THE MONIST

WHAT PRAGMATISM IS.

The writer of this article has been led by much experience to believe that every physicist, and every chemist, and, in short, every master in any department of experimental science, has had his mind moulded by his life in the laboratory to a degree that is little suspected. The experimentalist himself can hardly be fully aware of it, for the reason that the men whose intellects he really knows about are much like himself in this respect. With intellects of widely different training from his own, whose education has largely been a thing learned out of books, he will never become inwardly intimate, be he ever so familiar terms with them; for he and they are as oil and water, and though they be shaken up together, it is remarkable how quickly they will go their several mental ways, without having gained more than a faint flavor from the association. Were those other men only to take skilful soundings of the experimentalist’s mind,—which is just what they are unqualified to do, for the most part,—they would soon discover that, excepting perhaps upon topics where his mind is trammelled by personal feeling or by his bringing up, his disposition is to think of everything just as everything is thought of in the laboratory, that is, as a question of experimentaton. Of course, no living man possesses in their fullness all the attributes characteristic of his type: it is not the typical doctor whom you will see every day driven in buggy or coupé, nor is it the typical pedagogue that will be met with in the first school-room you enter. But when you have found, or ideally constructed upon a basis of observation, the typ-
ical experimentalist, you will find that whatever assertion you may make to him, he will either understand as meaning that if a given prescription for an experiment ever can be and ever is carried out in act, an experience of a given description will result, or else he will see no sense at all in what you say. If you talk to him as Mr. Balfour talked not long ago to the British Association, saying that "the physicist seeks for something deeper than the laws connecting possible objects of experience," that "his object is a physical reality" unrevealed in experiments, and that the existence of such non-experiential reality is the inalienable faith of science," to all such ontological meaning you will find the experimentalist mind to be color-blind. What adds to that confidence in this which the writer owes to his conversations with experimentalists is that he himself may almost be said to have inhabited a laboratory from the age of six until long past maturity; and having all his life associated mostly with experimentalists, it has always been with a confident sense of understanding them and of being understood by them.

That laboratory life did not prevent the writer (who here and in what follows simply exemplifies the experimentalist type) from becoming interested in methods of thinking; and when he came to read metaphysics, although much of it seemed to him loosely reasoned and determined by accidental prepossessions, yet in the writings of some philosophers, especially Kant, Berkeley, and Spinoza, he sometimes came upon strains of thought that recalled the ways of thinking of the laboratory, so that he felt he might trust to them; all of which has been true of other laboratory-men.

Endeavoring, as a man of that type naturally would, to formulate what he so approved, he framed the theory that a conception, that is, the rational purport of a word or other expression, lies exclusively in its conceivable bearing upon the conduct of life; so that, since obviously nothing that might not result from experiment can have any direct bearing upon conduct, if one can define accurately all the conceivable experimental phenomena which the affirmation or denial of a concept could imply, one will have therein a complete definition of the concept, and there is absolutely nothing more in it. For this doctrine he invented the name pragmatism. Some of his friends wished him to call it praxis or practicalism (perhaps on the ground that πράξις is better Greek than πραγματισμός). But for one who had learned philosophy out of Kant, as the writer, along with nineteen out of every twenty experimentalists who have turned to philosophy, had done, and who still thought in Kantian terms most readily, praktisch and pragmatisch were as far apart as the two poles, the former belonging in a region of thought where no mind of the experimentalist type can ever make sure of solid ground under his feet, the latter expressing relation to some definite human purpose. Now quite the most striking feature of the new theory was its recognition of an inseparable connection between rational cognition and rational purpose; and that consideration it was which determined the preference for the name pragmatism.

