



Peace Haven

12630 Rott Road
St. Louis, MO 63127
314.965.3833

Peace Haven is pleased to share this inspirational talk given by Dr. Laurance Doyle on April 1, 2017. You can also listen to an audio version of the full talk on our website phcsn.org under “Inspirational Talks.”

The Unreality of Matter by Dr. Laurance R. Doyle April 1, 2017

One time, when a student of Mary Baker Eddy’s had failed to heal a case, Mrs. Eddy told her to “Strike out for a higher nothingness of matter.” That is what we are going to be doing today—getting a better sense of the nothingness of matter. And we shall simultaneously be getting a better sense of the substantiality—actually the allness—of Spirit, which is another name for God. The former slave and abolitionist, Sojourner Truth, once said, “God is the great house that holds all His children; we dwell in Him as the fishes dwell in the seas.” So, to her, God fills all space. Mary Baker Eddy, the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science, writes, “God is one. The allness of Deity is His oneness.” (*Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* 267:5-6). It makes sense, then, that if God is infinite, there is nothing outside of Him/Her. How can we conceive this?

Mrs. Eddy writes about conceiving the infinitude of God. “[God] fills all space, and it is impossible to conceive of such omnipresence and individuality except as infinite Spirit or Mind. Hence all is Spirit and spiritual” (*S&H* 331: 22-25). So part of conceiving the infinitude of God is to see God as Spirit or Mind. Conceiving God as Spirit, or Mind, we can see that limitations do not apply—either spatial or temporal. In the first chapter of Genesis, God, or Elohim, creates in an unlimited way, by letting. To let is to allow the expression of. It has an ongoingness about it rather than a beginning. And in this creation, the expression is God’s image and likeness. So an unlimited Mind can only think up, create, unlimited ideas like itself. So all the ideas of creation are also unlimited. In contrast to creating by letting, in the second chapter of Genesis it is Lord God, or Jehovah, who creates man from dust, or matter. And the method of this second so-called creation is by forming, an automatic limitation built into the assumption of a matter or dust creation. The concept of limitation is introduced when creation is formed in matter. In this hypothetical creation, the Lord God breaks the Second Commandment by making a graven image and likeness of God, and calling it “man.”

Skeptics about the substantiality of Spirit, and the consequent insubstantiality of matter, should consider the well-used mathematical example of the chalk on the board. I use this analogy a lot because it opens up thinking to consider that the spiritual is more substantial than the so-called substance of matter. In a nutshell, it can be unequivocally stated that, “The mathematics is not in the chalk.” The Principle of mathematics never enters the chalk. Nor do any of the numbers expressing this Principle. Math is not limited to chalk, so that chalk is not a requirement for the expression of mathematics. Numbers do not require chalk to be expressed. Here in our analogy, of course, the Principle of mathematics is God, Life Itself, and the numbers are the expressions or ideas of God, infinite Mind; and the chalk is matter – the idea that life and creation are material. If there is a correctly written sum, or correctly balanced equation on the chalkboard (younger generation say “white board”), is this mathematics? Well, yes, in the sense that it is a limited way of looking at real, unlimited ideas. In this sense, a healthy body is a better expression of the perfect creation of God than a sick body.

But unlike the real idea, the chalk can also seem to express mistakes which the spiritual can never do. Mathematics, of course, can never make a mistake, and its expression in numbers can never be mistaken or

limited. This is what Christian Science means when we are taught to start with “. . . perfect God and perfect man, – as the basis of thought and demonstration” (S&H 259:13-14). If one starts with the evidence before the material senses, the chalk evidence, then it seems that the expression of numbers is a mixture of correct and incorrect answers, and also permanently limited. If mathematicians believed that numbers were in the chalk, then a quest after mathematics in the universe would be looking for places that could produce chalk. One would require chalk to do mathematics and have to wait for a piece of chalk before being able to calculate. And another large disadvantage is that the chalk would eventually be erased from the board, so that even correct and beautiful mathematical writings would eventually disappear. Well, no mathematicians I know of believe that the math is in the chalk. They know that the real substance of mathematics is mental, and there is perfection inherent in mathematics in the sense that it does not admit of any mistakes, not one.

