

rationally, it seems to me, for I cannot conceive how it is possible to dissociate matter and mind, substance and energy,—that,

"Greater than any conceivable personal being, greater than any known intelligence is the Ultimate Reality, in which all phenomena (physical and psychical) have a *common basis*—the foundation of the cosmic order we observe, and of that marvelous series of evolutionary processes by which from star dust have been produced myriads of worlds with their inhabitants, the brain and heart of man, his conscience, his hopes and aspirations, his wonderful achievements, his chequered history, his possibilities for the future."

And yet he tells us that this *common basis* is "that which is not an organism which has no genesis and growth, but is the cause and basis of all phenomena." I venture to suggest that all this argument to prove the existence of the "psychical basis" is not a whit less inconsistent and irrational than the arguments used to prove the existence of a personal deity. It is simply an effort to invest in *qualities superior to intelligence* an entity which the rational part of the argument clearly proves to be entirely wanting in the organization necessary for a manifestation of intelligence. So far as it is a rational argument, it proves that physical and psychical phenomena have a common basis. And, indeed, there is no more reason for postulating a Psychical basis for psychical phenomena than there is for postulating a Vital basis for the phenomena of life; a Vegetative basis for the phenomena of vegetation, or a Crystalline basis for the phenomena of crystallization.

The quest for a *psychical or spiritual basis* is but part of the hankering after a solution of the insoluble which has led so many of our theologians and philosophers away from the study of real and vitally important knowledge. God may think it "little" for a man to be soothed and satisfied by what he terms "an artful evasion," and he may think it "great" to rise to "a higher point of view;" but, whatever this latter may be, the fact remains, as Mr. Underwood points out more than once, that the more a man knows of Nature the less he knows of God; and that the most ignorant people are just those who are the most positive in their assertions about the infinite and the inscrutable; and it seems to me that, however "little" it may be, in regard to the "infinite," the "inscrutable," and the "Ultimate Reality," or by whatever other name the something which is beyond human cognizance may be known, the Agnostic position, whether it be soothing or artful or neither, is the only rational one.

I agree with Mr. Underwood's condemnation of Nature-worship. I do not see how a rational man can "worship" that which gives us earthquakes, tornadoes, rattlesnakes and tarantulas. But why worship anything? If we must worship something, it is simply because we are ignorant; and it certainly does not appear to me as any evidence of a "higher" mentality that we should be seeking something to worship in a sphere which includes only that which is confessedly *inscrutable*.