

THE ESSENCE OF THE PRIMARY PHYSICS

By Cyril W. Davson

. . . author of the remarkable book, 'The Physics of the Primary State of Matter'

IT has always seemed to me somewhat deplorable when scientists are attempting to discuss the origin of things that they become most unscientific, whereas in the techniques their accuracy and clarity are beyond praise. Why is this? I suggest, because science has not yet even sensed that there may be an entirely different functioning, which, to say the least, requires a new discipline in physics—or, better still, a new physics, in fact, a Physics of the Primary State of Matter. The present established physics holds only from the atomic into the techniques. The Primary Physics embraces the functioning from Origin to the Atomic.

Definitions

In present physics everything is defined: force, mass, acceleration, inertia, energy (translatory and rotary), etc., etc., each having its appropriate formula, each formula being linked to the others by algebraic and trigonometrical conversion. But let us be very clear on the major point here—that the above-mentioned definitions *treat only with what force, mass, etc., do, but not with what they are!* This cannot be too strongly emphasised. Furthermore, in the techniques (light, sound, heat, electricity, magnetism—whether pure, or applied as in engineering) this is entirely adequate, but when researching into origin functioning it is insufficient, incomplete.

Is there an ether? What a dismal and unedifying discussion ensues, in which none of the par-

ticipants first clearly specify what they are going to understand under the word "ether"—that condition which pervades all space, or, for some of these undoubtedly brilliant men, does not exist at all. Or, worse still, the statement made lately that scientists believe that everything has originated from energy, without making the slightest effort to define what is to be understood under the word "energy." Finally, by quietly but firmly pushing aside "consciousness," the Fundamental in all nature, as an interloper in the scheme of things, merely because mathematics, or, at least, present mathematics, cannot manipulate it, they demonstrate their unwillingness to take into account the truly basic factor. How, I do ask, can they hope to examine into origin if consciousness, and here I mean the Universal Consciousness in all nature, the one and only *Creative*, is to be eliminated?

The Missing Component

Einstein, with tremendous skill, was working towards origin, but nevertheless I contend that he was rather like a one-legged man supported on crutches, simply because he was only able to deal with one component, the physical component, because that, and that only, was metrical. The other leg, the other component, was missing, or at least unrecognised—the conscious component. The origin force (not the original force—there is no such thing) is conscious-physical. But this great scientist had also vast intelligence,

and towards the end of his life he did say: "I believe there is a *universal spirit*." Exactly so, the *Creative*.

Let us here, however, not be in a hurry; let us probe carefully into the cause of this confusion, lest we fall into the same disorder.

There are at present four kinds of directive agents used in scientific research.

Metaphysics deals with the fundamental nature of things, but its findings can rarely, if ever, be applied to physics and mathematics.

Physics may be said to accept or reject things according to observation confirmed or adjusted by actual experimentation.

Mathematics pays little heed to physical manifestation, its aim is consistency with relation to hypothesis.

Relativity regards space and time as physical concepts.

It will thus be seen that present science has, for examination into origin, four directive operators whose findings are, however, left, so to speak, as four loose ends. So when we ask of science a question regarding origin, we are told: the physicist says this, the mathematician says that, and the metaphysician mumbles something incoherent, whereas the relativist has obviously no truck with the Absolute. Listen carefully to the arguments of any of the four, or indeed all of the four, and you will "come out of the same door wherein you went."

The Infinite Scale

In judging persons, animals or things we use the relevant scale, which is always relative. Why? Because relationships are only comparable in the finite form. For the measurement of Infinity or infinite functioning, so far as the human mind can conceive it, we must use the Infinite Scale. We can express infinity quite simply in numerals. Point nine recurring is the same as One, since it implies that point nine is taken to an infinite number of decimal places. A surd is not absurd because its use is only an approximation. The infinite is the absolute measure of extent, the eternal the absolute measure of time. Absolute speed is Omnipresence; absolute power, Omnipotence; absolute knowledge, Omniscience. All

relative things exist. The Infinite, the Absolute, the Eternal does not—it is Existence. Separation thus only exists in the finite, e.g. space, time, speed, power, love, and all forms of functioning are different, whereas in the Infinite they are one unity, because in the Infinite all things are. This, briefly stated, is the significance of the Infinite Scale.

Now I have used many words but have not defined them. Let me do so now.

