate what in our judgment is the strongest basis upon which one may build the hope of life everlasting, it is what may be called a combination of Christian experience with the testimony of science, not to speak here of the evidence coming from philosophy. Take, for instance, the great fact of Christ's resurrection, which in days gone by was a matter of experience and still can be so to some extent—take this fact as one of the pillars upon which to build the hope mentioned. And then, as another pillar, stationed, we may say, away out in the other world, take all the testimony of science, and particularly that which comes from only a partial acceptance of the so-called spiritistic phenomena—take these two lines of evidence, and they form, so it seems to us, a great basis, or rather two strong foundations, upon which can be erected a veritable bridge of faith, reaching across from this world to the other. Moreover, this bridge would seem to be especially strong; it being constructed of something more than mere speculations or

philosophical reasonings. It is really made, in part at least, of actual knowledge, or from facts that have been established by experience—experience both of a sensuous and of a spiritual nature. Such being the case, this bridge, we are confident, will be able to support all our faith and all our hope, and all our expectations concerning the hereafter; and we do not believe that anybody will be disappointed who trusts this bridge.

Let us therefore no longer complain that we have no reasons for believing in a future life. We have such reasons in quite an abundance; and if we will only study to find them out, and afterward appropriate them in actual experience, we shall certainly find that we have no cause either for complaining or despairing with respect to a life other than this.

5. THE TESTIMONY OF SCIENCE NOT MERELY NEGATIVE

But there is one other conclusion we must notice here. It has often been said even by eminent scholars, that the testimony of science to a future life is only negative. That is, it merely declares that, while it is impossible to prove from scientific facts the doctrine of immortality, yet science itself has nothing to say against that doctrine. Man might be either mortal or immortal and, as far as science is concerned, none of its teachings would be contravened. Hear, e. g., what Professor Huxley has to say touching this matter. In one of his later letters he affirms that "If a belief in immortality is essential to morality, physical science has nothing to say against that doctrine. It effectually closes the mouth of those who pretend to refute immortality by objections deduced from mere physical data." So far so good; and thanks to Professor Huxley for his testimony that science can raise no reasonable objection to the doctrine of man's being immortal.

But in our way of thinking, science does more and far different for the doctrine of human immortality than

merely to occupy a negative position with regard to it. If the facts which we have found in our study of the different sciences are at all genuine, they certainly show that science, as a whole, assumes rather a positive attitude toward this doctrine than a negative one. True, as Professor Huxley affirms, science can say nothing against man's future life; but it also has not a little to say in favor of such a life, if what we have learned concerning the facts in the case is really true; and we think it is. Moreover, as has already been indicated, some of these facts were found by us in our study of biology; others, and a larger number of them, in our study of physics; still others, and one or two even of a positive nature, in our study of physiology; and then when we came to psychology, normal and abnormal, there we found quite an array of facts, all bearing positively upon the doctrine under consideration. And finally, from the spiritistic phenomena, the results of the scientific study of which we only partially accepted—from these we obtained at least some important favoring opinions, all bearing upon the subject. Now putting all these matters together, we think we are fully justified in claiming that science occupies really a positive attitude toward man's future life, rather than merely a negative one. This was, as we remember reading, the position taken by Sir Oliver Lodge in his address some years ago before the British Association for the Advancement of Science; affirming as he did, in that address, that his convictions from long study of different sciences caused him to believe that memory and affection, or the human personality in general, "persists beyond bodily death." This conclusion was surely not merely negative in character, but was decidedly positive; and being such, it of course had greater weight.

Thus we have indicated five different conclusions to which our various studies lead us; and all these conclusions, we believe, are well supported.

But this brings us to the end of the first part of our present chapter; so also to the end of our general argument for the future life of man. Let us however yet, under this head, quote Longfellow's inspiring lines:

There is no Death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call Death.

Also the eloquent words of Thomas Carlyle are appropriate here:

What, then, is man? What, then, is man? He endureth but for an hour, and is crushed before the moth. Yet in the being and in the working of a faithful man is there already (as all faith from the beginning gives assurance) a something that partakes not of this wild death-element of time, that triumphs over time, and is, and will be, when time shall be no more.

II. POSSIBILITIES OF FURTHER DISCOVERY

1. IN THE REALM OF SPIRITISM

We have now only to indicate what we conceive to be the possibilities of further discovery with regard to human immortality, and our work is finished. Some of the scholars who have given particular attention to the study of spiritism—such men, e. g., as Professors Barrett,¹ of Dublin, and Flournoy, of Geneva, Switzerland—tell us that all further investigations of the spiritistic phenomena will likely prove fruitless, for the reason that such phenomena, if of supernatural origin, belong to an order of things concerning which exact scientific information is impossible. But, on the other hand, there are many scholars, likewise conversant with those phenomena, who think differently, or in whose judgment the time may not be far distant when even the whole problem of an after-life will be fully demonstrated by science.

¹ Of late Professor Barrett seems to have changed his mind, for he now appears to be a declared spiritualist. See his book, "On the Threshold of the Unseen."

Sir Oliver Lodge goes so far as to say that even now we can almost hear "the pickaxes" of our friends—that is, of discarnate spirits on the other side—as they, with us, are engaged in excavating as it were a great tunnel that will connect this world with the other. Not only the "pickaxes," but as he says, "other noises" also, such as the roaring of tunnel-water, and perhaps even the voices of those friends of ours on the other side!² But just how much additional knowledge bearing upon immortality will yet result from further investigation of the spiritistic phenomena, it would be difficult to say. We only know that even now there are earnest-minded scholars engaged in the study of those phenomena; and whether the full problem of man's immortality will ever be solved or not, the probability certainly is that in the future we shall know more about the whole matter of spiritism than we do now.

2. IN THE NATURAL SCIENCES

But it is not only in the study of the spiritistic phenomena that an advance of knowledge may be expected; such advance can also be looked for, we think, in several of the real sciences—that is, an advance in such knowledge as bears upon the future life. In the study, for instance, of biology not all the discoveries possible to be made in that extensive and important field of knowledge have already been effected. This is in reality one of the new sciences; and, significant as have been the discoveries already made in it, the limit of such discovery has by no means been reached. On the contrary, we believe that the revelations of the future will not only confirm those already made in this science, but will be a positive advance of knowledge for us. Moreover, ever since Tyndall and Pasteur, with their rigorous experiments respecting the origin of life, proved the doc-

² This Sir Oliver said some years ago; at present his ideas respecting a fuller revelation of the after-life to man, are still more optimistic.

trine of what is called biogenesis, or that "life can proceed only from life," the materialists have been more or less in discredit with their opposite doctrine. And that being so, we have, even in this discovery, and in others like it that doubtless will yet be made, some important information having to do with human immortality.

For, as we saw in another chapter, in our study of the life-principle,³ that, if this principle as incorporated in the body is to some extent independent of its material surroundings, then it is possible for it to survive a dissolution of those surroundings. In other words, it becomes a kind of proof looking toward life everlasting. Accordingly we expect, even from the advanced studies yet to be made in biology, some important new information that will have a bearing upon the subject before us.

3. IN ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

So also from the study of physics, and especially from that of abnormal psychology, we are confident that there will yet result no small amount of new knowledge such as can be used to prove the doctrine that man is an immortal being. Even now such important discoveries have been made recently in the realm of abnormal psychology, and especially in the matter of the subconscious mind, as to an old-fashioned psychologist are really surprising; and this "new psychology," as it is termed, is full of ambition to push its studies into all departments of mental life and phenomena. So there is no telling what discoveries it may yet make. As we saw in another chapter, Dr. Thompson J. Hudson has built up an argument for the future life of man from some of the phenomena connected with the subconscious mind; and it might be added here, that the same author has undertaken to demonstrate, from the same or like phenomena, what he calls the "divine pedigree of man"; thus opening the way, through man's relation to the Divine Being, not only

³ Chap. III; see especially pp. 25-33.

to a better understanding of God, but also to a better understanding of that world in which he particularly dwells.

III. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. UNEXPECTED DISCOVERIES IN SCIENCE

There is no telling therefore—we emphasize the thought—no *telling* what extraordinary discoveries in all kinds of science may yet be effected. The time was when even so simple an act as crossing the Atlantic Ocean by steam was declared to be impossible. Dr. Dyonysius Lardner, who in the earlier part of the nineteenth century was considered one of the foremost living scientists, wrote a book in which he openly declared that navigation of that kind was utterly impossible. But it is reported that the very ship which brought his book to this country from England was propelled by steam, thus, of course, disproving his theory. So also it is not long ago when everybody supposed, or took it for granted, that aerial navigation could never be made practical, and all attempts in that direction were accounted in the highest degree foolhardy and vain. But what do we see now? Almost every day airships are seen in the atmosphere, and occasionally, floating over our larger cities and in other places, great fleets of such vessels can be observed moving about here and there, and seeming to be as much at home in those upper regions as the very birds themselves. Now, moreover, airships are being used as a regular means of transportation from one locality to another, also in warfare, and for other purposes. All this proves again that the predictions of any number of men are of little consequence when it comes to telling what science can or cannot do.

2. ANOTHER ILLUSTRATION

Any number of illustrations in this same line could easily be given. We offer only one more. Before the

discovery of America by Columbus the motto of Spain was *Ne plus ultra*, meaning, when translated, "Nothing beyond"; and the idea was that beyond the "Pillars of Hercules," or the great promontories jutting out on either side of the Strait of Gibraltar, there was no more land to be discovered. Nothing existed in the west farther than were the limits of Spain. Accordingly the government of that country had stamped upon its coins a picture of those promontories, with a scroll thrown over them, upon which were inscribed the words mentioned. But after Columbus by his great discovery had made known to the world the existence of another continent, now called America, then the Spanish Government changed its motto by striking off the word *ne*, thus making it read *Plus ultra*, "More beyond." So the idea now is that beyond the western boundaries of Spain there existed in those older times, as there does now, a vast territory which was then unknown. "More beyond"—that is the condition of things, so it seems to us, with regard to all the sciences; and if such is the case, then there is hope also that our knowledge respecting the future world will be not a little increased.

3. CLOSING THOUGHT

"More beyond"—this then shall be our final word; and if it is true, as we have affirmed, that our knowledge respecting man's after-life may be increased in the future, then as already said, why complain of the light we now have? Let us rather make a better use of this light, rejoicing in it, while we also hope that it will increase more and more even to the perfect day.

We will yet narrate an incident. The night before America was discovered, as above stated, while the great explorer, Columbus, was standing in the high towerlike cabin of his vessel, looking off wistfully through the darkness toward the west, he thought he saw a light in the distance, moving slowly along the horizon. That

made him suspect that land was near; but he was not certain, inasmuch as the light came and went, and then wholly disappeared. But the next morning, as from the deck of another vessel a member of his crew was gazing off steadily in the same direction, the land really appeared to him, more or less distinct and clear. Then, of course, the existing uncertainty was removed, and with high rejoicing the great discovery was made. So now with regard to the future world, it seems to us we are as yet only standing in the dark, looking off toward that great unknown country. We can see the light, but not yet the land. The time may come, however—and some think it is near—when other observers, better situated than we are, shall be privileged to behold the land; and then, all uncertainty being removed as to the existence of the future world, we can ask for nothing more. The greatest of all discoveries possible to man will then be made; and that in our judgment will be a time of great rejoicing. Let us hope that such will indeed be the case, or that we shall yet be able by some means to obtain a surer, or more generally satisfying, knowledge respecting the great unknown world than now seems possible to us.

Even now, however, we can see the light; let us hope also yet to see the land.

SUPPLEMENT

**RELATED MATTERS AND OBJECTIONS; WITH
OPINIONS OF EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS
AND SCHOLARS**

"On earth there is nothing great but man;
In man there is nothing great but mind."

—*Sir William Hamilton.*

"I am as convinced of continued existence on the other side of death as I am of existence here."—*Sir Oliver Lodge.*

"Even though our soul's life (as here below it is revealed to us) may be in literal strictness the function of a brain that perishes, yet it is not at all impossible, but on the contrary quite possible that the life may still continue when the brain itself is dead."—*Prof. William James.*

"The materialistic assumption that the life of the soul ends with the life of the body, is perhaps the most colossal instance of baseless assumption that is known in the history of philosophy."—*John Fiske.*

"We predict that the mysterious force-atom called your soul will exist and know itself and its friends ten thousand billions of centuries from now, and be as young as ever."—*Arthur Brisbane.*

"We today have infinitely stronger proofs that man does not die with the death of the body than Columbus, on his starting westward across the Atlantic, had that the earth was round."—*R. J. Thompson.*

PART A

RELATED MATTERS, INCLUDING OPINIONS OF EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS AND SCHOLARS

TOPIC I

DIFFERENT NOTIONS OF IMMORTALITY

THE general conception of human immortality includes within itself quite a number of possible meanings, according as a person may be thought of as still existing in one way and another, even after death.

(1) One such meaning is that a person might continue to exist merely in his offspring, or as a part of the race to which he belongs. This may be called either racial or genealogical immortality; and although of a very inferior and unsatisfactory nature, it is commonly thought to be better than no future life at all. Accordingly, it is reported of the great Emperor Napoleon, that one reason for his desiring to marry a second time was that he might have offspring, and thus continue to live, in a certain sense, even after death. But we should say regarding this story, that if Napoleon had no other expectation of a future life than this—of living again, so to speak, by proxy—then his faith in a real immortality must have been weak, or rather have failed him altogether.

(2) But another and in some respects a better conception of the after-life, is that one may continue living in

his words and deeds, or in the influence which he may exert upon coming generations. Just as before death occurs a man may exercise a strong and wide-reaching influence upon his fellows, provided he is a man of great achievements either of a literary or a practical nature, so also this same kind of influence may be continued on down the centuries long after a person's body has crumbled to dust. Moreover, it may be observed that usually this kind of immortality is highly prized, especially if the influence exerted is based upon worthy deeds or sacrifices. A good illustration of the matter is furnished us by George Eliot, in her famous poem entitled "The Invisible Choir." In that poem she breaks forth as follows:

O, may I join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence; live
In pulses stirred to generosity.

But all this finely worded sentiment, or poetic imagery, has in it little of real significance to the ordinary human heart, if we are to have no other immortality than that of personal influence. For what most men desire with respect to immortality is, first of all, to live themselves, or to exist in their own personal being, and then, so most people would say, they would be better prepared to appreciate living in the minds and hearts of others. As an illustration therefore of what might be called a satisfactory view of the after-life for man, this peculiar notion of living again only for the benefit of others must be pronounced a conspicuous failure, however attractive and highly ethical it may appear to some modern sentimental writers.

(3) But another notion that may be held, and sometimes is held, of man's future life, is one that gives to man a real substantial existence after death, and yet is in no respect a true or satisfactory theory. As almost

everybody knows, a person's body does not altogether perish when he dies; but since all matter is indestructible in its elements, so it is with the human body. That may perish or be dissolved as an organism, but the atoms composing it will still exist, and will do so forever. This is the common, or as it may be called, even the materialistic view of an organism.

