

## HAMILTON LETTER.

**Ecclesiastical—St. Joseph's Church—Renovated and Improved—Death of an old Resident—House of Providence Pictic—Miscellaneous.**

## ECCLESIASTICAL.

His Lordship Bishop Grinnon administered the sacrament of confirmation in Galt on Sunday last. He will give confirmation in St. Patrick's church in this city on Sunday next, the 11th inst.

Rev. E. Funcken of St. Agatha, celebrated this year the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination and is receiving the congratulations of his host of clerical and lay friends. His Lordship the bishop, who highly appreciates genuine worth, commemorated the event with a handsome present to the veteran priest.

The safe arrival of Vicar General Heenan in England has been announced. His ocean voyage was agreeable.

## ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH.

Our German co-religionists seem determined to have their church a handsome one. It is about to undergo an entire renovation both within and without. The architect for the work is Prof. H. A. Wilkens, the celebrated artist and sculptor, and judging by the ability which this talented gentleman has displayed on other occasions, we may expect very gratifying results. Operations have been already commenced under the management of Mr. James Sonneveld, a most competent artisan, to whom the contract has been awarded. By the time this is completed, and the works on the Cathedral brought to a close, the Catholics of Hamilton will be able to boast of having three of the finest churches in the province, with St. Patrick's in the front rank. The Rev. E. Bergmann, pastor of St. Joseph's, is most zealous in prosecuting the work of beautifying his church.

## DEATH OF AN OLD RESIDENT.

Our citizens generally were horrified on Saturday evening last when it became known that Mrs. Catherine Duggan had been struck by the engine while crossing the track of the Dundas railway, and instantly killed. Mrs. Duggan was an estimable old lady nearly 80 years of age, the widow of the late Daniel Duggan, and was well and favorably known to the Hamilton public. She was a resident of this city for nearly half a century, remarkable for a warm-hearted disposition, very industrious habits, close attention to religious duties. She was admired and respected by everybody with whom she was acquainted, so that her untimely death called forth a general expression of sorrow for herself and sympathy for her bereaved relations. No one stood higher in the estimation of the public, and in the locality in which she lived, now that she is no more, it will be a long time before she will be forgotten.

## HOUSE OF PROVIDENCE PICTIC.

The work of preparing for the House of Providence picnic goes busily on. It will be held in the grounds of that institution on Dominion Day, July the 1st. Hamilton people can get their tickets at 40c. for adults, and 25c. for children. This pays for admission to the grounds and fare for the round trip on the Dundas Railway. Father Feeney is making every effort to secure enjoyment for visitors and success to the enterprise.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

The election excitement increases apace and canvassers are presenting their work vigorously. On these days of the ballot it is unsafe to make any positive assertions, still, both sides are confident of victory.

The mild winter of the past season still continues, and people to a great extent have dispensed with overcoats and self-feeders. It may be necessary even to wear straw hats and linen dusters before the end of August.

## CLANCAHILL.

**HOW A CINCINNATI CATHOLIC EDITOR SAVED A MAN FROM SUICIDE.**

Last Sunday, writes Mr. H. W. I. Garland, of the Catholic Telegraph, we came face to face with a would-be suicide, in the very act of attempting to accomplish the crime under the influence of alcoholic frenzy. As some of the facts have crept into the daily papers, we will briefly utilize them to point a moral. Rowing upon the placid bosom of the little lake in Lincoln Park, our attention was suddenly called to a man who had leaped into the water at the deepest part of the lake, and was deliberately attempting to drown himself. We approached the spot as rapidly as possible, and proffered our assistance. The man plunged his head beneath the water, and it became necessary to leap overboard in order to save him. On grappling with him in the water we made a desperate effort by kicking and struggling, and eventually broke away and disappeared from the surface; we again succeeded in seizing him, and but narrowly escaped being dragged to the bottom by him, as he clasped us tightly round the arms and waist. Another struggle ensued, and we were for a moment between life and death. Seizing him by the collar, and digging our knuckles against his throat, we were able to turn on our back, and in that way swim to the shore, towing his exhausted body. An oar was stretched out to us, and dragging the would-be suicide with us, we were glad to stand on terra firma once more. As soon as the drunken wretch could speak he reviled us with curses loud and deep. He was "tired of living," he said, and upbraided us for saving that life of which he was so anxious to be rid. As from head to foot we had not a dry stitch of clothing on us, we could waste no time in useless talk, and consigning our friend to the care of others, we hurried home. The man was locked up, his case inquired into, and on Monday he was sent out to the insane asylum at Longview. The poor wretch had thrice before attempted to hang himself; his habitual use of strong drink had brought on alcoholic frenzy and rendered him a rabid and dangerous lunatic. With thousands of such cases before them, our legislators are wise indeed to adopt the restrictive measures they have as to the consumption of bad whiskey.

