

# ADVENT REVIEW EXTRA. No. 2.

## Elder Canright's Reply to Extra No. 1, and our Rejoinder.

VOLUME 65.]

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., FEBRUARY 21, 1888.

[NUMBER 8.]

### INTRODUCTORY.

THE readers of the REVIEW EXTRA of Nov. 22, 1887, containing the "Reply to the Attacks of Eld. D. M. Canright" upon Seventh-day Adventists, will remember the statement we made therein that we did not intend to publish anything further concerning him or his work. Having been forced by the publicity and virulence of his attacks, after long and patient waiting, on our part, to take up the defensive, notice him and his work, and reply to a few of his arguments and misrepresentations, we intended to leave the matter to the judgment of a discriminating public, and say no more concerning him.

But within the last few weeks we have received a document from him which he demands should be published by us, to correct certain "wrong statements" which he claims we made concerning him in the EXTRA. Of course, we ever hold ourselves ready as honest men to correct every wrong statement we make concerning others which really injures them. And if it be true that we have done Eld. Canright an injury by anything we have said, we would cheerfully correct and acknowledge it. But we will consider that question hereafter.

We make this preliminary statement that the reader may see that the cause of our bringing him again before the public is his own demand upon us to do so. We should not for a moment have thought of doing it, but for his urgent request. Our attitude is still that of the strictly defensive. As we do not care to bring these personal matters into the regular issue of the REVIEW AND HERALD, it is thought necessary to publish a small EXTRA, No. 2. We now give Eld. Canright's reply to the EXTRA in full.

Geo. I. Butler.

### ELD. CANRIGHT'S REPLY.

Otsego, Mich., Dec. 27, 1887.

EDITORS OF THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

Brethren: Your EXTRA relating to myself has been read. Of course, things appear to me very different from what they do to you. I would like to point out many things which to me seem clearly erroneous; but I know you would not publish them if I did. Many of your statements with regard to me are not correct; in some cases only half the truth is told, and in others facts are omitted which would give a very different coloring to the matter. Still, from my long acquaintance with you, I cannot believe that you would knowingly make a false statement to injure me, or that you are not willing to correct a wrong statement when convinced that it is wrong. Hence I ask you to correct two or three of the gravest ones, concerning which I can readily furnish the evidence. It was only a few weeks ago that you felt greatly grieved with the editor of the *Advocate* because he would not, as you claimed, correct an offensive statement concerning your people. So I will now expect you to be willing to do me justice in this matter.

On page 2 of the EXTRA, Eld. Butler says:—

A little previous to the time of our camp-meeting [at Grand Rapids], Eld. Canright came to the city and visited most of the newspaper offices, to obtain the privilege of inserting articles in the city papers against us.

Then it is stated that handbills were scattered by my agents (page 12) upon the grounds, etc. Neither statement is true. Two weeks before the camp-meeting, by urgent request I went to Grand Rapids, and met one of the men from the *Democrat* office at Dr. Veenboer's office. He said that the editors wished me to write a half dozen articles on the other side, as they had published so much from the Adventists that their readers did not like it. I agreed on six articles, for which Dr. Veenboer paid me. I came home the same day, and was not there again till after camp-meeting. Dr. V., without asking me, had some of the articles struck off and distributed on the grounds, which I should not have done. I did not visit a single newspaper office, nor ask any one to print anything for me. Here is the doctor's own statement:—

"Grand Rapids, Dec. 27, 1887.

"Rev. D. M. CANRIGHT, Otsego, Mich.

"Dear Elder: I received an EXTRA of the REVIEW AND HERALD, dated Nov. 22, 1887, in which Geo. I. Butler makes statements so utterly false that I wish you would call on him to retract and repair your injury done by his slander:—

A little previous to the time of our camp-meeting, Eld. Canright came to the city (Grand Rapids), and visited most of the newspaper offices, to obtain the privilege of inserting articles in the city papers against us, etc.

"Now, all the work of opposition, 'visiting newspapers,' 'distributing handbills at the West Michigan Fair,' 'scattering thousands of copies' of 'Mrs. White, the prophetess,' at the camp-ground, was done without the knowledge or consent of Mr. Canright, except that I made arrangement once for a newspaper man to meet the Elder at my office, where arrangements were made to publish a half dozen articles on Seventh-day Adventism, by Eld. Canright. These articles were written by him at the urgent request of half a dozen of our ministers and some laymen. They were used by me and some of these men for the good of the cause of truth against the unbiblical

doctrines of Adventism, at the Fair and camp-grounds, and in our daily papers.

MELLE VEENBOER."

This is enough on that point.

On page 15 is a statement from Bro. Butler, concerning my ordination, which is untrue and very unjust, both to myself and to the church with which I united. He accuses me of putting a padlock upon my mouth on the subject of the soul, insinuating that I sold my conscience and my liberty for a place in the church. Bro. T. M. Shanafelt, of Three Rivers, secretary of the Michigan Baptist State convention, was secretary of the council, and heard all that was said. Here is his testimony:—

"My attention has been called to a copy of the ADVENT REVIEW AND HERALD EXTRA, dated Nov. 22, 1887. This EXTRA seems to be devoted exclusively to replies to Rev. D. M. Canright, now pastor of the Baptist church in Otsego, Mich., but formerly a Seventh-day Advent minister. Mr. Canright was ordained at Otsego, after a thorough and satisfactory examination by a large council which met at the call of the Otsego Baptist church, March 19, 1887. The undersigned was secretary of the council.

"In the copy of the REVIEW AND HERALD referred to, in the article entitled 'O Consistency!' the following reference is made to Mr. Canright and the council that ordained him:—

We are also informed that in his examination before the council of Baptist ministers just before his re-ordination at Otsego last spring, when those points of faith involving the soul question came up, the Elder was meekly modest in his statements, and 'wanted time' further to examine the subject before he felt inclined to state his positions. And also that he was accorded a private examination by the council of divines on this question, the proceedings and result of which we have never been able to learn.

"Neither of the above statements is true. The 'soul question' was not discussed, and Mr. Canright was not accorded a private examination on that question nor any other. Such a proceeding, which is contrary to Baptist usage and custom, was not suggested nor thought of by Mr. Canright or any of the large number of ministers and laymen who composed the council.

"T. M. SHANAFELT.

"Three Rivers, Mich., Dec. 23, 1887."

This states the truth exactly. Eld. Butler was misinformed on this point, as on many others. Simply one question was asked with regard to the dead, I think, or the resurrection, that was all. My Baptist brethren have accorded me the fullest freedom in preaching the word of God as I understand it, and I have done so with all the freedom which I ever enjoyed among the Adventists, or could wish anywhere. If you think I am afraid to speak my mind on the soul question, give me two columns in the REVIEW, and you shall have it plainly.

