

*way and when historically interpreted, a legitimate test of the truth or falsity of a philosophical doctrine or system.*

This position is often denied. We are told we must love truth for truth's sake, and leave the consequences to themselves ; that the enquirer, the philosopher, cannot be responsible for consequences. This is sometimes true ; yet it is surprising in how few cases it is true. It is never true in philosophy. From the nature of the case, consequences enter as a part of the content of the philosophic solution, consequences in experience and life. Philosophy puts the question : How can I explain man and his environment. It is only half a solution to explain either man or his environment. Materialism does the latter, subjective idealism does the former ; but no philosophy is true which leaves out of its reckoning any degree on the arc which measures the mutual relation between personality and nature.

Life is, therefore—to go a little deeper—the sphere of experience, the only storehouse of data for the philosophic solution. And all aspects of experience must have equal right. It is the habit of natural science to magnify law, to deify universality, to disparage individuality, to ridicule heart ; this is the environment aspect of the question. The metaphysician and moralist is prone to magnify individuality, to deny law, to disparage the external ; this is the personality aspect. The balance must be rigidly preserved between the two, yet the latter is and should be popularly emphasized in this generation for several reasons.

In the first place, because the limitation of philosophical data to experience, carries the presumption that nature is always a party to experience, that is, that only is experience which consists in a reaction of man on nature. That this is a false presumption is seen in the larger half of human experience. The overwhelming testimony of life is that its greater part has both had no material reference and is incapable of such a reference. The entire range of higher emotion points to needs which life never realizes, or realizing, only enhances. The postulates of our ethical selves, which untutored intelligence spontaneously reckons the most important, durable, and true of all our experiences, not only run above natural reactions, but often seem to run counter to them. The tendency of natural science is to the refusal to the heart of all share in the determination of truth, the denial to the will of any validity in its requirement of