**DON'T DIE IN THE HOUSE.** "Rough on Rats." Clears out rats, mice, flies, roaches, bed-bugs. 15c.

## NOTES ON INGERSOLL.

By REV. L. A. LAMBERT, OF WATERLOO, NEW YORK.

## CONTINUED.

INGERSOLL. "This idea (of law) is produced from (by) the fact that under like circumstances the same (a like) phenomenon always happens."

COMMENT. A series of like phenomena suggest the existence of force, not the idea of law, and when like phenomena always happen under like circumstances, we are led to conclude that it is the same force that is acting in each case. Further observation of this force's manifestation—and all phenomena are the manifestation of force—enables us to distinguish it from other forces, to identify it with its invariable act and to associate it with its effects. Having arrived at this degree of familiarity with a force, and its act, formulate in words what it will do under given circumstances. This is to make what are called the laws of nature. In this sense the laws of nature are purely subjective, that is to say, they exist only in the mind conceiving them, and not in nature. There is an inherent principle in the forces of nature that causes them to act in the same circumstances. But this is not a law; it is rather the intrinsic nature of the forces themselves. The laws of nature then are the uniform action of natural forces expressed in words. When physicists speak of the laws of nature, they refer to the forces of which the laws are but the expression; and they suppose that philosophers have sufficient intelligence and common sense to understand this fact. And yet it appears they are sometimes mistaken.

INGERSOLL. "Mr. Black probably thinks that the difference in weight of rocks and clouds was created by law."

COMMENT. God directly created effects when He created the causes. He created the natural forces when He created nature, and the difference between the weight of rocks and clouds arises from the fact that, although the same force operates on both of them, it does so under different, and not like, circumstances in the case, and that of the rock is greater than that of the cloud. Thus, while the same force is acting on both, and in the same manner, it does it under different circumstances, and hence the difference in result.

INGERSOLL. "Mr. Black probably thinks that parallel lines fail to unite only because it is illegal."

COMMENT. Mr. Black "probably thinks" that when you trifle in this way you are not exercising the highest faculties of your mind to any great extent. Law, in what sense we understand it, has reference to the possible. Reason teaches us that a thing cannot be and not be at the same time. Your parallel-tangent lines suppose it can. Whatever else Mr. Black may be, he is certainly not a fool. You speak much of the candor and "honor bright." Do you intend what you have said as an illustration of those virtues?

INGERSOLL. "It seems to me that law cannot be the cause of phenomena, but an effect produced in our minds by their succession and resemblance."

COMMENT. It would seem that it seems so to you since you have repeated that idea three times in a half page of your article. Your quibbles on the word "law" have been sufficiently exposed. Law is not an effect produced in our minds. It is the result of the mind's own action, the deduction which the mind draws from the data or phenomena.

INGERSOLL. "To put a God back of the universe, compels us to admit that there was a time when nothing existed except this God."

COMMENT. As time began with creation and is the measure of its endurance, it follows that before creation was, time was not. To say, therefore, that God existed in time is unphilosophical. God IS. To Him there is neither past, present nor future—only eternity. But granted that God is alone before creation was, what do you infer from it?

INGERSOLL. "That this God lived from eternity in infinite vacuum and absolute idleness."