Once more: On page 14 Bro. Smith accuses me of duplicity in writing differently for different papers. Does he find a line in one contradicting what I wrote in another?—No, only as he construes it so. But he says I dare not send to the *Methodist Advocate* a certain sentence on the abolition of the decalogue which I published in the *Oracle*. But that is just what I did do; for I sent that very article, as printed in the *Oracle*, to the editor of the *Advocate*, and he wrote me, "Your article on Col. 2 is very fine," and offered to publish it. Lack of space was all that prevented its publication entire. Abridged, it was published as article No. 11.

I believe you will have the fairness to correct these statements which are calculated to injure my reputation as an honest man. I will try to profit by the lessons you read me in the EXTRA. I freely own myself to be a poor, erring mortal, liable to make sad mistakes, even when I try to do my best. The consciousness of my weaknesses often overwhelms me with discouragement, but I know I have tried to do what I thought was right. I try to show the same mercy and consideration for others which I hope for myself at the Judgment. I am not conscious of any hard feelings toward my former brethren, though I am well convinced that their doctrine is an error.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

### ELD. BUTLER'S WRONG STATEMENT.—NO. 1.

It will be seen from the above that Eld. Canright is so urgent to have us publish his article that he appeals to our sense of fairness to induce us to do so. He calls to our attention the fact that the editor of the REVIEW demanded of the *Advocate* the correction of some grossly erroneous charges, which the latter never would correct. He evidently thinks we will be more fair than the Methodist editor, and we will justify his good opinion of us by publishing his statement. Those who are right can afford to be fair. The reader will see, then, that this publication is issued entirely because of the Elder's demand.

Eld. Canright claims that I have misrepresented him, and injured his reputation by statements which I made concerning his visiting the newspaper offices in Grand Rapids before our camp-meeting, and getting his articles into the papers, and having them scattered on the camp-ground. He says my statements concerning these things are untrue. He brings in a letter from Dr. Veenboer to substantiate his statements. The reader will carefully notice what the Elder and his ally have said. I will at this point also introduce a letter from Eld. H. W. Miller, who lived at Grand Rapids at the time, and acted as the agent of our Conference, securing space in the columns of the city newspapers for the publication of reports of our camp-meeting:—

Grand Rapids, Mich., Jan. 31, 1888.

ELD. G. I. BUTLER, Battle Creek, Mich.

Dear Bro: In reply to your letter of the 26th, I will say that about the first of September, 1887, I visited the editors and business managers of three of the leading dailies of this city, and made arrangements to report, through their papers, the proceedings of our camp-meeting, which was to be held in this city the last of September. Four or five days before our meeting proper was to begin, and during our preparatory meeting, two of these papers began the publication of a series of articles from the pen of Eld. D. M. Canright, which consisted not only of an unjust attack upon certain points of faith held by Seventh-day Adventists, but of a personal reference to certain leading writers and speakers of that denomination. Now as the principal consideration in the matter of reporting our meeting was, that we should circulate several hundred copies of each of these dailies, we felt it duty to call and ascertain something of the nature of the articles we were about to circulate. We were informed by the managers of two of these dailies that arrangements had been made by Eld. Canright or his allies to have a series of articles from the Elder's pen appear in their columns during the week of our camp-meeting. And the business manager of the other paper told us that they had been urged to publish the same articles, but positively refused to have anything to do with it.

Whether Eld. C. personally visited these publishing firms is a very minor matter; but the evidence is abundant that they were visited by him or some of those who were intimately connected in the plot to secure the publication of his articles in the papers of which we expected to circulate about 2500 throughout the State. As his articles were so full of a revengeful spirit, and consisted so largely of personal attacks upon those from whom he had so recently withdrawn, it took but little argument to convince those who had published a few of his articles, that justice to us, in accordance with our former contract, would demand that they be discontinued, at least during the time we reported our meetings through their columns. Eld. Canright, however, was not well satisfied with all this, as was seen by the article he wrote and the strong effort he and his friends made to have it published in Sunday's issue of Oct. 2. I was personally interviewed by the editor concerning the publication of this piece, and he being more honorable than the others, did not allow its publication in his paper of that date.

But Eld. Canright and his associates were not of the submissive kind; so they had the said article struck off in sheet form, and all day Sunday, Oct. 2, their agents surrounded the camp, when thousands were in attendance, freely scattering these sheets. It was a very noticeable fact, however, that many of those who were doing this menial work for them, were so far down in the intellectual scale that they could not even read what they were giving to others.

H. W. MILLER.

This brings the whole question before us from parties intimately connected with the matter on both sides. Eld. Canright and Dr. Veenboer state that the Elder did not personally visit the newspaper offices, or engage in the circulation of these articles against us on the grounds, etc. Suppose we grant this to be true, as they state—and we have no disposition to deny it—what then is the result? And how far does it prove that we have treated him unjustly or misrepresented him? The facts admitted or proved are these:—

1. Eld. Canright knew very well that we were about to have a large camp-meeting in Grand Rapids, and that it was always our custom on such occasions to have full reports of the same in the leading city papers.

2. He knew this Dr. Veenboer was a very blither opponent of our people and doctrines, and that he would do everything in his power to make us odious in the eyes of the public.

3. Knowing this full well, as we have reason to believe there had been much correspondence between them, he came to this man's office, made a bargain with him to write six articles against S. D. Adventists, and placed them in his hands; and this man "paid" him for them, according to the Elder's own admission.

4. Somebody acting for this partnership of Canright, Veenboer, & Co., did visit the three leading newspapers in the city, and two of them published articles for them, and one refused.

5. When our agent, Eld. H. W. Miller, visited these offices, and objected to being made a party to carry out this plot of forcing our people to circulate Eld. Canright's virulent articles against our faith, and slanders against our leading workers, these papers agreed to withhold the publication of them till the camp-meeting was past.

6. During the progress of the camp-meeting, just before the most important day of it (Sunday), the Elder wrote another article, not included in the six he was "paid" for. It was the most bitter of any of them. From expressions in it concerning the "camp-ground," we know it was intended to be circulated on the ground; e. g., "All of Mrs. White's books from which I quoted are at the camp." "Examine them and see if I have not quoted them right." The agents of the above firm, Canright, Veenboer, & Co., brought a big pressure to bear to get this into the papers. Failing in that, as Eld. Miller says, their agents surrounded the camp, when thousands were in attendance, freely scattering these sheets."

These are the facts in the case. But now Eld. Canright feels he has been abused, treated unjustly, and

misrepresented by Eld. Butler, because I said, "Eld. Canright came to the city and visited most of the newspaper offices," and that his agents scattered handbills on the camp-ground, etc. And his right-hand man, Dr. Veenboer, steps up and generously exonerates the Elder, taking all the responsibility upon himself. We do not wonder the Elder desires to shift the responsibility of such dirty work as this, on to somebody. We are glad he has some sense of propriety yet left; but he will find it difficult to get rid of the responsibility, after all.