Universal-Thought

Consciousness is Directive Impulse—energy is its vehicle. In fact, it is true to say that the only manifest of Consciousness is in energy. So we may say that:

Energy is the operative of Consciousness in metrical, physical form, or, if you prefer it:

Energy is basically the dynamic essence out of the Universal—or God—thought. Thus:

God is the Universal Consciousness—the only Creative, of which all things are derivative, irrespective of condition or form, and whereby all things live, move and have their being—this, of course, refers to form. Whereas, by condition I mean the static state where life is remanent and latent, e.g. substances and the like.

The Universal Consciousness is the great Giver of Life, and this is basic or universal Love, and Love-Universal is therefore the act of giving and maintaining life.

Now the most basic form of energy is that which manifests itself in Universal-Thought. So we may say that Thought-Universal is the vehicle of Consciousness, and *Life is then Thought-form*, which may, of course, manifest in any condition from a cosmic body—a sun or other variant—to an organic body in any of its multifarious stages of development, in fact, from the unicellular to the human being on this planet, and possibly, and probably, limitless unknown forms on the planets of other solar systems.

It will now probably be asked whether this is science or metaphysics. That will naturally depend on what we are going to mean under the appellation—science. My definition of science, for what it is worth, is the knowledge of God (the Universal Consciousness) through Its laws,

and I am indifferent to any less basic definitions.

But we have not finished our definitions, so let us continue them.

What is Space? Which space? Infinite Space, unstimulated; or finite space, stimulated, e.g. a universe?

Space Infinite or finite is Extent. But finite space is tensioned by the Thought-force of the Creative to a generative centre, and therefore has texture. If, for example, a universe had no texture, there could be no manifestation of cosmic bodies. Such bodies must be derived from what is there, that is, from the texture of extent, from the material of finite extent, or, in more familiar language, from the ether which pervades all *finite* space.

Now the controversy begins. I shall be told that some scientists (remember, only some of them) contend that there is no such thing as ether. Emerson said: "Today say in hard words what today thinks; and tomorrow, in hard words, say what tomorrow thinks." And scientists certainly make use of this excellent maxim, freely.

Ether

I define Ether as the texture of finite stimulated space (such as in a universe), and it is obvious that if there is no Ether, there can be no cosmic bodies. What, then, is it that so limits a scientist's horizon; what veils his insight and screens his understanding? Just two things. He has not perceived that the only Creative is Consciousness (Universal or God-consciousness), the fundamental force from which all others are derivatives and the vehicle of which is thought-force, producing thought-forms, organic or otherwise; and, secondly, that energy (as has already been explained) is the operative of Consciousness, and that all functioning in physics or chemistry is first in the *energy-form*, before it manifests in the forms familiar to present science, e.g. ultra-radiation, light, sound, heat, electricity and magnetism. This is not just a statement, at the best to be accepted, or dismissed; it is a whole study. It is, incidentally, the reason why science cannot, as yet, decide whether there is an ether or not. I repeat, you cannot make a cake without the necessary ingredients, and the formation of cosmic bodies bespeaks that the ether must have the necessary ingredients for their formation, which I term the texture of space. But even the most delicate experiments (e.g. the Michelson-Morley)

and the like have apparently failed to detect it. Why? Because the ether is not in the *energy-form*, but in the latent state. It is a static condition in which there is no functioning except when polarisation takes place, and even then it is a very special form of polarisation, resulting in the birth of a cosmic body. Scientific instruments for various forms of measurement are immensely ingenious and accurate, but only for the measurement of phenomena in the secondary states of matter; they are utterly useless and inapplicable in the primary state, because the functioning there (as has already been stated) is entirely different.

Materialised Energy

I note that I have used the word "matter." There are, I believe, sects which affirm, and with conviction, that there is no such thing as matter, and assert, as all sects do, dogmatically, that there is only *thought*, but without understanding that thought (God-thought) is creative and thus produces various forms of derivatives—one particular form of these we term "matter," which is just as real as that from which it is derived. Matter, briefly stated, is materialised energy.

Science tells us that every form of material—organic or inorganic—has a different atomic structure and we have a name or names for the innumerable forms in which these atomic structures manifest themselves, which means that the thought-forms must surely be just as real as the thought which built them.

Nevertheless, one word of caution is necessary, very necessary, here. Definitions define, or perhaps, better expressed, specify what we are going to mean when we employ a word. This does not, however, mean that when we read through the definitions we are then familiar with the subject. A subject, or at least a scientific subject, e.g. physics, statics, dynamics, etc., etc., is the building up and enumerating of laws from first principles, and likewise the use of such laws for all and every purpose to which they are applicable—the meaning to be applied to the various factors used, e.g. force, mass, inertia, potential and kinetic energy, etc., etc., being specified in the definitions.