COMMENT. If God lived in it, as you say, it could not be vacuum. A vacuum is that in which nothing is. In the hypothesis that God, He is something; He is infinite and hence an infinite vacuum is infinite nonsense. But the word has a gross, material sense and you used it for a purpose.

INGERSOLL. "And in absolute idleness."

COMMENT. Christian philosophy teaches us that God is pure act, the source and origin of all activity and life. To say that such a being as God, who is pure act, stands in absolute idleness or nonaction is simply an expression of human ignorance. Activity is of two kinds, transitive and intransitive. The first passes from the actor to the object, the second is confirmed or limited to the actor. While God acts from eternity and by necessity of his nature, his acts, before creation necessarily terminated in Himself—ad intra.

You may say this theory of Christian philosophy is erroneous. But that is nothing to the purpose until you have demonstrated the error of it, which is what you undertook to do. You attack that philosophy and you must meet its positions as they are, not as you would make them appear, and overthrow them if you can.

INGERSOLL. "The mind of every thoughtful man is forced to one of two conclusions: Either that the universe is self-existent or that it was created by a self-existent being. To my mind there is far more difficulty in the second hypothesis than in the first."

COMMENT. It is to be regretted that you did not take the time and space to show the difference in the weight of those difficulties—to show how the existence of an eternal self-existent creator presents more difficulties to the mind than does the existence of eternal matter. The existence of an eternal creator may be beyond the grasp of pure reason, inconceivable to the mind, but it is not contrary to reason. While the eternity of matter, as we have seen, involves the co-existence of mutually destructive attributes in the same subject at the same time, and is therefore contradictory to reason.

There have been many men of thoughtful minds who did not see that they were forced to adopt either of your two conclusions. The pantheists of ancient and

modern times, of India and Europe, held that the universe was neither eternal nor created, but that it was an emanation from God, having no real existence of its own, a mere dream or illusion. These philosophers were more radical than you. They believed that God alone is real and that all else is phantasm. In believing that God is more immediately cognizable to the intellect than the material universe is, they showed a more profound philosophical sense than is exhibited by your school. The gnostics two thousand years ago held this same doctrine of emanation. The neoplatonists, like some of our German philosophers, denied the objective reality of the universe. Spinoza held that God alone has real existence and all things are but forms of his extension. Kant held that nothing exists but the *me*—individual consciousness, and that all things else are but the forms or manifestations of this *me* or individual consciousness. Schelling, Hegel and other philosophers of the German pantheistic school held the same as Fichte. The French eclectics, led by Cousin, denied the creation and held that the universe is a mere apparition by which the divine being is exteriorly manifested. All these are pantheists, and holding emanation, others formation, and others still, idealism. Now, none of these are included in either of your two necessary conclusions. You will see that thoughtful men have pondered long on this subject before you directed your attention to it, and that they did not come to the conclusion you did. They wrote many books to elucidate what you discuss in half a dozen lines. They erred in denying the reality of matter; you err in asserting its eternal existence. To assert God and deny matter shows a higher philosophical culture than to assert matter and deny God. The ontological conceptions of the Hindoos and Chinese of 3,000 years ago, were therefore profound and more in keeping with Christian philosophy than are the ill-digested notions of our modern infidels. The former grasped the idea of necessary being, but failed to recognize the real in the universe. The latter have the ability to apprehend the reality of the visible, tangible world, but cannot rise above it to a conception of necessary being.

INGERSOLL. "Of course, upon questions like this, nothing can be absolutely known."

COMMENT. To know anything absolutely is to know in all its relations with the universe and with God, with the necessary and the contingent. The infinite intelligences of the past, who wrote what we understand it, have reference to the possible. Reason teaches us that a thing cannot be and not be at the same time. Your parallel-tangent lines suppose it can. Whatever else Mr. Black may be, he is certainly not a fool. You speak much of the candor and "honor bright." Do you intend what you have said as an illustration of those virtues?

INGERSOLL. "It seems to me that law cannot be the cause of phenomena, but an effect produced in our minds by their succession and resemblance."

COMMENT. It would seem that it seems so to you since you have repeated that idea three times in a half page of your article. Your quibbles on the word "law" have been sufficiently exposed. Law is not an effect produced in our minds. It is the result of the mind's own action, the deduction which the mind draws from the data or phenomena.