Concerning the matter of philosophical nomenclature, there are a few plain considerations, which the writer has for many years longed to submit to the deliberate judgment of those few fellow-students of philosophy, who deplore the present state of that study, and who are intent upon rescuing it therefrom and bringing it to a condition like that of the natural sciences, where investigators, instead of concerning each the work of most of the others as mis-directed from beginning to end, co-operate, stand upon one another's shoulders, and multiply incontestable results; where every observation is repeated, and isolated observations go for little; where every hypothesis that merits attention is subjected to severe but fair examination, and only after the predictions to which it leads have been remarkably borne out by experience is trusted at all, and even then only provisionally; where a radically false step is rarely taken, even the most faulty of those theories which gain wide credence being true in their main experiential predictions. To those students, it is submitted that no study can become scientific in the sense described, until it provides itself with a suitable technical nomenclature, whose every term has a single definite mean-
ing universally accepted among students of the subject, and whose
vocabularies have no such sweetness or charms as might tempt loose
writers to abuse them,—which is a virtue of scientific nomenclature
not little appreciated. It is submitted, that the experience of those
sciences which have conquered the greatest difficulties of terminol-
ogy, which are unquestionably the taxonomic sciences, chemistry,
mineralogy, botany, zoology, has conclusively shown that the one
only way in which the requisite unanimity and requisite rup-
tures with individual habits and preferences can be brought about
is so to shape the canons of terminology that they shall gain the
support of moral principle and of every man's sense of decency;
and that, in particular, (under defined restrictions,) the general
feeling shall be; that he who introduces a new conception into
philosophy is under an obligation to invent acceptable terms to
express it, and that when he has done so, the duty of his fellow-
students is to accept those terms, and to resent any wresting of
them from their original meanings, as not only a gross discourtesy
to him to whom philosophy was indebted for each conception, but
also as an injury to philosophy itself; and furthermore, that once
a conception has been supplied with suitable and sufficient words
for its expression, no other technical terms denoting the same things
considered in the same relations, should be countenanced. Should
this suggestion find favor, it might be deemed needful that the
philosophians in Congress assembled should adopt, after due delib-
eration, convenient canons to limit the application of the principle.
Thus, just as is done in chemistry, it might be wise to assign fixed
meanings to certain prefixes and suffixes. For example, it might be
agreed, perhaps, that the prefix pro- should mark a broad and
rather indefinite extension of the meaning of the term to which it
was prefixed; the name of a doctrine would naturally end in -ism,
while -icism might mark a more strictly defined acception of that
doctrine, etc. Then again, just as in biology no account is taken
of terms antedating Linnaeus, so in philosophy it might be found
best not to go back of the scholastic terminology. To illustrate
another sort of limitation, it has probably never happened that any
philosopher has attempted to give a general name to his own doc-
trine without that name's soon acquiring in common philosophical
usage, a significance much broader than was originally intended.
Thus, special systems go by the names Kantianism, Benthamism,
Constitutionism, Spencerism, etc., while transcendentalism, utili-
tarianism, positivism, evolutionism, synthetic philosophy, etc. have
irrevocably and very conveniently been elevated to broader govern-
ments.

After awaiting in vain, for a good many years, some particu-
larly opportune conjunction of circumstances that might serve to
recommend his notions of the ethics of terminology, the writer has
now, at last, dragged them in over head and shoulders, on an oc-
casion when he has no specific proposal to offer nor any feeling but
satisfaction at the use usage has run without any canons or
resolutions of a congress. His word "pragmatism" has gained
general recognition in a generalised sense that seems to argue
power of growth and vitality. The famed psychologist, James,
first took it up, seeing that his "radical empiricism" substantially
answered to the writer's definition of pragmatism, albeit with a cer-
tain difference in the point of view. Next, the admirably clear
and brilliant thinker, Mr. Ferdinand C. S. Schiller, casting about
for a more attractive name for the "anthropomorphism" of his
Riddle of the Sphinx, lit, in that most remarkable paper of his on
Axioms as Postulates, upon the same designation "pragmatism," which
in its original sense was in generic agreement with his own
doctrine, for which he has since found the more appropriate speci-
fication "humanism," while he still retains "pragmatism" in a some-
what wider sense. So far all went happily. But at present, the
word begins to be met with occasionally in the literary journals,
where it gets abused in the merciless way that words have to ex-
pect when they fall into literary clutches. Sometimes the manners
of the British have effloresced in scolding at the word as ill-chosen,
—ill-chosen, that is, to express some meaning that it was rather
designed to exclude. So then, the writer, finding his hankering
"pragmatism" so promoted, feels that it is time to kiss his child
good-by and relinquish it to its higher destiny; while to serve the
precise purpose of expressing the original definition, he begins to an-
nounce the birth of the word "pragmatism," which is ugly enough to be safe from kidnappers."

