

Miscellaneous Study Topics

www.CreationismOnline.com

**Signs Publishing Company
Warburton, Victoria, Australia
1925**

Contents

- 1. The Origin Of Evil**
- 2. Religion and the State Schools**
- 3. Dietary Errors**
- 4. The Origin Of Adventism**
- 5. Ellen White and Her Visions**

1. The Origin Of Evil

To many minds the origin of sin and the reason for its existence are a source of great perplexity. They see the work of evil, with its terrible results of woe and desolation, and they question how all this can exist under the sovereignty of One who is infinite in wisdom, in power, and in love. Here is a mystery of which they find no explanation. And in their uncertainty and doubt they are blinded to truths plainly revealed in God's word and essential to salvation. There are those who, in their inquiries concerning the existence of sin, endeavor to search into that which God has never revealed; hence they find no solution of their difficulties; and such as are actuated by a disposition to doubt and cavil seize upon this as an excuse for rejecting the words of Holy Writ. Others, however, fail of a satisfactory understanding of the great problem of evil, from the fact that tradition and misinterpretation have obscured the teaching of the Bible concerning the character of God, the nature of His government, and the principles of His dealing with sin.

It is impossible to explain the origin of sin so as to give a reason for its existence. Yet enough may be understood concerning both the origin and the final disposition of sin to make fully manifest the justice and benevolence of God in all His dealings with evil. Nothing is more plainly taught in Scripture than that God was in no wise responsible for the entrance of sin; that there was no arbitrary withdrawal of divine grace, no deficiency in the divine government, that gave occasion for the uprising of rebellion. Sin is an intruder, for whose presence no reason can be given. It is mysterious, unaccountable; to excuse it is to defend it. Could excuse for it be found, or cause be shown for its existence, it would cease to be sin. Our only definition of sin is that given in the word of God; it is "the transgression of the law;" it is the outworking of a principle at war with the great law of love which is the foundation of the divine government.

Before the entrance of evil there was peace and joy throughout the universe. All was in perfect harmony with the Creator's will. Love for God was supreme, love for one another impartial. Christ the Word, the Only Begotten of God, was one with the eternal Father,-- one in nature, in character, and in purpose, the only being in all the universe that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God. By Christ the Father wrought in the creation of all heavenly beings. "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers" (Colossians 1:16); and to Christ, equally with the Father, all heaven gave allegiance.

The law of love being the foundation of the government of God, the happiness of all created beings depended upon their perfect accord with its great principles of righteousness. God desires from all His creatures the service of love--homage that springs from an intelligent appreciation of His character. He takes no pleasure in a forced allegiance, and to all He grants freedom of will, that they may render Him voluntary service.

But there was one that chose to pervert this freedom. Sin originated with him who, next to Christ, had been most honored of God and who stood highest in power and glory among the inhabitants of heaven. Before his fall, Lucifer was first of the covering cherubs, holy and undefiled. "Thus said the Lord God; Thou sealed up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering. . . . Thou art the anointed cherub that covered; and I have set thee so: thou was upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou was perfect in thy ways from the day that thou was created, till iniquity was found in thee." Ezekiel 28:12-15.

Lucifer might have remained in favor with God, beloved and honored by all the angelic host, exercising his noble powers to bless others and to glorify his Maker. But, says the prophet, "Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness." Verse 17. Little by little, Lucifer came to indulge a desire for self-exaltation. "Thou hast set thine heart as the heart of God." "Thou hast said, . . . I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation...I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High." Verse 6; Isaiah 14:13, 14. Instead of seeking to make God supreme in the affections and allegiance of His creatures, it was Lucifer's endeavor to win their service and homage to himself. And coveting the honor which the infinite Father had bestowed upon His Son, this prince of angels aspired to power which it was the prerogative of Christ alone to wield.

All heaven had rejoiced to reflect the Creator's glory and to show forth His praise. And while God was thus honored, all had been peace and gladness. But a note of discord now marred the celestial harmonies. The service and exaltation of self, contrary to the Creator's plan, awakened forebodings of evil in minds to whom God's glory was supreme. The heavenly councils pleaded with Lucifer. The Son of God presented before him the greatness, the goodness, and the justice of the Creator, and the sacred, unchanging nature of His law. God Himself had established the order of heaven; and in departing from it, Lucifer would dishonor his Maker, and bring ruin upon himself. But the warning, given in infinite love and mercy, only aroused a spirit of resistance. Lucifer allowed jealousy of Christ to prevail, and he became the more determined.

Pride in his own glory nourished the desire for supremacy. The high honors conferred upon Lucifer were not appreciated as the gift of God and called forth no gratitude to the Creator. He gloried in his brightness and exaltation, and aspired to be equal with God. He was beloved and revered by the heavenly host. Angels delighted to execute his commands, and he was clothed with wisdom and glory above them all. Yet the Son of God was the acknowledged Sovereign of heaven, one in power and authority with the Father. In all the councils of God, Christ was a participant, while Lucifer was not permitted thus to enter into the divine purposes. "Why," questioned this mighty angel, "should Christ have the supremacy? Why is He thus honored above Lucifer?"

Leaving his place in the immediate presence of God, Lucifer went forth to diffuse the spirit of discontent among the angels. Working with mysterious secrecy, and for a time concealing his real purpose under an appearance of reverence for God, he endeavored to excite dissatisfaction concerning the laws that governed heavenly beings, intimating that they imposed an unnecessary restraint. Since their natures were holy, he urged that the angels should obey the dictates of their own will. He sought to create sympathy for himself by representing that God had dealt unjustly with him in bestowing supreme honor upon Christ. He claimed that in aspiring to greater power and honor he was not aiming at self-exaltation, but was seeking to secure liberty for all the inhabitants of heaven, that by this means they might attain to a higher state of existence.

God in His great mercy bore long with Lucifer. He was not immediately degraded from his exalted station when he first indulged the spirit of discontent, nor even when he began to present his false claims before the loyal angels. Long was he retained in heaven. Again and again he was offered pardon on condition of repentance and submission. Such efforts as only infinite love and wisdom could devise were made to convince him of his error. The spirit of discontent had never before been known in heaven. Lucifer himself did not at first see whither he was drifting; he did not understand the real nature of his feelings. But as his dissatisfaction was proved to be without cause, Lucifer was convinced that he was in the wrong, that the divine claims were just, and that he ought to acknowledge them as such before all heaven. Had he done this, he might have saved himself and many angels. He had not at this time fully cast off his allegiance to God. Though he had forsaken his position as covering cherub, yet if he had been willing to return to God, acknowledging the Creator's wisdom, and satisfied to fill the place appointed him in God's great plan, he would have been reinstated in his office. But pride forbade him to submit. He persistently defended his own course, maintained that he had no need of repentance, and fully committed himself, in the great controversy, against his Maker.

All the powers of his master mind were now bent to the work of deception, to secure the sympathy of the angels that had been under his command. Even the fact that Christ had warned and counseled him was perverted to serve his traitorous designs. To those whose loving trust bound them most closely to him, Satan had represented that he was wrongly judged, that his position was not respected, and that his liberty was to be abridged. From misrepresentation of the words of Christ he passed to prevarication and direct falsehood, accusing the Son of God of a design to humiliate him before the inhabitants of heaven. He sought also to make a false issue between himself and the loyal angels. All whom he could not subvert and bring fully to his side he accused of indifference to the interests of heavenly beings. The very work which he himself was doing he charged upon those who remained true to God. And to sustain his charge of God's injustice toward him, he resorted to misrepresentation of the words and acts of the Creator. It was his policy to perplex the angels with subtle arguments concerning the purposes of God. Everything that was simple he shrouded in mystery, and by artful perversion cast doubt upon the plainest statements of Jehovah. His high position, in such close connection with the divine administration, gave greater force to his representations, and many were induced to unite with him in rebellion against Heaven's authority.

