

The Sun

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1898.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, per Month, \$1.00. DAILY, per Year, \$10.00. SUNDAY, per Year, \$3.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year, \$12.00. POSTAGE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES ADDED. THE SUN, NEW YORK CITY.

Printed at No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and No. 10, 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their names returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Beesotted!

One of the few fixed points of Democratic policy in Congress in the last weeks of 1898 is opposition to the necessary and inevitable increase of the United States army, to meet new conditions.

The bill agreed upon by the Democratic minority of the House Committee on Military Affairs, that is to say by Mr. SULZER of New York, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. COX of Tennessee, Mr. LENTZ of Ohio, Mr. HAY of Virginia, and Mr. JETT of Illinois, would put back the regular army to maintain peace strength of 20,000 men; put back our army to where it was before the war with Spain.

The immediate author of this measure is said to be Mr. HAY of Virginia, but the bill seems to have the approval of all the Democrats concerned, including Mr. SULZER. No doubt JIM HAY LEVIA is for it, too.

What drug of stupefaction, or what sudden stroke of hopeless hebetude, has paralyzed the perceptions and the understanding of the remaining leaders of the Democratic party in Congress?

Let the fight against the army of the United States proceed under the leadership of the besotted.

The Hearing on the Harbor.

No better presentation could be desired of the needs of New York harbor from the Narrows to the deep sea than that which has been made before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors by the delegation which went to Washington for that purpose. It was desirable to show that the improvement demanded will benefit the whole country, and not this community only; and on that point the demonstration was decisive.

Mr. AMBROSE proved by official figures that half the exports of the entire country and over two-thirds of its imports pass through New York harbor, so that the great grain fields of the Northwest are as vitally interested in this question as the merchants of the metropolis. Again, for the last two score years, more than two-thirds of all the revenue from imports has been collected at New York. But especially noteworthy was the point that larger channels mean larger vessels, while both always have meant and always will mean reduced freight rates for the producer as well as for the shipper, and for the inland consumer as well as for the seaboard consignee. The maximum draught, it was shown, increased from 21 feet, in 1871, to 32 feet, in 1898, and the maximum freight carrying capacity from 2,000 to 12,000 tons; but in exactly the same period the reduction in freight rates was from \$8.40 to \$2.40 per ton on flour, from \$6.32 to \$1.92 on wheat, and from \$9.40 to \$3 on provisions.

The use of these figures must be as convincing to the tiller of the soil as the merchant. American farm products and factory products are directly interested in giving all facilities to the shipping of this great port, and so are the consumers of imported products. As Mr. SCHWARZ said, the rates come down with ships of deeper draught just as on the railroads they come down with more capacious trains and more powerful engines. The main channel of New York is deep enough to-day for the shipping of 1870, but not for the shipping of 1898. In some places it is only 30 feet deep at mean low water, and Mr. BOAS informed the Rivers and Harbors Committee that his steamship line alone had seven vessels sailing out of this port that draw over 30 feet, and within two years would have even more, of which two would draw 34 feet.

No one can doubt that it is a detriment to the country to compel big ships to wait for high water at its principal port, and Government engineers have found that the best remedy is to deepen and widen the East channel. One advantage of the Main channel used to be that it brought foreign vessels under the Sandy Hook defenses; but now our long-range rifles and mortars command the whole area. The East channel is dominated completely by neighboring works, and also goes by Ronger Shoal, where it is proposed to plant the big 16-inch guns in a turret; and we may add that the dredgings from the new East channel will probably serve to build up the artificial island on which this turret is to be placed.

New York is today the most important seaport in the world, as Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, the Commissioner of Navigation, has shown in his recent annual report he points out that out of the fifty largest steam vessels in existence, no fewer than thirty-three run to this port, Liverpool standing second on the list, with seventeen; in fact, of the twenty-four largest all but two run to New York. We must provide for these vessels and we must encourage others to come. The Main channel is not only too shallow, but it is too long and too crooked, and statistics show that many wrecks and groundings have occurred from its shallowness and crookedness.

As to the cost of the proposed improvements it is very small compared with the benefits to be received. Mr. AMBROSE told the House Committee that in a little over a century only one and one-third percent of the national expenditures for rivers and harbors had been expended on New York harbor. But in any case the estimate for a 35-foot East channel is only \$4,510,000, while for the full 40-foot channel, 2,000 yards wide, it is only \$5,840,000. The latter depth and width should be chosen, because, as we have seen, vessels drawing 34 feet will soon be here, and there should be two or three feet of water under them. Since the dredging would occupy years, only from half a million to a million a year need be expended.