Much as the writer has gained from the perusal of what other
pragmatists have written, he still thinks there is a decisive advan-
tage in his original conception of the doctrine. From this original
form every truth that follows from any of the other forms can be deduced, while some errors can be avoided into which other pragmatists have fallen. The original view appears, too, to be a more compact and unitary conception than the others. But its capital merit, in the writer's eyes, is that if more readily connects itself
with a critical proof of its truth. Quite in accord with the logical
order of investigation, it usually happens that one first forms an
hypothesis that seems more and more reasonable the further one
examines into it, but that only a good deal later gets crowned with
an adequate proof. The present writer having had the pragmatist
theory under consideration for many years longer than most of its
adherents, would naturally have given more attention to the proof
of it. At any rate, in endeavoring to explain pragmatism, he may
be excused for confining himself to that form of it that he knows
best.

In the present article there will be space only to explain just
what this doctrine, (which, in such hands as it has now fallen into,
may probably play a pretty prominent part in the philosophical
discussions of the next coming years,) really consists in. Should the
exposition be found to interest readers of The Monist, they would
certainly be much more interested in a second article which would
give some samples of the manifold applications of pragmatism (as-
suming it to be true) to the solution of problems of different kinds.
After that, readers might be prepared to take an interest in a proof

*To show how recent the general use of the word "pragmatism" is, the
writer may mention that, to the best of his belief, he never used it in copy
for the press before to-day, except by particular request, in Baldwin's Dic-
tionary. Toward the end of 1890, when this part of the Century Dictionary
appeared, he did not deem that the word had sufficient status to appear in
that work. But he has used it continually in philosophical conversation since,
perhaps, the mid-seventies.
to say that one is to believe what is not true, or that what a man does not doubt is ipso facto true?"  No, but unless he can make a thing white and black at once, he has to regard what he does not doubt as absolutely true. Now you, per hypothesis, are that man. "But you tell me there are scores of things I do not doubt. I really cannot persuade myself that there is not some one of them about which I am mistaken." You are adding one of your make-believe facts, which, even if it were established, would only go to show that doubt has a *limen*, that is, is only called into being by a certain finite stimulus. You only puzzle yourself by talking of this metaphysical "truth" and metaphysical "falsity," that you know nothing about. All you have any dealings with are your doubts and beliefs, with the course of life that forces new beliefs upon you and gives you power to doubt old beliefs. If your terms "truth" and "falsity" are taken in such senses as to be definable in terms of doubt and belief and the course of experience, (as for example they would be, if you were to define the "truth" as that to a belief in which belief would tend if it were to tend indefinitely toward absolute fixity,) well and good: in that case, you are only talking about doubt and belief. But if by truth and falsity you mean something not definable in terms of doubt and belief in any way, then you are talking of entities of whose existence you can know nothing, and which Ockham's razor would clean shave off. Your problems would be greatly simplified, if, instead of saying that you want to know the "Truth," you were simply to say that you want to attain a state of belief unassailable by doubt.

Belief is not a momentary mode of consciousness: it is a habit of mind essentially enduring for some time, and mostly (at least) unconscious: and like other habits, it is, (until it meets with some surprise that begins its dissolution,) perfectly self-satisfied. Doubt is of an altogether contrary genus. It is not a habit, but the privation of a habit. Now a privation of a habit, in order to be anything.

---

4 It is necessary to say that "belief" is throughout used merely as the name of the contrary to doubt, without regard to grades of certainty nor to the nature of the proposition held for true, i.e. "believed."
excogitations, there is something of which you can only say, "I cannot think otherwise," and your experientially based hypothesis is that the impossibility is of the second kind.

There is no reason why "thought," in what has just been said, should be taken in that narrow sense in which silence and darkness are favorable to thought. It should rather be understood as covering all rational life, so that an experiment shall be an operation of thought. Of course, that ultimate state of habit to which the action of self-control ultimately tends, where no room is left for further self-control, is, in the case of thought, the state of fixed belief, or perfect knowledge.