So also with regard to the soul, if we are to accept the teachings of pantheism in this regard, that part of man does not wholly perish at death, any more than does the body. But the soul having, as pantheism teaches, been derived from the great universal sea of unconscious life out of which all things have emerged, only falls back again into that sea as a consequence of death. It loses all individuality or consciousness; but it still exists, as a part now of the great universal life—which, as said, is itself unconscious.

Thus according to both these systems of philosophy, pantheism and materialism, there is still something left to man even after death. But what kind of existence is this? Certainly nothing that can satisfy either the human heart or mind. On the contrary, this loss of all personal being, this existing after death only in the form of the material elements of which one's body or life was composed—this whole doctrine is nothing more nor less than an annihilation of all that makes a future existence at all desirable to us. No man in his right mind ever commits suicide with the idea that he shall never exist again as a personal being. And no human heart—if we understand the real nature of the human heart—ever desired, or could possibly desire, to become so absolutely and everlastingly extinct that it could nevermore think, or feel, or do anything whatever such as a living human being is accustomed to do. This doctrine of a complete extinction of personality is perfectly abhorrent to human nature in general.

And yet—would you believe it?—there are some schol-

ars, even eminent scholars, who, being materialists or pantheists, try to console themselves with the idea that after this troublous life is ended they shall at least be privileged to enjoy what one of them calls "the eternal peace of the grave," or as others have expressed the idea, they shall then be privileged to sleep that everlasting sleep that knows no waking. But how, let us ask, could a person who never wakes up from an everlasting sleep, and who moreover knows nothing about either that sleep or anything else, be considered a real person? Or how could a person enjoy the "eternal peace of the grave" or anything else, when he himself as a person no longer exists? These two questions not only reveal the perfect absurdity of the positions taken by the pantheistic and materialistic scholars we have mentioned, but they also show the utter inâdequacy of both pantheism and materialism to satisfy the needs of the human soul, hungry as it is for a real future life, or a personal existence beyond the grave.

There must therefore be still another conception of the life after death, such as can really satisfy the longing of the human heart and mind. That is the conception, we may say, which has been taken by our human race in all periods of its history, whether the peoples have been civilized or uncivilized, or whatever may have been their condition morally and intellectually. It is the view that after this life is ended, man, or more particularly the human soul, will still exist in another and different world from this. Or to analyze the conception somewhat, it is that the same man who once lived in this world will continue to live in another state of existence; his surroundings being changed, but not the man, not his personality, not his memory, affections, self-consciousness, self-determination, and whatever else may be necessary to constitute a human being a real personal existence.

This is the kind of doctrine that is held and advocated everywhere on the pages of this book, and in which we

are pleased to say nearly all men believe. It must therefore be the true doctrine—true because, in the first place, it satisfies the human heart and mind; and true, secondly, because nearly all men everywhere and in all the ages have believed it, and very likely will continue so to do.

TOPIC II

ORIGIN OF THE IDEA

SCHOLARS are as yet not fully agreed with regard to the origin of the general notion of man's life after death—whether it is the gift of revelation, the result simply of experience, or a kind of intuition belonging naturally to the human mind. One thing is certain, which is that, of all the orders of being upon this earth, man alone has the capacity either for forming or holding this peculiar notion. A dog cannot be taught it, neither can a horse, nor an ape, nor any other kind of animal. Even death, as it is understood by men, is a conception far beyond the ability of any mere animal to grasp.

Thus gifted, therefore, man very naturally, and without the aid of revelation, we think, has come to the notion that in some way he is immortal. Suppose, for instance, that a perfectly uncultured, ignorant savage who has never heard of a future life, has a dream, in which he sees, as fully alive and active, some well-known chieftain, or some friend, or any acquaintance that was known to be dead, what more natural than for him to conclude—unable, as he is, to distinguish between things living and things dead, or between a thing in motion and a thing actually alive—that somehow man must have a double existence, one connected with the body while that was alive and the other still enduring after the body was dead?

In some such way, doubtless, the idea of a future life originated; and then it was helped out by shadows following our supposed savage when he moved about, and also by reflections seen in the eyes of other people, or perhaps in ponds, or streams of water.

Moreover, the experience of death itself had not a little to do with the original formation of this idea. For comparing the condition of death with that of sleep, even a savage, or man in his primitive estate, could easily discover some very significant resemblances; as, e. g., when a person is asleep his soul, or "double," would seem to be absent from the body, just as in death. And then, when the soul is absent to return no more—in such case the savage would conclude that death had occurred. In other words, the only difference between death and sleep, to the mind of a savage, is that in one case the soul's absence from the body is continued, but in the other is only temporary. In consonance with this view it has been reported of the Malays, that they never like to wake a person from sleep, lest by disturbing his body while the soul is not present, they might do him some injury.

Thus in our opinion it was that the first notion of immortality came into being; or if others prefer to say that it was derived from revelation, then such revelation must have been given to man very early in history. In either case, moreover, this notion, as it has come down the centuries, has certainly been changed not a little by one influence and another. Probably the high moral character of it, as it is found today among most civilized peoples, is due to the Christian Scriptures; but in other respects we see no reason why it could not have been derived from human experiences, such as those we have above described. This latter view is the one taken nowadays by most scholars.

TOPIC III

IMMORTALITY AMONG SAVAGES AND PREHISTORIC PEOPLES

THE burial customs existing among all kinds of uncivilized peoples is a strong proof of their belief in a future life. So, e. g., among the different Negro tribes of Africa, among the millions of barbarians living in Australia and other islands of the South Pacific Ocean; also among the Indians of both North and South America, and even among the imperfectly civilized Chinese and other Orientals, the custom exists of interring, with the dead, weapons of war, utensils, ornaments, food, etc.—the idea being that these matters will be of service to the dead in another world. Also in some countries, as in different parts of Africa, when a great chieftain dies it is the practice to slay and bury with him a number of his wives and slaves, and perhaps some of his comrades in arms. In ancient Mexico a like custom existed; but after cremation came in—so we are told by W. L. Alger—the king's body was burned upon a separate pyre, and afterward a "crowd of his wives and slaves," being put to death, were also burned. All these cruel customs, with others that could be mentioned, indicate of course that the people engaging in them must have believed, or do now believe, in an after-life; for these sacrifices of human beings and of different commodities, were evidently made with the belief that in another world they might serve the necessities, or the pleasure, of the great king or chieftain because of whose high honor so much suffering and loss was endured.

In a descriptive poem Schiller celebrates one of these burial customs:

Here bring the last gifts! and with these
The last lament be said;
Let all that pleased and yet may please
Be buried with the dead.

Beneath his head the hatchet hide
That he so stoutly swung;
And place the bear's fat haunch beside—
The journey hence is long.

And let the knife new sharpened be
That on the battle day
Shore with quick strokes—he took but three—
The foeman's scalp away.

The paints that warriors love to use
Place here within his hand,
That he may shine with ruddy hues
Amidst the spirit land.

Then another evidence of belief, on the part of savages and other barbarous peoples, in a future state, is the almost universal faith existing among these classes in ghosts, apparitions, witchcraft, sorcery, voodoo, and other wild superstitions; many of which are harmful in their effects upon human life. For illustration, we are told upon good authority that in Africa alone the so-called "witch ordeal"—that is, an attempt to detect witches by a mysterious supernatural test—costs that country annually no less than four million human lives; and like injury has resulted from the same practice, in other lands.

THE BELIEF IN PREHISTORIC TIMES

But the inquiry may be raised as to whether or not this belief in man's future life existed away back in old prehistoric times. Did the troglodytes, or "cave-dwellers," the people who built their houses on some of the Swiss lakes, and those who left behind them the kitchen-middens, or shell-mounds, now found in Denmark—did

any or all of these peoples believe, as we do, in a life beyond the grave? What evidence is there that such was the case? There is an abundance of such evidence, but our space will permit us to indicate only one or two facts. Some years ago there was discovered in Southern France, near the town of Aurignac, a small grotto, or cave, in which were found no less than seventeen human skeletons; and then outside of this cavern were many fossilized bones and other relics, showing that away back there in those old prehistoric times funeral feasts had taken place here. Also on the inside of the cave other relics were discovered, indicating that food had been deposited there, evidently for the benefit of one or more persons deceased; so that, putting all these evidences together, they would seem to establish (that is, if these relics were genuine, and Monsieur Lartet, the great French palæontologist, who examined them, thinks they were) the fact that these old cave-dwellers really believed in an after-life. Only, of course, their general conceptions of this life were very different from ours.

Another indication of this same kind of ancient belief, is a rude ivory doll found, also some years ago, in a cave on the Dordogne river, in Southeastern France, which doll was evidently placed there many ages ago by loving parents, who believed that it would serve as an interesting plaything for some dead child of theirs, whose body was also buried in this same place. This incident shows also how parental affection, away back in those olden times, could triumph over death, just as it does now.

WORSHIP OF THE DEAD

But perhaps the strongest testimony to belief in man's future life among peoples outside of Christendom, is the fact that not a few of these peoples really worship the dead. Such a custom, in the form of ancestor-worship, exists today among the Chinese, the Japanese, and other Orientals; also anciently it existed among even so highly

cultured a people as were the Romans. In his despatch telling about the great naval victory achieved by the Japanese over the Russians in the sea of Japan, a few years ago, Admiral Togo wrote to his emperor, Mushito, that this victory was "not owing to the bravery, or skill, or devotion" exhibited by himself or his command, but "solely"—these are his words—"solely to your Majesty's ancestors" (!). Such language, to be sure, indicated that this distinguished naval officer believed, with his people in general, in the worship of spirits, or more particularly, in the worship of dead ancestors. But, as said, this kind of worship has extended very widely in the world, and it exists today among various heathen nations; all of which is proof positive that these people really believe in a future life.

TOPIC IV

OPINIONS OF EMINENT SCHOLARS RESPECTING CHRIST'S RESURRECTION

WHATEVER may have happened at the grave [of Jesus] and in the matter of the appearances, one thing is certain, this grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal. It is useless to cite Plato, it is useless to point to the Persian religion, and the ideas and literature of later Judaism. All that would have perished and has perished; but the certainty of the resurrection and of the life eternal which is bound up with the grave in Joseph's garden has not perished, and on the conviction that *Jesus lives*, we still base those hopes of citizenship in an Eternal City which make our earthly life worth living and tolerable.—*Prof. Adolf Harnack, "What is Christianity?" Eng. Trans., p. 178.*

“At the moment when Christ died, nothing could have seemed more abjectly weak, more pitifully hopeless, more absolutely doomed to scorn and extinction and despair than the church which he had founded. It numbered but a handful of weak followers. They were poor, they were weak, they were helpless. They could not claim a single synagogue or a single sword. So feeble were they, and insignificant, that it would have looked like foolish partiality to prophesy for them the limited existence of a Galilean sect. How was it that these dull and ignorant men, with their cross of wood, triumphed over the deadly fascinations of sensual mythologies, conquered kings and their armies, and overcame the world? There is one and only one, possible answer—the resurrection from the

dead. All this vast revolution was due to the power of Christ's resurrection."—*Canon Farrar, "Life of Christ," Vol. II, p. 452.*

"The resurrection of Christ was the most fundamental and decisive fact in all Christian history. The resurrection of Christ is the most demonstrable, as well as the most essential, fact in this history."—*Dr. Ezekiel Gilman Robinson.*

"I have been used for many years to study the history of other times, and to examine and weigh the evidence of those who have written about them; and I know of no fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better and fuller evidence of every sort, to the understanding of a fair inquirer, than the great sign which God has given us, that Christ died and rose again from the dead."—*Doctor Arnold, of Rugby, "Sermon on the Prophet Jonas."*

"Faith in the risen Jesus weaves its golden thread throughout all the literature of the apostolic age. It has been the same ever since. The faith which has conquered the world has been faith in the risen Jesus. The Christ of history has been not simply the prophet of Nazareth, nor even the atoning Saviour, but the conqueror of death, the one who has brought life and immortality to light through the Resurrection."—*Prof. William Adams Brown, "The Christian Hope," p. 92.*

One of the ablest treatises on the resurrection that have recently appeared is Doctor Orr's book, entitled "The Resurrection of Jesus." In it, after thoroughly discussing the entire subject and answering various objections which modern rationalism and unbelief have brought forward, the author concludes as follows:

"The resurrection of Jesus stands fast as a fact, unaffected by the boastful waves of skepticism that cease-

lessly, through the ages, beat themselves against it; retains its significance as a corner-stone in the edifice of human redemption; and holds within it the vastest hope for time and for eternity that humanity can ever know."
—James Orr, *"The Resurrection of Jesus,"* p. 288

"The importance of all this [the resurrection and various appearances] cannot be adequately expressed in words. A dead Christ might have been a Teacher and a wonder-worker, and remembered and loved as such. But only a Risen and Living Christ could be the Saviour, the Life and the Life-giver—and as such preached to all men. And of this most blessed truth we have the fullest and most unquestionable evidence. This is the foundation of the church, the inscription on the banners of her armies, the strength and comfort of every Christian heart, and the grand hope of humanity."—Alfred Edersheim, *"Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah,"* Vol. II., p. 629.

TOPIC V

THE PERMANENCE OF PERSONALITY

DIFFERENT views have been held with regard to the continuity of one's personal self, whether such is really the case or not. One notion is what is usually called the "common-sense" view; and this is described for us by Dr. Thomas Reid, as follows: "My personal identity . . . implies the continued existence of that invisible thing which I call 'myself.' Whatever this self may be, it is something which thinks and deliberates and resolves and acts and suffers. I am not thought, I am not action, I am not feeling; I am something that thinks and acts and suffers. My thoughts and actions and feelings change every moment; they have no continued, but a successive existence; but that self, or I, to which they belong, is permanent . . . the identity of a person is a perfect identity; . . . it is impossible that a person should be in part the same and in part different, because a person . . . is not divisible into parts."

This is really a strong presentation of the common-sense view; so called because it meets with the best judgment of men in general, or at least is believed so to do. But another and quite different view is held, in these times especially, by representatives of the newer, or physiological psychology. According to this conception one's personality is always changing, and is never even for one day quite the same. Prof. J. R. Angel, speaking of this view, says that "The contents of consciousness are continually undergoing alteration. . . . All our perceptions, images, emotions, the things we are aware of," continually change. "We probably never have exactly the same thought twice. Identity of any thor-

oughgoing sort is thus out of the question here." To be sure, he is speaking of what he calls the "objective side" of personality, but this is, or should be considered, not so very different from the subjective side; and after all, we are glad that he leaves us a personality such as even on one side may be considered unchanging.