But the entire harbor should also be improved. Only the other day the Government had a costly experience of its defects in the grounding of the Massachusetts off Diamond Reef. Off Bay Ridge the channel should be 40 feet deep and 1,200 feet wide, and then we should see not only new dock facilities but perhaps grain elevators and cold storage houses going up there, with big American-built steamers to carry

freight to and from them across the ocean. For the Red Hook channel a depth of 26 feet would not be too much. A depth of 26 feet and a width of 600 for Butternut channel would allow deep-draught vessels to go up that channel and the East river as far as Newtown. More depth and width in the Wallabout channel would give the Brooklyn Navy Yard a better approach to the Cob Dock, and a depth of twenty-five feet for the Coney Island channel would benefit the coastwise trade eastward. The Main ship channel should also be dredged. But at least the great East channel improvement should be begun forthwith. The House committee now has the facts before it. Let it act promptly on them.

Two Republican Senators for Indiana.

There are no Senatorial vacancies to be filled this winter from Illinois, Ohio, or Indiana. Indiana will be the only one of the four Ohio Valley States to have such an election. After the 4th of next March Indiana will be represented in the United States Senate by two sound money men, both Republicans. Heretofore the parties have been so evenly balanced in that State that each party has had a Senator. This is the record since 1875:

Table with 2 columns: Name and Term. Includes names like OLIVER P. MORTON, BENJAMIN HARRISON, CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS, etc.

During all this period, and in some of the years preceding, Indiana was at the head of the Democratic column for a debased and depreciated currency. It has been the leading State of the North in demanding dishonest money. For years it has maintained at Washington a Democratic Senator to defend and extol any form of unsound currency and irregular finance, whether by inflation, arbitrary paper coinage, or greenback issues. Indiana has usually led in the demand for dishonest money.

Although the Republican party in Indiana has kept up a vigorous fight with the financial heresies of its Democratic opponents, it has not been able, heretofore, in recent years, to secure a stable political predominance. During a considerable portion of President HARRISON'S term as Senator the presiding officer of the Senate was the Democratic leader of Indiana, THOMAS A. HENDRICKS, as Vice-President; and during the whole of President HARRISON'S term as President the two Senators for Indiana were Democrats; and, oddly enough, both of these Democratic Senators had been elected with Mr. HARRISON running against them as the caucus nominee of the Republican minority in the Legislature.

The term of Senator FAIRBANKS will not expire until March 4, 1903, and the term of his Republican colleague will not expire until 1905. This change in representation will be a distinct gain for the cause of honest money, for the preservation of the public credit, and against the revival of any schemes for assailing it.

Roberts the Mormon.

The Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church held a meeting in this city on Tuesday to protest against the admission to Congress of Mr. BURROUGHS H. ROBERTS, the newly elected Representative from the State of Utah.

The charge against Mr. ROBERTS is that he is a Mormon and a polygamist. It is not an offence against the law to be a Mormon—any more than it is to be a Buddhist, or an agnostic in religion. That portion of the accusation may therefore be dismissed from consideration as a reason for exclusion or expulsion from Congress.

The accusation of polygamy is more serious. At the meeting in the Presbyterian building on Tuesday a speech was made in opposition to Mormonism and polygamy by Mr. EUGENE YOUNG, a grandson of the celebrated Mormon leader who was the ruler of Utah for so many years. According to his statements Mr. BURROUGHS H. ROBERTS has been a polygamist since he was a child living in polygamy.

The Constitution of the United States provides that each house of Congress shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members. The act of Congress which provided for the admission of Utah into the Union required the Constitution of the new State to declare that polygamous or plural marriages were forever prohibited. Accordingly, we find in the Utah Constitution this provision:

"The following ordinance shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of this State: That no person shall be admitted to citizenship in this State who is a polygamist. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be held in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited."

The Constitution of Utah also contains a further provision relating to polygamy, which is in these words: "The act of the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah, entitled 'An act to punish polygamy and other kindred offences,' approved Feb. 4, 1892, in so far as the same declares and imposes penalties for polygamy, is hereby declared to be in force in the State of Utah."

Referring to the Territorial law thus contained in full force and effect in the new State, we find that it provides for the punishment of polygamous and unlawful cohabitation. "Every person," says the statute, "who has a husband or wife living, who hereafter marries another, whether married or single, and any man who hereafter marries another, or on the same day, marries more than one woman, is guilty of polygamy, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 and by imprisonment in the State prison for a term of not more than five years."

This enactment applies only to marriages entered into subsequently to the time when it became a law. From a statement attributed to Mr. ROBERTS by the New York Journal of Sunday, it would seem that he regards this prohibition of future plural marriages as the only law now in force in Utah in respect to polygamy. While Utah was a Territory there had been a provision in the so-called Edmunds act forbidding the continuance of cohabitation with more than one wife; but Mr. ROBERTS thinks that that part of the Federal law relating to cohabitation has been omitted from the Constitution and statutes of Utah as a State.