Two things here are all-important to assure of self of and to remember. The first is that a person is not absolutely an individual. His thoughts are what he is "saying to himself," that is, is saying to that other self that is just coming into life in the flow of time. When one reasons, it is that critical self that one is trying to persuade; and all thought whatsoever is a sign, and is mostly of the nature of language. The second thing to remember is that the man's circle of society, (however widely or narrowly this phrase may be understood,) is a sort of loosely compacted person, in some respects of higher rank than the person of an individual organism. It is these two things alone that render it possible for you,—but only in the abstract, and in a Pickwickian sense,—to distinguish between absolute truth and what you do not doubt.

Let us now hasten to the exposition of pragmaticism itself. Here it will be convenient to imagine that somebody to whom the doctrine is new, but of rather preternatural perspicacity, asks questions of a pragmatist. Everything that might give a dramatic illusion must be stripped off, so that the result will be a sort of cross between a dialogue and a catechism, but a good deal like the latter,—something rather painfully reminiscent of Mungall's Historical Questions.

Questioner: I am astounded at your definition of your pragmaticism, because only last year I was assured by a person above all suspicion of warping the truth,—himself a pragmatist,—that your doctrine precisely was "that a conception is to be tested by its practical effects." You must surely, then, have entirely changed your definition very recently.

Pragmatist: If you will turn to Vols. VI and VII of the Revue Philosophique, or to the Popular Science Monthly for November 1877 and January 1878, you will be able to judge for yourself, whether the interpretation you mention was not then clearly excluded. The exact wording of the English enunciation, (changing only the first person into the second,) was: "Consider what effects that might conceivably have practical bearings you conceive the object of your conception to have. Then your conception of those effects is the whole of your conception of the object."

Questioner: Well, what reason have you for asserting that this is so?

Pragmatist: That is what I specially desire to tell you. But the question had better be postponed until you clearly understand what those reasons profess to prove.

Questioner: What, then, is the raison d'être of the doctrine? What advantage is expected from it?

Pragmatist: It will serve to show that almost every proposition of ontological metaphysics is either meaningless gibberish,—one word being defined by other words, and they by still others, without any real conception ever being reached,—or else is downright absurd; so that all such rubbish being swept away, what will remain of philosophy will be a series of problems capable of investigation by the observational methods of the true sciences,—the truth about which can be reached without those interminable misunderstandings and disputes which have made the highest of the positive sciences a mere amusement for idle intellects, à sort of chess,—idle pleasure its purpose, and reading out of a book its method. In this regard, pragmaticism is a species of prope-positivism. But what distinguishes it from other species is, first, its retention of a purified philosophy; secondly, its full acceptance of the main body of our instinctive beliefs; and thirdly, its strenuous insistence upon the truth of scholastic realism, (or a close approximation to that, well-stated by the late Dr. Francis Ellingwood Abbot in the Introduction to his Scientifical Theism). So, instead of merely jeering at meta-
hypothesis. Passing over several ingredients on which we need not dwell, the purpose, the plan, and the resolve, we come to the act of choice by which the experimenter singles out certain identifiable objects to be operated upon. The next is the external (or quasi-external) act by which he modifies those objects. Next, comes the subsequent reaction of the world upon the experimenter in a perception; and finally, his recognition of the teaching of the experiment. While the two chief parts of the event itself are the action and the reaction, yet the unity of essence of the experiment lies in its purpose and plan, the ingredients passed over in the enumeration.

Another thing: in representing the pragmaticist as making rational meaning to consist in an experiment, (which you would speak of as an event in the past,) you strikingly fail to catch his attitude of mind. Indeed, it is not in an experiment, but in experimental phenomena, that rational meaning is said to consist. When an experimentialist speaks of a phenomenon, such as "Hall's phenomenon," "Zeeman's phenomenon" and its modification, "Michelson's phenomenon," or "the chess-board phenomenon," he does not mean any particular event that did happen to somebody in the dead past, but what surely will happen to everybody in the living future who shall fulfill certain conditions. The phenomenon consists in the fact that when an experimentialist shall come to act according to a certain scheme that he has in mind, then will something else happen, and shatter the doubts of sceptics, like the celestial fire upon the altar of Elijah.