Perhaps the most ingenious attempt at a reconciliation of these two conflicting views, that we have seen, is the one given by F. W. H. Myers, in his famous book, entitled "Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death." In this work he teaches that, for aught we know to the contrary, the human personality may include within itself almost any number of inferior or smaller personalities, just as the nervous system is composed of millions of cells. And then, just as all these minute cells, besides having a special function of their own, are as it were united in one, and are ruled over by a central system, so the normal personality belonging to man may be considered a higher authority ruling over, and perhaps uniting in one, all the inferior personalities had in view. This theory is certainly an interesting one; and besides being ingenious, it really shows how one's personality may at the same time be both one and many, or changeable. This hypothesis, Mr. Myers suggests, might be called the "colonial" view of the nature of the human soul.

But be this theory and all other merely speculative attempts at explaining the matter under consideration correct or otherwise, one thing is certain, and this no real psychologist will deny: every man feels in his inmost soul that he has such a thing as personal identity. In other words, we are all conscious of remaining in our personal being the same from day to day, or from one period of time to another; moreover, we believe that this personality will remain unchanged throughout our entire life, or so long as we exist. And this conviction by the way, is a very good proof that the human soul must be in its nature immortal.

TOPIC VI

JOHN FISKE'S ARGUMENT FROM EVOLUTION

NO one, perhaps, has stated the argument for a future life to be obtained from the doctrine of evolution better than has John Fiske. We give it as follows: "The Darwinian theory, properly understood, replaces as much teleology as it destroys. From the first dawning of life we see things working together toward one mighty goal, the evolution of the most exalted spiritual qualities which characterize humanity. The body is cast aside and returns to the dust of which it was made. The earth, so marvelously wrought to man's uses, will also be cast aside. The day is to come, no doubt, when the heavens shall vanish as a scroll, and the elements be melted with fervent heat. So small is the value which Nature sets upon the perishable forms of matter! The question, then, is this: Are man's highest spiritual qualities into the production of which all this creative energy has gone, to disappear with the rest? Has all this work been done for nothing? Is it all ephemeral, all a bubble that bursts, a vision that fades? . . . Now the more thoroughly we comprehend that process of evolution by which things have come to be what they are, the more we are likely to feel that to deny the everlasting persistence of the spiritual elements in Man is to rob the whole process of its meaning. For my part, therefore, I believe in the immortality of the soul, not in the sense in which I accept the demonstrable truths of science, but as a supreme act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work.

"The greatest philosopher of modern times [Herbert Spencer] holds that the conscious soul is not the product of a collection of material atoms, but is, in the deepest

sense, a divine influence. . . . I can see no insuperable difficulty in the notion that at some period in the evolution of Humanity this divine spark [consciousness] may have acquired sufficient concentration and steadiness to survive the wreck of material forms and endure forever. . . . Only on some such view can the reasonableness of the universe, which still remains far above our finite power of comprehension, maintain its ground."—"*Destiny of Man*," pp. 113-118.

TOPIC VII

OJECTIONS TO SPIRITISM

A PART from its peculiar religious views, there are perhaps only two important objections that in these times have been very often raised by scholars against the spiritistic doctrine. One of these objections is the trifling character of the messages purporting to come to us from the other or spiritual world; and the other is the fact that little or nothing really new respecting matters in either the other world or this, has been received. Indeed, it is claimed that spiritualism has "not added a new idea to our stock of knowledge or done anything to strengthen our desire to share in the life of the departed." Other forms of expressing the same ideas, have at times been used.

But to both of these criticisms learned exponents of spiritistic doctrine have a ready answer. There are, we are told, not a few very serious difficulties connected with the transmission of knowledge from the other world to this—difficulties, for instance, connected with mediums; also with the need of personal identification in case a discarnate spirit undertakes to communicate with some person in this world; and still greater difficulties exist because of the peculiar nature of the other or spiritual world, and also because of the very imperfect knowledge we have respecting that world. All of these difficulties being considered, they will, so we are assured, help not a little to explain the objections mentioned. Moreover, it is affirmed that in the future, after we have become better acquainted with things belonging to the other world, or after the channels of communication between that world and this have become better established, the two

objections indicated will wholly disappear; and there will no longer be any reason for complaining or finding fault with the messages referred to, either because they lack novelty or have but little significance connected with them.

Besides, it might further be observed here, with regard to the peculiar or unchristian religious views held by most spiritualists, that such an objection does not apply to the faith of at least most of the scholars who have taken part in the work represented by the various societies for psychical research; for, as is well known, the great majority of these men are, or have been (some of them being now deceased), professed believers in Christian doctrine.

TOPIC VIII

"RAYMOND," OR SIR OLIVER LODGE'S LATEST EXPRESSION OF VIEW RESPECTING A FUTURE LIFE

AMONG all the great English scientists of today no one stands out more prominently before the world as an earnest advocate of man's future life than does Sir Oliver Lodge. For many years he has given zealous study to that subject, or more particularly to all kinds of evidence which have a bearing upon the proof of another state of existence for man. Moreover, he has often expressed himself in one way and another regarding such existence; his last pronouncement in that regard being in the form of a book entitled "Raymond"—that being also the name of his youngest son, who was killed during the late European war, in one of the battles in Flanders. This book has been read very widely both in our country and in other lands; and for a considerable time after its first appearance it was a real sensation in the literary world. To be sure, it has not always been very highly commended; but on the other hand, the criticisms passed upon it have often been quite severe and censorial. In the following paragraphs we shall undertake, in the first place, to give very briefly only the general substance of this work, and then to estimate as best we can the value of the book.

The production is divided into three parts. Part First is biographical in its nature. It undertakes to give a brief record of Raymond's life, beginning with his earliest youth and carrying the record forward even to his death. Raymond was by occupation, or profession, a mechanical and electrical engineer; and for some six months before his death in Flanders, as already stated, he served in the

English Army as a lieutenant. From all that Sir Oliver tells about him in this book, he seems to have been a very capable, noble-minded, morally excellent young man, having many friends during his life, and his death being greatly lamented.

So much, then, for the first part of this book; and now with regard to Part Second, we have here what purports to be a record of many interviews taking place between the discarnate spirit of Raymond in the other world and Professor Lodge—including different members of his family—in this world. Besides, various communications represented as coming from other spirits are recorded; all these, however, having to do in one way and another with Raymond.

For instance, one such communication is represented as having come from the spirit of one of Sir Oliver's particular friends, Mr. F. W. H. Myers, which was in the nature of a warning to Sir Oliver that an untoward event would take place in his life, from which he would suffer greatly, but from the fatal effects of which Mr. Myers himself would defend him; and this peculiar prophecy, having reference to the death of Raymond, was afterwards fulfilled, even in its different points relating both to Raymond and Sir Oliver. Then another like communication which Professor Lodge thinks was even more "evidential" in its nature, had to do with a group photograph which Raymond and quite a number of other army officers had taken of themselves in France, but of which neither Sir Oliver nor any member of his family knew anything, until it was discovered through messages coming ostensibly from Raymond; and then when afterwards it was brought home, it was found to be, in nearly all respects, exactly as it had been described in those messages.

These two occurrences seem to have made a strong impression upon Sir Oliver, preparing him in his mind for an appreciative acceptance of many other like events

which took place in connection with the spirit of Raymond—that is, as represented in this volume. But these events are too numerous and too varied in their nature for us to give here any detailed description of them; and so we will only say of them, that they took place in all kinds of spiritistic manifestations, and along with the aid of various mediums; the principal ones, however, being a man by the name of Vout Peters and a woman whose name was Mrs. Osborne Leonard, both of them residing in London.

And now comes the strange and objectionable part of this story. It is the singular or even ridiculous character of some of the messages purporting to be descriptive of matters in the other world or of its peculiar nature. For instance, we are told that in that other state of existence people live in brick houses, that over there they have streets, and trees and flowers, and even *mud*, just as we do here; that people over there wear clothes, and eat and drink, just as we do here; although Raymond tells us that he himself had no need of food. Besides, he tells us that in the other world there are men and women just as there are here, and that they love one another, although no children are born in the spiritual world. And more ridiculous still, we are told that people over there both manufacture and smoke cigars, and they even drink whisky sodas, and sometimes get drunk, although Raymond says he had never seen people in that condition. To be sure, there is no hell in that world, so Raymond reports; but he also states that he has seen some young fellows who, because of "their nasty ideas and vices," were being sent, not to any place of punishment, but rather to some kind of reformatory, such as we have in this life.

These are, then, some illustrations of what people do in that other world, and they also show what kind of a world it is, according to the representations given in this book. In other words, that other state of existence is

not very different from this. In fact, it is only a replica, or a reflection of matters as they are found down here in this world of time and sense; and such being the case, it is no wonder that the critics have found much fault with this book of Sir Oliver's, as we have already indicated. For instance, many statements found in this book have been called the *merest nonsense*, "*balderdash*," "*subliminal dreaming*," even "*mischievous drivel*," and one writer goes so far as to say that the whole movement of modern spiritism, as represented by this book, should be stamped out at any cost and with a use of every possible weapon; because, as he regards it, that movement is a blotch upon the fair name of science. And still another writer declares that rather than pass an endless life amid such unsavory and repellent surroundings as are represented in this book to belong to that other world, he would prefer an entire extinction of being.

But then, if this production has been severely criticized, or condemned, it has also on the other hand, been received with no little commendation, especially by professed spiritualists. Or if it has been found difficult really to extol this book on account of its worth, not so with respect to the author of it. For instance, Sir Oliver Lodge has been pronounced one of the very greatest scientists of today, also a man possessed of remarkable intellectual acumen, one who has done very much already in the way of promoting the physical sciences and of applying science to the construction of useful inventions, such as even now are being used in different parts of our world. Moreover, it might yet be said of him, that he does not seem to be disturbed very much by the severe criticisms which have been passed upon his book, particularly so in regard to those which have been in the nature of ridicule. For, in a letter which he wrote not very long ago to one of his friends in this country, he said that inasmuch as ridicule is so very cheap a matter, a little more or less of it does not count. To be sure,

that is true; but, after all, it is not every man who has the mental reserve necessary to stand up bravely against ridicule, without making some effort to use the same kind of weapon, if not something worse, in return. Bravo! then we say, for Sir Oliver; and if we do not feel like commending him for anything else, we certainly do for this remarkable self-possession under trying circumstances.

But this brings us to the last section of our book, and this section may be regarded as containing the more scientific and philosophical teachings of the author. Besides, its purpose seems to be to explain and strengthen the peculiar views put forward in Part Second. Our space, however, is too limited for us to notice more than one or two items found here. One such item is the extraordinary confidence which Professor Lodge seems now to exercise with regard to the existence of another world; this being, at least in part, the result of his recent experiences, such as he claims to have had, with the departed spirit of his son Raymond. For he declares that he is now "as fully convinced of continued existence on the other side of death as he is of existence here." Certainly a statement like that is not only very rare, but also very brave for one to make in these times, considering the wide-spread unbelief, the uncertainty and doubt, that exist today with respect to immortality, especially among the class of men known as scholars.

But another item to which we desire to call attention is Sir Oliver's peculiar notion with regard to the connection of this world with the other. In his view these two worlds do not merely exist side by side, each being different from the other in nature, but they are interlocked in such fashion as to make a continuous universe. That is to say, the upper world, which we are accustomed to call heaven, is not a purely spiritual existence; but it is, so Sir Oliver thinks, made of ether, and is therefore material in its nature, just as much so as is this lower

world in which we are now living. The only difference between these two worlds is that the lower one is composed of a cruder or more condensed form of matter, while the upper world is made of matter in its more tenuous state. When a person dies, therefore, his soul is not translated from a purely physical or material world to one that is wholly spiritual in its form, but it simply passes up from a lower grade of material existence to a higher one of the same kind.

This seems to be Professor Lodge's peculiar view, and this fact may account for his seeming endorsement of all those strange materialistic notions respecting the after-life of man which are put forward in the book called *Raymond*—notions which make the other world merely a copy of things found here in this world of time. And nothing, we may say, connected with Sir Oliver's book has aroused so much prejudice and opposition to it, or caused such severe criticisms to be passed upon it, as just these peculiar notions. No wonder that such is the case; for such a view of the after-life of man is positively opposed not only to all sound Christian theology, but even to common-sense or any correct form of reasoning.

To come then to our final estimate of the real value of this book, what shall it be? That is a matter not so easily decided. For if we listen to the critics, then to be sure our estimate cannot be very high; but if, on the other hand, we are to judge of the character of this volume by what most people seem to think of Professor Lodge as a great scholar and as a man eminently qualified to write a very strong argument in favor of human immortality, then our estimate will be very different. As matters stand, therefore, we can only say that in our opinion this last book given to the world by Professor Lodge is not in all respects his best or least objectionable effort in the line of attempts to prove man's future life. At least two other of his publications are, in the respects

named, superior to this. One of these other works is his famous presidential address delivered some years ago before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in its session at Birmingham, England; and the other work, entitled "The Survival of Man," was published still earlier, it being largely the result of his studies made in connection with the British Society for Psychical Research. Both of these publications are of superior value, especially so as having little or nothing in them to which intelligent Christian people could seriously object.

Our judgment is therefore that, while this volume entitled Raymond really does possess no small amount of merit, especially when considered from a scientific and philosophical point of view, after all it does not in all respects take rank with some other publications by the same author. And if any one of the readers of this article is curious to know how strong and unobjectionable an argument in favor of man's survival of death Sir Oliver Lodge is able to write, we advise him to get and read those two older publications.¹

¹ For additional notice of much the same subject see *Spiritism and the Great War—A Historical Note*, pp. 191-193.

TOPIC IX

EUCKEN AND BERGSON ON IMMORTALITY

IN the opinion of most scholars the two greatest philosophers of today are probably Prof. Rudolf Eucken, of the University of Jena, in Germany, and Prof. Henri Bergson, of the College of France, in Paris. Being such eminent representatives of modern speculative thought, their views respecting man's future life should be, to say the least, particularly interesting. In all their writings these two men are very optimistic, and they both belong to what is known as the idealistic school of philosophy. Moreover, in their systems of thought they both start with the notion that the one great reality in our universe is life—life considered by the one as a physical entity, and by the other as a great spiritual attainment. But while on various points they thus seem to agree, on others they are widely apart. Professor Bergson, e. g., teaches the doctrine that mere physical life, as represented in men, animals, and plants, is the thing to be especially considered here and now, or as connected with the affairs of this world; and he has but little to say regarding spiritual life. But on the other hand, Professor Eucken, starting as he does with the idea that the first and greatest thing for man is a higher or spiritual life, very naturally pays but little attention to the mere life of the body. According to him, there is such a thing as a "Universal Spiritual Life," with which it is possible for man to become identified; and having done that, he is lifted to a higher plane of being, or becomes in a certain sense divine; in which state immortality is natural to him. Thus all the way through in his philosophical system, Mr. Eucken keeps his eye fixed

144

upon that higher spiritual life, as the guiding star of his thought.

