

and the very conceptions by which we describe it to others or think of it ourselves are abstracted from anthropomorphic fancies, which science forbids us to believe and nature compels us to employ."

#### INDUCTIVE THEORY INADEQUATE.

The school of John Stuart Mill held that the task of science ended if the sequences of our individual sensations were accounted for. Mill's "Logic" dealt with succession and co-existence in phenomena, with methods of agreement and difference, with the laws of nature as observed uniformities and nothing more. The inner character of physical reality was of no concern to science. This "thin intellectual fare" as the President styled it, is what was served out under the imposing title of Inductive Theory.

#### IF BODY AND MIND ARE EVOLVED WHAT FOLLOWS?

Our organs of sense (eyes, ears, touch, &c.,) inform us that there is a physical world: but science says the constitution of our organs, our eyes, our ears, &c., whose reports are really sense-perceptions, has reached its present condition by evolution or natural selection. So also have our intellectual powers. Utility has decided everything; what is fittest alone survives. Man's physiological and mental outfit, adapted to the highest scientific inquiries, are due to blind forces, which have no prevision of loftier uses. The rudimentary instincts of the animal have thus been perfected into powers of analysis and calculation enabling man to mete out the heavens or divide the atom. The imperfection of man's ordinary beliefs and ideas, based upon illusory experience, may be due to these circumstances and to this genesis. Too accurate and direct a vision of physical reality might have been a disadvantage in the struggle for existence. Falsehood being, perhaps, more useful than truth, and living tissues (composing the organs of sense) being such imperfect material, no better results could be attained. This applies to the senses: but it must also apply with equal force to the intellectual powers.

#### SCIENCE GIVES NO COHERENT INTERPRETATION.

If evolution thus provides man with untrustworthy instruments for obtaining knowledge, or rather sensations, the raw material of experience; why should it succeed better in regard to reason, whose task is to turn experience to higher account.