

ary Guide" and printed in the "Dominion Review," Toronto, Canada, for April, 1900. On page 79 he says: "Immortality is a dream and a delusion, full of absurdities in its orthodox presentation, and diametrically opposed to scientific anthropology. The best we can wish for a brave life devoted to good purpose, according to our conscience, is the eternal peace of the grave."

As to the dualistic Deity business, he negatives it utterly. He says, "Science, when its data are soberly interpreted, finds one entity—Nature—slowly, blindly, painfully unfolding itself on the Theatre of Time." All of the deities are thoroughly dissipated into nothingness. Nothing short of Pantheism or Atheism is reconcilable with modern knowledge of reality. "God and the world are one!" He uses the word "World Enigma" (Weltrathsel) as descriptive of the Ether problem which is next to be solved. The idea of the great Monist, Haeckel, countenancing the notion that some "Actuality," "Deity" or "Energy" of the universe could upset its laws in favor of the post mortem consciousness of a man or a mosquito, is a delicious absurdity. He says (p. 79): "The law of substance [correlation] rules in the remotest regions of space as it does on earth. The persistence of matter and force has been as universal in all time as it is today. The unity and continuity of the world, in time, has been proved as utterly as its unity in actual existence." Space limit prevents more quotations. Read his works, and all doubt about Haeckel's solid repugnance to every conceivable phase of God or Ghost will vanish at once.

But suppose all of these "authorities," and more, did support our Friend's notions, they could not help him a particle, except in so far as they express the facts, laws and results of Nature and Science. They all "err" as to many things, but Science never "errs;" and Science is the only final authority. Truth only bears the torch in the search for truth. Now that we come to first hand with our Friend's "Deity," let us see whether it is a reality or a spook.

As Haeckel says: "God and the world are one." This is his shortest way of re-stating the ultimate law of correlation and equivalence. If our Friend means only this, he is at one with the Science of the world, and we agree with him, and would rejoice as we began to do over the first part of his "Gospel." But his explaining definition of Evolution and Deity, above quoted, was sufficient to prompt the questions. Is not this the old Ghost? Is not this Dualism? For, by that definition we have "all things proceeding from an Imminent and Omnipresent Deity who eternally creates and de-creates"—what?

Why, evidently, "the all things which proceed from him." Here is the doctrine of the creation of the world—"all things," by an extra-mundane God. But worse than the old God, this one also "de-creates;" that is, he is the "Actuality" which may exercise the "possibility" of not only "de-creating" but of creating a "survival" and an "immortality" for the consciousness of a defunct mosquito. But how is he to do this? Scientifically, by the correlation of always existing matter and its changes called force? No! We read that he is to do it "by the ceaseless and orderly movings of his indwelling presence." That is, he, by ceaseless and orderly movings of his presence, dwelling inside of something[?], creates "all things," and they from him "proceed" out into existence? This is merely the old God of the Catechism which says: "The work of creation is God's making 'all things' of nothing, by the word of his power." Our Friend changes this creed only by inserting "Movings of his indwelling presence" instead of the "word of his power." I may be "superficial," but the material difference between the old and the new definition does not appear to me. In both cases "all things" came into existence from the creating God, and by the "energy" of his "presence," or the "word of his power" and out of nothing, for this is the meaning of the word "create;" and our Friend's definition does not intimate that the creation was out of anything; what's more, not even out of the God himself. Had he so meant, he might have used the word "correlate;" but the word correlate would at once oust his Deity, for by their correlation "all things" run themselves without creation, beginning or end, and are at once the world and God of Science. In that correlative view there is no possible room for a creator, or extra-mundane Deity, and so all references to "Him or "His" are omitted from modern scientific works. The world has ceased to be regarded as a Dualism, because it has been discovered to be a Monism. The All does not "reveal energy" nor "proceed from it" as a "Deity," as our Friend says. Energy is the power of the All to do work, its own activity, and is in nowise separate from it, nor creating it. You might as well say that a workman proceeds from his labor, or that a head proceeds or is created by its headache! But it is all too absurd to consider. There is nothing in it but Spook. Infinite correlation is Monism, and "The All" is all there is.

The ending of our Friend's "Gospel of Evolution" in this unscientific "Immortality and Deity" was a matter of profound regret to his scientific and Liberal friends. The lady referred to writes: "I wondered whether or no some well

known scientific evolutionist would not take Mr. Bland up on that point, for if there is one idea inconsistent with scientific evolution [as I understand it], it is the idea that is put forth by the word 'Deity' and the word 'God,' and the dependent pronouns, him and his."