Not so with Mr. Bergson. In his best-known book, entitled "Creative Evolution," he teaches, first of all, that mere physical life, or the life of the body, is the supreme, or in fact, the only present reality; and although this leads up to the life of the spirit, that higher life is not the thing primarily to be considered. Then, as connected with his peculiar theory of evolution, he teaches that life is itself creative. Its very nature is to move forward as it were in a great and impetuous stream, pushing its way through matter as a resisting force, and sweeping away all obstacles. Moreover, to continue the metaphor, this stream of life in its onward course creates, so to speak, on one side, the impression or appearance of matter, or really all we know about matter; and on the other side, or rather from within itself, it creates what we call intellect, or the power of knowing the external universe—that is, matter. Also this stream creates in man the powers of intuition and instinct, and is itself—as Mr. Bergson teaches—in a certain way conscious. And furthermore, according to this philosopher, time is itself a great reality; it being identical with life, in that both are included under the idea of duration. That is to say, time moves and so does life; and if life is a great reality, so is also time. Not only that, but time, like life, must even be regarded as the source whence all other things take their origin. This is Mr. Bergson's peculiar and strange notion.

But to notice now this philosopher's conception of immortality, it must be said at once that he does not really teach that doctrine. He teaches only, as we have already stated, that the life of the body naturally leads up to the life of the spirit; moreover, that as a great strong current, life has already won its way through all kinds of obstacles, or dead matter, until it has reached partial freedom in man. But in man as he is now, being still

clogged with the body, or matter, this freedom has not yet attained unto pure spirituality. Hence man cannot be regarded as being yet in any proper sense immortal. Here are some of Mr. Bergson's own words: "Life," he says, "as a whole, from the initial impulsion that thrust it into the world, appears as a wave which rises, and which is opposed by a descending movement of matter. On the greater part of its surface, at different heights, the current is converted by matter into a vortex. At one point alone it passes freely, dragging with it the obstacle, which will weigh on its progress but will not stop it. At this point is humanity; it is our privileged situation." Here Mr. Bergson uses the striking figure of a galloping army charging upon an enemy, to which he compares the current of life; and then, in closing, he says that this current is so strong and impetuous it "is able to beat down every resistance, and clear the most formidable obstacles—*perhaps even death.*"

Mr. Bergson is an obscure, or rather an abstruse and highly figurative writer; but as we understand him, he does not teach any immortality as yet obtained by man (at least, not by men on this planet), but only an immortality possible to man, provided the mighty forces resident in life continue to act. Surely, this is not such a view as the human heart in its longing requires, not a view that can satisfy either our hearts or minds.

Professor Eucken's conception, on the other hand, is much more positive and sure. He not only seems to believe in an after-life for man, but he teaches an immortality even for all men, provided only they will comply with its conditions. These conditions are, first, a complete breaking with the sordid motives and allurements of this lower world, and secondly, a full surrender of one's self to the higher or Universal Spiritual Life, which is in essence, or principle, the same thing as God. Or if we would draw an illustration from the Bible, this second condition is that, like Enoch of old, men shall

even now "walk with God," and thus by continual association with him they will become like him, or attain unto a fully spiritualized or glorified personality—which, in Mr. Eucken's view, is the same thing as becoming immortal. To all who comply with these two conditions Professor Eucken promises a real future life. But for all delinquents, or those who fail in making such high and extraordinary attainments, this philosopher has no immortality to offer. These simply perish, as do the brutes, body and soul together. Or as one of Mr. Eucken's interpreters explains, they perish because they have in them "nothing that can persist."

Thus it can be seen that neither of these two distinguished philosophers teaches the old and still commonly held Christian doctrine of a real future life, secured to all men. For while Professor Eucken knows of a future life made possible to all, yet in all probability but few will attain it. He therefore teaches what is usually called a "limited" or "conditional" immortality. Then, on the other hand, Professor Bergson does not, it seems to us, teach any real future life at all. But his view is only that, if the forces of life continue to operate, they may break down all opposition to another life for man, and thus secure immortality for him. At the utmost, then he teaches only a possible immortality, not one that has any certainty or present reality connected with it.

Choose ye, therefore, which is the better view—the old and still commonly held Christian view, or either of those presented by the two distinguished philosophers whose writings we have been studying. As for ourself, we are gratified to know that there are other and better reasons for believing in man's life beyond the grave than those offered by either of these philosophers.

TOPIC X

PLATO'S DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY

PLATO was not the first Greek philosopher who taught the doctrine of a future life for man. Pythagoras, e. g., who lived about a hundred years before Plato's time, taught the same doctrine, although in a considerably different form. But the peculiarity and distinction of Plato was that of all the ancient philosophers and thinkers he has given us the loftiest, the clearest, the fullest, and most ethical conception of man's after-life that has come down to us from that far-off past. Moreover, it may be said of Plato's teaching, that, besides being largely original, it is also an embodiment of all the best thought of those ancient times upon immortality. Such an extraordinary doctrine, therefore, should be of no little interest to us, especially since it treats of one of the most important of subjects, viz., the endless future life of all human souls.

But the exact nature of this doctrine, in its various peculiarities, need not be considered here; it will come up again for some notice farther on. Sufficient to say here, that Plato seems to have profoundly believed in the future life, and he has given us quite an array of arguments in support of such belief.

One of these arguments is drawn from the old Orphic tradition about the existence of Hades, or an underworld, to which go the souls of the dead, and from which also they return. This argument, however, Plato undertakes to strengthen by connecting it with his peculiar notion of the "generation of opposites," or that one opposite comes from another—evil from good, justice from injustice, the weaker from the stronger, waking from

sleeping, therefore, life from death. Another argument he deduces from what in these times is usually known as his doctrine of "the eternity of ideas": which is that there are certain truths, axioms, general notions, first principles, etc., which cannot be learned from observation and experience in this world; therefore the soul must have brought them, as matters of memory, from another state of existence. This argument no doubt might prove the soul's preexistence, but not necessarily its after-life or immortality.

Then another argument is drawn by Plato from the soul's natural simplicity, or its immateriality, indivisibility, and incorruptibility. Still another, much of the same nature, he deduces from the soul's natural vitality and its ability to command the body; both of which conceptions, in Plato's view, render the soul incapable of suffering death.

All these contentions for immortality are found in Plato's well-known dialogue called the *Phædo*; but in other of his dialogues he advances still other arguments, one of which is certainly peculiar. It is that inasmuch as the soul is capable of overcoming its own diseases, such as cowardice, injustice, intemperance, and folly, it should be the more capable of overcoming the diseases of the body, and possibly even dissolution, or death. But perhaps the strongest and the best of all Plato's arguments, is the one drawn from the soul's likeness to God, or from the fact that, having been created in the divine image, it is, like God himself, naturally immortal.

But now, while to the ancients these several arguments, or all of them taken together, must have seemed strong and convincing, and especially so to those who accepted of Plato's philosophy in general, to us they have lost nearly all, or at least much, of their force. With exception of two or three, we can no longer use them for proving the doctrine of man's future life. Belonging as these arguments do to a past age, we must say of them

in general, that they are old, out of date, and not well adapted to our modern ways of thinking. Moreover, even Plato's conception of the after-life, being very different from ours, must be considered as seriously defective. For instance, he did not believe, as we do, that the highest bliss of the other world can be obtained by all classes of men. That privilege was reserved exclusively for the philosophers, since they only could attain unto real wisdom, which among the ancient Greeks was esteemed the chief virtue. Then, also, Plato believed, as we do not—at least not many intelligent people nowadays so believe—in literal hell-fire as a means of punishment or of purification from sin. And perhaps worse than all, for some strange reason Plato not only accepted, but positively taught that absurd old Pythagorean doctrine about a transmigration of souls—a doctrine which, although still widely believed in, has not one particle of real evidence upon which to rest. And in still other respects Plato's doctrine was crude, irrational, and different from ours. Still with all these defects or shortcomings, Plato's eschatology was, as we have already said, the loftiest, purest, most ethical and spiritual, the most like our Christian doctrine, of all that we know of as belonging to those olden times.

Grand old Plato, then, we are glad to say! He stands out in human history not only as one of the very princes of philosophy, but more especially as the father of idealism, or that system of thought which puts spirit first and matter afterwards. As an idealistic thinker, then, he has wrought wondrously upon all the ages past ever since his day, and he is still working upon our own generation, in the way of lifting up thought and aspiration toward a higher and better world than this; not only that, but also toward higher and better things to be experienced in this life.

Speaking of Plato's philosophy merely as an argument for man's future life, Doctor Geddes says that it is

the greatest contribution to such an argument ever made from philosophical speculations. Or to give his form of expression more accurately, it is "the noblest single offering that human reason has yet laid upon the altar of human hope." If this verdict is correct, and we are persuaded that it is, then the question arises whether even our own age, with all its advanced knowledge and philosophy, could not be profited by giving more earnest and exhaustive study to this old Platonic system of thought. One thing at least we will recommend; it is for all honest doubters respecting the matter of human immortality to give this old philosophy, among other sources of proof, an honest and fair trial.

TOPIC XI

OTHER OPINIONS

IT is a very interesting thought, and really a strong argument in favor of immortality, that nearly all the great philosophers and thinkers, including the poets and most of the scientists, have believed this doctrine; and most of them have earnestly advocated it in one way and another. To be sure, during the last half century there has been quite an extensive outburst of materialism, and some even of the most eminent men of science have taught the doctrine that man is not immortal. But the number of these is comparatively small; and anyway materialism is now in a dying condition. For as Mr. Balfour has said, "Matter has not only been explained [in these times of ours], it has been explained away."¹ That is to say, a new, more spiritual, and far more believing interpretation of matter has been taken recently; so that the representatives of this school of philosophy have really nothing left upon which to stand.

As to the poets, however, we can most confidently say that the greatest of them, even from the time of old Homer and Hesiod, have stood almost solidly on the side of belief in man's future life. They have written and sung of this doctrine as of scarcely any other theme; and if it had been left with them to decide whether or not man is immortal, that question would long ago have been decided, and in the affirmative.

To give the names of some of these, we may begin with Longfellow and Bryant, of our own country. Then passing over to Great Britain, we find there Shakespeare and Milton, old Chaucer and Spenser, Walter

¹ On New View of Matter as Related to Force, see Note 1, p. 190.

Scott and Robert Burns; Pope, Dryden, Campbell and Cowper; Byron, in his better moments; Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning, and numbers more. On the continent of Europe, such eminent names can be noticed as Racine, Victor Hugo, Chateaubriand, Goethe (who is sometimes called the "Shakespeare of Germany"), Herder, Lessing, Klopstock, Tasso, and Dante. And now going away back to the days of the two great poets mentioned—that is, Homer and Hesiod—we find besides them, among the Greeks, at least Pindar, the great lyric poet, and nearly all the great writers of Greek tragedy. And among the Romans we find the almost incomparable Virgil, with even Ovid, despite his general tendency to levity. All these great poets have, as we have said, not only believed the doctrine of immortality, but some of them have sung of it, and written of it, and made it almost the great theme of their lives.

Or if now a catalogue also of the great believing philosophers and thinkers in all ages is desired, then we will go back to the ancient period of Socrates and Plato, and there we meet among the Greeks, besides the two great names just mentioned, Empedocles, Xenocrates, Pythagoras, and others.² And among the Romans we find such men as Cicero, Seneca, and Cato, all of whom in their better moods seem to have believed that the human soul is immortal. Of the Neoplatonists it can be said that they all, or at least the greatest of them, believed in this same doctrine; and all down through the Middle Ages the doctrine of man's future life was held, seemingly by all the great thinkers of that period without exception.

And now coming down to more recent times, we find here, in our search for great believing philosophers, such extraordinary names as Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel (when rightly interpreted), Wolff, Malebranche, Geul-

² Aristotle does not seem to have believed in immortality. Vid. Note 2, p. 190.

inex, Pascal, Herbart, Jacobi, and still others, all residing in Germany and France. Then passing over into Great Britain again, we meet here, to be sure, Herbert Spencer, who was an agnostic; David Hume, who was a universal skeptic, and a few other unbelievers. But over against all these we can put such great believing names as Sir William Hamilton, John Locke, Lord Bacon, Bishop Berkeley, Thomas Reid, Dugald Stewart, James McCosh, Ralph Cudworth, John Caird, and we know not how many more.

Even here in America, this newer country, a goodly representation of great believing thinkers can be found, such, e. g., as Jonathan Edwards, of old pre-Revolutionary times; Dr. L. P. Hickok, once president of Union College; Dr. Wm. T. Harris, late Commissioner of Education in the United States; Dr. Noah Porter and Professor Ladd, of Yale University; Professors Bowen and James, of Harvard University, with still others.

Now putting all these illustrious names together—the philosophers and thinkers, and poets, and the believing scientists whose names we have not mentioned individually—putting all these in one great group, we certainly have an extraordinary array of the world's best talent and culture, all testifying to the truth of the doctrine we are considering. Or, as was said at the beginning of this topic, the very fact of so many of the world's greatest thinkers and writers being on the side of belief in the future life, is itself a strong reason why that doctrine should be considered true.³

³ On Predominance of Great Believers above Unbelievers, see Note 3, p. 191.

PART B

VARIOUS OBJECTIONS—OLD AND NEW

QUITE a number of objections, mostly popular in nature, could not very well be answered in the main body of this work; so we shall undertake to answer at least some of them here.

I. THE DEAD TOO NUMEROUS

One such objection is that the number of human beings now dead, or that will be so before the end of time, is altogether too great for it to be considered reasonable that such a vast multitude of people, without regard to character, education, or moral culture, should be continued in existence forever. And then the question arises whether, if some members of the human race are not to be considered immortal, any other members of this same race can be so considered.

Accordingly, some thoughtful men—such as Prof. William James—have argued the question both *pro* and *con*; the view usually taken being that not all classes of men should have the privilege of living forever. What is the use, it is said, of perpetuating the existence of such low, degraded, morally, and intellectually worthless people as the Hottentots and Bushmen of Africa, the Aborigines of Australia, and many others of the uncivilized races that could easily be mentioned? Professor James tells us that there is a certain "unfitness of things" in this idea; and he affirms, moreover, that some of us are so overrefined and aristocratic in our way of thinking, that rather than harbor the notion of all men's living *in secula seculorum*, we would almost be willing to part with our own title to an existence beyond the grave. An-

other writer tells us that the thought of all these barbarous creatures living forever is "repulsive, revolting, intolerable"; and he also says that such a burden of human life is like "a millstone about the neck of creation," and that if this burden of mere "weltering and waste humanity" could be eliminated, the universe would even now seem to be a cleaner place. But all this kind of reasoning is in our judgment not in accordance with the facts. It rests either upon unwarranted prejudice or mistaken notions.

One such mistaken notion is that somehow the other world may not be large enough or sufficiently well supplied with the necessities of life to furnish accommodations for all the millions and billions of human beings that will, before the great panorama of time closes, have passed over to the other shore. How large, then, we ask is the other world?