God in His wisdom permitted Satan to carry forward his work, until the spirit of disaffection ripened into active revolt. It was necessary for his plans to be fully developed, that their true nature and tendency might be seen by all. Lucifer, as the anointed cherub,

had been highly exalted; he was greatly loved by the heavenly beings, and his influence over them was strong. God's government included not only the inhabitants of heaven, but of all the worlds that He had created; and Satan thought that if he could carry the angels of heaven with him in rebellion, he could carry also the other worlds. He had artfully presented his side of the question, employing sophistry and fraud to secure his objects. His power to deceive was very great, and by disguising himself in a cloak of falsehood he had gained an advantage. Even the loyal angels could not fully discern his character or see to what his work was leading.

Satan had been so highly honored, and all his acts were so clothed with mystery, that it was difficult to disclose to the angels the true nature of his work. Until fully developed, sin would not appear the evil thing it was. Heretofore it had had no place in the universe of God, and holy beings had no conception of its nature and malignity. They could not discern the terrible consequences that would result from setting aside the divine law. Satan had, at first, concealed his work under a specious profession of loyalty to God. He claimed to be seeking to promote the honor of God, the stability of His government, and the good of all the inhabitants of heaven. While instilling discontent into the minds of the angels under him, he had artfully made it appear that he was seeking to remove dissatisfaction. When he urged that changes be made in the order and laws of God's government, it was under the pretense that these were necessary in order to preserve harmony in heaven.

In His dealing with sin, God could employ only righteousness and truth. Satan could use what God could not-- flattery and deceit. He had sought to falsify the word of God and had misrepresented His plan of government before the angels, claiming that God was not just in laying laws and rules upon the inhabitants of heaven; that in requiring submission and obedience from His creatures, He was seeking merely the exaltation of Himself. Therefore it must be demonstrated before the inhabitants of heaven, as well as of all the worlds, that God's government was just, His law perfect. Satan had made it appear that he himself was seeking to promote the good of the universe. The true character of the usurper, and his real object, must be understood by all. He must have time to manifest himself by his wicked works.

The discord which his own course had caused in heaven, Satan charged upon the law and government of God. All evil he declared to be the result of the divine administration. He claimed that it was his own object to improve upon the statutes of Jehovah. Therefore it was necessary that he should demonstrate the nature of his claims, and show the working out of his proposed changes in the divine law. His own work must condemn him. Satan had claimed from the first that he was not in rebellion. The whole universe must see the deceiver unmasked.

Even when it was decided that he could no longer remain in heaven, Infinite Wisdom did not destroy Satan. Since the service of love can alone be acceptable to God, the allegiance of His creatures must rest upon a conviction of His justice and benevolence. The inhabitants of heaven and of other worlds, being unprepared to comprehend the nature or consequences of sin, could not then have seen the justice and mercy of God in the destruction of Satan. Had he been immediately blotted from existence, they would have served God from fear rather than from love. The influence of the deceiver would not have been fully destroyed, nor would the spirit of rebellion have been utterly eradicated. Evil must be permitted to come to maturity. For the good of the entire universe through ceaseless ages Satan must more fully develop his principles, that his charges against the divine government might be seen in their true light by all created beings, that the justice and mercy of God and the immutability of His law might forever be placed beyond all question.

Satan's rebellion was to be a lesson to the universe through all coming ages, a perpetual testimony to the nature and terrible results of sin. The working out of Satan's rule, its effects upon both men and angels, would show what must be the fruit of setting aside the divine authority. It would testify that with the existence of God's government and His law is bound up the well-being of all the creatures He has made. Thus the history of this terrible experiment of rebellion was to be perpetual safeguard to all holy intelligences, to prevent them from being deceived as to the nature of transgression, to save them from committing sin and suffering its punishments.

To the very close of the controversy in heaven the great usurper continued to justify himself. When it was announced that with all his sympathizers he must be expelled from the abodes of bliss, then the rebel leader boldly avowed his contempt for the Creator's law. He reiterated his claim that angels needed no control, but should be left to follow their own will, which would ever guide them right. He denounced the divine statutes as a restriction of their liberty and declared that it was his purpose to secure the abolition of law; that, freed from this restraint, the hosts of heaven might enter upon a more exalted, more glorious state of existence.

With one accord, Satan and his host threw the blame of their rebellion wholly upon Christ, declaring that if they had not been reproved, they would never have rebelled. Thus stubborn and defiant in their disloyalty, seeking vainly to overthrow the government of God, yet blasphemously claiming to be themselves the innocent victims of oppressive power, the arch rebel and all his sympathizers were at last banished from heaven.

The same spirit that prompted rebellion in heaven still inspires rebellion on earth. Satan has continued with men the same policy which he pursued with the angels. His spirit now reigns in the children of disobedience. Like him they seek to break down the

restraints of the law of God and promise men liberty through transgression of its precepts. Reproof of sin still arouses the spirit of hatred and resistance. When God's messages of warning are brought home to the conscience, Satan leads men to justify themselves and to seek the sympathy of others in their course of sin. Instead of correcting their errors, they excite indignation against the reprover, as if he were the sole cause of difficulty. From the days of righteous Abel to our own time such is the spirit which has been displayed toward those who dare to condemn sin.

By the same misrepresentation of the character of God as he had practiced in heaven, causing Him to be regarded as severe and tyrannical, Satan induced man to sin. And having succeeded thus far, he declared that God's unjust restrictions had led to man's fall, as they had led to his own rebellion.

But the Eternal One Himself proclaims His character: "The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." Exodus 34:6, 7.

In the banishment of Satan from heaven, God declared His justice and maintained the honor of His throne. But when man had sinned through yielding to the deceptions of this apostate spirit, God gave an evidence of His love by yielding up His only-begotten Son to die for the fallen race.

In the atonement the character of God is revealed. The mighty argument of the cross demonstrates to the whole universe that the course of sin which Lucifer had chosen was in no wise chargeable upon the government of God.

In the contest between Christ and Satan, during the Savior's earthly ministry, the character of the great deceiver was unmasked. Nothing could so effectually have uprooted Satan from the affections of the heavenly angels and the whole loyal universe as did his cruel warfare upon the world's Redeemer. The daring blasphemy of his demand that Christ should pay him homage, his presumptuous boldness in bearing Him to the mountain summit and the pinnacle of the temple, the malicious intent betrayed in urging Him to cast Himself down from the dizzy height, the unsleeping malice that hunted Him from place to place, inspiring the hearts of priests and people to reject His love, and at the last to cry, "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!--all this excited the amazement and indignation of the universe.

It was Satan that prompted the world's rejection of Christ. The prince of evil exerted all his power and cunning to destroy Jesus; for he saw that the Savior's mercy and love, His compassion and pitying tenderness, were representing to the world the character of God. Satan contested every claim put forth by the Son of God and employed men as his agents to fill the Savior's life with suffering and sorrow. The sophistry and falsehood by which he had sought to hinder the work of Jesus, the hatred manifested through the children of disobedience, his cruel accusations against Him whose life was one of unexampled goodness, all sprang from deep-seated revenge. The pent-up fires of envy and malice, hatred and revenge, burst forth on Calvary against the Son of God, while all heaven gazed upon the scene in silent horror.

When the great sacrifice had been consummated, Christ ascended on high, refusing the adoration of angels until He had presented the request: "I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am." John 17:24. Then with inexpressible love and power came forth the answer from the Father's throne: "Let all the angels of God worship Him." Hebrews 1:6. Not a stain rested upon Jesus. His humiliation ended, His sacrifice completed, there was given unto Him a name that is above every name.

Now the guilt of Satan stood forth without excuse. He had revealed his true character as a liar and a murderer. It was seen that the very same spirit with which he ruled the children of men, who were under his power, he would have manifested had he been permitted to control the inhabitants of heaven. He had claimed that the transgression of God's law would bring liberty and exaltation; but it was seen to result in bondage and degradation.