Another matter of regret was that our Friend's "gospel" did not bring forward the human, social race-Immortality, based upon "Scientific anthropology," to which Prof. Haeckel referred. That concept is the resultant flower of the grand Science of historical Sociology. Its "Enthusiasm and Religion of Humanity" is now the chief inspiration of the Liberals, Scientists, Philanthropists and Reformers of the world, upon whom its emancipation from superstition, and its progress towards the "Earthly Paradise" largely depends. A "Gospel of Evolution," which does not reach up to, and blossom out with that flower, is a sad case of "arrested development."

We regret that on account of our Friend's presenting an unscientific God and immortality, as the outcome of his "Gospel," it is likely, as it is, to be an injury rather than a benefit. The question of the age is, can Theology get some warrant or excuse for itself beyond the reach of Science and its knowable world? Then they can say as of old: "I believe because it is impossible." Thus, Sir William Hamilton and Mansel gave the ultimate as "belief," McCosh gave "intuition," the Spiritualists "spirit." And as long as there is any doubt about the certainty and infinite reach of Science, i. e., of correlation, the ignorant or fanatic priests and ministers, will have their way with the masses; will keep on saying, "Down on your marrow-bones, Ye miserable sinners, 'fess and pray and give us your hearts and money, or the "Deity" will damn you, sure." And so the redemption and progress of this world must wait upon an insane and stupid superstition about "another world;" for "where your [fear and] treasure is, there your heart will be also."

Another and an unexpected regret comes from the ungracious and unliberal way in which our Friend listens to questions or criticism. The questions referred to may have seemed "careless" because they were not expressed in his own inimitable style; but that was not material, for they were certainly intelligible—certainly so—when compared with our Friend's vapory definitions. That they were not "superficial" is evident from the fact that our Friend makes a reply without an answer. That they seemed "self-conceited" to him, is because he did not appreciate the importance of his work to others, nor their cruel disappointment when it led them back to the dirty flesh-pots of old Egypt, instead of forward, under

the banners of Liberty, Science and Humanity, to the "Earthly Paradise," the true "promised land" of Evolution.

Personally, this regret is great. As an instructor in a decisively Liberal, that is to say, emancipated, University, with its paper the Torch of Reason, we reach thousands of readers weekly, besides our students. A "Gospel of Evolution," scientifically written, is what we need. In our Friend's work we thought it was coming, and we quoted from and advertised it largely. We had no idea that a retrograde "gospel" about "Immortality and Deity" was appearing in our reliable old Liberal Investigator; and, least of all, did we suppose that "questions," enabling answers to be given that might save the whole work at the last moment, would be treated as a presumption or an insult. But alas! as the Romanists say it: "Once a priest, always a priest"—not only in thought, but in manner.

Travels: Morning on the Pacific Shore: Baths, and Sights and Thoughts.

BY T. B. WAKEMAN.

We first saw this shore with the setting sun, and followed that over to Asia with various reflections on the progress of Empire, to be read in the last Torch.

Now the fresh light and breeze of the morning finds me on the same fine, soft, light grayish bed of sand, looking out on the same, but different appearing world of waters and shore. For the wind had freshened at night, and the rollers seemed more like ranges of young mountains trying to find the greater ranges on the shore. But they had their old long majestic sweep.

Byron's ocean apostrophe: "Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll," etc., seems to recall the Pacific rather than the Atlantic, after you have seen both.

The Pacific makes us exclaim:

Thou glorious Mirror, where the Almighty's form
Glasses itself in Tempests; in all time
Calm or convulsed—in breeze, or gale,
or storm,
Icing the pole, or in the torrid clime
Dark-heaving, boundless, endless and
sublime,
The Image of Eternity.

Quite different all this from the rushing currents and high tides, the fitful hurricanes and tornadoes, the "gray melancholy waste," broken by the chop-seas, of the narrow, rock-bound and storm-tossed Atlantic.

The children have brought up from the tide-rim strange shells, razor clams and "sea-weeds rich and strange." Did you ever see a "sea-onion" nearly a hundred feet long? It is a sort of vegetable sea-serpent. Its germ catches on some

Concluded on 8th page.