Before attempting to answer this question it may be needful to state that the spiritual universe not being under the conditions of time and space, it seems hardly appropriate to speak of it as having dimensions; still, since in popular usage as well as in accordance with Scripture teachings, we often speak of heaven, and also of the underworld, after the form of material existence, it will be proper enough for us to take that view of matters here. So we again ask the question: *How large is the spiritual world?* To compare it with the world of time and sense in which we are living, it might be observed that the astronomers tell us that the extent of our material universe is practically infinite. In other words, it is so extensive that on all the broad face of our earth we have really no sufficient measures with which to estimate its greatness. Take, for instance, a ray of light which travels at the rate of one hundred and eighty-five thousand miles per second, how long would it take this ray to reach us from the nearest fixed star? The answer is, as is taught in our schoolbooks, some four years and

four months! But then it should be remembered, in connection with this answer, that there are other fixed stars much farther removed from us, some of them being so distant that it would take even centuries for light coming from them to reach our earth; and for aught we know to the contrary, there may be worlds even outside of such fixed stars—worlds upon worlds—so far distant that even yet the light has not reached us which commenced to shine away back there, even at the beginning of our human history! Such estimates as these give us to understand that our universe is indeed practically infinite in extent, even as the astronomers tell us. And now our argument is this: Inasmuch as spirit is a higher order of existence than matter, the spiritual universe must be still larger, or so extremely vast that we have, or can have, little or no comprehension of its greatness.

Or to take another illustration, one coming from the Bible. We read in this sacred book, that the New Jerusalem, which, as the final abode of God's people, is at the end of time to come down from God out of heaven, is a city fifteen hundred miles long, fifteen hundred miles wide, and fifteen hundred miles high. Or in other words, it is so large that perhaps all the cities now in our world, or at least the greater ones, could be put on the inside of it! Or as some speculative, curious-minded man has figured it out, the space in this city is so extreme that it would furnish roomy accommodations not only for the entire population of our earth, but also of many other worlds, even should these different places of abode continue in existence yet for thousands of years! Supposing, then, that this estimate is true, it would give us some data from which we might calculate the extraordinary greatness of the spiritual universe, or at least of some part of it.

And now, putting these two estimates together, the one appertaining to the greatness of the spiritual world, and the other being based upon the extreme greatness of the

physical universe—putting these two estimates together, or rather side by side, and comparing them, it is easy to be seen that, no matter how great may be the multitude of human beings passing out of time into eternity before the history of man on this planet closes, there is room enough in the spiritual world to accommodate each and all of them, and to do so with ease. No one therefore need to have any fears or doubts respecting that matter.

So much, then, for one of these mistaken notions which have been entertained. Several others might be considered here, but we shall notice only one. It is the exceedingly erroneous conception that a person's right to a place in the eternal world does not depend upon his natural attributes, such as self-consciousness, thinking, feeling, memory, affection, and the like, but rather upon some external circumstances or attainment he might have made—such, e. g., as one's social position, his intellectual or moral culture, the degree of civilization by which his life was surrounded, etc., not any one of which notions can be justly maintained. For, in the first place, both philosophy and our Christian Scriptures teach very plainly that man has been created in the image of God, and therefore being made in the likeness of his Maker, he must be considered immortal, even as God is immortal. Of a truth, if man has been made simply in the likeness of an animal, then, like all animals, he must necessarily perish, both in body and soul. But man is, at least in his spiritual being, something more than an animal. For we read in the Biblical account of creation that, after God had formed man out of the dust of the ground, he breathed into his nostrils even—as we must understand—the *breath of a divine life*; and that act has lifted man away up above all other earthly orders of creation; making him in some sense divine, even as God is divine; and now it is because of this exalted nature of man that he must be considered immortal, not because of any external circumstance or attainment made by him.

Of course, this throws the gates of the eternal world wide open to all classes of people, white and black, rich and poor, educated or uneducated, "barbarian, Scythian, bond or free"; and no matter what a person's social position may be in this life, he has just as good a right to hope for a home in the other world as does any other member of the human race, no matter how high, or "aristocratic," his position in society may be. For be it remembered that the great gift of immortality is not bestowed upon man because of any chance circumstance connected with his life, or of any external attainment he may have made, but simply and solely because of one thing—which is that he, or rather that *all men alike* have been created in the image of God.

II. IF MEN ARE IMMORTAL, WHY NOT ANIMALS AND PLANTS?

This is a question raised sometimes, or perhaps quite frequently, and not seldom it has been answered in the affirmative; because it is thought that, since men are surely immortal, animals and plants should be considered so also. Accordingly, ever since the time of Plato, and perhaps earlier, there have been those who have argued for the future life of animals and plants, or more especially of animals. But it is not with such meaning that we use the question here. We employ it as an argument that may be used against human immortality; because it can be concluded, that, since plants and animals are not believed to be immortal, neither should men be so considered. All these kinds of being seem to be much of the same class, therefore if one species is regarded as mortal, the other must be considered so also.

Upon the face this objection looks quite specious or formidable; still we think it can be quite easily answered. First, from psychology. True, there are resemblances between human beings and the two lower orders of life just mentioned. The life-principle in all is much the

same, and they all alike have material bodies. Moreover, animals as well as men have intelligence, or what may be called a soul; although this soul is very different from reason, or the human spirit. Also a kind of determination, or will, may be attributed to animals, and even emotions that somewhat resemble ours. But with all these resemblances, there is still a vast difference between men and animals, and of course also between men and plants. No animal, for instance—be it even one of the highest order—possesses what we call self-consciousness, or the ability to look in upon itself and recognize its own being, or individuality. Neither does any animal possess real free agency; but they are all governed either by impulse or by impressions made upon them from without. Of course, then, no animal has what we term a conscience or a moral nature, or religious instinct, or anything of the kind. The Sermon on the Mount, or the Ten Commandments, would have no significance to any sort of animal. So also the dog or the ape, or any other mere animal, is devoid of reason, or the ability to think logically and consecutively—first stating its propositions and then trying to prove them, perhaps from mere abstract notions, or from axioms and first principles. Even the possession of “intelligible speech” puts man, so Professor Huxley tells us, “upon a mountaintop,” far above the reach of any mere animal capability. And once more, man alone, of all living beings upon the earth, possesses the wonderful faculty of real memory; which, combined with other capabilities, is able to treasure up knowledge from one generation to another, and thus to make it possible for a race to improve, or become civilized and progressive.

Or to put all these peculiarities belonging to man in a single group and give that group a name, such name would be *personality*. Surely no brute can claim to be a person; and, as it has been suggested, if an animal of any kind should rise up and say “I,” or “You,” or talk

about persons in society, from that moment it would no longer be an animal, but a real human being.

This much we can learn from psychology; and now by giving some attention to the science of physiology, we can learn from that source also something that will be of peculiar interest to us in this connection. Some years ago Prof. Paul Flechsig, of Leipsig, Germany, made an important discovery. It was the existence in the human brain of certain structures such as are not found in the brains of animals. These structures, as we have described them in another place,¹ help to form that part of the brain in which most, if not all, of our real thinking is done; hence they have been called the "association or thought centers." Very likely, moreover, these peculiar tissues are the organs or instruments through which the soul acts or manifests itself to the outer world.² Or, putting them all together, these portions of the brain may be considered as forming the basis, or seat, of the human soul in the body, or more particularly in the nervous system.

Such being the case, several important inferences naturally follow. First, we have in these structures additional evidence that man really has such a thing as what we call the soul, or spirit; for nature seems by these peculiar structures to have provided for such an entity in man. Then secondly, another inference is that man is different from all animals and plants not only in soul—that is, if plants and animals have souls—but in body also. And still another inference is that since man is in his brain so very different from any animal, and since that difference points toward the possession of a soul on the part of man, it is possible that, although all animals and plants must necessarily die, man may escape death; he being

¹ See chapter V, p. 48.

² Of course, Professor Flechsig and other materialists have interpreted these peculiar structures as organs that produce thought, and not as is done above. Still we think that our interpretation is quite as legitimate; the brain, or the nervous system, being regarded as an instrument through which the soul acts.

a so much higher order of existence than are either plants or animals.

But now, if to this testimony coming from physiology we add the much stronger testimony coming from psychology, we have, so it seems to us, peculiarly strong evidence that the objection to human immortality which we have been considering, is groundless. For if there is so much difference between men and animals, not only in soul, but to some extent also in body, then, although all animals and plants must die and become extinct, not so with man, not so with his higher or spiritual nature, or with his soul; the existence of that being proved, or indicated, both by physiology and psychology.

III. MAX VERWORN'S MATERIALISTIC ARGUMENT

Next to Ernst Haeckel (recently deceased) probably no one of all the great German materialists has exerted so wide an influence in the way of propagating materialistic doctrine as Max Verworn. He is, or was, professor of physiology in the University of Jena; and a few years ago—that is, before the war—as an exchange professor, he gave a series of lectures in Columbia University, in the city of New York. His ideas thus getting into our American newspapers, an article purporting to have been written by him was sent to us for examination, and for answer if possible. This was at the time when, as a series of articles, the main body of this work was being published in a Chicago journal. Recognizing therefore the duty thus laid upon us, we attempted to make such answer as we could in the case.

Preliminarily, however, we called attention to the fact that, although Max Verworn at that time claimed to be what is known in scientific circles as a *psycho-monist*, he was (and he very probably still is) a rank materialist, and in the article mentioned he teaches nothing else than the baldest kind of materialism. For in the first place, he uses quite often in that article a peculiar phrase which

materialists seem to be quite fond of using. It is "*living substance*"—as though a substance, or mere dead matter, could be living. To be sure, matter can exist in two forms; it can be organized or living matter, or it can be unorganized or dead matter. For all that, however, matter in its natural state is not living, but dead; and before dead matter can become living in its nature, a great transformation must occur. What is it then, we ask, that brings about such transformation? Certainly nothing in matter itself—no chemical, physical, or mechanical forces, such as are inherent in matter, or belong naturally to it. For if that was the case, then these forces would everywhere and always be producing life, which is really not so. On the contrary, so far as we have any evidence upon this subject, it goes to prove the very opposite doctrine, or that life can come only from life, and from no other source. "I am ready," says Lord Kelvin, "to accept it as an article of faith in science, valid for all time and for all space, that life is produced by life, and only by life"; and this is at least the prevailing opinion nowadays among all classes of scholars. That being so, it is simply a misnomer, or a mistake in science, for one to speak of matter as being naturally, or in its primitive state, a "*living substance.*" It becomes living only when life is put into it, and not otherwise.

Another mistake made by this German professor, is—so it seems to us—his claim that the life-principle is the result of cell activity. His words are as follows: "Our body is made up of billions of little cells, and all our life, physical and mental, is the result of the activity of these cells." But that is, of course, going farther than either this German professor or any other materialist is able to prove. For what life is in essence no mortal man has yet been able to explain. We can only say of it, that it is either a divine creation or that it has existed forever; but in either case the statement is not scientific. Life is really a great mystery, or something that we do not

know much about; and for one to declare positively that this mystery is the product of cell activity and not rather the cause of it, is going much farther than the facts warrant. He is simply dogmatizing; and therefore if Professor Verworn wishes to be considered a dogmatist in science, affirming as a fact something he does not really know, he has that privilege. But he must be considered a dogmatist, nevertheless.

Still another of these errors is the assertion made by our professor, that wherever the internal and external conditions of life are present, no matter whether it be on our planet or any other, there of necessity life will eventually appear. Most certainly it will; but only with the understanding that one of these conditions shall be the life-principle itself. Or in other words, this is simply begging the entire question; for it makes the effect of cell activity to be also the cause of the same activity. Or if it is not that, then it makes merely a condition having in itself no producing cause to be after all the cause of one of the most wonderful things in the world. Professor Verworn therefore can take his choice—either to talk confusion and absurdity, or to commit that blunder known in logic as a *petitio principii*.

But the greatest blunder of all committed by Professor Verworn in this article is expressed by himself in the following words: "Every act of consciousness is intimately dependent upon the vital processes of certain cells of the cortex or outer layer of the brain . . . the phenomenon of human consciousness ceases with the life of the brain cells. . . Hence our individual soul is no more immortal than our individual body." This is again going away beyond any conclusion warranted by the facts. For the facts are, as determined by all the best psychologists and physiologists, that there is a certain parallel activity between the brain on one side and the mind or soul on the other; but this by no means signifies either that the mind is dependent upon the brain for its exis-

tence, or the brain upon the mind. The relation between them is one of concomitance or juxtaposition, not of cause and effect. This we have shown more fully in another part of this book. (See Chap. VI, pp. 59, 60.) Such being therefore the real nature of the case, it is not true, as Mr. Verworn tells us, that every act of consciousness is so intimately dependent upon the vital processes of certain cells that, when these cells cease to live, the phenomenon of consciousness must cease also. On the contrary, for all we know about the relation existing between consciousness and the brain-cells, this consciousness—which is, of course, the same thing as mind—may continue to live on even forever, even though the entire brain is destroyed or perishes. We hold, therefore, as already said, that all this very confident assertion about consciousness being so intimately dependent upon brain activity, is only an assertion and nothing more. The facts do not warrant any such statement; and unless Professor Verworn changes this statement, we must insist that he has committed here a serious blunder.

Perhaps one thing more needs to be said. In closing his article this distinguished professor takes occasion to preach a little sermon against the fear of death, caused largely, as he seems to think, by the "gloomy" Christian doctrine of future punishment. Also he seems to take the view, common among materialists, that death is only like going to sleep, and hence there can be nothing formidable connected with it. But suppose that when a person goes to sleep he never wakes up afterward; or suppose rather—which is the true materialistic doctrine—that death means to every one of us absolute and eternal extinction of personal being, that surely puts a different face on the matter. So we will say that until this materialistic professor, or anybody who believes like him, can give us a better doctrine than this abhorrent one of eternal annihilation, we prefer continuing on in the old Christian belief of rewards and punishments in another world; the actuality

of that world being assured to us, and the punishments being so conditioned that no one need to suffer them against his will. And this, we think, is a much more reasonable, as also a much less gloomy doctrine, than the one advocated by materialists.

IV. UNANSWERABLE QUESTIONS

As with regard to not a few other matters met with in this world, there are, respecting the great matter of a future life, questions that can much more easily be asked than answered. One such question, for instance, is: What is to become of cripples and idiots in the other world, also insane people and persons afflicted with disease? Shall all these poor unfortunates be compelled to suffer with such infirmities forever? Or is there some way provided by which it is possible for them to be delivered from all such afflictions, or to become sound both in body and soul? Confessedly, this is a question that we cannot even pretend to answer in full. We can only, in the first place, ask another question, which is: How would a place like heaven with its absolute perfections appear, if encumbered by all such infirmities, or by people suffering as we have described? If it is true as it is expressed in an old Christian hymn, that "Earth has no sorrow that heaven cannot heal," then we can believe that there can be no infirmities of any kind in heaven. And as a further confirmation of this doctrine, Christian theologians sometimes affirm that, as a complete Saviour both of the souls and bodies of men, Christ has already made provision for delivering humanity from all kinds of infirmities and imperfections, whether they be mental or physical in nature.