What is the difference in principle, whether a man does a mean act himself, or so associates with other men that they do it for him, when the motive is transparent that he desires it done? The first course shows courage. The other looks more sneaking. But the responsibility inheres in either case. The principle is recognized everywhere, that responsibility rests as much upon a person when he acts through agents, as when he does a thing himself. The popes erected St. Peter's cathedral; yet we do not suppose they ever struck a blow upon it, or laid a stone. Vanderbilt built one of the finest mansions in New York, yet never drove a nail in it. Satan is the murderer of our race, yet perhaps never killed a man directly. But it is his influence which has led men to their ruin. Eld. Canright, in constant communication with Dr. Veenboer, visits him, writes some articles for him, gets "paid" for them, and places them under his control; and he cannot escape the responsibility of what follows. Eld. C. is neither a child nor a fool. He well knew what prompted Dr. V. to pay for these articles, and that he would do his utmost to make them hurt S. D. Adventists. And on the very face of it, one was written by the Elder to be circulated on the camp-ground; for it was directed to those on the ground, and they were told to "examine" certain books there. It was written with malevolent intent,—written to break down before the citizens of Grand Rapids the influence of "Mrs. E. G. White, the prophetess." It speaks of her in a most scandalous way, implying that she was acting a double-faced, hypocritical part: "Her words will be smoother than oil." But her statement about the popular churches is "shamefully false."

We claim emphatically, that Eld. Canright intended to have these statements of his circulated in some way upon that camp-ground; and the very words of his own article, and all the circumstances connected with it, abundantly substantiate the truthfulness of this statement. He must either stand in this position, or deny the authorship of this wretched sheet which was circulated by the thousand on the camp-ground, on his "Sunday Lord's day." How much he knows as to just what the agents of this "partnership" would do, and just how far they would go, has little to do with it. When a man puts liquor to his throat, and goes off under its influence and murders a man, the law holds him responsible for his acts. He knew what sort of stuff that was before he swallowed it. He knew what kind of work it sometimes made men do when under its influence. So Eld. Canright, when he wrote such words and placed them in the hands of a man actuated by the spirit that Dr. V. had, knew, or should know, the use to which he would likely put them. A little dodge that he himself did not go to any printing-offices, or personally hire any agents to go to the camp-ground and scatter this trash, has very little importance. He placed it in the hands of those whom he had every reason to believe would do it and, as the result proved, actually did do it. And he himself was really a party to the whole transaction, and got "paid" for his part of it. How could his responsibility be made more manifest. Why, on the same ground the writer could claim no responsibility in the circulation of the EXTRA, though he wrote a large part of it. He has no remembrance of circulating even three copies. Yet Eld. C. will hardly be likely to release him from responsibility in the premises. The Elder will have to try again before he convicts Eld. Butler of any substantial misrepresentation.

#### ELD. BUTLER'S WRONG STATEMENT.—NO. 2.

I am next charged with doing Eld. Canright and the Baptist Church great injustice by some statements made concerning his ordination. He says my statements are "untrue" and "very unjust." He says I accused him of putting a "padlock upon his mouth" on the "subject of the soul," and that he "sold his conscience and his liberty for a place in the church." Well, such charges do seem rather hard on such a *consistent, conscientious* man as Eld. Canright has proved himself to be surely. He calls upon one of his good brethren in the Baptist ministry to help him out, and relieve him from the odium of my "unjust" charges. So the Rev. T. M. Shanafelt, secretary of the council which examined Eld. C. before his ordination, comes gallantly to the rescue, and declares two of my statements "untrue." "The soul question was not discussed" at all, he would have us believe, at the time of Eld. Canright's ordination. He had no "private examination" of any kind. This is wholly "contrary to Baptist usage and custom," the good secretary tells us. The Elder himself also kindly assures us that he has the most delightful liberty among his new associations in the Baptist Church, "to preach the word of God as he understands it." His "Baptist brethren have accorded him the fullest freedom in preaching." He assures us that when he was examined before being ordained, little or nothing was said on the soul question. "Simply one question was asked with regard to the dead" or "the resurrection; that was all." The Elder wants us to understand he has no "padlock on his mouth," as Eld. Butler has wickedly insinuated. He has the most perfect freedom to speak and teach what he pleases, "all he could wish anywhere." He says if

we do not believe it, and think he "is afraid to speak his mind on the soul question," to give him "two columns in the Review, and we shall have it plainly."

Surely, what more could we ask in the premises, and how consistent and suitable everything has been all the while between the Elder and the good old Baptist Church on this soul question. It seems almost a pity to try to exonerate myself in the least from the "injustice" I have committed in insinuating anything about that "padlock" on the Elder's mouth, when everything is so serene and perfectly candid and fair in this new, loving fraternal relationship between the Elder and the good church of his choice on the "soul question." But we all know human nature will do its best to absolve itself from blame, even if it has a poor chance. So we must make an effort:—

1. It will be noticed by the reader, in the extract Mr. Shanafelt quotes from me in the EXTRA, that I made no claim of knowing anything *personally* about the proceedings of the council examining Eld. Canright before his ordination, not being present. I only stated that I was "informed." This is true. I was so informed.

2. I intimated in the article in the EXTRA, entitled "O Consistency!" that the relationship on the soul question, between Eld. Canright, an ordained Baptist minister, and the church with which he was connected, was a very anomalous one, to say the least.

3. I stated that he had been a man of very pronounced views on the question of the immortality of the soul and kindred topics, for many years, having been intensely opposed to the view that man by nature is immortal, and also to the doctrine of eternal torment.

4. I further stated that the Baptist Church, as everybody knows, held both of these views very strenuously in their creed; indeed, that the orthodox churches with whom Eld. Canright now affiliates regarded a belief in these doctrines as more important than many others they held, and denounced the views which the Elder has always advocated on this subject as the most dangerous "infidelity."

5. That so far as I had learned, the Elder had never intimated in a single instance, publicly or privately, that he had changed his former opinions a particle on this subject. But on the contrary, considering the fact that he so bitterly opposed S. D. Adventists on the Sabbath, the law, the prophecies, and most other points of faith, but never did on the question of the soul and kindred subjects, we were authorized to believe he still held the views he always had on this point.

6. That it was a most inconsistent position for a church to employ a man as pastor over a congregation, to teach what it regarded as a great error, or refrain from teaching what it considered important truth, there being scarcely any question in the whole realm of Bible doctrine made more prominent or important than that relating to man's future. It is directly involved in the plan of salvation, and has an important bearing on the government of God; and Eld. Canright has ever taught that many of the most erroneous doctrines existing grow out of this one of the immortality of the soul.

7. In view of the ominous silence of both parties on this question, and the Elder's marked reticence concerning it, while we know he always used to have so much to say upon it, we intimated that he had a "padlock on his mouth," on the soul question, the expression only implying that something remarkable had choked his utterance. He thinks this very unjust.

