

reader, not less than in the sweep of a solar system through unmeasured space; in every evil, not less than in every good. Such is my belief. If then the British power, ruthless, shall complete its destruction and construction in Tibet, then this ruthless act shall have demonstrated its necessity in the general scheme of things. Why preach about it, then? I do not know why, the ultimate why. But this preaching is also compelled; it is an effort toward something desired.

As to the application of adjectives such as "unjust," "unwarranted," "cruel," "unnatural," and the like, to any act of individual or government, with the seeming intent to condemn, as one condemns who believes in individual free-will; concerning this, it must be explained that the determinist finds his tongue taught certain tricks in childhood. He cannot easily lay them aside. Language has been formed chiefly by those who have been made to believe, among many other errors, that concerning the freedom of the will. The words "sunrise" and "unnatural" spring equally from erroneous belief, which it pleased the Power to create. The sun does not "rise" and nothing is "unnatural." When the determinist condemns and executes for murder, his position toward the murderer is this: "You have been brought to kill a man under such and such conditions. I have been brought to believe such an act as directly or indirectly harmful to me; I have been brought to believe it now to my interest to kill you. We are both acting under law, no man or beast can act otherwise." Now if the determinist stands quite alone in his condemnation