So also even on scientific grounds it might be affirmed that there is some help to be expected for the overcoming of these evils. For it is a law of nature that all organisms or germs of life seek complete development; and in cases of injury another law comes in to heal the part affected. And these matters being so, it may be reason-

ably hoped that in another and better world, where all the conditions of life are more favorable than they are or can be here, both injuries and lack of development, or all kinds of defects, may be overcome. Or we might call attention to the wonderful achievements of modern medicine and modern surgery, both of which agencies, in their demonstrated capabilities, would help us out here.

But all this, we are well aware, is no complete answer to the question we are considering. It is only the best answer that we at present are able to give; and if any one can furnish a better, we certainly will not object.

Another question, which is really unanswerable, is one that the great skeptic Voltaire once propounded, many years ago. It is: "When does immortality begin in man?" Or when does a person attain to such a condition of soul as to be rendered immortal? Is it at the time of birth, or of conception, or after one has arrived at the age of accountability? This question also, we must perhaps say, is best answered by asking another. "Tell us, if you please"—so we might argue—"the exact time when a person becomes a person, or a real human being, then we shall be able to decide also when he becomes immortal." For immortality and personality go together. If one has all the attributes of personality, he is already immortal; and he does not need to attain any right or title to that distinction. He carries such distinction in his very nature.

This is, we believe, going about as far as any of the philosophies or theologies are able to guide us. Or if anything can help us further, it is orthodox theology. According to this there are three possibilities presenting themselves for the origin of human souls. One possibility is that they were all created in another world, at the same time perhaps with the angels, but that, owing to sin committed in some way, they have been condemned to a lower state of existence, in this world. This is called the theory of preexistence. Another possibility is that every

individual soul is created at the time of birth, or of his appearance in time; and this is denominated the theory of creation. And a third possibility, termed the theory of traducianism, is that all souls, like the human body, are propagated from one generation to another, and that all the generations have thus descended from a first man, or Adam. All this, you say is mere theorizing, or speculative theology; and so it is. Surely, it does not help us much in answering the old question proposed by Voltaire, as to when immortality begins.

But these two and other unanswerable questions do not affect, we are glad to say, the immortality of man; because, as we have often affirmed, immortality being a natural possession, belongs to the human race as a whole, or to all men alike, provided only they are men, or members of this race.

V. LIMITED OR CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY

The doctrine that not all men are immortal, but only a certain class—the kings and great chieftains, heroes of one kind and another; persons especially favored of the gods; the philosophers, or the truly wise and virtuous; the elect, the regenerate, those who are morally fit, etc.—this doctrine is far from being new. Traces of it can be found away back among the ancient Egyptians, also among the Babylonians, as well as among the Greeks and Romans; and it would seem to have been taught by some of the Jewish writers, not long before the time of Christ. Or coming down to the Christian era, we find this doctrine appearing, first, it would seem, in Northern Africa, in the earlier part of the fourth century, when Arnobius, a convert to Christianity from heathenism, wrote a book upon the annihilation of the wicked, which was the form in which the doctrine in those days was considered. The most flourishing period, however, in the history of this doctrine, is one still in progress. It began in England some seventy years ago, when another book, written by

the Rev. Edward White, created quite a stir regarding the matter. Since then the movement has spread widely in different parts of Europe and in our own country; so that now this teaching numbers its adherents by many thousands. Also it has, or has had during its history, not a few capable and learned men to advocate and represent it.

To formulate the doctrine as now commonly held, it is about as follows: All men are born naturally mortal, but with the capacity of becoming immortal. Like the "beasts that perish," they have only a kind of animal soul, but no spiritual nature. To obtain immortality, therefore, the soul must be changed in its very nature; it must be lifted to a higher plane of being, or receive something into itself that it did not originally possess. That something is, of course, life everlasting, which is really a free gift of God; although it comes to an individual also because of a certain peculiar relation existing between him and Christ. That is to say, a person must repent of his sins and exercise living faith in Christ, and in that way he experiences a new birth, or becomes a new creature, possessing now different elements of being from what he had before. This is, as we understand it, the doctrine which in these days is known as at least one form of *conditional* or *limited* immortality; the condition being that one must be in Christ, or occupy a certain peculiar relation to him.

What then, are some of the proofs by which this doctrine is sustained? One is an appeal to the great and now so widely accepted law of evolution. A recent writer has said that this doctrine "has much in its favor," because it is "the exact counterpart in the theological world of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest in the scientific world." And as applied to the question of immortality he says this belief "affirms that only those survive death who are morally fit." All others must of course perish.

But in refutation of such teaching it need only be said that it is difficult to see how merely moral or spiritual influences can affect, or change, the nature of the essential elements of the soul, so as to make it either mortal or immortal. For these elements—that is, the powers of thought, feeling, and volition—must always remain the same, no matter what the moral or spiritual changes may be. For a concrete illustration of this fact, notice, e. g., the case of the apostle Paul. Before his conversion he was a violent persecutor of the Christian church. As he himself says, he was “exceedingly mad” against Christians, and he persecuted them “even unto strange cities.” But after his conversion all this was changed. Now he loves what before he had hated; and the very Christianity which he undertook to destroy he now endeavors by all kinds of efforts and sacrifices to build up, and make it a great power in the world. Indeed, the change was great, but it did not affect any of Paul’s natural powers of mind or personality. So far as his personal being was concerned he remained the same after his conversion as before. Here, then, we have positive proof that merely moral or religious influences cannot affect the essential nature of the soul, or make it immortal when not constituted such by nature. Or in other words, the law of evolution is, as we now see, of no avail when appealed to for making an immortal man out of one who is naturally mortal.

Other arguments, and especially the Scripture proofs advanced by conditionalists in support of their peculiar theory, we shall not particularly notice here. But we will say of these Scripture proofs, that, however numerous and strong they may be, or appear to be in the estimation of those who bring them forward, they have all been contradicted and, as we think, overthrown by orthodox theologians, arguing on the other side of this question. The battle, though, between orthodox theology and conditionalism has already lasted for many years; and some

Biblical scholars seem to think this battle never will terminate, because in their view the Scriptures themselves are not as clear as they might be on this question—containing, it is held, passages which can be interpreted either in favor of or against the conditionalist doctrine. But that is not our notion of the matter. As already said, we think that the warfare against conditionalism which has been waged by orthodox theologians, has thus far resulted in favor of the latter party; and the reason such has been the case, is, in our judgment, because not only philosophy and reason, but the Bible also has been decidedly on the side of this orthodox party. Such being the case, we have no fear for the future of the doctrine we are considering. This doctrine, or that all men are naturally immortal, has always been held by the great majority of Christians: so it has been in the past, and so we believe it will be in the future. It is altogether too aristocratic a doctrine, to suppose that only a few human beings will be favored with the great gift of immortality, while all others must be denied. The Bible view, as well as the view of common sense and philosophy, is much more democratic in nature.

VI. IMMORTALITY A SELFISH DOCTRINE

We have already referred to the doctrine taught by George Eliot, as expressed in her desire to

join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence,

as not being a doctrine that can at all satisfy either the heart or mind of men in general. But we again call attention to it, for a somewhat different purpose. It has sometimes been argued, especially by a modern school of philosophy founded by Auguste Comte, of France, that the whole doctrine of personal immortality as commonly held is selfish in its nature, because it desires something for the individual rather than for society or for

the human race in general. Accordingly, not only Comte himself, but also certain of his followers, particularly in Great Britain, have taken the view that we should be more unselfish in our anticipations with regard to the future life; and we are told that a better conception of the great hereafter is one from which the idea of personal existence is entirely excluded, but in which one might be conceived of as existing merely in his offspring or as an influence among coming generations. So, for instance, George Meredith, in one of his poems entitled "Earth and Man," exhorts men to live in their offspring, and the only immortality he seems willing to recognize, is one of an impersonal nature. Or as another has put it, it is only "the immortal mark which one has made upon the race in which for a time he has lived and moved and had his being." So also others have expressed themselves in a similar way. But this entire doctrine is nothing more or less than blank materialism. It blots out completely the existence of the soul, and makes it, so far as it makes anything of it, to be simply a product of matter, or a link in the succession of material changes.

But what about the selfishness or unselfishness of a desire to live forever? One thing is certain, and at once apparent; which is that, so far as this world is concerned, there is certainly nothing improper or particularly selfish in a person's desiring to prolong his days. A patriot, for illustration, might desire to live some years longer so that he might be of greater service to his country. Or a devoted father and mother might wish to prolong their days, so they might have the opportunity of rearing their children and of properly caring for them. Precisely so it is with life in the other world. There is no reason conceivable why a person might not desire even in eternity to do good, and to continue so doing all through the infinite ages that are to come. The longer he might live in that world the better it would be for him, from the standpoint of benevolence or the desire to do good.

Or if any one objects that the moral law requires of us to love our neighbor as well as ourself, we reply, that is even so. But this same moral law does not require of us to exercise such excessive love toward the neighbor that we have none left for ourself. The fact is that in order even to do good unto others or to society, one must, first of all, care for himself. Self-existence is absolutely necessary to fulfilling the great law of benevolence; and for one to argue differently, is to argue unwisely, not to say foolishly.

And this is exactly, so it seems to us, what these disciples of Mr. Comte are doing. They expatiate largely upon the beauties of benevolence, or of a person's doing good unto others even when he no longer exists. But how, let us ask, could a person, as a person, do good unto others, when he no longer has a personal existence? Or how could a person who does not really exist find any satisfaction in doing good unto others when all through the time to come he should neither know anything about those others or any influence he might exert upon them? The fact is there is a very great difference between living after death merely as an influence upon others and living in one's own personal being. With the latter one's soul can be satisfied, but never with the former. Indeed, this kind of immortality, which is only one of personal influence, is really no immortality at all. It is only a delusion, a pretense, a hollow mockery with which one attempts to satisfy the cravings of his heart when he has nothing better to offer it. Or, as Dr. Charles Edward Jefferson puts the matter, "The denial of personal immortality is the denial of immortality altogether." And he adds, that

if funeral bells are really tolling for each and all of us the march to everlasting death [or complete extinction of being], let us face the fact, never wincing, nor attempt to muffle the solemn music of their tones in the seductive rustling of deceitful phrases.

In other words, if the Comtean philosophy can offer us nothing better than complete and everlasting extinction of being, we can afford to do without that philosophy; at all events, we do not care to be deceived by it.

VII. THE AGNOSTIC'S POSITION

Because the great doctrine of immortality cannot, as we have seen, be fully demonstrated as a matter of positive science, therefore the agnostic claims that we really know nothing about it, or to say the least, we do not know sufficiently about it to make it a matter of practice in life. Hence to be consistent the agnostic's motto should be, and sometimes is, "One world at a time"; or as the old Epicureans phrased it, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." But the case is, in our judgment, not nearly so desperate as the agnostics would have us believe. For as we have already observed—that is, in the studies constituting the main part of this book—there is not only some evidence, but a large amount of evidence, to the effect that man does not perish altogether when he dies, but that the soul continues to live on, even after death. Or as is said in the poem from which we have already quoted:

The stars shall fade away, the sun himself
 Grow dim with age, and nature sink in years,
 But thou [that is, the soul] shalt flourish in immortal youth,
 Unhurt amidst the wars of elements,
 The wrecks of matter, and the crush of worlds.

The evidence to be deduced, as we have seen, from science, philosophy, and religion, is sufficient to lay a really strong and secure foundation upon which one may confidently build his hope of life everlasting. True, this evidence does not amount to a positive demonstration; but it does amount to something more than mere speculation, something more even than moral probability; it amounts to at least a partly scientific, or a very rational

proof of the actuality of man's future life. And for a fuller exposition of this matter we refer especially to the last, save one, of the conclusions which we drew in the last chapter of the main body of this work.³

Such therefore being the nature of the evidence upon which one may rest his expectation of a future life, it does not seem to us reasonable that agnostics should reject all such testimony. Neither does it seem reasonable that, with such an amount of evidence in favor of the doctrine of immortality, anybody, be he agnostic or whatever else, should hesitate about making that doctrine a matter of practise in his own personal life. Surely, even the agnostics do not treat other great subjects that naturally have an interest for human life, with so much indifference or practical disregard. Many illustrations of this fact could easily be given. Moreover, it can be confidently asserted that none of the great scientific hypotheses, such as the nebular theory of the origin of the universe, the atomic theory of the structure of matter, the evolutionary theory of the production of organic species, and the theory of the existence of ether as an element filling all space, is better, if as well attested by facts and arguments, than is this great doctrine of man's future life. Nevertheless, unbelieving agnostics still refuse to accept this teaching; and they still insist that the whole matter of life after death is a thing both unknown and unknowable.

What then shall be done with skeptics of this class? Nothing whatever, except to point out their great inconsistency. However, there are two things, so it seems to us, of which they should be reminded. First, their entire system of the Comtean or positivistic philosophy, which teaches that we can know for certain only what is capable of being proved by observation and experience, is not true. For we actually do know many things, and know them for certain, which cannot be thus proved—

³ See pp. 106, 107.

all axioms, e. g., all first principles, and the great fundamental truths both of mathematics and logic. Then another thing of which these skeptics should be reminded, is that by refusing to put the doctrine of man's future life to the test of experience, they thus deprive themselves of one of the best ways of knowing for sure respecting its verity. The Greatest of all teachers has said, "If any man will do his will"—that is, the will of God—"he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." And just so, we may affirm, it is possible to know the truth respecting the great doctrine of human immortality. That is, by trying it in our own experience; or, as the Scripture enjoins, by setting our affections on things above, not on things upon this earth. Or as a brilliant modern writer has expressed the thought:

To feel assured that one is indeed a son of God, one must live like a son of God. To attain confidence that one lives forever, he must live today like an Immortal.

Thus coming to a knowledge of the truth respecting this great matter of a future life by one's experience in this life, he surely will not be disappointed when the hour of great trial comes.

We recommend, accordingly, to all genuine agnostics, or skeptics of whatever class, to try this doctrine in their own personal experience; and if it does not thus work out to be true, of course reject it. But if, on the other hand, it does work to be true, then the least common sense would suggest that it be accepted. Surely, there is nothing in all the realm of possible human experience that is more important to men than this matter of an endless future life. Shall we find out then whether this doctrine is, or is not, really true?

