

The present Lord Kelvin, the greatest living scientist of the day, admitted before the Royal Society that his supposition of the Origin of the Universe, in no way explains the matter or helps us out of the difficulty, for that is only to shift the ground from the real to the ideal, and to leave us still in the dark as to how the Universe came to be a Universe, and by whom it was originated. We have a right to enquire how it originated and particularly how it has exercised such a tremendous influence on the minds of the people.

As for himself, he had had such a lengthened experience, and had viewed the question from every vantage ground, that he was now forced to acknowledge and recognize "A Sovereign Intelligence" as the Source and Destiny of Existence.

Huxley was not as frank as this, though he ought to have been so, for what is Huxley's Mysterious Activity but a "Sovereign Intelligence"—or Bishop Berkeley's "Supreme Mind"—even Hume said that he did not pronounce it absolutely insuperable, for you can easily see Faith professed between the lines of my book. Neither did Locke deny the existence of a Supreme Being, for in his *Conduct of the Understanding* (pp. 82, sect. 38), he says: "God has made the intellectual world harmonious and beautiful without us; but it will never come into our heads all at once. We must bring it home piecemeal, and then set it up by our own industry or else we will have nothing but darkness and a chaos within, etc."

Berkeley's assaults upon Metaphysical abstractions, etc..... had more than anything else to do