However, there seems to be a current notion that the substance of Life is material—limited and temporal—and that there is inherent imperfection in the expression of Life. Yet even natural science shows that the evidence of the material senses is unreliable—whether it is the perception of a flat Earth, the Sun circling the Earth, or any other misperception. Such misperceptions are based on taking the material sense so-called evidence as reliable. However, we know the Earth is round and orbits the Sun because here science has disputed the material sense evidence with the evidence of intelligence. Natural science is not about taking the evidence of the material senses as the final work—it is about taking the evidence of intelligence as more reliable than the evidence of the material senses. As the mathematician and philosopher Bertrand Russell put it, “Physics is based upon the idea that things are as they appear; and then it proceeds to prove that things are not as they appear.” Mary Baker Eddy writes, “Science shows appearances often to be erroneous, and corrects these errors by the simple rule that the greater controls the lesser. The sun is the central stillness, so far as our solar system is concerned, and the earth revolves about the sun once a year, besides turning daily on its own axis. . . As thus indicated, astronomical order imitates the action of divine Principle; and the universe, the reflection of God, is thus brought nearer the spiritual fact, and is allied to divine Science as displayed in the everlasting government of the universe” (S&H 121: 22-32).

So we have introduced some analogies to help guide thinking in the direction we are headed—that matter is insubstantial (in Christian Science matter is completely unreal) and that the spiritual is the substantial (in Christian Science the only substance). But is this what is really going on? In the teachings of Christian Science, Christ Jesus was a scientist whose mission was to reveal the spiritual nature of reality by healing and overcoming all limitations, even death. He did not come to impress people into a certain religious behavior or as an appeasement to an anthropomorphic deity that somehow required a blood sacrifice to find the magnanimity to forgive. Jesus said he had come to bear witness to the truth (see John 18:37). Jesus’ great mission was to reveal that reality – and that Reality, is perfect. God, the Creator, whom he called “Father,” is unchanging Love – as unchanging as the principle of mathematics—and also the only Mind, being the infinite Mind. This creation he demonstrated by healing, and overcoming limits of any kind. He taught that Truth itself is our Father, our Source, our Creator.

So here in the modern age, might we be seeing a trend toward matter being more substantial, or are we seeing trends more toward the mental nature of the universe? The famous British astronomer, Sir Arthur Eddington, was the first person to confirm Einstein’s General Theory of Relativity by observing a total solar eclipse in 1919. This made Einstein instantly famous around the world. Eddington once wrote, “It is difficult for the matter-of-fact physicist to accept the view that the substratum of everything is of mental character. But no one can deny that mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience, and that everything else is remote inference.” I think it is interesting that a renowned astronomer in the early part of the 19th Century would argue that the foundational reality is of a mental nature, and that matter, for example, was a “remote inference.” When I read this I often think of the phrase, “the matter-*as*-fact physicist.”

The folks in the natural science community that are at the frontiers of asking what the nature of substance is today, are the quantum physicists who are involved with what is widely known as “the measurement

problem.” In classical science, there is an experimenter who does an experiment and what he knows about the experiment does not affect the experiment at all. In what is called “modern science” things are a bit different as it seems that what the experimenter knows or can know about the experiment actually affects the results. This is the measurement problem—it appears that the consciousness of the observer, via what they can know or not know about the experiment—seems to be able to enter into the experimental results. This, of course, has only been demonstrated for single or a few particles in various experiments, but the results are nevertheless unequivocal. To put it succinctly, the fundamental notion of objective matter has had to be rejected by the quantum measurement community as simply not possible. For the quantum physics folks in the audience, I’m referring to the exclusion of local reality by the results of experimental violation of Bell’s Inequalities. “Local” here means at the speed of light or slower, and “reality” refers to particles existing whether they are observed or not. “Local reality” has been disproved by many experiments and, in physics lingo, this disproof is called a “violation of Bell’s Inequalities” after John Bell, the great Irish physicist.