But what does he say to relieve himself or his church from this aspersion upon the propriety of their present relation? Why does he call in Eld. Shanafelt to state that certain remarks which I gave simply as second-hand information were incorrect? that he did not have a "private investigation," and was not asked concerning the soul question? This question was entirely ignored. There seems to have been a beautiful and harmonious understanding on this subject, and never a word said. There was such a sweet and perfect union of spirit on this interesting occasion when the Elder was to be ordained as a Baptist minister, that such little matters of theology as to whether countless myriads of men, women, and children were to be tortured to all eternity, or not, were not worth considering for a moment. It mattered not whether the soul was immortal or not, in the minds of this large council of reverend D. D's. No matter what the Elder thought about it,—whether he believed men go to heaven at death, or that man had no more soul than a brute. Such little matters were not worth asking a question about, if he was only to be made a Baptist minister. What is theology any way, and what does it amount to? And why should they ask him any questions at all, or hold any council over him? Wasn't the fact that he had left the poor, deluded "Adventists" enough evidence any way to show he was all right? Truly the Baptists are a large-hearted people, and believe in great freedom, when they can take a minister so readily and so fully on trust, who has been under the corrupting influences and the "fanaticism" of this despised people for twenty-eight years, and never ask him a question upon the most important doctrines of their faith. It doesn't seem to be of much importance any way what a man believes or teaches, if he is only to join the church.

Now in all seriousness, we say it is very hard for us to believe this matter was left in any such loose way as the two Elders would have us believe. It does not look sensible. All the facts seem to us to point rather to this conclusion, that there was a perfect understanding beforehand between Eld. Canright and some of these good Baptist divines, and that he was to keep *mun* on this subject. Very likely this was not made apparent on the surface. Such understandings are not usually blown out upon the world with a trumpet. They are more apt to occur in some very quiet, retired way. I have no idea

that this understanding was reached in that public examination. Hardly; those doctors of divinity would not have been likely to leave their pleasant homes to come to Osego, at large expense and inconvenience, until this matter was all well understood. And here is where the "padlock" question comes in. What evidence has Eld. Canright given us that he speaks his mind freely on this soul question? Why, forsooth, he will furnish the Review, if we will open our pages, two solid columns of matter on this subject. Generous soul! In the first place, he knows we would not open our pages to him any way, so he is perfectly safe in making the statement. In the second place, we are in no need of enlightenment on the question, if he holds his old views. We are all sound on that subject. But to give him a chance to show his sincerity and the "fullest freedom" to speak "the word of God as he understands it," let him speak his sentiments in his own church, where they need it so badly. Let him enlighten the Baptists on the horrible nature of eternal torment, publish it in their papers, etc., and see how much this "fullest freedom" amounts to.

Let the reader carefully peruse his present article, and tell us of a single hint, the remotest intimation in the whole article, as to what his views are on this subject. If this does not indicate the tightest kind of "padlock" on the Elder's mouth yet, then we are unable to judge. We dare the Elder to publish his views on that subject in any way that will tend to influence Baptist opinion; that is, if he still holds to his former opinions. We think it very probable he will, after long meditation, come out on the other side, and be an immortal-soulist. He has placed himself in a false position, and made such radical changes, that we are fully prepared for this. It will be no great matter to turn one more somersault for one who has proved himself so agile heretofore. Poor, poor man! what a pitiable spectacle his course for the last year presents! From our souls we pity him. He may call it "injustice," "misrepresentation," or what he will, he cannot conceal the fact that the attitude he has taken, and that of his church concerning the soul question, is anything but a proper one.

"O Consistency, thou art a jewel," applied to this matter, we know cuts close. But it is the truth in the case which furnishes the edge to make it cut. The effort to get rid of the force of what I said in the EXTRA, by calling attention to supposed errors in what I gave as information furnished by another, does not change the actual status. To all intents and purposes, the Elder's mouth has been "padlocked" on the soul question for a year past, to the very best of our knowledge. And the greediness with which these popular churches take up men for ministers who have been tainted so long with gross error, "fanaticism," "infidelity," as they claim Adventism to be, is most illuminating. It shows right on the face of it that they don't really believe that this doctrine injures people, corrupts their morals, or keeps them from being Christians. Their course shows unmistakably that they would be wonderfully glad to get all of us, if they could.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

#### ELD. SMITH'S MISREPRESENTATION.

IN EXTRA No. 1, p. 14, appeared the following short article, to which Eld. C., as appears from his reply, takes great exception on the ground that it presents him in a wrong light before the public. The body of the article consists of extracts from what he has written to different papers; and the name of the paper in which each quotation was published, and the date when published are explicitly given, so that any one can verify the quotations if he so desires. We ask the reader to compare again carefully these quotations, and judge whether it is not Eld. C.'s own words which have placed him in the light in which he stands before the public, which to be sure is not a very enviable one. The article as published in EXTRA No. 1 was headed, "All Things to all Men," and reads as follows:—

"We notice quite a difference in the tone of Eld. C.'s arguments, according to the views of the paper for which he writes. Thus, while writing for the Methodist paper, the organ of a denomination which has strenuously maintained the unceasing obligation of the ten commandments, he says:—

"P. 8: Let my position should be misunderstood before I have time to explain it, I will say here that I believe as strongly as Sabbatharians do in the perpetuity of the holy immutable law of God, and every moral precept taught in the Old Testament. The Methodist Discipline (Articles of Religion, sect. 6) exactly expresses my position on the law: 'Although the law given from God by Moses as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.'—Advocate, Sept. 24, 1887.

"Now he knows, as all know, that the Methodist Discipline by the expression, 'the commandments which are called moral,' means the decalogue, the ten commandments, as they were spoken by God from Sinai, and written on the tables of stone. So the Methodists will get the idea that Eld. C. agrees with them in this, and so be much pleased. But when he is writing to an anti-nomian paper, as the *Christian Oracle*, of Des Moines, Iowa, instead of saying what is to be understood that no Christian whatsoever is free from obedience to the decalogue, he says that all Christians are free from it; for it has been nailed to the cross, and taken out of the way. Thus in the *Oracle* of June 9, 1887, we read the following from his pen:—

"The simple facts, I believe, are these: Paul [in Col. 2:14-17] refers to the entire Jewish system, the law of Moses as a whole, of which the decalogue was only a small part. Every word of the ten commandments, Sabbath included, was written



by the hand of Moses, on parchment, right in with the rest of the law of Moses. (See Deut. 5, and other places.) As an entire system, as a law taken in all its parts, it was a burdensome system, a yoke of bondage, a school-master designed only to lead us to Christ. It was against us and contrary to us, and as such it was nailed to the cross. The decalogue being written on parchment in the book of the law, it would be proper to speak of it as blotted out, nailed to the cross, etc., with the rest of the law.

"Eld. C. would not dare address such language to the Methodist Advocate. If he did, it would not be published. This is being all things to all men with a vengeance. U. S."

