

this world, it does attempt to prevent them. It strives to teach the principles that in the long run will do away not with broken hearts but with the breaking of them, not with physical starvation but with the moral and spiritual conditions that lead to it. Compared with so fundamental a practicality, what has pragmatism to show? A method which concentrates on mere success, and which fails to judge between this success and that, is, to the extent of such a failure, not practical enough.

The chief quarrel of pragmatism with the absolute is its alleged supreme indifference to what the particular facts in our world really are. "Be they what they may, the absolute will father them. Like the sick lion in Æsop's fable, all footsteps lead into his den, but *nulla vestigia retrorsum*. You cannot redescend into the world of particulars by the absolute's aid or deduce any necessary consequences of detail important for your life from your idea of his nature. He gives you, indeed, the assurance that all is well with him, and for his eternal way of thinking; but thereupon he leaves you to be finitely saved by your own temporal devices."

Now this is very true of certain phases of philosophy, and the more is the pity. But is it not in some measure true of pragmatism itself? Anything may go into the den of the doctrine that anything is true if it works, that anything will work that is worked, and therefore that anything is true. But what is the practical result of this stupendous syllogism? What is to be worked? What shall we choose from among infinite possibilities? On what grounds shall we choose?

A standard we must have, and a standard must be taught us by a philosophy with any pretensions to the name. When the pragmatist declares that "what is better for us to believe is true *unless the belief incidentally clashes with some other vital benefit*," he admits the necessity of a standard. Indeed, the pragmatist is continually going far beyond the borders of pragmatism, and in so doing is making it clear that in order to be a good pragmatist you must be infinitely more. Thus Dr. James, when he says "The notion of God has this practical