INGERSOLL. "To put a God back of the universe, compels us to admit that there was a time when nothing existed except this God."

COMMENT. As time began with creation and is the measure of its endurance, it follows that before creation was, time was not. To say, therefore, that God existed in time is unphilosophical. God IS. To Him there is neither past, present nor future—only eternity. But granted that God is alone before creation was, what do you infer from it?

INGERSOLL. "That this God lived from eternity in infinite vacuum and absolute idleness."

COMMENT. If God lived in it, as you say, it could not be vacuum. A vacuum is that in which nothing is. In the hypothesis that God, He is something; He is infinite and hence an infinite vacuum is infinite nonsense. But the word has a gross, material sense and you used it for a purpose.

INGERSOLL. "And in absolute idleness."

COMMENT. Christian philosophy teaches us that God is pure act, the source and origin of all activity and life. To say that such a being as God, who is pure act, stands in absolute idleness or nonaction is simply an expression of human ignorance. Activity is of two kinds, transitive and intransitive. The first passes from the actor to the object, the second is confirmed or limited to the actor. While God acts from eternity and by necessity of his nature, his acts, before creation necessarily terminated in Himself—ad intra.

You may say this theory of Christian philosophy is erroneous. But that is nothing to the purpose until you have demonstrated the error of it, which is what you undertook to do. You attack that philosophy and you must meet its positions as they are, not as you would make them appear, and overthrow them if you can.

INGERSOLL. "The mind of every thoughtful man is forced to one of two conclusions: Either that the universe is self-existent or that it was created by a self-existent being. To my mind there is far more difficulty in the second hypothesis than in the first."

COMMENT. It is to be regretted that you did not take the time and space to show the difference in the weight of those difficulties—to show how the existence of an eternal self-existent creator presents more difficulties to the mind than does the existence of eternal matter. The existence of an eternal creator may be beyond the grasp of pure reason, inconceivable to the mind, but it is not contrary to reason. While the eternity of matter, as we have seen, involves the co-existence of mutually destructive attributes in the same subject at the same time, and is therefore contradictory to reason.

There have been many men of thoughtful minds who did not see that they were forced to adopt either of your two conclusions. The pantheists of ancient and

modern times, of India and Europe, held that the universe was neither eternal nor created, but that it was an emanation from God, having no real existence of its own, a mere dream or illusion. These philosophers were more radical than you. They believed that God alone is real and that all else is phantasm. In believing that God is more immediately cognizable to the intellect than the material universe is, they showed a more profound philosophical sense than is exhibited by your school. The gnostics two thousand years ago held this same doctrine of emanation. The neoplatonists, like some of our German philosophers, denied the objective reality of the universe. Spinoza held that God alone has real existence and all things are but forms of his extension. Kant held that nothing exists but the *me*—individual consciousness, and that all things else are but the forms or manifestations of this *me* or individual consciousness. Schelling, Hegel and other philosophers of the German pantheistic school held the same as Fichte. The French eclectics, led by Cousin, denied the creation and held that the universe is a mere apparition by which the divine being is exteriorly manifested. All these are pantheists, and holding emanation, others formation, and others still, idealism. Now, none of these are included in either of your two necessary conclusions. You will see that thoughtful men have pondered long on this subject before you directed your attention to it, and that they did not come to the conclusion you did. They wrote many books to elucidate what you discuss in half a dozen lines. They erred in denying the reality of matter; you err in asserting its eternal existence. To assert God and deny matter shows a higher philosophical culture than to assert matter and deny God. The ontological conceptions of the Hindoos and Chinese of 3,000 years ago, were therefore profound and more in keeping with Christian philosophy than are the ill-digested notions of our modern infidels. The former grasped the idea of necessary being, but failed to recognize the real in the universe. The latter have the ability to apprehend the reality of the visible, tangible world, but cannot rise above it to a conception of necessary being.

INGERSOLL. "Of course, upon questions like this, nothing can be absolutely known."