The article published in the Oracle, from which the foregoing extract is taken, Eld. C. says he did send to the Advocate, and the editor pronounced it "very fine," and promised to publish it if space permitted. Personally, the editor might have been willing to do this. He has come in contact with arguments in defense of the true Sabbath. He understands how grave the situation of the Sunday institution is becoming, and has endeavored to defend it. He might be willing to resort to any expedient, even to the abolition of the whole law, to get rid of the Sabbath. We have before had occasion to note that the Sabbath controversy is forcing people either to accept the Sabbath of the Lord, or to retire to the "last ditch" of anti-mianism; and some are making this latter move with great precipitation. But the consciences of the great body of the Methodist and Baptist denominations, have not yet reached that degree of depravity to which these men are trying to force them. And the influence of this fact is seen in the treatment of Eld. C.'s article by the Advocate.

As abridged, says Eld. C., the article appeared as number eleven of the series of articles in the Advocate. We look over the article, and what do we find?—Every plague touch of the virus of antinomianism carefully removed. All expressions to the intent that the decalogue was "a part of the Jewish system, the law of Moses, written by the hand of Moses on parchment right in with the rest of the law of Moses," that it was "a burdensome system," "a yoke of bondage," "against us," "contrary to us," and "nailed to the cross," and "blotted out,"—all these expressions are carefully left out. Want of space is pleaded as an excuse for omitting these expressions. But these were the real gist and point of the article as sent to the Oracle. If the article must be abridged, why not take out some of the less important portions, instead of those vital and essential parts which show what his position really is, as it was published in the Oracle?

It is useless to claim that the position of the Methodists as expressed in their Discipline, on the law, is the same as that of the Disciples. It is equally evident that the readers of the Advocate, the Methodists, will understand that Eld. C.'s position is exactly like theirs, and the readers of the Oracle, the Disciples, will understand that his position is exactly like theirs. If this has come about so far as the Methodists are concerned, by suppression of those declarations which show his real position, then the editor of the Advocate has misrepresented him; and yet he utters no protest against being placed in this false light before the readers of the Advocate. Indeed, he takes the same position himself in that paper, in the postscript to his article in the Advocate of Sept. 24, as already quoted. The Methodist Discipline recognizes the distinction in laws, as ceremonial, civil and moral; and while the former are done away, the latter are immutable and perpetual; and this, Eld. C. says to the Methodists, "exactly expresses" his position. But to the Disciples, who do not acknowledge any such distinction, he says he believes it was an "entire system," a "law in all its parts," and all done away, nailed to the cross, and blotted out. If these two declarations set forth one and the same position, it remains, at least to our mind, yet to be shown.

We said that he would not dare address to the Advocate such language as he addressed to the Oracle. But this he says he did do; and we will take his word for it. We added, however, this: "If he did, it would not be published." And this conclusion stands verified; for the Advocate would not, or at least did not, publish it. When Eld. C. will induce the Advocate to publish from him the statement that the decalogue, containing the commandments which are called moral, has been blotted out and nailed to the cross, and call it "very fine," and induce the Oracle to indorse the position that "the law of God," the "commandments which are called moral," is a "holy and immutable" law, he will have done something toward proving that he does not designedly stand in a different light before the readers of these papers respectively. But then he would simply contradict himself in both papers. U. SMITH.

#### "I HAVE TRIED TO DO WHAT I THOUGHT WAS RIGHT."

We take the words here used as a heading, from Eld. Canright's closing paragraph in his article published in these columns. One might judge from the remarkable meekness of the Elder's closing words, that he was considerably reformed and somewhat ashamed of his previous performances, and that the castigation he had received through the EXTRA had brought him back to a more rational and consistent state of mind. We would that we could indulge in such a hope. None would more freely forgive than ourselves, could we see any signs of true repentance. But we have long since learned the difference between a "godly sorrow" which leadeth to true repentance, and a put-on outside appearance of submission and regret because of overmastering circumstances which have placed a person where he could not help himself for the time being. Such may appear to be quite meek till a more fa-

vorable opportunity is presented. The Elder evidently had a big tussle with that EXTRA. But he found himself so hedged about on every hand by the truthfulness of its statements, and his feet so entangled with the wicked inconsistencies of his own course, that the best he could do was to write this reply, claiming that we had done him injustice in a few instances, and closing up with some very lamb-like expressions concerning his "desire to be profited" by the "lessons read to him" in the EXTRA, and his sense of his own "weaknesses" which at times "overwhelms" him. Does he really cherish such sentiments? We would that we could believe it.

But, alas! since these words were written, we find he is out in different parts of the State not only repeating his former statements, but even going further than ever in his desperate efforts to injure S. D. Adventists, and misrepresent us before the public. We are therefore forced to believe that these words of his showing meekness and humiliation are but empty nothings, designed merely for effect, while in his heart he is determined to continue to wage this unjust war upon his former brethren.

But what about this statement, "I have tried to do what I thought was right"? Well, it is an astonishing one, to say the least. The Elder evidently realizes that his course has been such that no candid man knowing the facts would be likely to think he had done right. He must know that it was not "right." No wonder that the "consciousness of his weaknesses often overwhelms" him. But this "consciousness," alas! does not become so firmly fixed that he changes his course. He has since engaged in the same work in a more aggravated style than ever. But we must not forget that all the while, according to his statement, he has "tried to do what he thought was right." We hardly feel like denying the Elder the slight satisfaction still remaining, in cherishing the bare "thought" that after all he had a little desire left to do right. It would seem cruel to wrench this from him. It would not look well on paper to charge him with being a hypocrite, and we should greatly regret to be obliged to come to such a conclusion, in view of our many former associations. We have long known that much allowance must be made for persons who have fallen into great darkness by a failure to live up to the light they have received, especially when that light has been very great. Light may seem darkness to them, and darkness light. The mind becomes perverted. The Saviour speaks of some who shall "hear, and shall not understand," and shall see, and yet "shall not perceive." Their "heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed." We are not to suppose they realized this themselves.

The apostle also speaks of a class who "received not the love of the truth." "They should believe a lie," and be damned in so doing. When the light in us becomes darkness, how great is that darkness! This is a sentiment we see demonstrated often in this world of changes. Here are principles brought to view which are constantly illustrated. When the light of God's Spirit is withdrawn from a man, and he plunges along with a desperate spirit of resentment against his former belief and companions, he is not apt to study his motives very carefully. Such may have thought they did right. It is very natural to take complacent views of ourselves. Go into any prison in the land, and ask the inmates about their former conduct, and how many of them do you suppose will be found who did not think they were about as good as most men? When reverence for the law of God is broken down,—that law which Paul declares is "holy, just, and good," that law which is "spiritual," and searches the deep things of the heart,—we are left to form our own standard quite largely, and then it is the most natural thing in the world for a man to say, even when under grievous condemnation, if he used the highest standard of rectitude: "I have tried to do what I thought was right." So we feel bound still, under the necessities of the case, to grant this slight consolation to the Elder.

But let us notice a few points, and see to what lengths the Elder's conscience will let him go and still retain this hope that he is doing "right," that we may measure the present condition of his moral sense.

