

not, in reason, to wish to remain under its discipline and pretend to be what he is not.

If a man becomes a member of any particular denomination he thus virtually endorses its doctrines and government, whether he is required or not to make a formal declaration of that acceptance. A Presbyterian church is organized for the purpose of uniting persons of Presbyterian faith and principles, in order that they may be upheld and promulgated. So with every religious denomination. No person connected with it is forced to believe or disbelieve any particular tenet, but dissent from the essential principles of its creed should disqualify the dissenter for membership. He can hold to his views as an individual, but not as a member. Some religious bodies allow greater latitude than others in this respect. They have but few essentials. Their members may believe what they choose on most things, but must agree on those few or there would be nothing in their membership except form. If a church have a creed, reason would say that those who belong to it must be persons who hold to that creed, and that if they change their minds they should relinquish their membership. It all depends upon the rule, or obligation or understanding in each denomination.

But one thing seems indisputable: No minister of a religious society has any right to preach or administer in that capacity, whose views are not in accordance with its established tenets. He has no right to preach doctrines contrary to the creed of his church. If he wants to advocate something different to its accepted principles, he should go outside its pale. We have no sympathy for those bogus martyrs who pretend to be suffering for conscience sake, when attempting to proclaim their own views under authority of a church which repudiates them. They are impostors, not martyrs. If they "grow out" of a body let them leave it. If they loose faith in a creed, let them set it aside. They have no right to fight it while wearing its garments or wielding its authority.

The world is wide enough for all. The field is ample for every laborer. A man who wants to keep his Presbyterian or Methodist or Episcopalian gown, and in it oppose or throw doubt upon any of the doctrines of which his garb is the token, is not brave, nor consistent, nor sincere; he is a coward and a hypocrite. If he wants to be free to proclaim his own peculiar views, let him join a church with which he is in harmony, or come out alone and lift up his voice without pretending to be what he is not.

It should be clear, we think, that an Episcopal minister who denies the doctrine of the Trinity, is a living contradiction. As a man he is at liberty to disbelieve the absurdity which is an essential of the Episcopal creed. As a minister of that church he is not. He cannot reject that doctrine, foolish as it may be, and remain a minister of the church which is founded upon it. So with the divinity of Christ, the literal atonement and the physical resurrection. They are fundamentals of the Episcopalian faith. Right or wrong, they are components of a code of articles to which every minister of that church must subscribe; and when such a minister can no longer maintain them, common sense and common honesty would suggest his withdrawal from the church.

In the Episcopal church the Holy Scriptures are made the standard of doctrine. Whatsoever is not in accordance therewith and cannot be proved thereby is not to be received as an article of its faith. But that church has decided that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary." That the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are three persons in one God. That Jesus Christ was crucified for the sins of the world, and His blood was shed as an atonement. That the third day after, He arose from the dead, and that the resurrection of the body is a necessary part of the confession of faith. And it has decided that these are in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and are proved thereby. And each Priest at his ordination must subscribe to all this and much more.

Therefore, while every man must be free in his personality to believe what seems right to him, and to promulgate his views if he can find opportunity to do so, he has no right or reason on his side when he attempts to do this as a member of a church which holds the opposite as its established creed, and he is particularly wrong and unreasonable when he does so as a minister of that church.

The tendency of the times is to depart from old creeds and break loose from time-honored doctrines. Many of them are foolish and unscriptural, and it is well for the world that independent thought is exposing their fallacy. But in these departures from human systems, once considered of Divine origin, there is danger of complete demoralization and the shipwreck of faith. In discarding man-made dogmas some of the plainest truths of the Christian religion are cast aside, and the liberty demanded is

running into religious lawlessness and virtual infidelity.

What is needed is a thorough and concerted overhauling of creeds and systems and a return to the first principles of the Christian faith. This seems unlikely to be effected by the churches as a whole, or by any sect of itself, and so, independent thinkers will come out as reformers, each declaring his own unbeliefs and his personal disregard of the trammels of creed. That is all right if the dissenters take a bold and consistent stand for what they believe to be right. But they should not seek to fight a church while claiming its membership nor officiate in authority which they set at naught themselves. Religious liberty must not disregard religious rights nor destroy religious obligations.

THE INSULT TO EMPRESS FREDERICK

THE visit to and compulsory exit from France of Empress Frederick, mother of the present German Kaiser, constitute an important episode. The circumstance may lead to serious European complications and possibly to a gigantic war. At the very least, the result will be strained relations between Germany and England on the one side and France on the other.

The mission of the Empress to Paris was to make arrangements for the representation of French artists at the approaching Berlin exposition. Her arrival at the French capital produced no friendly demonstration, but quite the contrary. Instead of waiting upon the royal personage himself President Carnot delegated a subordinate to attend to that formality. This was an unqualified indignity to begin with, because it meant that her presence in Paris was unwelcome. The public journals took the matter up and intimated plainly that the Empress could not do a better thing than get out of Paris at the earliest practicable date. The artists who favorably entertained the ostensible object of her visit were also abused without stint.

Of course there was no alternative for the lady but to leave, especially as she was advised "by very high authority" that such a course was the best she could take. Here presence in Paris was not even free from personal danger to herself. An indubitable evidence of this fact was exhibited by the Parisian authorities furnishing a force of 500 men to protect her on the outward journey.

The effect of this affair upon Germany and upon Queen Victoria is apparent already. The mother of the Kaiser—as well as the representative of Germany in a pacific capacity—and