

the critical scholar. He can increasingly maintain that his theories, be they philosophically valid or not, are practically useful, that they *work*, that his methods are at least clear and definite, his path distinctly marked out, his conclusions logically consistent, that his knowledge is daily increasing, and that, above all, he can foretell in many cases what will happen, discover that which has been hidden, and that the practical applications and triumphs of technical science are the most eloquent testimony to the value of his pursuits, sufficing to dispel all critical doubts in the mind of any reasonable person.

15.
Peculiar
strength in
their prac-
tical utility.

Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the object of scientific research, the facts and processes of nature, are not really accessible to human criticism. Criticism implies a standard from which we can judge the object of our reflection. It further implies that what we criticise might have been different. Now we have no standard from which we can judge Nature herself, and we have no justification for the assumption that facts and events in the natural world might have been different from what they are. Nature is simply what she is, and if we attempt to pass judgment upon her phenomena we transcend the limits of natural knowledge, we import considerations which are foreign to science. Nature may be an object of curiosity, of admiration, wonder, or awe; she is not an object of criticism. Criticism is only possible where we can apply such categories as true or untrue, good or bad, beautiful or ugly, useful or useless. These categories, however, contain a reference to the human mind. Nature

16.
Besides,
man cannot
judge
nature.