1. *His treatment of old friends.* As stated in the EXTRA, Eld. Canright at the time when he withdrew from us, professed the most pacific intentions. He said at Otsego, Feb. 17, 1887, before the church, that he thought there was a larger percentage of true Christians among S. D. Adventists than among any other denomination. He expressed the highest appreciation and confidence in many of our leading laborers; said he was perfectly satisfied with the treatment he had received from our people, and that he felt that he had been used in all respects as well as a Christian should. His greatest sorrow was that he felt compelled to part company with us. He despised the course others had taken who had gone out from us and then opposed and ridiculed us, and he would never do this. He would give himself wholly to revival work. He never would become a bitter assailant of our people. Yet within a few months he began the most bitter warfare upon S. D. Adventists which has ever been waged by any one. He has held us up to ridicule, and made us the laughing-stock of crowds for hours together. In his speeches, time and again he has done his best to cause us to be despised as a set of fanatics, narrow, bigoted, and unworthy of respect.

Think of it, candid reader. What could be the motives which would prompt you thus to treat old and long tried friends with whom you had labored and prayed, enjoyed their hospitality, and professed to love them so much,—with whom you lived in sweet communion as the dearest friends on earth for more than a score of years? After he had come to the point of finally parting company with us, he felt himself forced to say that he had no complaint whatever to make of our treatment of him. We had used him tenderly as a Christian in every sense. Yet he holds us up to ridicule, doing what he knows will wound our feelings most cruelly, when we have never

done him an injury. We know he will try to find excuses for such conduct. But we showed in the EXTRA that he had none whatever, and in his reply he finds no fault with the EXTRA on that point.

Ingratitude is ever considered a base sin. If this is not such, what shall we call it? Yea, is it not a base return for past kindnesses? Think of yourself, dear reader, holding up your long tried and best friends as a body before a congregation, and raising the derisive laugh at their expense night after night! He may say it was their doctrines or some persons among them that he thus treated. Does he not know that in no other way could he wound the feelings of old friends so much as by holding up to ridicule their religious belief or the friends they hold most dear? Does he say it was necessary to show up the iniquity of our doctrine? How about his statement, then, that there was no other church in which there were so many Christians, proportionally, as among S. D. Adventists? He said this himself after he had given up our faith. Is a doctrine very terrible or dangerous which develops more Christians in proportion to numbers than any other? He goes from place to place giving discourses every night for a solid week, every one aimed against his former brethren with whom he has lived in friendship and sympathy for twenty-eight years, ridiculing, defaming, and bringing them into the greatest disrepute, and doing so without a single discourse having been given against him on our part, or any public attack upon him whatever. If this be not a base return for past kindness, what is it? And yet we are bound to accept his statement: "I have tried to do what I thought was right."

2. *His unchristian course as a minister of the gospel.* Having shown the ingratitude of Eld. C. according to the plainest principles of common justice, we next notice how this course looks according to the higher code of Christian ethics. He has been a Christian minister for more than twenty years, and of late since he has left our people, he claims to have had special light concerning the gospel. Having discarded the old law, he has been illuminated by the full blaze of the gospel sunlight. We have a right, then, to expect of him a close imitation of Christ, the great Master, whom he claims now to specially serve. Will he inform us where the meek and lowly Man of Calvary ever went from place to place for two dollars a day, and in eight or ten long discourses held up for ridicule the worshippers of the true God, and the followers of Jesus himself. Eld. C.'s former brethren may be poor, perhaps, and unlearned, and possibly very faulty, yet as he himself admits, many of them are true Christians. Did our Saviour ever do this to any class, whether heathen, Samaritans, Pharisees, or Sadducees, to say nothing of his own disciples? He commands all of his followers to do good to those who hate them, and to pray for those who despitefully use them. He prayed for his enemies who were murdering him, and when reviled, reviled not again; and he requires all to do good for evil. His ministers are required to follow his example more closely than other Christians. Will the Elder find any example for his present course in the lives of the apostles, or any authority for it in any of their writings? If so, let us have the chapter and verse. He knows these things as well as we do. He is perfectly familiar with the many commands of Christ requiring love, meekness, mercy, and humility, even toward those who have wronged us, and rebuking scorn, derision, ingratitude, and such a course as he is pursuing. He knows the apostle's statement, that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." An "unchristian" course is one that is contrary to the teachings of Christ. Any candid mind can see that his course in pursuing a Christian people as he has, and holding them up to ridicule, has been utterly contrary to Christ's life and teachings. And yet we must not be uncharitable, but accept his statement, "I have tried to do what I thought was right."

3. *His treatment of the dead.* The readers of the EXTRA have not forgotten Eld. Canright's treatment of Eld. White, the honored pioneer in this religious movement. He characterized him in the Des Moines Oracle as a tyrant, "domineering over" his people, and claims that whole Conferences sat "for hours like whipped dogs" under his "terrible denunciations," and that he "quarreled" with all his leading brethren, etc., etc. We knew him as well as he, and know these representations to be grossly unjust, a veritable caricature of a man with some faults and many noble qualities, a devoted, earnest, sacrificing Christian whose life was worn out prematurely by his untiring and unselfish labor in his Master's cause. He admits Eld. White's readiness to confess his faults and mistakes, and says he at times made confessions to him,—a sure sign of an earnest purpose to do right. They were fast friends for many years. Eld. White indeed showed often a special interest in, and kindness toward, him, and treated him as an own son. At the time of his death, we are sure he felt kindly toward Eld. Canright. Yet Eld. C. does not hesitate to take up his old friend who sleeps in death, and parade before the world and hosts who never knew him, a grossly exaggerated statement of his faults and a most unjust view of his character. In the world around us, whose standard of propriety is far too low, there is a general acknowledgment that the memory of the dead, who cannot defend themselves, should be respected. What shall we say, then, of a Christian minister whom the Bible commands to speak evil of no man, when he, because of a change of religious views, proceeds remorselessly to break the cements of the tomb, and drag before the public an old friend five years dead, and parade through the public prints to exulting enemies, grossly unjust statements concerning his character? Eld. White was highly respected by leading citizens where he was best known. His biography was published among others in the list of prominent citizens of the State of Michigan, as a man worthy of honor, for energy, breadth of mind, and Christian philanthropy. But it is left for one who for years ate at his table, associated with him in the most familiar manner as a personal friend, a brother in Christian fellowship, to now drag his supposed faults before a cold world, and denounce him as tyrannical, a quarrelsome, domineering man worthy of little respect. But the Elder says, "I have tried to do what I thought was right," and we are, of course, bound to believe him.