And do not overlook the fact that the pragmaticist maxim says nothing of single experiments or of single experimental phenomena, (for what is conditionally true in futuro can hardly be singular,) but only speaks of general kinds of experimental phenomena. Its adherent does not shrink from speaking of general objects as real, since whatever is true represents a real. Now the laws of nature are true.

The rational meaning of every proposition lies in the future. How so? The meaning of a proposition is itself a proposition. Indeed, it is no other than the very proposition of which it is the meaning: it is a translation of it. But of the myriads of forms into which
a proposition may be translated, what is that one which is to be
called its very meaning? It is, according to the pragmaticist, that
form in which the proposition becomes applicable to human con-
duct, not in these or those special circumstances, nor when one enter-
tains this or that special design, but that form which is most directly
applicable to self-control under every situation, and to every pur-
pose. This is why he locates the meaning in future time; for future
conduct is the only conduct that is subject to self-control. But in
order that that form of the proposition which is to be taken as its
meaning should be applicable to every situation and to every pur-
pose upon which the proposition has any bearing, it must be simply
the general description of all the experimental phenomena which
the assertion of the proposition virtually predicts. For an experi-
mental phenomenon is the fact asserted by the proposition that ac-
tion of a certain description will have a certain kind of experimental
result; and experimental results are the only results that can affect
human conduct. No doubt, some unchanging idea may come to
influence a man more than it had done; but only because some experi-
ence equivalent to an experiment has brought its truth home to him
more intimately than before. Whenever a man acts purposively, he
acts under a belief in some experimental phenomenon. Consequently,
the sum of the experimental phenomena that a proposition implies
makes up its entire bearing upon human conduct. Your question,
then, of how a pragmaticist can attribute any meaning to any asser-
tion other than that of a single occurrence is substantially answered.

Questioner: I see that pragmaticism is a thorough-going phe-
nomenalism. Only why should you limit yourself to the phenomena
of experimental science rather than embrace all observational sci-
ence? Experiment, after all, is an uncommunicative informant. It
never expiates: it only answers “yes” or “no”; or rather it usually
snaps out “No!” or, at best, only utters an inarticulate grunt for
the negation of its “no.” The typical experimentalist is not much
of an observer. It is the student of natural history to whom nature
opens the treasury of her confidence, while she treats the cross-
examining experimentalist with the reserve she merits. Why should
your phenomenalism sound the meagre jugs-harp of experiment
rather than the glorious organ of observation?

Pragmaticist: Because pragmaticism is not definable as “thor-
ough-going phenomenalism,” although the latter doctrine may be
a kind of pragmatism. The richness of phenomena lies in their
sensuous quality. Pragmatism does not intend to define the phe-
nomenal equivalents of words and general ideas, but, on the con-
trary, eliminates their sentential element, and endeavors to define
the rational purport, and this it finds in the purposive bearing of the
word or proposition in question.

Questioner: Well, if you choose so to make Doing the Be-all
and the End-all of human life, why do you not make meaning to
consist simply in doing? Doing has to be done at a certain time
upon a certain object. Individual objects and single events cover
all reality, as everybody knows, and as a practicalist ought to be
the first to insist. Yet, your meaning, as you have described it, is
general. Thus, it is of the nature of a mere word and not a reality.
You say yourself that your meaning of a proposition is only the
same proposition in another dress. But a practical man’s meaning
is the very thing he means. What do you make to be the meaning
of “George Washington”?