Mrs. Eddy wrote in the Victorian Era about the nature of matter as nothing, according to the teachings of Christian Science. In this period, matter was thought to be solid and substantial. While astronomical discoveries, for example, had uncovered the fallacy of relying on the evidence of the material senses, the insubstantial and ethereal nature of matter itself had not yet been discovered by the natural science community. In the latter part of the 19th Century, Ernest Rutherford, a New Zealand physicist working in England, did an experiment where he bombarded a gold foil with alpha particles, which are helium nuclei. Most of the alpha particles went right through but some actually bounced right back to the source. He was actually amazed. The only explanation that made sense was that the atom must be mostly empty space, and that there was a dense nucleus which an alpha particle would occasionally hit and bounce back from. This is the experiment people refer to when they say that the atom is mostly empty space. For example, if one took out all the space between the atoms of planet Earth so that the Earth was a black hole, then the Earth would be about one-half inch in diameter. But modern quantum physics was to go much further.

At this point, I’d like to say where we are going. Mary Baker Eddy was way ahead of her time not just in her understanding of theology and her healing methods. She was also more than a hundred years ahead of her time in science—in the understanding of reality, which is fundamentally what science is all about. She wrote: “Whatever furnishes the semblance of an idea governed by its Principle, furnishes food for thought. Through astronomy, natural history, chemistry, music, mathematics, thought passes naturally from effect back to cause. . . Academics of the right sort are requisite. Observation, invention, study, and original thought are expansive and should promote the growth of mortal mind out of itself, out of all that is mortal” (*S&H* 195:15-22). Through observation, invention, study, and original thought natural science has made progress in the uncovering of the nature of reality in just this direction—in the direction of outgrowing the mortal, limited way of looking at things. In other words, I would say that the quantum physicists are the unknown friends of the Christian Scientists—although they may not know it. (I’m working on it!)

The mainstream theory of substance in quantum physics is called the “Copenhagen Interpretation” after the city where Niels Bohr had his institute. He was Einstein’s main foil, or mental ping-pong partner, in discussing the nature of reality in light of experimental results in quantum physics. I should say that this is the mainstream interpretation but only one of about a dozen interpretations, and that none of these experiments in quantum physics allow objective matter to exist in a usual time like framework. The Copenhagen Interpretation states that matter particles do not exist until they are observed. And remember, this has been the main-stream theoretical interpretation of the underlying reality.

Then the question arises as to what constitutes an observer. Many quantum physicists would say that an observation requires consciousness. So in modern physics it appears that consciousness is tied up with the results of not just a measurement of matter, but with the very existence of matter. It is very remarkable, then, to the natural science community anyway, that Mrs. Eddy wrote, in the Victorian Era, this definition of matter:

“Matter. Mythology; mortality; another name for mortal mind; . . .” (*S&H* 591: 8-9). And elsewhere she wrote: “The material atom is an outlined falsity of consciousness . . .” (*Unity of Good* 35:26-27).

At the Institute for the Metaphysics of Physics at Principia College we are doing some experiments to demonstrate that mortal mind is indeed outgrowing itself through observation, invention, study, and original thought. This process and these discoveries should not surprise the Christian Scientist. When the results of the gold foil experiment indicated the insubstantiality of matter, I’ll bet the Christian Scientists who read about it were not surprised. When the “reluctant metaphysicians”—that’s what I call the quantum physicists—had to conclude from experimental results that not only was matter insubstantial, but somehow related to what the observer could know or not know, again the Christian Scientist would not be surprised. And I think this is about where quantum physics is at this point—in Christian Science language I would say that quantum physics has discovered, as Mrs. Eddy already stated, that matter and mortal mind are the same thing. Matter is a supposed mortal mind limited (or formed) way of looking at reality.

But the Christian Scientist knows that there is more! In Christian Science we know that there is, in reality, no mortal mind. Mrs. Eddy writes that the Sun does not send out little suns, but light (*Ret* 56:22). And that there are not a whole bunch of little minds but only one infinite, divine Mind. Remember, in the Sermon on the Mount Christ Jesus talks about building one’s house/consciousness, on the Rock and not on the sand? Well sand is just a bunch of little rocks, isn’t it? And the Rock Jesus is referring to is the one infinite divine Mind which is God. So if we let our consciousness be that of the divine Mind – that Mind which was in Christ Jesus—and not buy into the notion of many little sandy minds, we shall endure—our house-consciousness will stand—and the winds and storms of mortality cannot affect the immortality of this infinite, divine consciousness.