4. *His treatment of Mrs. White.* For a full description of Eld. Canright's course toward her, we refer the reader to the article in the former EXTRA, where it is presented at length. In his reply herein published, he makes no complaint of injustice in this particular in the EXTRA. In that article, it will be seen that at one time when it will suit his purpose, he presents her as being "as good a woman as he knew." "Her piety was unquestioned." "She was a kind-hearted woman, philanthropic, charitable, and gentle in her life, and ever evinced a love for humanity." And "she was doubtless honest in supposing she had revelations," etc., and much more of this complimentary talk. But when he chose to take the other side of the question, he denounced her as acting a hypo-

critical part, talking "as smooth as oil" before the public, but making statements to her own people that were "shamefully false;" and declared that her course was so wicked that it ought to "shut her out of every pulpit in the land;" that she rules her "people with a rod of iron," and "condemns everybody who rejects her testimonies." He compares her work with that of Joseph Smith, Joanna Southcott, and Ann Lee, giving them the preference in point of ability or excellence, and in their proof of inspiration, and really sets the Mormons, Shakers, and followers of Southcott far in advance of the S. D. Adventists. In thus doing, a man of his parts, if he stopped to reflect a moment, must see that he utterly contradicts his own statements made over and over, as we clearly showed in the EXTRA, and proved them to be utterly unreliable.

We here inquire, What cause has he for thus treating Mrs. White? What injury has she done him? How has she provoked his wrath, and where did she do him any wrong? He has never informed us. No, he has not even given us a hint of anything of the kind. Why, then, should he feel called upon to parade her name through column after column of the public prints, when, according to his own statements since he became a Baptist minister, she was "as good a woman as he knew," "her piety was unquestioned," she was "kind-hearted," "philanthropic," and "ever evinced a love for humanity." These were his own statements at Otsego, Mich., before a public congregation in the Baptist church where he was pastor. From that day to this, to the best of our knowledge, Mrs. White has never referred to him in print or in public speaking. She has used him well, has been like a mother to him in the past, and only a year or two before he began this raid upon her, he was most glad to have her make a home at his house through a series of meetings; and when they parted last, they did so as warm friends. And now he can hold her up to ridicule, excite the derisive laugh, and sneeringly speak of her as the "prophetess" before a public congregation or in print. Is this a consistent course for a Christian minister to take toward a lady, as "good a woman as he knew"? Is this politeness? Is this being "courteous" to all, as the Bible commands him? Is this doing as he would be done by? Should a minister of Jesus Christ repay kindness with bitterness and public denunciation, simply because he has changed his religious views? Such conduct seems to the writer to be not only unchristian but utterly ungentlemanly. Yet the Elder assures us he has all the while "tried to do what he thought was right," and it would not be courteous to question his word.

4. *His untruthful representations of our positions.* Eld. Canright, two or three weeks since, had a very triumphant (?) meeting near Bushnell, Mich., during which he "exposed" S. D. Adventism in eight solid discourses, at the rate of two dollars per day and some extra collections thrown in, much to the satisfaction of many who wish us ill, but without any damage to ourselves. Eld. I. D. Van Horn was present a portion of the time, and replied to his attacks. He makes the following statements:—

St. Charles, Mich., Feb. 6, 1888.

Having recently had the opportunity of hearing Eld. Canright in his raid against his former brethren, the S. D. Adventists, I can truthfully say that he often uses unfair and dishonorable means to carry his points, to prejudice the people against us. This is seen in his gross misrepresentations of points of our faith which he must surely know by his long experience with our people. I will give one instance: He stated plainly, before a crowded house, "that S. D. Adventists have believed and taught that Sunday is the mark of the beast, and that all who have kept Sunday, and who are now keeping it, have had, and now have the mark of the beast. Their prophetess, Mrs. White, says so in 'Vol. IV., Great Controversy,' page 281. She says: 'The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark.'"

Taking this sentence out from its connection, and using it in the manner he did, is a direct falsehood against Sr. White, and against the whole body of S. D. Adventists. Any one taking the pains to read the whole paragraph in which this sentence is found, must arrive at the same conclusion.

I. D. VAN HORN.

Eld. Van Horn is well known as one of the most candid and careful men in his statements. Eld. Canright himself indorses him before that public congregation as an "honest man and a Christian;" besides, a crowd of people heard him at the time. We must express our astonishment that Eld. C. should make such statements as these, and we can account for it only by the fact that he is evidently driven on and controlled by a spirit which makes him utterly reckless. Lest the reader will think this a harsh statement, we will present a few facts. We quote a few statements from our standard works, which have been long in print, to show the position of our people on this subject:—

It will be said again, Then all Sunday-keepers have the mark of the beast; then all the good of past ages who kept this day had the mark of the beast; then Luther, Whitefield, the Wesleys, and all who have done a good and noble work of reformation had the mark of the beast; then all the blessings that have been poured upon the reformed churches have been poured upon those who had the mark of the beast. We answer, *No!* And we are sorry to say that some professedly religious teachers, though many times corrected, persist in misrepresenting us on this point. We have never so held; we have never so taught. Our premises lead to no such conclusions. Give ear: The mark and worship of the beast are enforced by the two-horned beast. The receiving of the mark of the beast is a specific act while the two-horned beast is to cause to be done. The third message of Revelation 14 is a warning mercifully sent out in advance, to prepare the people for the coming danger. There can therefore be no worship of the beast, nor reception of his mark, such as is contemplated in the prophecy, till it is enforced by the two-horned beast.—*Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, pp. 602, 608.

Much more of the same kind follows. Again:—

We know the objection which will here immediately fly to the lips of an opponent. He will say, Then all Sunday-keepers past or present, however eminent as servants of God, have had or now have the mark of the beast. And we quickly answer, Not one. Why?—Because they have not kept it, and are not keeping it, with the issue before them presented in the prophecy. They have supposed they were keeping the fourth commandment according to the will of God.—*Synopsis of Present Truth*, p. 89.

Much more to the same intent might be taken from this work, and also from the "Marvel of Nations," pp. 184, 185. These are all standard works with which Eld. C. was well acquainted. He has known these were the positions of our people for a quarter of a century. And having been with him in tent labor four different tent seasons, I personally know that he taught the same thing, and did not teach that the honest Christians of the past had the mark of the beast. He ever argued against that idea with all his might. How, then, dare he make such statements?

But he must not fail, of course, to give Mrs. White a thrust, so he says:—

Their prophetess, Mrs. White, says so in "Vol. IV., Great Controversy," p. 281. She says: "The keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark."

To show how the Elder longs to "do what he thinks is right," we will quote verbatim from Mrs. White, on the page he cites and the connection on p. 282:—

That institution [the Sabbath] which points to God as the Creator, is a sign of his rightful authority over the beings he has made. The change of the Sabbath is the sign, or mark, of the authority of the Romish Church. Those who, understanding the claims of the fourth commandment, choose to observe the false in place of the true Sabbath, are thereby paying homage to that power by which alone it is commanded. The change in the fourth commandment is the change pointed out in the prophecy, and the keeping of the counterfeit Sabbath is the reception of the mark. But Christians of past generations observed the first day, supposing that they were keeping the Bible Sabbath, and there are in the churches of to-day many who honestly believe that Sunday is the Sabbath of divine appointment. None of these have received the mark of the beast. There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. The test upon this question does not come until Sunday observance is enforced by law, and the world is enlightened concerning the obligation of the true Sabbath. Not until the issue is thus plainly set before the people, and they are brought to choose between the commandments of God and the commandments of men will those who continue in transgression receive the mark of the beast.