Satan's lying charges against the divine character and government appeared in their true light. He had accused God of seeking merely the exaltation of Himself in requiring submission and obedience from His creatures, and had declared that, while the Creator exacted self-denial from all others, He Himself practiced no self-denial and made no sacrifice. Now it was seen that for the salvation of a fallen and sinful race, the Ruler of the universe had made the greatest sacrifice which love could make; for "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." 2 Corinthians 5:19. It was seen, also, that while Lucifer had opened the door for the entrance of sin by his desire for honor and supremacy, Christ had, in order to destroy sin, humbled Himself and become obedient unto death.

God had manifested His abhorrence of the principles of rebellion. All heaven saw His justice revealed, both in the condemnation of Satan and in the redemption of man. Lucifer had declared that if the law of God was changeless, and its penalty could not be remitted, every transgressor must be forever debarred from the Creator's favor. He had claimed that the sinful race were placed beyond redemption and were therefore his rightful prey. But the death of Christ was an argument in man's behalf that could not be overthrown. The penalty of the law fell upon Him who was equal with God, and man was free to accept the righteousness of Christ

and by a life of penitence and humiliation to triumph, as the Son of God had triumphed, over the power of Satan. Thus God is just and yet the justifier of all who believe in Jesus.

But it was not merely to accomplish the redemption of man that Christ came to the earth to suffer and to die. He came to “magnify the law” and to “make it honorable.” Not alone that the inhabitants of this world might regard the law as it should be regarded; but it was to demonstrate to all the worlds of the universe that God’s law is unchangeable. Could its claims have been set aside, then the Son of God need not have yielded up His life to atone for its transgression. The death of Christ proves it immutable. And the sacrifice to which infinite love impelled the Father and the Son, that sinners might be redeemed, demonstrates to all the universe--what nothing less than this plan of atonement could have sufficed to do--that justice and mercy are the foundation of the law and government of God.

In the final execution of the judgment it will be seen that no cause for sin exists. When the Judge of all the earth shall demand of Satan, “Why hast thou rebelled against Me, and robbed Me of the subjects of My kingdom?” the originator of evil can render no excuse. Every mouth will be stopped, and all the hosts of rebellion will be speechless.

The cross of Calvary, while it declares the law immutable, proclaims to the universe that the wages of sin is death. In the Savior’s expiring cry, “It is finished,” the death knell of Satan was rung. The great controversy which had been so long in progress was then decided, and the final eradication of evil was made certain. The Son of God passed through the portals of the tomb, that “through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” Hebrews 2:14. Lucifer’s desire for self-exaltation had led him to say: “I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will be like the Most High.” God declares: “I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth, and never shall thou be any more.” Isaiah 14:13, 14; Ezekiel 28:18, 19. When “the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, said the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” Malachi 4:1.

The whole universe will have become witnesses to the nature and results of sin. And its utter extermination, which in the beginning would have brought fear to angels and dishonor to God, will now vindicate His love and establish His honor before the universe of beings who delight to do His will, and in whose heart is His law. Never will evil again be manifest. Says the word of God: “Affliction shall not rise up the second time.” Nahum 1:9. The law of God, which Satan has reproached as the yoke of bondage, will be honored as the law of liberty. A tested and proved creation will never again be turned from allegiance to Him whose character has been fully manifested before them as fathomless love and infinite wisdom. [The Great Controversy 492-504]

2. Religion And The State Schools
SIGNS PUBLISHING COMPANY LIMITED
Warburton, Victoria, Australia
1925

Of recent years a controversy has arisen over the question of religious instruction in State Schools. It is being agitated with more or less zeal in many countries.

The issue is one of grave importance, for it involves the question whether the State can of right have anything to do with religion. It is, therefore, but the part of wisdom to examine it candidly, viewing it from all sides. Personal likes or dislikes should be set aside, and reason, right, and justice, allowed to prevail.

A full and impartial investigation of the subject requires a consideration of such questions as, What are the State Schools? For what were they instituted? To whom do they belong? How and by whom are they maintained? Are they designed to teach religion? If so, what religion, or whose particular views of religion? All these questions must be settled before a correct decision can be arrived at whether religion should be taught in the State Schools.

The State School is organized and maintained by the State. It is, therefore, distinctly a State institution.

But what is the State? The State is the body politic. It is composed of the people of the State, united under a form of government organized for orderly purposes.

And who are the people? They are the men, women, and children, of different ages, nationalities, and religious beliefs, residing in the territory controlled by the State. So far as citizenship is concerned, their rights and interests are equal. They are associated together for

the protection and preservation of their rights. All legislation by them is for their mutual protection and profit. Therefore, no distinction can be made, no favors shown, to any.

If, then, the school belongs to the State, and the State is the people, it is evident that the State School is the people's school. It belongs to the people, to all the people. All are taxed for its support, hence all have equal rights in its management. No class of citizens can justly claim special favors in it for themselves.

But all are not agreed as to the kind of education the State School should provide. On one point, however, all are agreed, and that is that the various secular studies should be taught in them, such as reading, writing, spelling, grammar, arithmetic, geography, and history. All desire their children educated in these, and in the various arts and sciences, such as music, drawing, painting, physiology, physics, botany, zoology, and astronomy. But others go farther, and claim that the State should teach religion. They argue that no instruction is complete that does not teach the art of right living. "If we want the children to be moral," they say, "the surest and easiest way is to educate them to be Christians." And believing this (and it is true), they conclude at once that religion should be taught in the State School, and think it sacrilegious for any one to oppose the proposition. They forget that what may be suitable for one thing may not be adapted to another; that the factory which produces good pianos might be quite unsuited for making good bread.

Therefore, we ask, Can religion be brought into the State Schools without encroaching upon the rights of any who maintain them? Can it be done with perfect justice to every citizen? Is it within the province of the State to teach religion? Is it in harmony with Christ's instruction, to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's?

What Religion?

If religion is to be taught in the State Schools, the question at once arises, What religion shall it be? There are a great many religions, and a great variety of opinions respecting religion. The citizens of the State who support the schools often hold very different and conflicting views of religion. Doctrines firmly believed by some are utterly rejected by others. Those who believe certain doctrines, disbelieve all others not in harmony with these. Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and infidels not only differ in matters of religion, but are positively, and often hotly, antagonistic. While all would agree that two and two make four, that there are two hemispheres, and five oceans, and that a verb should agree with its subject in person and number, all are not agreed touching the doctrines of the trinity, baptism, and the immaculate conception.

Suppose, then, the Catholic religion were introduced into the schools, and read and taught to all the children. That might please the Catholic, for it is in harmony with his conscience. But how would it suit the Protestant, the Jew, and the infidel? What a monster indignation meeting would be held by Protestants to protest against such an invasion of their rights! Suppose, again, the infidel should succeed in securing the reading and teaching of infidel views to the children in the schools. What a storm would emanate from believers in religion! And the opposition in either case would be justifiable, for neither the Catholic nor the infidel has any right to make the State School the medium through which to propagate his views respecting religion.

Now, justice declares that what is true of the Catholic and the infidel in this respect is equally true of the Protestant. This must be evident to every candid mind. It is passing strange, therefore, that a Protestant who denies the right of the Catholic or the infidel to introduce his views of religion into the State Schools, should persist in claiming the right to place his own religion there. Those who are so biased as this have need to study the golden rule again, which says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

There are many who sincerely believe that the eternal welfare of their children depends upon the teaching and acceptance of their particular views of religion. To force upon the children of such, religious instruction which the parents do not believe, and entailing, to their minds, such unspeakable horrible consequences, would be the most odious of tyrannies. Taxation without representation would be a trivial grievance compared with it. This is what Russia is attempting to do at the present time. In certain provinces of Russia there are as many as 130,000 dissenters, but state church missionaries are being stationed in every village of the country, and all children are to be compelled to attend the state church schools.

