THE UNITY OF THOUGHT AND THING.

"Philosophy tells us that the world is a picture which we ourselves make. There is nothing in the world, [including that object itself,] which we do not put there. Our whole life, then, is one creative process."

The above affirmation of monism and denial of dual subject and object is taken from T. Bailey Saunders's, M. A. (*Oxon.*), profound article on the "Origin of Reason," in No. 160 of *The Open Court*.^{*} It seems completely to bear out the scientific veridity of my title, and of Hylo-idealism, that on the apparitional, phenomenal, or relative theory of the universe, to which we have alone access, self is to self, further than which research is vain, the Be all and End all of sentient existence. Hence religion is seen to have run its baneful course and to be superseded by reason, on which Mr. Saunders so lucidly discourses. For if self be all in all there can be no room, in such a *pleroma*, for any *Latria* or worship, in the religious sense of the word, except Narcissus-like self-worship:

We are thus thrown back on, and face to face with, mere physical conditions, out of which *ideal* concepts proceed, while rigidly excluding all those misnamed "*spiritual*" ones, which hitherto have played so momentous a rôle in the destiny of humanity. We thus make hygiene, as defined by Dr. Parkes in the solemn introduction to his manual of that last (and first) of the sciences, as not merely bodily sanitation, though that is already much, but as supreme culture of mind and body, (or to be more scientifically precise, of body merely, including brain,) the all-sufficing surrogate of Divine worship. The old adage, *mens sana in corpore sano*, should thus read

^{*}See also a lengthy and serious review of that able thinker's *Translations from Schopenhauer* in the London *Athenæum* for October 4, 1890.

corpus sanum==*mens sana*, merely. This *Volte face* turns every extant ethical and mental view *topsy-turvy*. As it must do by exploding "thing" altogether, and by substituting our own thoughts for objects of all kinds. It is true, or it may be granted, that there is an objective or distal *aspect* of subjective thought. But that fact, or admission, in no degree invalidates the position that the only objects cognisable are those incorporated with, and by, the subject self, from which all "things" proceed. This interpretation of the universe is, *inter alia multa*, that of the emancipated Baccalaureus in the second part of Goethe's "Faust," as enunciated in the lines:

"I tell you this is Youth's [Man's] supreme vocation !
Before me was no world—'tis my creation :
 'Twas I who raised the Sun from out the sea ;
 The Moon began her changeful course with me.
 I gave the signal on that primal night
 When all the host of heaven burst forth in light.
 Who but MYSELF saves Man from the dominion
 Of dogmas cramping, crushing, Philistinean ?"

Indeed it is the very first and last principle of common sense and common place that before a "thing" is *perceptible* it must be made *sensible*, and where can sensibility lie except in the *sensorium* which manifests that property? On the ground alone of consciousness or sensation being a somatic office or function it can only be, like all other organic functions, an emanation of the self, and hence we are coerced into the conclusion that all things are but forms of the *Ego itself at once both Creator and Creation*.

This non-animism thus makes each unit of humanity all that has, in pre-scientific minds where absolutism and dualism is the watchword of the intellect, been predicated as *Divine*. Where reason, based on positive science, comes into play, or, in other words, when man ceases to be an infant, religion or theism disappears as a childish illusion utterly incompatible with right reason and rational ethics. All religious ideals and systems—none more than the Christian—are based on hideous immorality. For what can be more iniquitous than the doctrine of the Atonement, i. e., of the vicarious sacrifice of a sinless victim for a sinful criminal? But preceding this ethical *crux* is the logical fiction. For how can the Parthenogenetic birth of Christ redeem him from the primeval "curse" en-

tailed on all mankind by the mythical "disobedience" of our federal head and representative? From this "curse" virgins are no more exempt than their grandmothers, and thus, on its own *data*, Christianity is "hoist with its own petard." Indeed, a *replica* of Adam's abiogenetic "creation" would not serve, since earth and air partook of the "curse" entailed on our "first parents." No God is needed since man is seen to be an Autochthon and, as such, an Anteus, who derives all the faculties required for existence out of the telluric *matrix* or *humus* (living earth) from which he sprang.

As long as the absolute doctrine of dual existence vitiated philosophy—a dual factor, in the guise of an animating principle was, or seemed, a *desideratum*. But since the inductive biological theory, which defines life as the sum of the organic functions and a physiological state, was established, man can quite rest content in the satisfactory creed that he himself—each for each—is his own law, standard, criterion, and *final* court of appeal. Clericals of all denominations are then seen to be self-evidently "kicking against the pricks," when, in our *fin de siècle* age, they attempt to bolster up the obsolete anachronism of animism (dualism)—a quite impossible task, as I have before shown—from the incompatibility of two such factors as matter and what they are pleased to call "spirit" reacting on each other.

It is, I repeat, a case of pure fetichism or ghostism—the same in essence that induced the ancients to formulate their Lares and Penates, Dryads, etc., and in short, to feign a god, or goddess, for every phenomenon from Jove, launcher of the thunderbolts, to Cloacina of the sewers.

Pope, even, in his "Essay on Man," written many years after the appearance of Newton's "Principia," could not rid himself of the notion that "ruling angels" were required to regulate the spheres. And, long after Pope, poets invoked their muse as a source of inspiration separate from themselves! But, in our age, all such confusion of thought is a really inexcusable blunder which must, sooner or later, prove a Nemesis to that vicious civilisation which fosters so palpable a delusion.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

R. LEWINS, M. D.