

"Such words as 'intelligence' and 'design' are still used by theologians in referring to God, but thinkers see that they are inadequate and inapplicable. *Intelligence implies perception and external objects perceived*; ideas, or impressions based upon perceptions; reflection and reasoning. . . . *Intelligence implies organism and environment, genesis and growth, new experience, added knowledge,*" etc.

I have purposely italicized some of these more or less axiomatic passages. As knowledge necessarily depends upon a correlation of an organism with its environment, being in reality the interpretation by one part of the universe, in *suitably organized form*, of its sensations as produced by the phenomena presented to it by the rest of the universe or by its own constituents, to speak of the "Ultimate Reality" as intelligent, of Absolute Knowledge, or of an Infinite Intelligence, is necessarily idiotic.

I do not see why we should invoke the shade of Goethe to learn a lesson in wisdom in talking about "the Great Being whom we name the Deity." If what has been said about intelligence have any value, Mr. Underwood's own phrase "Words inadequate to describe the Infinite," might better be rendered: "The Infinite" is a term totally discrepant from anything which can be correlated with knowledge or intelligence." Nor can I weep with Mr. Fiske over the loss of "the infinite and inscrutable God of the cosmos," even if it be replaced by a mere strand in the web of phenomena." Indeed, I conceive that this "strand in the web of phenomena" is the very first thing to be secured, before we shall have taken the first step on the road to any sort of knowledge of the "infinite and inscrutable" things we hear so much of; though we shall, of course, never really find out anything about them if they are *inscrutable*.

Mr. Underwood quotes Tyndall's questions: "Who or what made the sun or gave to his rays their alleged power? Who or what made and bestowed upon the ultimate particles of matter their wondrous power of varied interaction? Science does not know. The mystery, though pushed back, remains unaltered. The mystery is as old as human thought, and to-day we can only answer, as science teaches us that what we know as Nature is but the manifestation of forces which are inherent in the things perceived, and, indeed, without which the substances themselves would disappear and cease to be perceptible. To speak of *intelligence* in connection with this imperceptible substratum—even if dignified by being called "Being," with a capital B and in the words of Goethe, seems to me to be reversing our logic. *Being*, existence, is what we know as Nature, the Ultimate Reality, which is said to be above, beneath, behind, or beyond Nature, is simply *Not-Being*.

So far, I have not much to say against Mr. Underwood's positions, but under the heading "Philosophical Materialism," he says:

"Philosophical materialism, which ascribes sensation and thought to physical causes, and assumes that matter is the ultimate cause of phenomena, finds as its

justification is no pre-
collision
thought a
That two
another, a
path, is a
This la
conscious
"blocks
cesses in
ties and c
be so, the
view that
of change
position is
ward. A
days. An
only how
proper sup
psychic p
Motion :"
"There
life and th
attended to
no experim
material str
ditions for
and body.
explained
spending pl
indicate an
activity. T
able to mos
where the o
no evidence
generation of
there is no
There is no
question."
It is clea
have not a
presuppose