Non-Sectarian Religious Instruction

Many, however, who contend that religion should be taught in the State Schools, argue that the instruction for which they plead is nonsectarian. But there is no such thing as nonsectarian religious instruction. A religion so broad as to harmonize with the views of all, and conflict with none, would be a big humbug. Even Christianity, the broadest and best of all religions, in fact, the only true religion, is not a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something, or it means nothing. It consists of doctrines and ordinances the most positive and explicit, and enjoins duties the most obligatory and binding. But Christianity is

sectarian as compared with Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Judaism, and infidelity. Protestantism is sectarian as compared with Catholicism and the Greek Church; and sectarianism among Protestantism is almost beyond enumeration.

The fact is, there are so many sects, holding such diverse and conflicting views, that it would be impossible to teach any phase of religion without teaching what some believe and what others disbelieve. One believes that sprinkling is baptism; another believes that immersion only is baptism. One believes that infants should be baptized; another, that it is altogether wrong to baptize infants. Some believe that the future destiny of every person was fixed and predestinated from creation; others believe that the destiny of every person is placed in his own hands, and that he decides it by his own voluntary choice. Some accept only the Old Testament; others only the New; while still others accept both. Only some believe in a living, personal devil, called Satan; others reject the idea. Some teach that there is an awful burning place into which all the lost will be cast, and there burned to all eternity; others denounce this doctrine as diabolical, and teach that the wicked will be burned up and destroyed. Some teach that no one will be destroyed, that all will [finally be](#) saved; while others hold that only a portion of the race will be immortalized and receive eternal life.

Even the great moral code, the Ten Commandments, has not escaped the sectarian dissecting knife. Some cut away the whole code; others only a part. Some have expunged the second commandment, and divided the tenth to make good the number ten. Some observe the seventh day of the week according to the fourth commandment, while others claim that the commandment has been changed, and that the first day should now be kept as the Sabbath.

Some Text-Books Examined.

In the "Third Reader" of a series of national readers gotten up by the Irish National Board of Education, and revised and adapted for use in the State Schools of Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand, occurs a lesson on "The Law." In this it is stated that the ten commandments are "the moral law." The lesson goes on to say:

"The moral law was given to teach, not only the Israelites, but all mankind, the duties which they owe to God and to one another." "The moral law continues to be of universal and everlasting obligation." "The brevity, simplicity, and comprehensiveness of the commands of the moral law fit them, in a peculiar manner, for being a code which all are bound to obey. They are so comprehensive as to include every duty which every human being owes, in every condition and relation of life." Third Reader of The Irish National School Readers," pages 291, 292.

Now, while some firmly believe this, and can heartily endorse every word of it, and while it is certainly in harmony with the Scriptures, and the past teachings of Christianity in general, still there are, at the present time, some, even whole religious denominations, which teach quite to the contrary; who deny that the ten commandments are the moral law, and of "universal and everlasting obligation."

Again, these readers teach that people go to heaven as soon as they die. While this might be endorsed without question by many, yet there are parents who hold this idea to be quite contrary to the teachings of, the Scriptures, and would not, therefore, care to have such instruction given to their children. They believe that the faithful are to receive their reward, not at death, but at the resurrection of the just, when Christ comes the second time.

And so, again, it is demonstrated that no series of religious lessons could be gotten up that would be in harmony with the religious beliefs of all. It would not be possible for such a book to be written or compiled. Even the Bible itself would not obviate the difficulty, for, while it is the word of God, and should be received as such, and while we would not, therefore, for the world, lay a straw in anyone's way from reading it, or from obtaining a true knowledge of it, many who profess to believe it refuse to accept some of its plainest utterances. They would not themselves receive instruction from it on doctrines which they did not care to believe. It is not the Scriptures such wish taught in the schools, but their own particular views of religion, which frequently are quite out of harmony with the Scriptures.

Therefore, we say, it is neither practicable nor within the province of the State to attempt to give religious instruction in its schools.

A Practical Test

The logical results of the State attempting to teach religion are well illustrated in the following incident which occurred not many years ago in one of the public schools of New South Wales. The teacher selected as a Bible study for her class the record concerning Nebuchadnezzar's dream. The gold, silver, brass, and iron of the great image were explained by the teacher to represent the succeeding kings of the Babylonian empire. One little girl in the class dissented from the application, and when asked the reason, replied, "that she had been taught by her Sabbath-school teacher that the different parts of the image represented the four kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome." The teacher, not feeling inclined to admit of superior knowledge in the child, demanded

that she should say it as she said it, on pain of punishment. This the little girl refused to do, and the cane was applied accordingly. The child accepted the situation and the punishment with heroic fortitude, and a faith unchanged. When relating the occurrence afterwards, she said, "I knew that my Sabbath lesson was right."

This case well illustrates the futility and error of attempting to give religious instruction in State Schools. In it are contained, in miniature form, all the elements of a church establishment and religious persecution. If this teacher had a right to teach religion in this school, she had a right to require her pupils to accept her views of it, or to receive punishment for their refusal. No one could object to her punishing a child for refusing to repeat a problem in arithmetic, or to say that the countries of England, Scotland, and Wales together form Great Britain. The error was in attempting to give, in a State institution, instruction respecting a religious subject, the question of the fulfillment of divine prophecy.

Need of Religious Instruction

As to the need of religious instruction there can be no question. Manifestly such instruction is essential to a complete education, for man has a religious, as well as a physical and an intellectual nature.

Moreover, a true religious education is the most important of all educations. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do His commandments." "Fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." "By the fear of the Lord men depart from evil." "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." Psalm 111:10; Ecclesiastes 12:13; Proverbs 16:6; John 17:3.

The study of God's word is the most important of all studies. "Search the Scriptures," says Christ, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of Me." "By grace are ye saved through faith," but "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." "From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to Thy word." "Thy word have I hid in my heart, that I might not sin against Thee." "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy word is truth." "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature."

The word of God furnishes the foundation of all true education, for it leads to God, the source of all true wisdom and knowledge. In it are revealed the most lofty and most sublime and soul-inspiring themes which the mind can contemplate. Its opening words present the most stupendous truths, four great immensities and totalities. "In the beginning." Who can go back of the beginning? "God." Who can think of a greater? "Created." What greater act could a God do? "The heaven and the earth." What is there outside of these? No other book begins thus. No other presents, at its outset, and in so few words, such grand and awe-inspiring themes. No other study will so ennobles and strengthen every faculty of the mind as the study of the Scriptures.

Where and by Whom Should Religion be Taught.

To teach religion successfully, the teacher himself must be religious. He must know God, and the way to God, even Jesus Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No one can safely lead another along a path which he himself has not trod, or conduct him to heights which he himself has not attained. The teacher of religion must himself be religious. But for the State to require all teachers of State Schools to be religious, would be for it to make a religious test a qualification for positions of trust and emolument under it. This would discriminate against non-professors of religion, and so be class legislation. It would make professors of religion a preferred and select class in the eyes of the law. It would, in reality, be putting a State premium upon a religious profession, and thus induce many to make a profession of religion who knew nothing of it at heart or by actual experience, and so promote hypocrisy and meanness. Clearly, therefore, the State cannot consistently require of its teachers the qualification essential to the giving of religious instruction.

But the question is asked, If religion is not to be taught in the State Schools, where are the young to learn of God and His word? A large proportion of them, it is asserted, will grow up in ignorance of religion if religion is not taught in these schools. If it be replied that they should learn religion at home, in the church, and in the Sabbath-school, the objection is at once raised that many of their homes are not religious, and when they are it is often the case that their parents do not have time or inclination to instruct them, and that thousands of children never attend church or Sabbath-school. Such objections are common.

The question for all to consider, if correct conclusions are to be arrived at in this matter, is, not what is, but what ought to be. No matter how "secular" the State Schools may be at the present time, if religion ought to be taught in them, if this can be shown, then that settles the controversy at once; that is the place to have it taught. The State should then select a religion, adopt it, and devote its first and chief energies to the promotion of it. But those who have read history will doubtless think twice before they consent to all this. Those also who have any true sense of the importance of their children receiving correct ideas concerning religion, and not a

mixture of truth and tradition, inspiration and infidelity, will be very loath to consent to allow the State to select the religion which their children are to be taught.