My candid reader, what do you think of the conscientiousness of the man with these words before him, who can say emphatically before a public congregation, "S. D. Adventists have believed and taught that Sunday is the mark of the beast, and that all who have kept Sunday, and who are now keeping it, have had and now have the mark of the beast. Their prophetess, Mrs. White, says so in 'Vol. IV., Great Controversy,' p. 281?"

We know he must have read this very language; for he quotes a sentence out of its connection, which he could not have done had he not read it. What can you make of that but a willful perversion of the truth, a square falsehood? We are astonished beyond measure that a man who has known for more than twenty years what S. D. Adventists have taught on this subject, should dare to say what he does. We can make some allowance for one not acquainted with the facts, but not for him. He knows better.

But I suppose we must again return to his oft-quoted statement: "I have tried to do what I thought was right." Poor man! He must have "tried" and grievously failed. He is so driven to desperation by that spirit of hatred that he cannot control himself. Such progress has he made in one short year, under his new and improved religion.

We now draw this article to its close. We pity Eld. Canright, and wish to fling no unkind epithets at him. We have tried to weigh the condition of his present moral sense, and, alas! it seems to have woefully deteriorated. So we should expect of a man who casts aside the law of God, and runs the race he has. He will doubtless go on trying to "do what he thinks is right," and we expect to find in him the bitterest of opponents. Holy Writ informs us that there are "blind leaders of the blind," and those who "believe a lie." But the end they reach in either case is not desirable. We would gladly help such, but we know not how. When forced, as in this case, to consider the crooked, slippery ways of opposers of the truth, we must for the truth's sake and the cause of God speak plain, and strip off the covering of deception, and expose the hiding-place of iniquity. We dislike, however, to have to do this work, and much prefer to preach the truth of God and labor for the salvation of precious souls.

G. I. B.

#### A STRAW.

We present as a theological curiosity, and as an evidence of pastoral consistency (?), the following leaflet, which Eld. Canright himself was seen to circulate with his own hand, in a revival meeting in his own church at Otsego, Mich., a few weeks since, according to the statement of an eye-witness, and which very likely he prepared with his own pen:—

#### WHY AM I NOT A CHRISTIAN?

1. Is it because I am afraid of ridicule and of what others may say of me?  
"Whoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed."
2. Is it because of the inconsistencies of professing Christians?  
"Every man shall give an account of himself to God."
3. Is it because I am not willing to give up all to Christ?  
"What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"
4. Is it because I am afraid that I shall not be accepted?  
"Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."
5. Is it because I fear I am too great a sinner?  
"The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin."
6. Is it because I am afraid I shall not hold out?  
"He that hath begun a good work in you will perform it unto the day of Jesus Christ."
7. Is it because I am thinking that I will do as well as I can, and that God ought to be satisfied with that?  
"Whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."
8. Is it because I am postponing the matter, without any definite reason?  
"Boast not thyself of to-morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth."

#### Will You be a Christian NOW?

It will be noticed that a reply to one question in the list, we have italicized. We have no fault to find with the leaflet, or the portion emphasized above. It is very good. But we quote the remaining part of the scripture in full from which this is taken. James 2:8-12: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [or, that law which said, margin], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty."

This glorious text shows so clearly the kingly authority of the law of ten commandments, the binding force of each and every command contained in it, the fact that it is the standard by which we shall be judged in the last day, that it is the law which condemns men now, and that true liberty is to be found only by obedience to every one of its requirements after we have been forgiven the sins caused by its transgression, yet Eld. Canright is everywhere trying to show that this law is "abolished," "done away," "nailed to the cross," and gone forever; and that one of its commands (the fourth, concerning the Sabbath) is better broken than kept. Yet when holding a revival meeting in his own church, he quotes a portion of it in order to impress the mind of sinners with the necessity of obeying God wholly. Thus he can blow cold and blow hot on the same subject, hold on to a portion of the decalogue where it seems to serve his purpose, and abolish the whole when fighting the Adventists, and take contradictory positions whenever the public demand seems to require.

Such "a straw" indeed shows how the wind blows, and emphasizes the sentiment, "O Consistency, thou art a jewel!" This is being all things to all men with a vengeance.

G. I. B.

#### THE "GRAVEST" "WRONG STATEMENTS."

It will be noticed that Eld. Canright, in his reply to the EXTRA, printed in this issue, complaining of the treatment he has received, and the "injustice" done him, and the "wrong statements" we have made concerning him which he demands we should correct, states that he presents a few of the "gravest" mistakes to be found in the EXTRA. He intimates that there are others, "half truths" or matters colored somewhat, and points on which we have been misinformed, etc., which he will not present. But he has singled out a few of the "gravest" cases, and calls upon us, if we have any sense of fairness, to make reparation in public for such injuries to his good name and reputation. He then presents the three points we have noticed. The discerning reader can see for himself from the charges of Eld. C. and our replies to the same, how far astray we were in our statements. We are certain we have done the Elder no wrong whatever. Our criticisms upon his course in the EXTRA, on the very points about which he complains, are substantially and amply justified by the facts we have presented, whether or not there were any slight technical errors in our statements. He has utterly failed to make the point against us he has undertaken to make. Our charges fall back upon him after a careful examination, with greater weight than in our original statements in the EXTRA. He will certainly have to try again if he hopes to break their force.

But how can he do this, when in the very article from his pen, here presented, after a month's opportunity of studying the EXTRA, he states over his own signature that these three particulars which he cites are the "gravest" "wrong statements" we have made. He says these are the most objectionable points he can find. If these are the "gravest," and he utterly fails to prove any injustice against us whatever, how will he be able hereafter to deny the charges made against him in the EXTRA?

The word "gravest," according to Webster, means, *the most serious, the most important.* All other statements, then, in the EXTRA, which he thinks somewhat objectionable, are less serious than these he cites. The ones quoted have plainly no force, and utterly fail to show any wrong done him. Therefore, after weeks of time in which to hunt up something to turn against us, he virtually admits the substantial justice of our charges against him. Our statements in the EXTRA, concerning Eld. Canright's course, we well knew were serious and grave, and they are many in number. We knew full well that possibly they might strike a person unacquainted with the facts, as being extreme. But the unchristian course which he has pursued for months past, demanded plain talk and explicit and emphatic statements of his evil conduct. The EXTRA was a large sheet, containing a great amount of this kind of matter. One could hardly hope in so many words to exactly express every charge without a single mistake. But we knew there was no intentional wrong, and were very sure there were no errors of importance. And now, after weeks have passed, Eld. Canright, after much study, with plenty of time in which to do a thorough job, presents two or three statements where he claims we have done him an injury. These, he tells us, are the most serious ones he can find. We have plainly demonstrated the justice of our original statements, and he utterly fails to show that we have done him any injustice whatever. Thus we claim that Eld. Canright himself virtually indorses the EXTRA as true, and its statements incontrovertible. Let this virtual admission not be forgotten.

G. I. B.