So can we see any progress toward an omnipresent Mind in the current directions in which the quantum physicists who study its foundational aspects are headed? Well, quantum physicists are certainly discovering—putting it in Christian Science lingo—that matter and mortal mind are aspects of the same thing, like ice and steam. But is quantum physics really approaching the outgrowing of this notion of a mortal mind thinking up matter for an infinite Mind as the Source of all creation? For this, let’s discuss a discovery that Einstein made in the 1930s that was so radical that he didn’t even believe it at the time. It is called “entanglement,” and it indicates that things across the universe can be instantaneously in touch with each other. For decades Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr would go back and forth about various weird aspects of quantum physics. There is a famous story of Bohr picking Einstein up at the train station in Copenhagen and having discussions with him while riding the trolley to the Institute. They, of course, missed their stop and knew it finally when the trolley turned around at the end of the line. They rode back and missed their stop again and realized it when they were back at the train station. So this went on several times. I forget how the story ends but I think that either Niels Bohr’s assistant or his wife finally came to the trolley stop and waved at them and got their attention long enough to tell them to get off the trolley!

But the point is, that when Einstein came up with entanglement, it was so remarkable and unexpected that Bohr described it as a bolt of lightning. And he actually had no reply to it. So Einstein didn’t believe it at first—he thought this underlying instantaneous connectedness (which Irwin Schrödinger, another founder of quantum physics named “entanglement”) was so absurd that it showed that something was missing from quantum physics. He called it instantaneous “spooky action at a distance.” But in the 1960s the quantum physicist already mentioned, named John Bell, came up with an experiment to see if entanglement could be real, and in the 1970s it was shown that, yes, entanglement was real. Instantaneous connectedness, entanglement, became an experimental fact in quantum physics. Now this came as a great surprise to the natural science community and many “matter-as-fact” physicists have tried to ignore it, pretend it is philosophy, or pretend somehow that classical physics is still foundational. But “spooky action” is here to stay. Entanglement should not come as a surprise to the Christian Scientist, of course, when we have read in the

textbook of Christian Science, for example, “Science can heal the sick, who are absent from their healers, as well as those present, since space is no obstacle to Mind” (*S&H* 179: 5-7). This is referring to the one, infinite divine Mind that fills all space.

So is the nothingness of matter and the nothingness of mortal mind (as the notion that one can have a “formed” creation) being outgrown today through observation, invention, study, and original thought? I would say, yes. But for Christ Jesus, Mrs. Eddy, and Christian Scientists this should come as no surprise, for they are, through healing, already demonstrating the nothingness of matter/mortal mind, and the allness of the perfect, infinite, divine Mind whose ideas we are, who thinks us up constantly (and forever), and whose nature as infinite Love produces in us, and everyone, the perfect man and woman. Matter seems to come and go, as we are all aware. Let us consider, then, that Spirit is more substantial than matter. That intelligence is more reliable than material sense observation. And that indestructible and unlimited spiritual qualities are more fundamental than limited material objects.

So what about the role of Christian Science in the 21st Century? In the natural science community the really greatest scientists have been the ones that have unified two apparently separate fields. For example, Isaac Newton unified the terrestrial mechanics of Galileo Galilee with the celestial mechanics of Johannes Kepler in the theory of gravity. James Clerk Maxwell, who has been called the Einstein of the 19th Century, was ten years younger than Mrs. Eddy and he discovered that electricity and magnetism were the same thing, giving us the equations for all modern electrical systems. Einstein, of course, showed that spacetime and gravity were the same phenomenon—that is, that gravity was not a magic force (which Newton said he could not explain – he said, “I form no hypothesis”). Einstein explained that gravity was actually the result of the warping or bending of spacetime itself.