On the contrary, if the home, the church, and the church school are the proper places for the children, and all, to learn of God and His word, if this can be shown, then it matters not what the home may be, or how disinclined the parents may be to teach religion, or how little time they think they have for such work, or how few children attend church and the Sabbath-school, these are, nevertheless, the places for such teaching. Where, then, we ask again, and by whom should religion be taught?

First, let us inquire as to the family. Should religion be taught in the home? Is it the duty of parents to instruct their children in the way of the Lord, to teach them a knowledge of God and His word? It is to be supposed that those who talk so much about religion being taught in the State Schools believe the Bible. What, therefore, does this say as to the duty of parents on this point? Will they let it speak, and themselves receive instruction from it? To fathers and mothers it says:

“These words which I command thee this day, shall be in your heart. And thou shall teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sits in your house, and when thou walks by the way, and when thou lies down, and when thou rises up.” Deuteronomy 6:6, 7.

Now, it matters not what parents do, or what they do not do in this direction; here is what God has said they ought to do. The instruction here is explicit and unequivocal, too plain to be misunderstood, it is the duty of parents to teach their children the word of God at home. Religion should begin at home. Those who believe the Bible cannot consistently plead lack of time, ability, or inclination as an excuse for parents not thus teaching their children. God makes no unreasonable or impossible demands. It is the business of parents to take time, to inform themselves, and to become inclined.

And if every parent did this, what would be the result? All, from the least to the greatest, would know the Lord, and be familiar with His word, regardless of what was taught in the State Schools, or whether there was ever such a thing as a State School in existence. There was religion before there were State Schools, and it can be taught and thrive without their assistance still. If parents would take up this duty, many blessings would come to them. In their own homes they might “have a little heaven to go to heaven in.”

It is, therefore, with poor grace that those who profess to believe God’s word, and who appear so anxious for the young to receive religious instruction, plead as an excuse for asking that this sort of instruction be given in the State Schools, that parents do not have time to teach religion to their children at home. It would be far more consistent for them to teach what the Bible says on this point, and to instruct parents in regard to their duties in this matter, than to thus encourage them in their irreligion and neglect of duty. What more important business than this can parents engage in? What more solemn responsibility rests upon them than to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? It is the business of the church and of church leaders to teach what the Bible says, to “preach the word,” and to urge Bible instruction along Bible lines and in Bible ways, and not try to invent some new way of saving souls, some short route or wholesale method of getting people to heaven, while they are neglecting known duties, and evading and shirking non transferable responsibilities. This will never do.

Some who are in grossest error make efforts to have their children taught and brought up in the religion which they profess, which put to shame those who have had far greater light and privileges, but have not enough energy or love for their children or their religion to start a church school, or to maintain one after it is started, but must needs appeal to the State to perform this most important of all duties-the imparting of religious instruction to the young.

Many seem to imagine that civil governments are a kind of second Providence to deal with everything, whereas their chief duty is to protect human rights. The education of children belongs to, and can not be taken away from, their parents. The State has no right to tell any father or mother what they are to do with their children.

And this matter of parents instructing their children in the way and word of the Lord solves the whole problem. If parents would do as God commands them to do, their children would grow up with a knowledge of God and His laws, and there would be nothing left for the -State, the State School, or any other civil institution to attempt to do, and make a dismal failure in the attempt, in the way of giving religious instruction to the young.

But if the family refuses to do its duty, and the church confesses itself a failure, and the church school says it is unequal to the task of instructing the young in religion, then the case is hopeless. There is no remedy. The State need not try; for the State is made up of the aggregate of the families and parts of families in it, and it is a moral impossibility that it should be better than the people composing it. A fountain cannot rise higher than its head. If the duly and divinely qualified institutions for teaching religion, - the family, the church, and the church school,-therefore fail, it is useless to call on an institution which is in no way qualified nor authorized to do the work to remedy the difficulty. It will never do it. Certain failure is a foregone conclusion.

The great trouble with the world to-day, the reason there is so much ungodliness, corruption, and sin in the world, is because parents have ceased to be religious and truly pious themselves. Piety and the fear of God have ceased to form a part of their home and everyday life. They have, therefore, either neglected the spiritual interests of their children altogether, or relegated it to others. Temporal concerns have been allowed to crowd out religious culture and eternal interests.

In too many homes prayer is neglected. "Parents feel they have no time for morning and evening worship. They cannot spare a few moments in which to give thanks to God for His abundant mercies,-for the blessed sunshine and showers of rain, which cause vegetation to flourish, and for the guardianship of holy angels. They have no time to offer prayer for divine help and guidance, and for the abiding presence of Jesus in the household. They go forth to labor as the ox or the horse goes, without one thought of God or heaven. They have souls so precious that, rather than permit them to be hopelessly lost, the Son of God gave His life to ransom them; but they have little more appreciation of His great goodness than have the beasts that perish." Christian Education, page 221.

Parents do not follow Christ's instruction to "seek first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness." They make temporal and transitory interests, rather than religion, the first business of their lives. They are not themselves obedient to God's commands, and as a result the spirit of disobedience is early seen in their children. Failing themselves to walk in God's statutes, they do not command their households to keep the way of the Lord. The law of God is not made the rule of life. The children as they grow up and make homes for themselves feel under no obligation to teach their children what they themselves have never been taught. This is why there are so many godless families, and why depravity is so deep and widespread.

Not until parents themselves walk in the law of the Lord with perfect hearts, are they prepared to command their children after them. A reform in this respect is needed, a reform which shall be deep and broad. Parents, ministers, and all, need to reform. They need God in their households. If they would see a different state of things, they must change the order of things in the home, the foundation of society and the wellspring of life. They must bring God's word into their families, and make it their daily counselor. They must teach their children that it is the voice of God addressed to them, and that it is to be implicitly obeyed. They must patiently instruct their children, and kindly and untiringly teach them how to live so as to please God. Every house should be a house of prayer, every home a heaven on earth, every family a church of God, every father a priest of his own household, to lay on the altar of God the morning and, evening sacrifice, while the wife and children unite with him in thought, in prayer, and songs of praise.

Therefore, we say, leave religion and religious instruction where they belong, to the individual, the family, the church, and the church school supported entirely by private contribution. Keep church and State forever separate. The business of teaching religion God has committed to the church, not to the State. The State may educate the children to make them citizens, but not saints. Moral instruction has been committed to other hands.

The demand that the State shall teach religion augurs no good. It is a backward step. It indicates a retrogression on the part of the family and the church,-that those who profess to be followers of Christ are forgetting Christian principles, and walking in false ways. The turning of the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers (Malachi 4:5, 6) is the only true remedy for the situation.

W. A. COLCORD.

3. Dietetic Errors **THEIR RELATION TO DISEASED** **H. KRESS, M.D.**

The origin of nearly all the diseases that afflict mankind may be traced directly or indirectly to the organs of digestion, principally the stomach. The primary difficulty, however, lies not with these organs as is supposed, but with that which is put into them. It seems strange indeed that out of impure and indigestible foods, sensible men and women should expect pure blood and healthy tissues. Observe what the average civilized man eats, and you will agree with me that the stomach is a most terribly abused organ. Is it any wonder that sooner or later it wears out or becomes disabled, losing its power to digest even healthful foods? When this organ is deranged, food ferments, and the system is flooded with poisons instead of nutriment. The constitution is undermined, the tissues lose their power of resistance, and thus the foundation is laid for all kinds of diseases. This increasing feebleness of the digestive organs, and the consequent headaches, neuralgia, nervous exhaustion, and other disorders, have stimulated a world-wide search for artificial means of aiding the feeble stomach in its work. "Man has sought out many inventions," and numerous digestive agents are recommended and employed to whip up the tired, worn-out organs to greater activity. All of these so-called remedies only increase the evils that they are designed to cure. The exhausted horse needs not the whip, but a lessening of its burdens, or rest. This is equally true of the overworked organs of digestion. The remedy for enfeebled digestion is not found in, the use of these artificial digestive agents. The real remedy is to

be sought for in the study of the natural dietetic needs of the system and the substitution of healthful and easily digested foods for the dyspepsia making compounds.