NOTES TO THE WORK IN
GENERAL

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

Note 1, page 5, PROPER DEFINITION OF THE WORD "SCIENCE"

AS is well known, materialistic and positivistic scholars are accustomed to restrict the meaning of the word "science" to such knowledge as comes to us through the senses, or as can be obtained by external experience; whereas the truth is that we have an internal experience of facts, or realities, just as certainly as we have an external experience of those matters. For instance, we are fully as conscious, and perhaps more so, of our own existence and of the three great activities of the human mind, viz., thinking, feeling, and willing, as we are of anything whatever belonging to the external world; and to deny this is simply to deny our own consciousness. Such being the case, therefore, it naturally follows that to attribute reality only to the external world of matter, and to deny it as belonging to the internal world of mind, is poor philosophy, or poor science. A much better way of regarding those objects is to consider them both objects of knowledge, or of real science; and if materialists would only do this, they would find no difficulty in recognizing the existence of the human soul, or even of immortality as connected with it. Their definition of the word "science" is therefore too small, or limited in its meaning.¹

So also, on the other hand, when materialistic scholars apply the word "science" to each and all of their peculiar doctrines, or theories, or to any one of those doctrines, such, e. g., as that all spiritual existence has no

¹ See Prof. James, *Psychology*, Vol. 1, p. 185; also Bergson as quoted in these Notes, p. 186; McCosh, "Christianity and Positivism," pp. 101-116.

foundation in fact, or that the only really existing thing in all the universe is simply matter, they go away beyond anything that is really known about such matters; or in other words, they are simply speculating, or making assumptions which they cannot prove. And it might be said further, that there is only one real truth to be noted in materialism, which is, that it gives reality to the external world.

Note 2, page 4, BELIEF AND UNBELIEF OF ENGLISH AGNOSTICS

Most of the English agnostics, such as Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, etc., seem to have had an inward struggle between believing in immortality and a rejection of that doctrine. Their scientific theories about the potency and eternity of matter, the capability of mere atheistic evolution, and the like, naturally drew them away from faith, while, on the other hand, the natural sentiments of the heart, or perhaps early training, strongly inclined them toward belief; and, with some of them at least, this inward struggle seems to have continued even to the end. In his old age Darwin confessed that he was, and would have to remain, an agnostic; saying that "amongst a mass of contradictory evidence" he could "see no basis for a future life." Tyndall tried hard, at least during some part of his life, to be an earnest believer. Professor Huxley, as we mention also in another place (Chap. II, p. 15), even said that he would much rather be in hell than to suffer an extinction of personal being. And even Professor Schaefer, in his presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science (at Dundee, 1912), after arguing all the way through in favor of some of the most advanced materialistic notions, in the end uses such language as leads one to suspect that after all he at least half-way believed in the old Christian doctrine of a "happier existence" beyond the grave.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

Note 1, page 13, GREAT WRITERS AND THE ARGUMENT
FROM NATURAL INSTINCT

The argument for immortality, drawn from man's natural instinct prompting him to believe in an after-life, seems to be a favorite one with great writers; at all events, they have often used it. So, e. g., Goethe:

You ask me what are the grounds for this belief [in immortality]? The greatest is that we cannot do without it.

So also Victor Hugo:

The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes with the twilight, to open with the dawn. . . I feel that I have not said the thousandth part of what is in me. . . The thirst for infinity proves infinity.

And, Theodore Parker, in his great sermon on *The Immortal Life*, affirms:

All men desire to be immortal. This desire is instinctive, natural, universal. . . It belongs to the human race. You may find nations so rude that they live houseless, in caverns of the earth, nations that have no letters, not knowing the use of bows and arrows, fire, and even clothes, but no nation without a belief in immortal life.

Note 2, page 15, ANNIHILATION INTOLERABLE TO GREEK
MIND

Plutarch observes that the idea of annihilation was so intolerable to the Greek mind, that if they had no other choice left them between entire extinction and an eternity of torment in Hades, they would have chosen the latter. Also he says that almost all the Greeks, both men and women, would have surrendered themselves to the teeth of Cerberus or the buckets of the Danaidæ, rather than to nonentity. (See Salmond's "Christian Doctrine of Immortality," p. 610.)

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

Note 1, page 25, IMPORTANT WORKS ON THE CELL

The cell has been briefly defined as "a nucleated unit-mass of living protoplasm." Many learned works have been written upon this little structure, telling all about its peculiarities, activities, history, etc. Of such works produced in America, probably none is more thorough-going and important than Prof. E. B. Wilson's volume, entitled "The Cell in Development and Inheritance" (New York, 1896). Also Professor Conn's little book, entitled "The Story of the Living Machine," is a good exposition of the subject.

Note 2, page 26, CHEMISTS CANNOT PRODUCE ORGANIZED MATTER

Chemists can produce dead organic matter, such as protein, urea, indigo, etc., but not organized or really living matter. Only life itself can do that, or transform dead matter into living matter. Professor Conn, of Wesleyan University, says:

Protoplasm is not a chemical compound, but a mechanism. . . Unorganized protoplasm does not exist. . . It could never have been produced by chemical process. Chemistry has produced starches, fats, albumens, but not protoplasms.

Note 3, page 29, GREAT MYSTERY OF LIFE

Regarding the great mystery of life, Professor Conn tells us that, although a scientific explanation of the "life substance" has been assiduously sought during the last fifty years or more, the solution of the mystery is "as far off as ever," or that "the solution has retreated before us even faster than we have advanced toward it" ("Story of the Living Machine," p. 128). So also G. F. Elliot, another biologist, says of protoplasm, which is usually regarded as the earliest form or manifestation of

life, that we are still in a state of "hopeless ignorance" as to "what it is, how it is, and how it lives, dies, and reproduces itself."

Note 4, page 29, **VARIOUS DEFINITIONS OF LIFE**

The definition we have given of life is of course only a popular one, intended merely to describe some of the offices performed by this principle. Various other definitions made by specialists in science are as follows: Kerner pronounces the life-principle a "vital force"; Huxley calls it an "organizing power"; Cope terms it a "growth force"; Williams, a "genetic energy"; Henslow, "self-adaptation"; Eimer, "self-direction"; and Haeckel, as we note in one or two other places, had of necessity to postulate a kind of "soul," or psychic principle, in all matter, even in every atom, in order to account for the intelligence everywhere manifested in nature. But probably the most eminent vitalist now living is Dr. Hans Driesch, of Leipzig, Germany; and his view is somewhat like that of old Aristotle living away back more than twenty centuries ago, who held that life was a kind of autonomy, or that it had within itself a principle of development and growth. So Doctor Driesch believes that life is a real autonomy, containing within itself a principle of self-direction, as well as of development and growth. Of course, it contains also a principle of self-propagation.

Note 5, page 30, **DISTINGUISHED VITALISTS AND MECHANISTS**

As said above, probably the most eminent vitalist of today is Hans Driesch, of Germany; but other recent German scholars who hold to the vitalistic doctrine are Reinke, Schneider, Gustav Wolff, Pauly, Bunge, Noll, and still others. In Great Britain probably Sir Oliver Lodge stands at the head; also Alfred Russell Wallace was a strong vitalist. Likewise of late, Prof. J. Arthur

Thompson, of Aberdeen University, Doctor Haldane, and H. R. Jennings, have been doing important service in the interest of vitalism. In our own country some of its active representatives have been Prof. E. B. Wilson, of Columbia University; Prof. W. K. Brooks, of Johns Hopkins University; John Burroughs, Dr. J. S. Christison, and others. Just now both in Europe and America quite an extensive movement seems to be forming, called the "New Vitalism," which promises strong opposition to some of the materialistic doctrines. Of the materialists themselves, it need only be said that they are all, and of necessity, on the side of the mechanistic doctrine. One of their prominent representatives in our country is Prof. Jacques Loeb, of the Rockefeller Institute, New York; and another, in Great Britain, is Prof. E. A. Schaefer, of Edinburgh University.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

Note 1, pages 47, 53, MAN NOT MERELY A PSYCHOPHYSICAL ORGANISM

The materialistic argument in disproof of man's immortality, based on the association of mind with the brain, can be stated differently, and really stronger than we have given it on the pages above indicated. One can affirm, e. g., that the human soul is only a part of the human organism, or in other words, that man is not a compound being in the sense that his two natures, body and soul, are distinct entities joined together only in some mechanical way; but these natures are rather to be considered as inseparable parts of one whole, the tie connecting them being one of life. Accordingly, modern physiological psychology, with its strong tendency toward materialism, is accustomed to speak of man as being a *psycho-physical organism*—merely an *organism*, having nothing of a higher or more spiritual nature connected with it. Then moreover, if this theory is correct, it natu-

rally follows that when this peculiar organism perishes, its two component parts—body and soul—must perish together. For it would be a strange thing indeed, in the realm of nature, for only one part of an organism to perish and not also the other.

Looked at therefore merely upon its surface, this argument of the materialists seems to be peculiarly strong; still it can, we think, be answered without much difficulty. For, in the first place, we need only to say that nobody knows exactly how the human soul is united to the body. It may be that the connection is only one of a residential nature, which would seem to be the teaching of the Bible regarding this matter. Then also, as far as science throws any light upon the subject, its teaching is that, however intimately the soul, or mind, is connected with the body, or more particularly with the nervous system, such connection does not involve any real dependence of the mind upon the body for its existence. The relation is rather one of mutual influence and of parallel activity, not by any means a relation signifying that one of these entities owes its existence to the other. Putting therefore these two teachings together, the inference is plain that whenever the materialists assert that the soul could not live independently of the body, they go farther than they have any warrant for going. In other words, they merely dogmatize, putting assumption in the place of fact.

Then another strong contention—so it appears to us—against this theory of man's being only a psycho-physical organism, is the fact that the properties of mind are very different from those of matter. As we have represented in another place (*viz.*, Chap. VI, p. 57), the properties of mind are thought, feeling, purpose, self-activity, and self-consciousness; whereas the properties of matter are extension, weight, divisibility, inertia, etc. Such being therefore the vast difference between these two entities, one can by no means be transmuted into the other. Neither can the two be united in the form of an organism.

For an organism is made up simply of life and matter; but the human spirit, or the soul, is something very different from mere animal or perishable life. Such being the case, it of course follows that the spiritual nature of man cannot be classified with mere organic being; it is a very different kind of existence, and is not subject to the laws and conditions of mere animal life. The soul is therefore, when properly considered, neither an organism nor any part of an organism.

To be sure, man has a body as well as a spiritual nature, or soul; and in his body man is truly an organism; but not so with man's spiritual nature, or the soul. As already said, that is something above and beyond mere animal life. That is really an immortal principle. In its nature the soul is like unto God; and since God can by no means be conceived of as an organism, or a being made up of parts, neither can the soul. It must therefore be considered as something very different from a mere organism, or even from a part of an organism. Or, if the soul is to be considered as united to the body vitally, then there must be a higher life for the soul; so that even after its separation from the body, it can continue to live.

**Note 2, page 48, BERGSON ON CERTAINTY OF KNOWLEDGE
RESPECTING SELF-EXISTENCE**

Regarding the certainty of our knowledge respecting our own existence, Mr. Bergson, the well-known philosopher so much in favor just now, says:

The existence of which we are most assured and which we know best is unquestionably our own, for of every other object we have notions which may be considered external and superficial, whereas, of ourselves, our perception is internal and profound. ("Creative Evolution," p. 1.)

Note 3, page 51, LONGEVITY AND THE MENTAL POWERS

As an offset to Professor Haeckel's doctrine of "Ontogenesis," or that the mental powers of men always de-

cline with advanced years, the following facts may be noticed. Victor Hugo published some of his most striking works, such as his "Pope" and his "Tornequada," after having passed his seventy-fifth birthday; the latter named work being produced when the author was at the age of eighty-one. The great philosopher Kant wrote his famous "Critique of Pure Reason" after having passed middle life, and he was seventy-four years old when he gave to the world his last important treatise, which was on anthropology. Gladstone became premier of Great Britain for the fourth time at the age of eighty-three. Isaac Newton and Herbert Spencer up to their deaths at eighty-three gave continual proofs of their intellectual vigor. Lord Palmerston died in power as premier of Great Britain at the age of eighty-one. John Wesley preached up to the age of eighty-eight. Tennyson wrote his immortal poem, "Crossing the Bar," at the age of eighty-three. At seventy-three Wordsworth was made poet-laureate of England. Longfellow and Washington Irving both did some of their most important literary work at seventy-five, and afterward. Tolstoy was an old man, eighty-two years of age, when he died; and everybody knows how versatile and vigorous was his pen, even to the last. Many other similar illustrations both from ancient and modern times could be given, but the above are sufficient to establish the fact that intellectual powers do not always decline, or become feeble, when the body grows old and more or less infirm.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

Note 1, page 58, JOHN FISKE ON RELATION OF THOUGHT TO CELL ACTIVITY

John Fiske says regarding the materialistic doctrine of thought being a product of cell activity, that:

although thought and feeling are always manifested in connection with a peculiar form of matter, yet by no possibility can

thought and feeling be in any sense the product of matter. . . It is not even correct to say that thought goes on in the brain. What goes on in the brain is an amazingly complex series of molecular movements, with which thought and feeling are in some unknown way correlated, not as effects or as causes, but as concomitants. ("Destiny of Man," p. 109.)

Note 2, page 66, MATERIALISTS' ADMISSION OF MIND-
POWER IN NATURE

The existence of a psychic principle in nature is not only taught by Haeckel; but Max Verworn, Professor Naegeli, and many other materialists are compelled to make the same admission. Alfred Russell Wallace even says that all

our greatest authorities [in science] admit the necessity of some mind—some organizing and directive power—in nature; but they seem to contemplate merely some unknown forces or some rudimentary mind in cell or atom. Such vague and petty suppositions, however, do not meet the necessity of the problem. I admit that such forces and such rudimentary mind-power may and probably do exist, but I maintain that they are wholly inadequate, and that some vast intelligence, some pervading spirit is required to guide these lower forces in accordance with a preordained system of evolution of the organic world. ("World of Life," p. 333.)

Thus this distinguished scientist comes pretty near to recognizing the existence of a true personal God, such as is revealed in our Christian Scriptures; and he does this, it should be remembered, on distinctly scientific grounds.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

Note 1, page 95, NOTED MEDIUMS EXAMINED BY THE
BRITISH SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

The four or five most extraordinary mediums whose special phenomena were investigated by the British Society for Psychical Research or some of its members,

were Mrs. Leonora F. Piper, of Arlington, Mass.; Daniel Douglas Home, born in Scotland, but spending most of his early life in America, and dying in France; the Rev. William Stinton Moses, of the Isle of Wight, England; Miss Eusapia Paladino, a native of Italy; and Miss Florence Cook, resident of a small town in England. Each of these mediums had his or her more or less peculiar phenomena, but those occurring through the agency of Mrs. Piper are generally considered the most important. Moreover, it has been said of Mrs. Piper that she, "more than any other medium, has been the means of converting to the spiritualistic hypothesis nearly all the prominent investigators of psychic phenomena." For over twenty years she was under the strict surveillance of this British Society, and never for once was she detected, or even suspected, of fraud in bringing about her "manifestations." These were mostly of an intellectual description, consisting of what were represented to be communications with the spirit world; these communications being delivered by her automatically, either by writing or speaking. So also the phenomena induced through the agency of Mr. Home was very interesting, and some of them extraordinary, and he, too, has been accredited with being a thoroughly honest medium. Indeed, that characteristic seems to have belonged to all the above-named individuals, with one exception—this being Miss Eusapia Paladino. She has quite a number of times been caught in using trickery to help on her peculiar displays. Still many of her performances have been so exceedingly marvelous and beyond the ordinary, that, despite her deception, she has been believed, at least by most of her investigators, to possess real and very remarkable mediumistic powers. Of late she seems to have fallen largely out of notice, the public press making little or no mention of her.

