

including Spencer, in the organisation, the demands, and the authority of human society. But it must be remarked that naturalism is not, in our present stage of knowledge, identical with mechanism, and that the extreme view mentioned above implies the assertion that the phenomena of life, individual and social, and those of consciousness can be explained on purely mechanical principles. This is, at the present moment, impossible, and naturalists such as du Bois Reymond, Herbert Spencer, and Haeckel have been, perhaps reluctantly, forced to admit this; whereas, on the other side, thinkers whose own original work was confined to purely mechanical reasoning, have either, with Lord Kelvin, distinctly asserted the impossibility of understanding the phenomena of living matter on purely mechanical principles, or have, with Clifford, invented a theory of "mind-stuff."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> An interesting article dealing with this subject will be found in the American 'Philosophical Review' (1896), with the title "Morality the last of Dogmas," by Antonio Llano. The author identifies the naturalistic with the purely mechanical point of view—in fact, he practically accepts what du Bois Reymond termed the "Laplacian world-formula." This position is, to say the least, premature, and the contention that "naturalistic and utilitarian philosophers; who—strange to say—establish the premises as indispensable, shrink before their logical consequences," is not correct if applied to such thinkers as the author deals with. But assuming that it were possible to reduce everything in human life and conduct to purely mechanical

sequences, and that the author's conclusions were established "that morality with its machinery of obligation, conscience, and duty, being based on feelings originated in superstition and slavery, and in an inadequate and unscientific conception of the world in general, and of man in particular, is doomed to vanish under the pressure of enlightened reason, which will cease to consider it either necessary or profitable," we may ask the question, What is to take the place of morality? The author is very definite on this, saying that "the evolution (I might better say the dissolution) of morality is from 'duty' towards 'right,' the former diminishing as the latter increases." Now this suggests a very important distinction. The word "right" has several meanings, and the use