IMPERFECT MASTICATION

The most important step in the process of digestion is mastication, or the chewing of the food, because it is the only part of the digestive process over which man exercises entire control, the only part over which control is needed. If this part is well done, and the food properly prepared for the organs which receive it from the mouth, they will not experience any difficulty in carrying the digestive process farther, or in doing their part in the work. Digestive disturbances in the stomach or intestines are nearly always due to improper preparation of food in the mouth.

The starch in food is digested by the saliva. Chewing stimulates the flow of saliva. At the same time that the food is thoroughly divided by mastication, it is saturated with this fluid, but the quantity mingled with it depends upon thorough mastication.

The digestion of the starch started in the mouth continues for thirty or forty minutes after it reaches the stomach. As the starch surrounding the gluten or vegetable albumin is digested, the way is prepared for the gastric juice to digest or dissolve the albumin. Troller, a well recognized authority on digestion, called attention to the fact that the mere act of chewing also stimulates the secretion of the gastric juice. He discovered that as soon as the food entered the mouth and the process of chewing began, the stomach made preparation for its reception by pouring out its fluid. There is a direct telegraphic communication between the mouth and the stomach, so the more thoroughly the food is masticated, the more abundant will be the flow of the stomach fluids. Difficulty in the digestion of albumin is not always due to inability of the stomach to digest, but may be due to a lack of stomach fluid, resulting from improper mastication and to the starch surrounding the albumin not being dissolved, owing to insufficiency of saliva.

It is well known that the saliva itself acts as gastric stimulant. Consequently, the more saliva mingled with the food, the more stomach fluid will be secreted, and the more thorough will be the digestion of the albumin. The quantity of the saliva mingled with the food, however, depends upon how thoroughly the food has been masticated. Therefore, too much stress cannot be laid upon the necessity of thorough mastication, since both starch and albumin digestion are so greatly influenced by it.

SOFT STARCHY FOODS

One of the most common dietetic errors is the free use of soft, starchy foods, as soups, porridges, pastries, puddings, etc. Cereal foods are composed principally of starch. If starchy foods are taken in a soft form, the salivary glands are not stimulated, the food being already sufficiently moist to swallow. The result is that in the absence of saliva, the starch, instead of digesting, undergoes fermentation; alcohol, acids, and other irritants are formed, and the system is flooded with poisons. Starchy food should be taken in as dry a form as possible, so as to compel complete mastication, and to insure thorough salivation. In other words, starchy foods should be moistened only by nature's digestive saliva, and not with water or other liquids.

ALBUMINOUS FOODS

The majority of people seem to be of the opinion that the free use of albuminous foods is necessary. This is a mistake. In wheat, maize, and most cereals, we have the albumin and starch almost in their proper proportions to meet the requirements of the system, about one part of albumin to seven or eight of starch. If the albuminous foods are taken too freely with cereals, injury may result.

Even nuts, although a pure food, being rich in albumin, may be eaten too freely. If nuts or nut products are eaten freely, it should be with the free use of fruits. Very little cereal food need be taken at such a meal.

TOO GREAT A VARIETY AT MEALS

This is often responsible for mischief. In the first place, too many dishes encourage over eating. The digestive organs become weakened from over-work and exhaustion. As a result, the food is poorly digested and fermentation results. There is no reason why more than two or three foods should be taken at a meal. By following this rule, changes in foods may be made at each meal; thus the food will be relished better than by having a great variety at one meal, which necessitates much of the sameness at each meal.

HIGHLY SEASONED FOODS

This is one of the greatest abominations in cookery, encouraging overeating. Nature has kindly provided her own seasoning. Each seed, fruit, and vegetable has the various salts, acids, and sugars in sufficient quantities for our needs. These can be readily detected and relished by the normal palate if the foods are properly prepared. They do not tempt to over-indulgence. As soon as we add other

seasonings which are unnatural as pepper, mustard, spices, we break down the indicator, and can no longer depend upon our palates for guidance as to the quality or quality for they are unnatural and perverted.

CONDIMENTS

The use of condiment, as pepper, mustard, vinegar, etc., is unquestionably a strong auxiliary to the formation of the habit of using intoxicating drinks. Persons addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors are as a rule fond of stimulating and highly seasoned foods, and although the reverse is not always true, yet it is apparent to every thoughtful person, that the use of a diet composed of highly seasoned, irritating food institutes the conditions necessary for the acquirement of a taste for intoxicating liquors. The false appetite aroused by the use of food that "burns and stings" craves something less insipid than pure cold water to keep up the fever the food has excited. Again, condiments, like all other stimulants, must be continually increased in quantity, or their effect becomes diminished, and this leads directly to a demand for stronger stimulants both in eating and drinking, until the probable tendency is toward the dram shop.

THE FREE USE OF SUGARS

Sugar interferes with the action of saliva, and prevents the digestion of starch.

To demonstrate this a very simple test may be made. Place a small quantity of masticated starch from a mouthful of either bread or potato into a test tube. The saliva incorporated by mastication at once begins to act upon the starch, converting it into sugar. This process continues until the contents of the tube reach a certain degree of sweetness, then the action of the saliva ceases. If the sugar should be removed as fast as formed, the saliva would continue the digestion until the whole of the starch was converted into sugar. This is what actually occurs in the stomach. The sugar formed by the action of saliva is readily absorbed, or expelled from the stomach to the intestines, where the more complete digestion of sugar takes place, and does not interfere with the digestion of the remainder of the starch.

Cane sugar, it is well known, is not in a condition to be absorbed, neither is it acted upon by the saliva or gastric juice, but it remains in the stomach as cane sugar. Its presence in the stomach renders the digestion of starchy foods difficult or impossible, and fermentation invariably results. Therefore, by the addition of cane sugar to cereal preparations rich in starch, as sago, rice, tapioca, porridge, cakes, pies, puddings, etc., or vegetables or milk, we make digestion difficult in proportion to the quantity added.

While the sugar found in fruits requires no digestion, if freely taken with starchy foods it will also in a measure retard digestion. Nearly every dyspeptic has made the discovery that the eating of sweet fruits with legumes, vegetables, tuber, or cereal products, favors fermentation, and the many disagreeable symptoms resulting from the formation of alcohol, acetic acid, butyric acid, lactic acid and other irritants and poisons. Drowsiness, sick headache, biliousness, irritability in children and parents, may many times be traced to some simple error of this kind in diet. Potatoes and prunes eaten together will invariably be followed by acid regurgitation and ejections of gas, or what is known as heartburn. Porridge and fig sauce, or stewed apples, jam, etc., eaten together are apt to produce disturbance.

The consumption of sugar is greatly on the increase in all civilized countries. The increase of sugar in the United Kingdom is as follows, per capita:

| | |
|------|------------|
| 1866 | 41 pounds. |
| 1871 | 46 pounds. |
| 1876 | 58 pounds. |
| 1881 | 57 pounds. |
| 1886 | 66 pounds. |
| 1892 | 77 pounds. |
| 1898 | 85 pounds. |

It will be seen that the consumption of sugar has more than doubled during the past thirty-two years.

The free use of canned fruits having large quantities of sugar added, and the, use of jam, are practices which are both highly injurious.

