

all created things, including every tree and plant that grows upon the earth. I cannot conceive how that which is non-corporal, not incorporated in the body, could constitute self, or *ego*; I would call this non-corporal entity, God. Remember I am speaking of man simply as animal. Now, although a non-corporal entity, as its name implies, is not incorporated in the body, there is no reason why there should not exist a union between the body and its entity, and I believe there is. I believe there is a union between God and all created things, and this which unites God with all created things, of which he is the entity, I would say was life. But why life? First, because I cannot conceive of anything else that it can be; secondly, because God is life-giver, and that life emanates from him. I consider it an absurd expression to say God created the world, and all that therein is, out of nothing; something could not come from nothing, from negation. God created the world and all things from Himself, all and everything emanated from Him, and with everything life; and by this life is He, as entity of all things, united to the animal man, and also to all created things. But what is life in the abstract? I do not know, but it is certainly a something that is tangible and explicable, as exemplified in the animal. It is in, but not of, the blood, and the same can be said of the respiratory organs, although both are necessary for its continued sustenance in all animals. I say it is not of the blood because of the physiological fact that in suspended animation the blood ceases to circulate, yet life is not extinct; in like manner it is not of the respiratory organs, for respiration ceases in suspended animation and life is not extinct; and physiological experimentalists know that an animal will live for hours, sometimes as many as twelve, after the division of both the pneumogastric nerves. Again, both the circulatory and respiratory systems are for their action dependent upon the motor nerves, so that it is evident that these two systems are necessary for the continued sustenance of animal life, yet it is not of or from either of these two systems. In what part of our system, then, does it exist *per se*? Physiology proves that it is in the nervous system, as it is in this system is the motor power in man and in all other animals, and not only from this system comes our motor power, but our sense of hearing, seeing, smelling, tasting and feeling, &c. But the nervous system is matter. What is it that is in this system, this tangible something that we call life, the absence of

which causes death? The sciences of physiology and biology prove to us that it is an electric fluid circulating through the whole nervous system. I will have to recur to this subject again before closing my paper.

Man, in common with all other animals, has, in virtue of his physical organization, an animal nature, but, like all other animals, he has two natures, and, like all other animals, this second nature, not in virtue of his physical organization but a something given to him, in virtue of which he is a man, in fact, the animal man, I speak of his human nature, the highest nature possessed by any animal, and possessed by him alone; the term explains itself, human (*humanus*) from *homo*, a man and *natus*, born, to be born a man.

Now, my theory is that this human nature is man's *corporate entity*, whence he derived personality, self, *ego*, soul, free will, and a higher order of conscience than that which he possesses in virtue of his animal nature, consequently a higher order of conscience than that possessed by any other animal, and that it is this conscience which makes man a law unto himself, makes him know right from wrong in the abstract, and causes him to recognise a supernatural power. This human nature I hold to be supernatural of itself, and never to die, but not actually necessary to the life of the animal man. Query, are there animal men who never possessed a human nature? Judging some men by their brutal and inhuman acts, we might be led to the conclusion that there were.

We have such evidence of animal knowledge, and consequent animal conscience, that I need not occupy your time proving that fact, but this animal conscience that we find the best example of in the dog, what is it? It is simply a trained conscience, trained to fear punishment if it does that which it has been taught is wrong, and to look for reward if it does that which it has been taught to believe is right; and such is man's animal conscience, which would appear to be universally recognised, if we judge by the universal moral teaching which man has received and is receiving every day. Are we not taught that if we do good we shall be rewarded, if not in this world certainly in the world to come; and if we do evil, if we are not punished in this world certainly in the world to come. I do not say this is false teaching, but that it is an appeal to our animal nature, and not to our human, it is the same sort of appeal that is made to the lower order of animal, differing only in degree.