It is very doubtful whether he is correct in this view. The Constitution of Utah, in addition to the specific provision which we have quoted concerning the Territorial Anti-Polygamy act of 1892, provided that all laws of the Territory should remain in force until they were altered or repealed by the Legislature. As now those laws we find the following: "Among constituting section 4,209 of the

Revised Statutes of Utah, as published by the authority of the Utah Legislature:

"If any male person hereafter cohabits with more than one woman, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than six months, or by both said punishments in the discretion of the court."

If Mr. ROBERTS is accurately reported in the statement to which we have referred, he evidently takes the position that he may lawfully continue to cohabit with his wife, or be married before the enactment of any legislation prohibiting polygamous marriages.

Precisely how he excepts himself from the operation of the foregoing section of the Utah Revised Statutes requires explanation. Apart from that question, however, if it appears to Congress that he is cohabiting with the three women who are described as his Mormon wives, the House may undoubtedly refuse to admit him to a seat, in the exercise of its constitutional power to pass upon the qualifications of its members.

It is the prevailing opinion among authorities on the Federal Constitution, that this power, like the power of expulsion, may be exercised so as to exclude any person who is deemed by the House unfit for membership by reason of wrongdoing, even though his acts may not amount to a crime, or, if it does, even though he may never have been prosecuted or punished therefor. If this view be correct, Mr. ROBERTS can be barred from admission to the House of Representatives on the ground that he is actually a polygamist, if the House is satisfied of that fact, even in the absence of any judicial decision on the subject.

And ample justification for this course could be found in the former declarations of Congress as to the consequences which ought to follow persistence in the practices of polygamy. The Edmunds act of 1882 expressly provided that no polygamist, bigamist or person cohabiting with more than one woman in any Territory or other place over which the United States had exclusive jurisdiction should be entitled to vote at any election therein "or be eligible for election or appointment to, or be entitled to hold any office of public trust, honor or emolument, in, under or for any such Territory or place, or under the United States."

We doubt whether Mr. ROBERTS is right in his conclusion that the demand of the American people as expressed in the Utah enabling act went no further than the prohibition of plural marriages in the future. We think the American people were almost equally zealous to prevent the continuance of cohabitation with a plurality of wives.

The Moral of Fashion. The recent publication of rumors of a scandal in New York circles of fashion simply gives emphasis to the fact of the prevailing moral purity of that society. Any man whose memory goes back over the social occurrences in New York for a generation past can recall easily the whole number of notable instances of scandalous immorality which had any existence outside of mere gossip and malicious inference. They can be counted on the fingers of one hand, yet during that generation the whole circle of the society of wealth and brilliant fashion as we now know it has come into being. The social transformation in New York, so far as concerns that element of its population, has been complete.

Before then there hardly existed in the town a private house which made possible the grandeur of social display now requisite to satisfy the standard of sumptuous and elegant entertaining. As compared with hundreds of houses of this time the residences of the richest and most important socially were narrow and bare of luxurious appointments and costly decorations. The domestic service in the most imposing establishments of that day was less extensive and even actually small and inexperienced. Liveries were almost unknown, and such men servants as were employed were usually coached-bodies, who performed also the functions of general utility men. Equipages were simple and few, and the standard of expenditure even among the most lavish was frugal as compared with the outlay of every family which has now any distinction in the grander world of fashion.

All that is so well known to the older generation that for them the recapitulation of such facts as we have related savors of the commonplace. Meantime, the composition of the circle about which fashion gathers has been transformed not less completely, and its tone and character have changed radically. The great majority of the present members were wholly without fashionable amenities a generation ago. Very many of them come from families which were then restrained by religious habit and scruple from taking any part in the world of gaiety. They were Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian families, which had been taught to regard such pleasures as of the earth, earthy, unbecoming a life directed by obligatory religious principle and totally foreign to it and subversive of it.

Subtract that element from the society of which we are speaking, and it loses a large part of its present most brilliant constituents—the boxes at the opera would be depleted of many of their most conspicuous occupants. They come of progenitors who were as familiar with the prayer meeting as they were horrified by the playhouse, and by the exposure of physical charms which is conventional in the simple, God-fearing people, frugal in their ways and serious in their occupations.

This very self-restraint laid the foundations of the material accumulations upon which their descendants have built their present luxurious state. They saved their money, did not even know how to expend it, having cultivated none of the innumerable artificial wants which have become veritable necessities for their children. At that time one of the founders of one of the greatest fortunes of the present was asked by an old friend why he did not give himself more latitude in expenditure, for he lived with comparative modesty, although his accumulations had become large already. He replied that his wife and himself could not do anything more money than they did; that they had everything they wanted, and did not know how to spend any more. A few thousands a year was all they could get rid of, for that much money bought all they cared for. They had no expensive tastes to gratify, and they were wisely unwilling to disturb the placidity of their lives by hunting after them.