Pragmaticist: Forcibly put! A good half dozen of your points
must certainly be admitted. It must be admitted, in the first place,
that if pragmaticism really made Doing to be the Be-all and the
End-all of life, that would be its death. For to say that we live
for the mere sake of action, as action, regardless of the thought it
carries out, would be to say that there is no such thing as rational
purport. Secondly, it must be admitted that every proposition pro-
fesses to be true of a certain real individual object, often the en-
vironing universe. Thirdly, it must be admitted that pragmaticism
fails to furnish any translation or meaning of a proper name, or
other designation of an individual object. Fourthly, the pragmati-
cistic meaning is undoubtedly general; and it is equally indisputable
that the general is of the nature of a word or sign. Fifthly, it must
be admitted that individuals alone exist; and sixthly, it may be
admitted that the very meaning of a word or significant object
ought to be the very essence of reality of what it signifies. But when, those admissions having been unreservedly made, you find the pragmaticist still constrained most earnestly to deny the force of your objection, you ought to infer that there is some consideration that has escaped you. Putting the admissions together, you will perceive that the pragmaticist grants that a proper name, (although it is not customary to say that it has a meaning,) has a certain denotative function peculiar, in each case, to that name and its equivalents; and that he grants that every assertion contains such a denotative or pointing-out function. In its peculiar individuality, the pragmaticist excludes this from the rational purport of the assertion, although the like of it, being common to all assertions, and so, being general and not individual, may enter into the pragmaticistic purport. Whatever exists, ex-sists, that is, really acts upon other existents, so obtains a self-identity, and is definitely individual. As to the general, it will be a help to thought to notice that there are two ways of being general. A statue of a soldier on some village monument, in his overcoat and with his musket, is for each of a hundred families the image of its uncle, its sacrifice to the union. That statue, then, though it is itself single, represents any one man of whom a certain predicate may be true. It is objectively general. The word "soldier," whether spoken or written, is general in the same way; while the name, "George Washington," is not so. But each of these two terms remains one and the same noun, whether it be spoken or written. and whenever and wherever it be spoken or written. This noun is not an existent thing; it is a type, or form, to which objects, both those that are externally existent and those which are imagined, may conform, but which none of them can exactly be. This is subjective generality. The pragmaticistic purport is general in both ways.

As to reality, one finds it defined in various ways; but if that principle of terminological ethics that was proposed be accepted, the equivocal language will soon disappear. For realis and realitas are not ancient words. They were invented to be terms of philosophy in the thirteenth century, and the meaning they were intended to express is perfectly clear. That is real which has such and such characters, whether anybody thinks it to have those characters or not. At any rate, that is the sense in which the pragmaticist uses the word. Now, just as conduct controlled by ethical reason tends toward fixing certain habits of conduct, the nature of which, (as to illustrate the meaning, peaceable habits, and not quarrelsome habits,) does not depend upon any accidental circumstances, and in that sense, may be said to be destined; so, thought, controlled by a rational experimental logic, tends to the fixation of certain opinions, equally destined, the nature of which will be the same in the end, however the perversity of thought of whole generations may cause the postponement of the ultimate fixation. If this be so, as every man of us virtually assumes that it is, in regard to each matter the truth of which he seriously discusses, then, according to the adopted definition of "real," the state of things which will be believed in that ultimate opinion is real. But, for the most part, such opinions will be general. Consequently, some general objects are real. (Of course, nobody ever thought that all generals were real; but the scholastics used to assume that generals were real when they had hardly any, or quite no, experiential evidence to support their assumption; and their fault lay just there, and not in holding that generals could be real.) One is struck with the inexactitude of thought even of analysts of power, when they touch upon modes of being. One will meet, for example, the virtual assumption that what is relative to thought cannot be real. But why not, exactly? Red is relative to sight, but the fact that this or that is in that relation to vision that we call being red is not itself relative to sight; it is a real fact.

Not only may generals be real, but they may also be physically efficient, not in every metaphysical sense, but in the common-sense acceptance in which human purposes are physically efficient. Aside from metaphysical nonsense, no sane man doubts that if I feel the air in my study to be stuffy, that thought may cause the window to be opened. My thought, be it granted, was an individual event. But what determined it to take the particular determination it did, was in part the general fact that stuffy air is unwholesome, and in part other Forms, concerning which Dr. Carus has caused so many
men to reflect to advantage,—or rather, by which, and the general truth concerning which Dr. Carus’s mind was determined to the forcible enunciation of so much truth. For truths, on the average, have a greater tendency to get believed than falsities have. Were it otherwise, considering that there are myriads of false hypotheses to account for any given phenomenon, against one sole true one (or if you will have it so, against every true one,) the first step toward genuine knowledge must have been next door to a miracle. So, then; when my window was opened, because of the truth that stuffy air is malsain, a physical effort was brought into existence by the deficiency of a general and non-existent truth. This has a droll sound because it is unfamiliar; but exact analysis is with it and not against it; and it has besides, the immense advantage of not blinding us to great facts,—such as that the ideas “justice” and “truth” are, notwithstanding the iniquity of the world, the mightiest of the forces that move it. Generality is, indeed, an indispensable ingredient of reality; for mere individual existence or actuality without any regularity whatever is a nullity. Chaos is pure nothing. That which any true proposition asserts is real, in the sense of being as it is regardless of what you or I may think about it. Let this proposition be a general conditional proposition as to the future, and it is a real general such as is calculated really to influence human conduct; and such the pragmatist holds to be the rational purport of every concept.