COMMENT. To know anything absolutely is to know in all its relations with the universe and with God, with the necessary and the contingent. The infinite intelligences of the past, who wrote what we understand it, have reference to the possible. Reason teaches us that a thing cannot be and not be at the same time. Your parallel-tangent lines suppose it can. Whatever else Mr. Black may be, he is certainly not a fool. You speak much of the candor and "honor bright." Do you intend what you have said as an illustration of those virtues?

INGERSOLL. "It seems to me that law cannot be the cause of phenomena, but an effect produced in our minds by their succession and resemblance."

COMMENT. It would seem that it seems so to you since you have repeated that idea three times in a half page of your article. Your quibbles on the word "law" have been sufficiently exposed. Law is not an effect produced in our minds. It is the result of the mind's own action, the deduction which the mind draws from the data or phenomena.

INGERSOLL. "To put a God back of the universe, compels us to admit that there was a time when nothing existed except this God."

COMMENT. As time began with creation and is the measure of its endurance, it follows that before creation was, time was not. To say, therefore, that God existed in time is unphilosophical. God IS. To Him there is neither past, present nor future—only eternity. But granted that God is alone before creation was, what do you infer from it?

INGERSOLL. "That this God lived from eternity in infinite vacuum and absolute idleness."

COMMENT. If God lived in it, as you say, it could not be vacuum. A vacuum is that in which nothing is. In the hypothesis that God, He is something; He is infinite and hence an infinite vacuum is infinite nonsense. But the word has a gross, material sense and you used it for a purpose.

INGERSOLL. "And in absolute idleness."

COMMENT. Christian philosophy teaches us that God is pure act, the source and origin of all activity and life. To say that such a being as God, who is pure act, stands in absolute idleness or nonaction is simply an expression of human ignorance. Activity is of two kinds, transitive and intransitive. The first passes from the actor to the object, the second is confirmed or limited to the actor. While God acts from eternity and by necessity of his nature, his acts, before creation necessarily terminated in Himself—ad intra.

You may say this theory of Christian philosophy is erroneous. But that is nothing to the purpose until you have demonstrated the error of it, which is what you undertook to do. You attack that philosophy and you must meet its positions as they are, not as you would make them appear, and overthrow them if you can.

INGERSOLL. "The mind of every thoughtful man is forced to one of two conclusions: Either that the universe is self-existent or that it was created by a self-existent being. To my mind there is far more difficulty in the second hypothesis than in the first."

COMMENT. It is to be regretted that you did not take the time and space to show the difference in the weight of those difficulties—to show how the existence of an eternal self-existent creator presents more difficulties to the mind than does the existence of eternal matter. The existence of an eternal creator may be beyond the grasp of pure reason, inconceivable to the mind, but it is not contrary to reason. While the eternity of matter, as we have seen, involves the co-existence of mutually destructive attributes in the same subject at the same time, and is therefore contradictory to reason.

There have been many men of thoughtful minds who did not see that they were forced to adopt either of your two conclusions. The pantheists of ancient and

modern times, of India and Europe, held that the universe was neither eternal nor created, but that it was an emanation from God, having no real existence of its own, a mere dream or illusion. These philosophers were more radical than you. They believed that God alone is real and that all else is phantasm. In believing that God is more immediately cognizable to the intellect than the material universe is, they showed a more profound philosophical sense than is exhibited by your school. The gnostics two thousand years ago held this same doctrine of emanation. The neoplatonists, like some of our German philosophers, denied the objective reality of the universe. Spinoza held that God alone has real existence and all things are but forms of his extension. Kant held that nothing exists but the *me*—individual consciousness, and that all things else are but the forms or manifestations of this *me* or individual consciousness. Schelling, Hegel and other philosophers of the German pantheistic school held the same as Fichte. The French eclectics, led by Cousin, denied the creation and held that the universe is a mere apparition by which the divine being is exteriorly manifested. All these are pantheists, and holding emanation, others formation, and others still, idealism. Now, none of these are included in either of your two necessary conclusions. You will see that thoughtful men have pondered long on this subject before you directed your attention to it, and that they did not come to the conclusion you did. They wrote many books to elucidate what you discuss in half a dozen lines. They erred in denying the reality of matter; you err in asserting its eternal existence. To assert God and deny matter shows a higher philosophical culture than to assert matter and deny God. The ontological conceptions of the Hindoos and Chinese of 3,000 years ago, were therefore profound and more in keeping with Christian philosophy than are the ill-digested notions of our modern infidels. The former grasped the idea of necessary being, but failed to recognize the real in the universe. The latter have the ability to apprehend the reality of the visible, tangible world, but cannot rise above it to a conception of necessary being.