Dr. Von Bunge, the eminent professor of chemistry in the medical school of the University of Basle, Switzerland, in an article under the heading, "The Increasing Consumption of Sugar, and Its Dangers," attributes the bad teeth, pale faces, and general malnutrition of so large a portion of children of the rising generation to the increasing consumption of sugar. Dr. Von Bunge insists that the use of sugar "should not be recommended," and advocates as a means of curtailing its use, "an increase of the sugar tax." The reason given

by Dr. Von Bunge for the injurious effects of sugar is that this substance is not a complete food, but is deficient in the elements necessary for the building up of the nerves and bones.

Other eminent authorities have pointed out other objections to the use of sugar. Ogata, in experimenting upon dogs for the purpose of determining the effects of cane sugar upon digestion, observed that the addition of one-third of an ounce of cane sugar to three and one-third ounces of meat fibrin, interfered decidedly with digestion, the quantity of food digested in a certain time being only three-fourths that digested in a normal condition.

Cane sugar, whether in the form of sweets or syrups, produces catarrh of the stomach, and gives rise to various digestive troubles of nutrition, such as gastric intestinal catarrh, jaundice, gall stones, neurasthenia, nervous exhaustion, constipation, dilation of the stomach in adults, and in children rickets, stunted-development, and various other grave conditions.

The popular notion that cane sugar is a wholesome and valuable food, a notion propagated by those who have given the matter only a very superficial study, is working vast mischief, and it is high time that earnest efforts be made to, counteract these erroneous views. Great good may result from the warning voice raised by Dr. Von Bunge, whose fame as an authority upon questions of living, diet, and digestion is world-wide, and whose works are used as text-books in the leading medical colleges of all countries.

FREE FATS AND OILS

The chief objection to the use of oil, lard, tallow, butter, and other forms of "grease," in that they present the fat in an artificially concentrated form; in which it does not harmonize with the other elements of foods while undergoing digestion in the stomach.

In nature, the fat is separated or held apart in minute particles, or drops, and these are arranged in the proteid, masses in such a way that they cannot be set free until after the proteid or albumin is digested. When the proteid has been dissolved, the fats are set free to be acted upon by the bile and pancreatic juices.

This arrangement of the fat with the proteins prevents its interfering with digestion; but when fat in the form of lard, butter, etc., is added to the foods, it smears over the particles of proteid, gluten, albumin etc, that the gastric juices cannot get access to them to digest them. The gastric juice cannot act upon fats.

In the same way, fat interferes with the digestion of starch, saturating the particles of starch so that the saliva cannot act upon them to convert them into maltose. This is the principal reason why fats and fat foods are so apt to produce fermentation, sour stomach, heart-burn, and other symptoms of indigestion. There are many persons who can not digest butter and other forms of free fats for this reason.

Pure fats are very disturbing to the stomach in some forms of gastric disorder, especially in gastric catarrh and dilatation of the stomach. The cooking of fats in connection with cereals and albumins greatly aggravates the difficulty, for the reason that the fluid fat penetrates the starch granules, thereby rendering their digestion impossible, even after coming in contact with the digestive fluids. This is the reason that fried foods, griddle cakes, dough nuts, pastry, etc., disagree with so many persons.

In nature, fats are in a state of emulsion, as in cream. An emulsion may be diluted with water to an limited extent, as the, oil is in minute particles, which are prevented from uniting by the thin film which surrounds each globule. Cream can be eaten better than butter by many persons.

In nuts, fats are presented in an emulsified and entirely wholesome state. Cream and milk made from nuts are entirely wholesome, and agree with persons who cannot take cow's milk and cream without harmful results, on account of their inability to digest casein.

It may be mentioned also that many of the nuts oils and butters, are made from most unwholesome materials. Some cocoanut preparations, for example, are made from the most rancid cocoanut oils by a chemical process. Such preparations cannot be wholesome. There are now prepared a variety of nut fats which are exceedingly wholesome and palatable, and are perfect substitutes for all kinds of animal fats and oils. Nut butter from peanuts which have not been roasted, almond butter, nut meals, cocoanut cream, and various other nut foods are especially commended.

OVER EATING

This is one of the principal causes of disease. It is usually due to hasty eating, the free use of highly seasoned foods, the free use of sugar or free use of soft mushy foods. Nature designed that every mouthful of food should be thoroughly masticated. For this reason we are kindly furnished with strong teeth, or a mill, to do the necessary grinding. When food is taken dry and well masticated, the taste buds are stimulated, and the sense of taste which has the function of regulating the supply of food is given an opportunity to say "Enough,"

before too much has been swallowed. The satisfaction and strength obtained from food depends upon proper mastication, or the length of time it is retained in the mouth. "Who satisfies thy MOUTH with good things, so that thy strength is renewed like the eagle's." Soft foods and, highly seasoned foods are the principal causes of gluttony. Overeating finally results in feebleness of the digestive organs, and general ill-health with all its disagreeable symptoms. If the appetite has been so long abused that the nerves of taste are no longer a safe guide, reason or enlightened conscience must rule and determine the quality and quantity of food needed. But there can be no doubt when non irritating foods are eaten there is very little danger of over eating.

The hearty Sabbath dinners are no doubt responsible for many other forms of Sabbath-breaking, as it draws away the energy from the brain to assist the overburdened stomach in its work. No one can have clear perceptions of right, And a quick sense of wrong who indulges in overeating. The Sabbath may become a curse instead of a blessing to mankind. Much of the drowsiness in church, impatience and wickedness in homes, is due to over-crowding and over-work of the digestive organs. Paul, in speaking of this evil and its result, says, "There are many of whom I have often told you, and now tell you even with tears, who are living in enmity of the cross of Christ. The end of such men is ruin: for their appetites are their god, and they glory in their shame. Their minds are given up to earthly things." Philippians 3:18, 19. The sooner that people recognize that true religion includes the government of the appetite, the better it will be for both the people and religion.

TOO MANY MEALS A DAY

One of the most pernicious customs of modern society is that of frequent meals. The idea seems to prevail that the stomach must never be allowed to become empty under any circumstances. Healthy gastric digestion requires at least five hours. Then the glands supplying the digestive secretion being exhausted need an opportunity to recharge or store up fluids for the digestion of the next meal. Six hours at least are, therefore, necessary between meals. In some cases even a longer interval between meals is indicated. It is positively harmful to eat one meal, however small, before the previous one is digested, the, stomach is empty and the glands recharged.

MEALS

The meals should be taken regularly, and never more than three times a day. Two meals are better than three in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred. The stomach is a muscle, and needs a period of rest in which to build up the tissue that has been broken down by work, and to allow the wastes that have resulted from tissue breakdown to be washed out. It is this accumulation of wastes in the muscles of the stomach that causes the sensation of faintness so frequently experienced about four or five hours after eating. This is not a call for more food, as many suppose, but a call for a period of rest. This feeling usually disappears by taking a drink of water and lying down for a few minutes. The muscles of the stomach should be treated as any other healthy muscle of the body. There should be perfect freedom from all pain and unpleasant feeling before more work is placed upon it. Besides this, the nerve centers controlling the digestion become exhausted after the digestion of a meal, and need replenishing. They need a period of rest. The last meal should be eaten at least three hours before tiring. Every muscle, including the stomach, should be at rest during sleep. When allowing a sufficient period of rest between meals, and a sufficient time to elapse between the last meal and bedtime, it will be found difficult to take more than two meals a day. Three or more meals are advisable only in some exceptional cases where partially digested, light foods are indicated, which require only a short time to digest, and tax the digestive organs but slightly. When intelligently carried into effect two meals will be found to be better than three or more.

By taking breakfast at 7:30 or 8 AM, and dinner at 3 or 3:30 PM, the third meal will not be required. If the three meals are taken, they should be at least five hours apart, and the third meal should be composed principally of fruit, and taken at least two or three hours before retiring.

HOT AND COLD FOODS

Very hot and very cold foods should be avoided. Dry foods having little moisture never become quite cold. If they gather moisture they should be placed in the oven before using until well dried and slightly browned. This renders them more palatable, and stimulates a greater flow of digestive juices. Moist foods, such as porridges, legumes, vegetables, which always contain much water, should be served warm, especially in cold weather. Cold foods of all kinds delay digestion. Hot foods debilitate and weaken the organs of digestion, and through them the whole system. They also weaken the throat, often causing chronic sore throat.