This is all, we think, that need be said of the mediums here.

Note 2, page 98, WAS PROF. WILLIAM JAMES A
SPIRITUALIST?

In Volume IV, pp. 350-357, of "Proceedings of the American Society for Psychical Research," is found a report made by Prof. William James of certain phenomena occurring with Mrs. Piper when under hypnotic influence. In this report Mr. James seems to endorse without reserve the spiritualistic interpretation of such phenomena. In other of his writings, however, he is more reticent, not seeming willing to commit himself fully on the subject; his view appearing to be that while the spiritualistic theory was the best all-round interpretation, there were some serious difficulties connected with it. Possibly therefore his mind varied from one view to another; or a better representation would be, as is expressed in Chapter IX, that he suspended judgment on the question, hoping for fuller information respecting it.

NOTES TO SUPPLEMENT

Note 1, page 152, NEW VIEW OF MATTER AS RELATED
TO FORCE

It was the impossibility of finding in mere matter, or in the atoms, any of the elements of real causation that led scientists to take a changed view of matter itself. The old theory used to be that matter was the cause of all things, and that force, or energy, was only a property of matter; but the notion now held, at least by many scholars, is that force is fundamental and matter is only the manifestation of force.

Note 2, page 153, ARISTOTLE'S VIEW OF IMMORTALITY

Aristotle does not seem to have anywhere fully defined his view respecting immortality; but, from what we know of his belief, he seems not to have held to that doctrine. He says of death, that it is "of all things the most to be

feared," and "it appears to be the end of everything"; and that "for the deceased there appears to be no longer either any good or any evil."

Note 3, page 154, W. R. ALGER ON PREDOMINANCE OF
GREAT BELIEVERS

Speaking of the weight of authority that might come from the fact of so large a majority of the great thinkers and scholars being on the side of faith in immortality, Mr. W. R. Alger says, in his "Critical History," that "the company of great believers would incomparably outshine and a thousand times outweigh the army of those who deny this doctrine." All of which is true; only the statement, strong as it is, falls short of the real facts in such comparison.

(END OF NOTES PROPER)

SPIRITISM AND THE GREAT WAR—A HISTORICAL NOTE

(To connect with article on "Raymond," pp. 137-143)

As everybody knows, there has taken place in connection with the great European war, recently brought to an end, what may be called a fresh and wide-reaching outbreak of spiritistic doctrine and phenomena. These phenomena have been mostly in the shape of visions, dreams, mediumistic communications, apparitions, and the like. For instance, it has been reported that sometimes on the field of battle, in the midst of all the excitement and dangers existing there, guardian angels have appeared, to encourage the soldiers in their work, or to care for them when in distress or dying; and on one occasion, it is claimed that a whole legion of medieval soldiers, armed with bows and arrows, made their appearance, to assist the Allies in withstanding, or turning back, a fierce drive which at that time was being made by the German army. Also forewarnings of events to

occur in the future were not infrequently given to different soldiers. Indeed, so numerous and so widely varied in form have been these phenomena, as reported, that—as in the case of Sir Oliver Lodge's book entitled "Raymond"—quite an extensive new literature has lately come into existence; its purpose being to describe and explain the meaning of these new phenomena, or perhaps also it was, with the aid of these phenomena, to strengthen the argument which can be made from older occurrences of the same nature for the truth of the spiritistic doctrine in general.

But this whole subject is much too large for us here to undertake any special discussion of it; so we shall only give the names of some of the publications which constitute the new literature referred to, leaving it to the reader to decide for himself what value, or lack of value, may be connected with these new works, if he cares to read them.

However, it might be stated that, in our judgment, and so far as we have been able to examine these new publications, they do not, all of them taken together, furnish so strong an argument for the truth of the spiritistic teaching as was done by some older phenomena—that is, phenomena occurring even before the war, and which were examined by the British Society for Psychical Research and its auxiliaries.

The new publications, then, to which we have referred, are as follows—the list being additional to Sir Oliver Lodge's book above mentioned: First comes a book written by Sir Conan Doyle, entitled "The New Revelation," which, we might say, has been read quite widely. Next follows a publication given to the world by Prof. William Barrett, the title of which is "On the Threshold of the Unseen"; and then comes still another book, written by Arthur Hill, the name of which is "Spiritism, Its History, Phenomena, and Doctrine." And last on the list, although still others of less significance could be men-

tioned, is a volume prepared by our American author, Hereward Carrington, its name being "The Psychical Phenomena of the War." These different publications will give one a pretty good idea of this later movement, as it may be called, in the interest of spiritism; although, of course, we do not endorse all, or perhaps not any great part of what is said in any or all of these books. And not all of them, it might still be observed, devote much space to a consideration of the special phenomena that occurred during the war; only some of them do so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Digitized by Google

BIBLIOGRAPHY

IN Alger's "Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life," Dr. Ezra Abbot gives a list of over five thousand different publications on the general subject of immortality; many of them dating back to early Christian times, and some still further back. As might be expected, most of this literature is old and not of much service to us; but the vastness of it shows how extensive and profound has been the interest taken in the subject, an interest that seems to have been literally world-wide, and to have continued down the centuries even from the time of Plato, and before that, until now. Below we give, with a few exceptions, a catalogue only of some of the more recent works upon the subject; classifying them, so far as has seemed practicable, under the heads of scientific publications, philosophical treatises, religious treatises, general discussions of the subject, and history of the doctrine.

1. SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS BEARING UPON IMMORTALITY

- James, William: "Human Immortality," Boston, 1898.
"The Will to Believe," New York, 1897.
- Lodge, Sir Oliver: "Continuity," Birmingham address, London and Toronto, 1913.
"The Survival of Man," New York, 1909.
"Raymond, or Life and Death," New York, 1916.
- Hyslop, James H.: "Life After Death," New York, 1918.
"Contact with the Other World," New York, 1919.

- Meyers, F. W. H.: "Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death," two volumes condensed into one and edited by his son, New York, 1907.
- "Science and a Future Life," London, 1907.
- Barrett, Sir Wm. F.: "On the Threshold of the Unseen," New York, 1917.
- Hill, J. Arthur: "Spiritism, Its History, Phenomena, and Doctrine," New York, 1919.
- Hudson, T. J.: "The Law of Psychic Phenomena," Chicago, 1894.
- "Scientific Demonstration of a Future Life," Chicago, 1907.
- Frank, Henry: "Modern Light on Immortality," Boston, 1909.
- D'Albe, Fournier: "New Light on Immortality," London, 1908.
- Elbé, Louis: "Future Life in the Light of Ancient Wisdom and Modern Science," Chicago, 1906.
- Thomson, W. H.: "Brain and Personality," New York, 1907.
- "Life, Death, and Immortality," New York, 1911.
- Thompson, R. J.: "Proofs of Life After Death," Boston, 1908.
- Maeterlinck, Maurice: "Our Eternity," New York, 1913.
- Fiske, John: "Life Everlasting," Boston, 1901.
- "Destiny of Man Viewed in the Light of His Origin," Boston, 1899.
- Dickinson, G. L.: "Is Immortality Desirable?" Boston, 1909.
- Dole, C. F.: "The Hope of Immortality," New York, 1906.
- Fechner, G. T.: "Life After Death," new ed., Chicago, 1906.

- Savage, Minot J.: "Life Beyond Death," New York, 1901.
- Funk, Isaac K.: "The Widow's Mite and Other Psychic Phenomena," New York, 1911.
"The Psychic Riddle," New York, 1907.
- Podmore, Frank: "Modern Spiritualism, a History and Criticism," London, 1902.
- Carrington, Hereward: "Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism," Boston, 1907.
- Wallace, Alfred Russell: "Miracles and Modern Spiritualism," London, 1885. ✓
"The World of Life," London, 1910.
- Crookes, Sir William: "Researches into the Phenomena of Modern Spiritualism," Rochester, N. Y., 2d ed., 1905. ✓
- Flournoy, Theo.: "Spiritism and Psychology," tr. and abridged, with introduction, by H. Carrington, New York, 1911.
- Bruce, H. A.: "The Riddle of Personality," New York, 1908.
- Schaefer, E. A.: "Nature, Origin, and Maintenance of Life," Glasgow address, "Science," Sept. 6, 1912.
- Driesch, Hans: "Science and Philosophy of the Organism," 2 vols., London, 1908.
- Thomson, Arthur: "Is There a Science of Nature?" "Hibbert Journal," vol. 10, pp. 110-129, also pp. 308-327.
- Burroughs, John: "The New Vitalism," "North American Review," vol. 196, pp. 759-771. .
- Loeb, Jacques: "The Mechanistic Conception of Life," Chicago, 1912.
- Ritter, W. E.: "Controversy Between Materialism and Vitalism," "Science," N. S., 33.

2. PHILOSOPHICAL TREATISES HAVING TO DO WITH MAN'S FUTURE LIFE

Plato: Dialogues, especially the "Phædo," the "Apology," the "Phædrus," and the "Timæus," Jowett's trans., London, 1892.

Cicero: "Tusculan Disputations," first book, "Scipio's Dream" and extracts from "Old Age" and "Friendship," in Latin, with Eng. notes by Thos. Chase, Cambridge, Mass., 5th ed., 1863.

Gaye, R. K.: "The Platonic Conception of Immortality and Its Connection with the Theory of Ideas." London, 1904.

Royce, Josiah: "The Conception of Immortality," Boston, 1900.

Gordon, G. A.: "Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy, and Life," Boston, 1900.

Kant's "Critique of the Practical Reason," trans. by T. K. Abbott, London, 1909.

Paulsen's "System of Ethics," trans. by Frank Thilly, New York, 1900.

Ladd's "Philosophy of Religion," vol. II, chaps. XLIV and XLV, New York, 1900.

Bowne, Borden P.: "Present Status of the Argument for Life After Death," "North American Review," vol. 191, pp. 99-104.

Eucken, Rudolph: "Problem of Immortality," "Hibbert Journal," vol. VI, pp. 836-851.

McConnell, L. D.: "The Evolution of Immortality," New York, 1904.

3. RELIGIOUS TREATISES HAVING TO DO WITH MAN'S FUTURE LIFE

Salmond, S. D. F.: "The Christian Doctrine of Immortality," Edinburgh, 1900.

- Chambers, Arthur: "Man and the Spiritual World," Philadelphia, 1900.
- Brown, W. A.: "The Christian Hope," New York, 1912.
- Strong's "Systematic Theology," vol. III, pt. VIII, pp. 981-1056, Philadelphia, 1909.
- Clarke's "Outline of Christian Theology," pt. VI, pp. 428-480, New York, 1899; ~~Philadelphia, 1899~~
- Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology," vol. III, pp. 713-880, New York, 1873.
- Dorner's "System of Christian Doctrine," vol. II, pp. 84-88; vol. IV, pp. 373-434, Edinburgh, 1883.
- Muirhead, L. A.: "Eschatology of Jesus," Glasgow, 1904.
"The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testament," Glasgow, 1908.
- Kennedy, H. A. A.: "St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things," London, 1904.
- Orr, James: "The Resurrection of Jesus," New York, 1908.
- Milligan, William: "The Resurrection of Our Lord," New York, 1894.
- Westcott, B. F.: "Gospel of the Resurrection," New York, 1874.
- Lake, Kersopp: "Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ," London, 1907.
- Uhlhorn, J. G. W.: "The Resurrection of Christ as a Soteriologico-Historical Fact," in Bremen Lectures, pp. 211-248, Philadelphia, 1897.
- Loofs, Friedrich, "*Die Auferstehungsberichte*," New York, 1898.
- Bartlett, S. C.: "Life and Death Eternal," Boston, 1866.

4. GENERAL DISCUSSIONS OF THE SUBJECT

- Salmond, S. D. F.: op. cit., entire book.
- Elbé, Louis: op. cit., entire book.

- Jefferson, Chas. E.: "Why We May Believe in Life After Death," Boston, 1911.
- Chester, William: "Immortality a Rational Faith," New York, 1903.
- Brown, W. A.: "The Christian Hope," New York, 1912.
- Spindle, Simeon: "The Belief in Immortality," "Journal of Religious Psychology," Jan., 1912, Worcester, Mass.
- Smyth, Newman: "Modern Belief in Immortality," New York, 1910.
- Weldon, J. E. E.: "The Hope of Immortality," London, 1898.
- Delanne, G.: "Evidence of a Future Life," New York, 1904.
- Schneider, W.: "*Das Andere Leben*," Paderborn, 1902.
- Andersen, K.: "*Die Unsterblichkeitsfrage*," Leipzig, 1906.
- Hillis, Newell Dwight: "Foretokens of Immortality," New York, 1897.
- Holmes, J. H.: "Is Death the End?" New York, 1915.
- Fosdick, H. E.: "The Assurance of Immortality," New York, 1915.

5. HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE

- Alger, W. R.: "Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life," Philadelphia, 1864.
- Salmond, S. D. F.: op. cit., first three chaps.
- Elbé, Louis: op. cit., pt. One.
- Charles, R. H.: "Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity," New York, 1898-1899.
- Adam, J.: "The Religious Teachers of Greece," Edinburgh, 1908.

- Budge, E. A. W.: "Egyptian Ideas of a Future Life," London, 1899.
- Jastrow, Morris: "Religious Beliefs in Babylonia and Assyria," New York, 1911.
- Hopkins, E. W.: "Religions of India," Boston, 1895.
- "Teachings of Zoroaster and the Philosophy of the Parsi Religion," New York, 1908.

For the doctrine among the Chinese see:

- Elbé, Louis: *op. cit.*, pp. 34-49.
- Nevius, J. L.: "China and the Chinese," New York, 1869.

For the belief among uncivilized peoples and prehistoric races see:

- Fraser, J. G.: "Belief in Immortality and Worship of the Dead," 2 vols., London, 1913.
- Lord Avebury (John Lubbock): "Prehistoric Times," Edinburgh, 1900.
- Edward, Clodd: "Primitive Man," New York, 1909.
- Count D'Alviella: "Origin and Growth of the Conception of God," "Hibbert Lectures, 1891, London.