more than two thousand years ago that it should be offered from the rising to the setting of the sun. I have felt the force of that word, "we are one," having traveled in many countries with different tongues and customs, and found Catholics everywhere the same, and having conversed and associated and labored with priests from all parts of the world. It is to this wonderful unity of the Catholic faith and communion that I owe it, that I do not find myself a stranger in Ireland in spite of my nationality."

## REASON AND FAITH.

The Independent has a delectable article on "Mental self-mutilation," which has much of the good, old-style, ignorant Protestant ring in it. "The Jesuit would pluck out the eye and have men go behind in religion," says our intelligent contemporary in the language of the past. Now, does the Independent believe any such nonsense, and if it does not believe it, why state it? In what do Jesuits differ from other men, save perhaps as a class in exceptional charity, exceptional training and exceptional holiness? Does the Independent of its own knowledge know of a Jesuit who could "pluck out the eye and have men go blind in religion?" And if so would it kindly name him that we may have him "as our rarer monsters are, painted upon a pole, and underneath 'Here may you see the Jesuit.'"

The whole article is a tissue of nonsense, and much of it is unintelligible. What is the common sense meaning of sounding sentences such as these? "Some men can see truth best with their eyes shut. The eye is the main obstacle to some forms of faith. . . . The eyes, if they are open defeat many religious schemes." and much more of the same sort. "Therefore," says the champion of infallible dogma, put out the eyes; suppress the room; take religion on authority. Become blind, that you may be led. Give up thinking, that you may believe."

There is no blindness like that of ignorance and prejudice, for these close the windows of the soul. The Master said "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven." And taking a little child he said to his apostles, not of course to the writers in the Independent, "Amen, amen, unless ye become as one of these ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven." The Independent would put this down as recommending an ignorant and blind faith, an act of "mental self-mutilation."

The truth is that there are no such earnest searchers after truth and no such keen and bold inquirers as the teachers, doctors, and fathers of the Catholic Church. There is not a question in theology or philosophy that they do not probe as far and as deeply as human reason will allow them to go.

The questions and objections of avowed infidels have always been weak or puerile compared to the deep soundings taken through all the ages by the men in the barque of Peter. The mental self-mutilation of the Fathers of the Holy Roman Catholic Church put out their eyes that they might not see God and his truth? What new truth has Protestantism brought to light? It has simply been a religion of negation from first to last, and what fragments of truth it held were borrowed from the Catholic Church. The Catholic faith is the only reasonable, intelligent and intelligible faith in this world. Protestantism is of its very essence the religion of negation and doubt. There is no surety of faith in the system. It has no solid foundation, no sure guide, no resting place for the soul, no justification in reason. Yet those who go out from it to enter the Catholic fold are objects of scorn to the Independent. "Reason gave them no rest," says our contemporary truly, for the simple fact that they were in search of reason; "philosophy led them into skepticism; science made them materialists. In despair of accepting any religion with their eyes open, they resolved to put out their eyes, that they might have peace," in other words, blind themselves in order to see the light.

Then follows the old story. "They embraced the Roman or some other religion, and determined to be led by the Church." And why not? Was the Church meant as a head or as a tail to the individual man? Is a soldier an unreasonable being because he recognizes superiority outside of himself and obeys it? Are all of us unreasonable beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent to the law of the land? And is the law of the land worthy of deeper respect and more implicit obedience than the law of Christ coming to us through the authoritative body that He founded for the express purpose of proclaiming and promulgating His law and His doctrine? According to the Independent, whose able beings because we freely assent