Accordingly, the pragmatist does not make the sumnum bonum to consist in action, but makes it to consist in that process of evolution whereby the existent comes more and more to embody those generals which were just now said to be destined, which is what we strive to express in calling them reasonable. In its higher stages, evolution takes place more and more largely through self-control, and this gives the pragmatist à sort of justification for making the rational purport to be general.

There is much more in elucidation of pragmatism that might be said to advantage, were it not for the dread of fatiguing the reader. It might, for example, have been well to show clearly that the pragmatist does not attribute any different essential mode of
substantially the essential proposition of pragmaticism. Of course, its parallelism to the *dictum de omni* will only be admitted by a person who admits the truth of pragmaticism.

Suffer me to add one word more on this point. For if one cares at all to know what the pragmaticist theory consists in, one must understand that there is no other part of it to which the pragmaticist attaches quite as much importance as he does to the recognition in his doctrine of the utter inadequacy of action or volition or even of resolve or actual purpose, as materials out of which to construct a conditional purpose or the concept of conditional purpose. Had a purpose article concerning the principle of continuity and synthetising the ideas of the other articles of a series in the early volumes of *The Monist* ever been written, it would have appeared how, with thorough consistency, that theory involved the recognition that continuity is an indispensable element of reality, and that continuity is simply what generality becomes in the logic of relatives, and thus, like generality, and more than generality, is an affair of thought, and is the essence of thought. Yet even in its truncated condition, an extra-intelligent reader might discern that the theory of those cosmological articles made reality consist in something more than feeling and action could supply, inasmuch as the primeval chaos, where those two elements were present, was explicitly shown to be pure nothing. Now, the motive for alluding to that theory just here is, that in this way one can put in a strong light a position which the pragmaticist holds and must hold, whether that cosmological theory be ultimately sustained or exploded, namely, that the third category,—the category of thought, representation, triadic relation, mediation, genuine thirdness, thirdness as such,—is an essential ingredient of reality, yet does not by itself constitute reality, since this category, (which in that cosmology appears as the element of habit,) can have no concrete being without action, as a separate object on which to work its government, just as action cannot exist without the immediate being of feeling on which to act. The truth is that pragmaticism is closely allied to the Hegelian absolute idealism, from which,

however, it is sundered by its vigorous denial that the third category, (which Hegel degrades to a mere stage of thinking,) suffices to make the world, or is even so much as self-sufficient. Had Hegel, instead of regarding the first two stages with his smile of contempt, held on to them as independent or distinct elements of the triune Reality, pragmaticists might have looked up to him as the great vindicator of their truth. (Of course, the external trappings of his doctrine are only here and there of much significance.) For pragmaticism belongs essentially to the triadic class of philosophical doctrines, and is much more essentially so than Hegelianism is. (Indeed, in one passage, at least, Hegel alludes to the triadic form of his exposition as to a mere fashion of dress.)

*Milford, Pa., September, 1904.*

C. S. P.

**Postscript.** During the last five months, I have met with references to several objections to the above opinions, but not having been able to obtain the text of these objections, I do not think I ought to attempt to answer them. If gentlemen who attack either pragmaticism in general or the variety of it which I entertain would only send me copies of what they write, more important readers they could easily find, but they could find none who would examine their arguments with a more grateful av山西省 for truth not yet apprehended, nor any who would be more sensible of their courtesy.

Feb. 9, 1905.