Mary Baker Eddy, who discovered Christian Science in the 19th Century, was also a great unifier in the scientific sense. Christianity is really about unconditional Love. And Science is about unconditional Truth. Mrs. Eddy discovered that Love and Truth were identical, and are actually names, or synonyms, for God, the infinite Creator, and the Source of all Being. I think in the 19th Century Mary Baker Eddy was recognized as a revolutionary in theology. For example, she disputed notions of predestination—that God could sanction eternal punishment. She overturned the idea that God could make mistakes, as another example. She saw infinite Love as just that—infinite, meaning no other source or quality of creation but Love. In the 20th Century, it was shown (for anyone paying attention) that Mrs. Eddy was also a revolutionary in medicine, in healing. For example, she fully explained the placebo effect in which a change in the thought of the patient results in a faith healing. Today the name “placebo” is invoked, but remains wholly unexplained in schools of allopathic medicine. Now, in the 21st Century, we can begin to see that Mrs. Eddy was also very much ahead of her time in science—the discovery of the underlying nature of things—as well. In his book *Mary Baker Eddy: Years of Trial* (Appendix B) Robert Peel writes, “Only after the successive emergence of relativity and quantum theory could even the most rudimentary conceptual bridges be thrown between, for instance, Mrs. Eddy’s explanations of mind, matter, and causation and those of the more philosophically-minded natural scientists.”

Mrs. Eddy states that Christian Science is based upon Christianity as Christ Jesus taught it more than 20 centuries ago. So let’s start with Christ Jesus again to discuss the premise of Christianity being Science. Mrs. Eddy has written about Christ Jesus (*S&H* 313: 23-26), “Jesus of Nazareth was the most scientific man that ever trod the globe. He plunged beneath the material surface of things, and found the spiritual cause.” What did Jesus say of his mission? One thing he said was “To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth” (John 18:37). So he did not say that he came to start a new religion. He said that his purpose was to bear witness to the Truth.

He was asked, “Who bears witness for you, John the Baptist?” He said, essentially, that there is no greater

human authority than John, “But I receive not testimony from man: . . . I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me” (See John 5: 31-33, 34, 36-37). So Christ Jesus said that, rather than even the highest human authority, it was his healing works that were the true test of the truth of what he taught. So we have, perhaps for the first time in history, a statement of the scientific method—that experimental verification is more important and reliable than human authority. And healing is, indeed, the ultimate verification. Christ Jesus also added—in case his disciples were not getting it—“If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.” (John 10:37). So now he is excluding human opinion altogether. Healing works are the only experimental verification of the spiritual reality of God’s creation.

But if such Christian healing is really a science, then others should be able to follow Jesus’ example in demonstrating healing as well. Well, Christ Jesus taught this also. He said, “Verily, verily I say unto you, the works that I do shall ye do also, and greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto my Father.” (John 14: 12). So Jesus taught that this spiritual understanding of healing could be applied by others as well. In other words, Jesus said it was not his personal charisma that healed. He was able to do these healing works because he went unto his Father, turned to God. He was not talking about leaving, he was talking about going to the Source, Creator, the Principle of the universe, divine Love, for the demonstration of his healing works.

So Christ Jesus sounds like a scientist to me. He came to bear witness to “the Truth.” He may have been the first person in history to state that works—one might say, in modern language, experimental verification—is more important than any human authority. And he recommended that we all follow him in doing even greater works by turning to the Principle of the universe, which he called “Father.” Mrs. Eddy re-discovered this Science of Reality that Jesus taught and united the concepts of Christianity and Science. She writes, “It has been said, and truly, that Christianity must be Science, and Science must be Christianity, else one or the other is false and useless; but neither is unimportant or untrue, and they are alike in demonstration. This proves the one to be identical with the other” (*S&H* 135:21-26). Note, again, the scientific statement that if these two are alike in demonstration (experimental verification) then this is the proof of their being identical. This leads to scientific rather than faith healing.

