

ditional, absolute decree of God." Now, what kind of freedom belongs to man's will, if this is true? None whatever. Calvinists do talk about the freedom of the will, but they are deceived by a sham freedom. They say "a man can act from choice," but they do not admit that he is *free in arriving at the choice*; nor will they admit that man has power of *contrary* choice. And yet without this the word freedom is a delusion. The decrees of the Confession of Faith destroy all true freedom. We will ask the indulgence of our readers, while we introduce a distinguished Calvinistic author, who has the intelligence to see, and the honesty to confess that the decrees of the Confession are inconsistent with true psychological freedom. We introduce Dr. Dick.

"Liberty does not consist," he says, "in the power of acting or not acting, but in acting from choice. The choice is determined by something in the mind itself, or by something external influencing the mind; but whatever is the cause, the choice makes the action free, and the agent accountable. If this definition of liberty be admitted, you will perceive that it is possible to reconcile the freedom of the will with absolute decrees; but we have not got rid of every difficulty. By this theory, human actions appear to be as necessary as the motions of matter, according to the laws of gravitation and attraction; and man seems to be a machine, conscious of his movements, and consenting to them, but impelled by something different from himself."

What a specimen of sophistry in reasoning, and honesty in confession. Dr. Dick's liberty and necessity are the same thing; and yet man is accountable for his actions though his choice is as necessitated as the law of gravitation, or the movements of a machine. This is the kind of fallacious freedom that is taught in the Confession of Faith, according to its standard expounders and defenders. The reasoning is irrefutable which charges the decrees of the Confession of Faith as being destructive of mental freedom. They are only consistent with the liberty of the machine, or the ass. How terrible to think of the consequences. If true, there is not a demon in hell, or a rascal on earth, that could have done differently. All their "volitions" and "deliberations" were produced by the decree of God. Will any supporter of this Westminster Confession say that any of them could have chosen differently from what they have? Not one can say so. *Every sin* was decreed by God eternally, and produced by God in time. Is there any relief from this difficulty? *How can a man be free in willing,*