Definitions in *The Physics of The Primary State of Matter*, of which there are about forty-eight, were not so easily evolved, because in present physics and like subjects the definitions

express what something, say energy, does, whereas in the Primary Physics it must express—so far as this is possible in restrictive human language—what it is. Present physics is quantitative; the Primary Physics is qualitative. Present physics deals with the finite, the relative; the Primary Physics with the Infinite, the Eternal, and thus the Creative.

Atomic particles are not basic, they are evolved, and the atom is, itself, a built-up structure. The theory that all cosmic bodies come from nebulae or gas masses is presumably based on the principle that matter (in a molecular or atomic condition) is disposed throughout space, which, due to gravitational concentrations, finally condenses to so-called nebulae. But the gaseous, liquid and solid states are secondary, built-up products, like that complex structure, the atom, itself, as are also the particles of which the atom—according to present theory—is composed, e.g. protons, neutrons, electrons and what-nots. The Primary Physics, on the other hand, contends that atomic particles, as such, or in combination as in the atom, and even more so atoms in combination as molecules and molecular structures, were not present when the universe was formed as a unit in Infinite Space, and that all such were after-products of cosmic functioning as yet unknown to science.

Energy-Form

The operative origin from which all things come in a universe is that to which we give the name of energy.

Very briefly stated (for detailed examination a careful study of the Treatise is necessary), a universe is a thought-form in Infinite Space, a tensioning towards a generative centre. The space within this tensioning is stimulated, whereas Infinite Space itself is unstimulated. In Infinite Space there is no functioning; in tensioned stimulated space functioning takes place. Tensioning towards a centre must produce curvature, but curvature cannot produce matter, neither can it modify its distribution *if matter is in the latent form*. Primary matter is not an inertial mass; far from it—it is the operative of consciousness. It is energy, but in the energy-form; not an element, but *the Elemental*. The texture of space (the ether) is thus homogeneous oxygen and hydrogen energy in the *energy-form*, not the gaseous state. It may be said, then, that the Elemental is a

duality—no, hydrogen (energy-form) is the elemental condition (it is not yet substance) and oxygen (energy-form) is merely its complementary, protective covering. On polarisation of the ether, the hydrogen component conglobates out and the oxygen forms the protective covering, and a sun or other variant is born. Lightning is formed in the clouds in the same way, but in air and without protection, and for this reason it instantly discharges.

Time Relative

One further definition, and that must suffice for an article: what is time? Einstein says that for measurement in the cosmos we require three geometrical vectors and then a fourth dimension—time. Time for him is measurable as some unit of the periodicity of the earth's orbit. It is therefore, at the most, referable purely to this solar system. Each solar system, of which astronomers tell us there are millions within the range of modern astronomical telescopes, must have its own relative time, which will bear no relationship to the movements of planets of another solar system. But suppose we expand our horizon of time indefinitely, in order to measure, not merely planetary orbital motions of solar systems, but *cosmic duration* irrespective of such minor happenings. What, then, is time, and how do we measure it? What is the unit then? Will the unit be a period or an angular movement, e.g. a second of time or some minute angular division such as a second of arc per century? Neither. Yet there must be some way of expressing that Time which is over and above all movement in solar systems. Yes, Absolute Time is irrespective of all cosmic functionings, solar systems or otherwise; it is not periodic, it is the continuous unfolding of the Divine Thought. Since Divine Thought is the only *Creative*, it must in its continuous unfolding occasion *Happening*, resulting in Event. In the Absolute there is no past, present and future, there is, and can be, no division, no unit of measurement, merely eternal unfolding of Creative-Thought, and if we must, even here, express this Absolute Time in human phraseology, we can term it, not the past, present or future, but what it is—since it is the Eternal—the Ever-present!

It is obviously impossible in an article to expound what has been dealt with at length, and in great detail, in a treatise on the subject.

STRANGE LUNAR LIGHTS

by W. K. Oliver

WHILE observing the moon in the region of Mare Imbrium on November 24, 1955, at 2200 G.M.T. I noticed a brilliant reddish-amber light on the darkened portion.

I have a 3-in. telescope and at the time was using a 0.2-in. Huygenian eyepiece. Thinking that the light might be a reflection, I moved the telescope both vertically and horizontally but found that the relative position of the light remained the same.

Continued observation showed the light to be stationary and steady. In order to ascertain the position I drew an imaginary line from Picard in Mare Crisium, through the centre of Copernicus, to the light and estimated it as being in or near the crater Kepler.

The seeing conditions at the time were ideal—cold and clear and, as the moon was well up in the sky, there was no interference from heat haze.

I kept the light under continuous observation

