

servant of the machines of Evolution,—that pain is the red flag of danger of a smash, and pleasure the green sign of a perfectly running physique.

*Chateaucclair*,—What they really mean by the smash of the machine is the pain it would bring. What difference would it make to us how perfect or imperfect our bodies were, so long as their perfection or imperfection made no kind of difference to our happiness? And if an imperfect body were accompanied by all kinds of happiness to us would we not prefer it? Or if a perfectly running physique were accompanied by all kinds of agony, how readily we would exchange it.

*Justus*,—You have spoken of the Inorganic Universe—that part outside of the wide family of consciousness known to us, the protoplasmic Race, which began in the Ocean?

*Chateaucclair*,—That also falls within the same evolutionary movement and must be conscious. Few conclusions seem more absurd than that Life is confined to the protoplasmic Race. It stands, in logic, with the idea of Man as the monarch and goal of the Universe; with the Creation in seven clock days; with the Chosen People; and other historical theological myths abandoned during the past fifty years. Has all this marvellous life itself sprung out of nothing? Have this petty corner of the cosmos, and these few moments of eternity been all there ever was of any import?

*Justus*,—Well, what if Life were meteor-borne from another water-bearing planet? Space is filled with incredible numbers of small meteors and flying debris, and meteoric dust is constantly falling on us in an invisible rain.

*Chateaucclair*,—That only carries the absurdity a step further back, and a highly improbable step. Let us not stop, in our hypotheses of the conditions of life, at the nebulae, at molten and vaporous temperatures astronomical distances, unlimited shapes and forms of intelligence. James Hinton, the brilliant surgeon, gave the world some striking reflections on this "Life in Nature." I want rather to work it out on a basis of fact, and I think there is a lead in the facts of the purposive consciousness shown by the feelings.

## II.

### COALESCENCE OF EGOS

*Justus*,—What do you mean by your theory of Coalescence of Egos?

*Chateaucclair*,—I feel that some regular explanation is necessary to account for the unity of action between the ordinary Individual Self and the Deeper Self—or more accurately, the relations between them. I find it in a law of Coalescence of Egos—applying not merely to them but to all the forms of consciousness we know. I had better read you my