When starting a new science one often has to introduce new terms. Mrs. Eddy did this. She writes, “After the author’s sacred discovery, she affixed the name ‘Science’ to Christianity, the name ‘error’ to corporeal sense, and the name ‘substance’ to Mind” (*S&H* 483: 13-16). We read in one of Mrs. Eddy’s letters to a minister, “Christian Science like all Science must be discovered or learned. It is not a native of the senses and cometh not with observation . . . indeed the testimony of or the evidence before the senses contradict it but not more flatly than they disputed the facts of astronomy and then accepted them through the understanding. . . . It is only more difficult to understand Christian Science than astronomy because the former [Christian Science] wars against the whole mortal man and the latter [astronomy] against only a part of him.” Then she says, “I never know where to stop on this subject.” (*Mary Baker Eddy: Years of Authority*, Robert Peel, p. 112).

So science is not about believing the evidence of the material senses. It is about the evidence of intelligence being regarded actually as more reliable than the evidence of the senses. About 400 years ago this idea really took off with the realization that, in spite of the “obvious” evidence to the contrary, the Earth went around the Sun, rather than the other way around. This took a while to catch on, as one can imagine what a farmer who had plowed his field that morning might have thought of it going around the Sun at 18 ½ miles per second! We still use the terms “sunset” and “sunrise” today. But, as mentioned, science had shown that the evidence of intelligence was a more reliable indicator of reality, or the truth, than the evidence of the so-called material senses. This resulted in the idea that the Earth was not in the center of the universe—where hades was beneath and heaven above—but rather Earth was within the universe, one of the many planets and the Sun one of many stars. Rather than be at the bottom of creation, Earth became a participant in the

universe. And this led to our understanding of the size of the stellar universe vastly expanding by more than ten million trillion times in the next four centuries!

Today, an even more radical scientific revolution is under way. Mrs. Eddy writes, “The sun is not affected by the revolution of the earth. So Science reveals Soul as God, untouched by sin and death,—as the central Life and intelligence around which circle harmoniously all things in the systems of Mind” (S&H 310: 12-17). So today there is a revolutionary idea that we are not the center of our own little minds with heaven elsewhere. Mrs. Eddy states that God, infinite Mind, is the only Mind and that we are the ideas of this Mind which “circle” it “harmoniously.” This is still quite a radical thought because it means that all creation is really infinite divine Mind and its ideas. Since a mind cannot think thoughts unlike that mind, it must be that all of divine Mind’s ideas are its image and likeness.

Mrs. Eddy started a revolution in both Science as well as in Christianity in the 19th Century way ahead of the knowledge of natural science we have today—of the underlying metaphysical nature of things in the field of, for example, quantum physics. To put things in some perspective, Mrs. Eddy was born the same year that Napoleon Bonaparte passed on. This is the same year that scientist Michael Faraday invented the first electric motor. Queen Victoria once asked Faraday, “Of what use is electricity?” and he replied, “Your Highness, of what use is a baby?” When Mary was five years old, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams passed on. When she was 18 years old, photography was invented. When she was 37, Charles Darwin wrote *The Origin of Species*. She would know about the first successful flights of heavier-than-air aircraft invented by the Wright Brothers, and her household would take a keen interest in going to some of the air shows. She would certainly be well read about discoveries in science, including the unexplained energy source of atomic force discovered by Madame and Pierre Curie in the mid-1890s. By 1898 this would even become a topic, “Is the Universe, Including Man, Evolved by Atomic Force?” in the weekly Bible lesson!

But now in the 21st Century, how do Mrs. Eddy’s scientific discoveries—her statements about the nature of consciousness, matter, and reality—match up with and foretell future discoveries of natural scientists? I should say that spiritual healing is the ultimate experimental verification of the truth of Christian Science, as Christ Jesus and Mary Baker Eddy both proved. But what these proofs say about reality—the goal of the scientist to discover—is interesting.

We would find that the Victorian concept of solid matter was incorrect—that matter was mostly empty space. But with the discovery of the quanta of energy by Max Planck in the year 1900, as mentioned, things were to take a much more radical turn. Albert Einstein would win his Nobel Prize in physics for formulating the particle nature of light. A discovery as initially innocent as light coming in little packets or quantities would lead to the mainstream conclusion that matter does not exist until it is observed. It would also lead to an underlying connectedness—the “entanglement” which Einstein discovered but couldn’t quite believe. Light travels about one foot every nanosecond (billionth of a second), and the current record is that entangled particles 143 kilometers apart have been shown to respond to each other within a nanosecond, clearly much faster than even light could have traveled between them. So this instantaneous spooky action has already been demonstrated over significant distances.

