

1890
Mildford 1840 Sep 6.

My dear Sir:

Yours dated "August 3rd"
with check has come safely
& hand.

You should not attribute anon-
ymous articles to me, as you don't
know what editorial liberties may
have been taken with them. As you
justly say a brief article in a weekly
paper can do little more than
scatter suggestions. But I have al-
ways declined to identify myself with
associations for "conciliating religion
with science". Best let them work out
their own roads to truth. It is not
likely I shall be drawn into any further
discussion of this question which being
one of wisdom has to be settled by the
slow peristalsis of the mind. I shall
read with attention your articles and
that of Mr. Hegeler.

I have been looking over your article

on Kant's Evolutionism. I myself
came into philosophy by the road of
Kant, of whom I was long an enthusi-
astic student, & for whom I retain a
certain veneration.

Your lauded quotation from the
Critique of the Pure Reason, — a cele-
brated passage, — appears to me to
have no bearing on the question,
being merely a point of logic.

Nor can I admit that Kant
either in the passage about the
baby's cry or anywhere else antici-
pates the Darwinian idea in
the least.

I have heard too much of Kant's
being hard reading. I think he
is one of the easiest of philoso-
phers; for he generally knows what
he wants to say, which is more
than half the battle, and he says
it in terms which are very clear.
Of course, it is quite absurd to try
to read Kant without preliminary

studies of Leibnizian & English philosophers, as well as of the terminology of which Kant's is a modification or transmigration. But there is a way of making out what he meant, while such writers as Hume and J. S. Mill, the more you study them the more they puzzle you.

I wish you would not talk about the "Critique of Pure Reason"; first because the proper English word is critic not critique (we having two forms where the German has only one) and second because the name of faculties take the definite article. Reason is one thing in English, and the reason, that is the reasoning faculty, is quite another. It is absurd to talk of criticizing Reason, for reason means conformity with truth as far as we can see it.

What you say of ~~people's~~ men's
attitude of hostility to those
whose views are very nearly
their own is quite true. Your
views of ethics, by the way, seem
to me a good deal nearer
those of Spencer than to those
of Kant.

Kant was splendid; - but
after all he lived a hundred
years ago, - and what a hundred
years it has been!

Yours faithfully

Wm. L. Garrison

Dr Paul Cairns

Editor Open Court

Chicago -

file 30/1