That was the prevailing tone in the New York of a generation ago. Life was very simple, and a social entertainment which satisfied the contemporary notions of magnificence was a rare and notable occasion, though by the side of social functions which take place now on every night of the gay season it was only bare and parsimonious frugality. As compared with the few women servants who ministered to the richest families of that time the household

of the luxurious fashion of this day swarm with men and women servants, each expert in duties subdivided into many specialties. The neighborly intercourse which made up of old the chief social diversions has passed out of vogue entirely.

Now, all this social transformation has occurred, all this luxury, this lavishness of display, this comparative prodigality of outlay has come in, without any accompanying deterioration in conventional morals. It may even be said that there has been coincidently an improvement in the outward moral behavior, resulting in a decrease proportionately in the number of flagrant scandals, for the reason that the safeguards afforded by the far wider publicity in which fashion now moves make breaches of morality so much more liable to exposure. Vice itself is still in a crowd and the glare of light. It needs no denunciation and does not intrude more easily into lives whose monotony is tempted by its irregular variation than into those passed in constant excitement and under the public criticism now invited by fashion.

We speak merely of superficial propriety, and not of any outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, for it is questionable if that grace is not shut out from a society which depends for its existence on the gratification of the senses and receives its animating impulse from pure love of the world. The plain living and high thinking of the saints and philosophers belong to another sphere.

The Dual Voice of Labor. The voice of labor has given utterance to interesting sentiments, both in the Mississippi Valley and on the Atlantic seaboard. At Kansas City, on Saturday evening, the convention of the American Federation of Labor, numbering more than 2,000 delegates, adopted this resolution by a vote of more than four to one:

"We are committed against the enforcement or introduction of partisan politics, religious intolerance or race prejudice. We hold it to be the duty of trades unionists to study and discuss all questions that have any bearing upon their industrial or political interests, and on the Atlantic seaboard, the American Federation of Labor to designate any political party a member shall belong to or which political party he shall vote."

Nothing could be more sensible, conservative, or likely to perpetuate and increase the power for good exercised by this important labor organization. On Sunday, the Central Labor Union in this city conduced with the Mayor of the Greater New York for reason of his avowed inability to find good men to serve as School Commissioners, and sent him a list of their own members whom they deemed qualified to fill the office.

"What the Board of Education wants is some new school," said the delegate who introduced the subject at the meeting. "There are many members of the Central Labor Union who would be excellent School Commissioners. The children of the wealthy have private tutors. The public schools are used principally for the children of the working people."

It should not be forgotten, however, that while all interests may properly be represented on the School Board, no more admirable service has ever been rendered to the children of the working people in our schools than by those members of the Boards of Education in New York and Brooklyn whose circumstances have enabled them to devote their time, energy and ability to promoting the welfare of the public school system, in disregard of the fact that they worked without pay.

Before the list of nominees was agreed upon another delegate insisted that there should be no teachers upon it, because they knew nothing of the duties of children. There is nothing to indicate whether this suggestion was acted upon or not. We hope it was not. The best book of modern times on education was written by HERBERT SPENCER, a bachelor from Bachelorville.

BOSTON, Dec. 22.—No man is stronger against the "hot-headed Southern Democrat" than ex-Governor BURWELL, Springfield, Mass. And no man was more strongly in favor of letting England have her own way in Venezuela or more strongly opposed to the war with Spain.

Some of the Iowa Democrats have taken the trouble to hold a meeting and resolve that they are opposed to fusion and that 1810 is not a sacred ratio and should be given up in 1900. Apparently the Hon. HOP BOISE, a weakly but no less a member of the Iowa Legislature, has taken the most advanced position in the matter. He has written a letter to the Iowa Democrat, in which he says that he is not a fusionist, and that he is in favor of the Iowa Democrats.

Colonel BRYAN no longer wears his uniform, but he still has his military hat, which is very becoming to him. Atlanta, Ga. What a property man the Colonel would have been if he had not preferred to act.

A MCKINLEY SOUTH IN 1900. A "Hot-Headed Southern Democrat" for the President's Unanimous Re-election. From the Washington Post. The South has not been slow to recognize a willing hand extended or an effort raised by representative man of the North, in an voice to make the history of our country, from 1860 to 1865, to so good as to lose all trace of sectionalism. Of this we are proud to say. To say that the intelligent interpretation of the Word of God has led to the present state of affairs, which is the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted, and we are particularly indebted to the late Dr. H. H. Hensley, who has written a book which is better understood and more intelligently interpreted by larger numbers of Christians than any other book since the publication of the Bible. But with this latter fact denominationalism has had little to do, and on any basis of sound reasoning it would be impossible to get away from the fact that the drift of religious thought has been all in the wrong direction is a great mistake. To modern scholarship and archeological research every student of the Bible is greatly indebted