Today I do hear people talking about matter being “mostly empty space” using analogies such as: if an atomic nucleus were the size of a pea, then the nearest orbiting electron would be over a mile away, and so on. But what has occurred in quantum physics in the last century is a whole lot more radical than this. It seems that the days of objective matter are over—“There is no local reality to matter” is a way that quantum physicists would put it. The way Mrs. Eddy put it is, “There is no life, truth, intelligence, nor substance, in matter.” And this is because, “All is infinite Mind and its infinite manifestation, for God is All-in-all” (S&H 468:9-11).

As one of the founders of quantum physics, Werner Heisenberg in the first half of the 20th Century, concluded from the experimental results at the time: “Some physicists would prefer to come back to the idea of an

objective real world whose smallest parts exist objectively in the same sense as stones or trees exist independently of whether we observe them. This however is impossible.” So there appears to be an inseparability of the material sense observation itself and the very so-called coming into existence of matter. And yet this is not even the foundational underlying reality. The reality is that all is actually only the one, infinite, divine Mind.

This illusion of material substantiality is admitted in the quantum physics community but is also recognized as not necessarily very easy to overcome. As another famous quantum physics founder, Irwin Schrödinger wrote, “Discoveries in physics cannot, in themselves—so I believe—have the authority of forcing us to put an end to the habit of picturing the physical world as a reality.” So picturing the physical world as a reality is simply a habit which apparently physics alone cannot, by itself, put an end to, according to Schrödinger. Mrs. Eddy writes, “Hence the fact that the human mind alone suffers, is sick, and that the divine Mind alone heals” (*S&H* 270: 29-30). I think Christian Science does have the key to putting an end to this “habit of picturing the physical world as a reality.” It takes the next stately step—that there is only one, infinite, divine Mind that can create.

So 21st century physics has arrived at the point where it is saying that matter is not substantial, long after Mrs. Eddy—with great courage in the midst of Victorian objective materialism—already stated and demonstrated this.

One of the big questions in quantum physics right now is, “What, then, constitutes an observer?” In a way this is asking, “Who, then, is the Creator?” Well, this also depends on what creation is, of course. The few physicists that have tried not to avoid this question generally say that consciousness has to be involved in the explanation of what a measurement is at some level. So we have the interesting situation, for example, that biology is saying that the electrons in the brain synapses produce consciousness, while the quantum physicists are saying that some sort of consciousness is needed to produce any electron, whether it is in the brain or not. Interesting situation—still is.

More and more, it seems that consciousness is coming into play in the quantum physics of the 21st Century. I was just at a Foundational Questions in Physics (FQXi) meeting in August, – which is by invitation only,—a group of about 200 of the top theoretical physicists in the world. Session topics included topics like: What is consciousness? What is reality? Who is the observer? And so on. So how interesting it is to read what Mrs. Eddy wrote over one hundred years ago in *Unity of Good*. She wrote, “The material atom is an outlined falsity of consciousness . . .” (*Unity of Good* 36: 26-27). Mrs. Eddy wrote about reality, “Infinite Mind creates and governs all, from the mental molecule to infinity” (*S&H* 507:24-24). It essentially took the whole 20th Century for physicists to begin to catch up with what Mrs. Eddy had already written about the nature of reality as Mind.

Mrs. Eddy has a chapter in *Science and Health* entitled, “Science, Theology, and Medicine” and I think her contributions to science, specifically, will be more recognized in the 21st Century. As already quoted, Mrs. Eddy has written, “Observation, invention, study, and original thought are expansive and should promote the growth of mortal mind out of itself, out of all that is mortal” (*S&H* 195: 19-22). So why should we be surprised that this is happening in our day?

Thought has been unfolding in the direction of the reality taught by Christ Jesus and re-discovered in Christian Science by Mrs. Eddy. Mrs. Eddy has stated this science clearly and scientifically, and we have only to get to practicing it. So let’s do our experiments in healing Love and demonstrate the Truth that Jesus came to bear witness to. Christian Science heals with reality, and this is scientific.

Thank you!