

A little thought will show the reason for the difference.

Men can learn a great deal about the facts in any field to which they can gain access. But if the facts are out of reach, investigation is useless. In such a field one must either remain ignorant, or gain his knowledge by revelation from someone who knows. If you are in Brazil and want to learn about the interior of the country, you can organize an expedition to travel far westward and to examine the country in detail. But if you want to learn something about Africa, and if you have no means of going there, no amount of standing on the shore and peering at the ocean waves will tell you anything about your subject of interest. You will never know how long its rivers are, or whether they run from west to east, like the Amazon, or from north to south like the Mississippi, or from south to north like the Nile, unless you are able to go there, or to receive information from someone who has been there. If Africa is inaccessible to you, you will never know what kind of trees it produces, or what minerals are found there, or what languages its people speak, unless you can get a revelation from someone who knows.

I fear that a good deal of recent philosophy is exactly like