The matter would soon termmate if we would assume the sycophants cringing attitude. But this can scarcely be expected. Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. We claim to represent the progressive liberty of Protestantism. And opposed to this, as it has always, is the old spirit of domination. Liberty of thought must be chained. Liberty of utterance must be curbed. If this liberty is persisted in, it cannot be within the pale of the churches, and so it has ever been.

When will rulers learn wisdom? Surely they know that the Lord is abroad on the earth? Have they no fear of His judgment? Truth is never advantaged by terrorism, however, hence we refrain, but we could give harrowing details of God's dealings with antagonists of this way.

Professors of rightcous living run no danger. It is the practicers whose blood is heing sought after. And what can the descendants of the crucifiers hope to gain by this fresh onslaught? Do they expect to stop the onward march of Gospel truth? The task is a hopeless one. The "beast that cometh up out of the abyss" may triumph the professed "three days and a half." They may even "rejoice and make merry and send their gifts one to another." But the result is invariably the same. God's truth, from the ashes of persecution will rise, clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners.

And what has created this furore? We can only speak for ourselves. We have been attacked because in the natural order of things we have taken the liberty of looking into and comparing what the Scriptures say about the birth of Christ.

We have looked at that 'Scripture' where the angel is recorded as saying to Joseph, "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."—And to Mary, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God." We have compared these two Scriptures with the hundreds of other passages bearing on Christ's birth, and comparing Scripture with Scripture have been unable to arrive at

any positive conclusion. And because of our utter ignorance, because of our, for the time being, isolation from the great procession, because we can't fill up the measure of truth, as it has been and is being filled with the "orthodox" on this matter, resentment is manifested at our examination. We should at least have held our peace and not published our ignorance to the world; not made public our doubts to the great injury of evangelical Christianity.

If evangelical Christianity is built on so fragile and so flimsy a foundation that it can be shaken because of our inability to understand the mystery of the immaculate conception—of our inability to harmonize the two passages that teach one thing, with those that seem to teach the reverse, the sooner it is known the better. But seriously where does the Protestants right to liberty of conscience end. We know where it has its beginning, and we rather think its end will also be in God.

What liberty can be taken by the Protestant with the utterances of the Bible? Is the interpretation of every passage therein contained a foregone conclusion? Are there certain passages that must have a uniform interpretation by all the sects, and others that a sectarian interpretation of, is allowed?

Here is the opinion of a Roman Catholic to be found in the Review of Reviews for June. This editor of the "Civilita Catholica" asks: "must we bow to the teaching church that condemned the teaching of Gallileo as false and heretical." "Does the teaching church or does it not recognize the facts that have been brought out in modern research?" He says, "I and many loyal Catholics with me hold and will continue to hold and confess that Moses did not write or dictate any of the books commonly ascribed to him by our theologians—that the section of Isaiah which treats of Babylon and its destruction cannot have been composed by Isaiah, in whose time there was no Babylonish empire; that the Jews could not have been actually languishing in exile when Isaiah was written; that there is no reasonable doubt in the mind of any unbiassed thinker who has carefully sifted