DRINKING WITH MEALS

.-Fluids taken immediately before and during eating, or shortly after a meal, dilute the various digestive fluids, rendering them less efficient. These liquids must be absorbed before the normal digestion can be carried on. As a result of this delay, fermentation is favored. Hot drinks are debilitating to the digestive organs, and should not be used frequently. The free use of hot drinks is one of the principal causes of indigestion. The most healthful way is to cease drinking half hour before meals. Take no drink during meals, and

only a few sips, if any, after. About two eating, pure water may be taken quite frequently, but not more than one-half cup at a time, and this should not be taken hot or too cold. In some cases of gastric catarrh a hot drink one hour before meals is beneficial as a cleansing agent. Hot drinks should only be taken as a medicine, not as a beverage, and the practice should not be continued long.

EATING WHEN TIRED OR EXHAUSTED

When fatigued or tired the body needs rest. Food is often taken when there is not sufficient force to carry on properly the work of digestion. It would be better to rest a short time before a meal, when tired. Those who have weak digestion will find it greatly to their advantage to rest before the meal in the middle of the day. When exhausted in the evening, it would be wiser to give the system the needed rest by at once retiring, than to force upon one of its members a load which it is in no condition to dispose of. By following this rule, the ill-feelings and dull headaches experienced in the morning upon waking, resulting from decay or fermentation of foods in the stomach, can be avoided. This practice of taking a hearty meal at the close of the day is pernicious.

SLEEPING AFTER MEALS

Sleep at this time is fully as bad as vigorous exercise of either mind or body. Good digestion can never take place during sleep. Digestion is an involuntary act, dependent upon the activity of the nervous system for its proper performance. During sleep, both the respiration and the circulation are greatly lessened in vigor, from lessening of nervous activity. The activity of the digestive organs is also decreased. Nature intends every organ and muscle to rest during sleep. People who lie down and sleep soon after taking food, nearly always awake feeling un-refreshed.

VIOLENT, EXERCISE AFTER MEALS

This should also be avoided, as it leads to exhaustion, and retards digestion by using up the nerve energy which should be employed in carrying forward the work of the stomach.

IRREGULARITY IN EATING

If meals are taken irregularly, the stomach is not in that state of readiness in which it should be for the prompt and perfect performance of its work. The habit which many have of allowing their business or work to intrude upon their meal hour, obliging them to take it an hour or two earlier or later than the usual time, invariably undermines in time the best digestion.

EATING BETWEEN MEALS

Those who indulge in this habit usually complain of little appetite, and wonder why they have no relish for their food, overlooking the real cause. This evil begins in early childhood. Indeed, it is too often cultivated by mothers and would-be friends of the little ones, who try to please and gratify them by presents of confectionery or sweets. When the stomach is disturbed by eating too frequently between meals, the glands of the stomach do not have an opportunity to store up a proper amount of material out of which to manufacture gastric juice, and consequently, the secretion is imperfect, and as a result the food cannot be properly digested. By the constant burden imposed on the organs of digestion, they weaken and wear out.

POOR COMBINATIONS

It often happens that persons can eat various articles of food separately or with certain others, but certain combinations cause distress in the stomach and intestines. It is well to have a thorough knowledge, not only of what to eat, but how properly to combine the various foods. Fruits and vegetables require a different degree and kind of activity on the part of the digestive organs. There is also a difference in the time required for their digestion, so that they frequently disagree when taken at the same meal.

The reason why vegetables and fruits combine poorly is that the coarse woody structure of nearly all vegetables renders necessary their retention in the stomach for a long time. Fruits, on the other hand, are digested and assimilated with very much greater ease. The time required for the digestion of Cabbage is from four to six hours, while a ripe apple digests and should leave the stomach in one hour and thirty minutes. If these two articles are eaten at the same time, they become so intermingled that they cannot be separated, and both remain in the stomach the same length of time. The apple digested, and ready for absorption, if not allowed to leave the stomach, undergoes fermentation.

The following table shows the time necessary for the

| | Hrs. Min. |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Rice | 1:00 |
| Eggs, whipped | 1:30 |
| Salmon, salted, | 4:00 |
| Oysters, raw | 2:55 |
| Oysters, stewed | 3:30 |
| Beef, lean, roasted | 3:00 |
| Beefsteak, boiled | 3:00 |
| Beef, lean, fried | 4:00 |
| Beef, salted, | 4:00 |

The following food combinations are among the best, the relative excellence of each being indicated by the order in which they are named:

- Breads, cereals, and fruits.
- Breads, cereals, and legumes.
- Breads, cereals, nuts or nut products, and fruits.
- Fruits and nuts.
- Cereals, breads, and eggs.
- Milk, bread, and cereals.
- Nuts, or nut products, and vegetables, and breads.

Persons with sound stomachs and vigorous digestion will seldom experience inconvenience in making use of other and more varied combinations, but dyspeptics and persons troubled with slow digestion will find it to their advantage to select from the bill of fare such articles as best accord with each other, and to avoid, such combinations as fruits and vegetables, milk and vegetables, sugar and milk, milk and fruits. A moderate quantity of fruit may be eaten at the close of any meal not containing vegetables, by the majority of people.

TEA, COFFEE, AND COCOA

The evils arising from the use of tea, cocoa, and coffee are more numerous than are supposed. The characteristic sallow skins, pinched faces, irritable nerves, impatient dispositions, can frequently be traced to the use of these beverages. Their free use is more injurious than the use of mild alcoholic drinks, as wine.

The poison in alcohol is readily eliminated, being volatile, but the theine, caffeine, and theo-bromine, are not only more toxic, but they accumulate in the system. Their effect upon the nervous system is more pernicious. This can readily be seen in the shattered nerves of the habitual user of these poisons. Tea also contains tannin, which coagulates Albumin, and precipitates or neutralizes the pepsin of the gastric juice, and so weakens its digestive power. Tea drinkers are therefore poorly nourished and frequently troubled with sick headaches.

The tannin also neutralizes or destroys the iron of the foods, thus causing anaemia, or what is known better as poverty of blood.

Theine, theobromine, and caffeine, the active principles of tea, cocoa, and coffee, are toxic elements, which at first increase, and then diminish vital action, thus occasioning debility of the digestive organs from long continued use.

Tea, cocoa, and coffee are objectionable in connection with meals on the same grounds as other beverages, because they disturb the digestion by the dilution and consequent weakening and overtaxing the absorbents, delaying the digestion of the food, and thus giving rise to fermentation. When taken hot, as is the usual custom, these beverages, as do others, first stimulate, but ultimately relax and debilitate the stomach: this in itself is sufficient reason why they should not be used at meals.

The objection mentioned as applying to tea, cocoa, and coffee may be urged with equal force against chocolate, the effect of which differs from the effects of tea and coffee chiefly in degree.

VINEGAR

Like alcoholic liquors, vinegar is a product of fermentation or decay, being the result of carrying a little farther the same process by which alcohol is produced. It has been demonstrated that vinegar is more irritating to the digestive organs and the liver even than

alcoholic liquors of the same strength. One table spoonful of vinegar will entirely neutralize the digestion of the starch of an ordinary meal.

THE INDIGESTIBILITY OF FLESH FOODS

It is a very widely current error that flesh foods are more easily digested than vegetable foods. Of course there is a difference in the digestibility of certain classes of flesh foods: the same is also true in reference to vegetable foods. But if we consider these vegetable preparations which naturally belong to the human bill of fare, viz., fruits, grains, nuts, it is only necessary to glance at the table prepared by Dr. Beaumont, from the results of his studies of the stomach of Alexis St. Martin, to see at once that vegetable foods, at least fruits and cereals, which constitute the essential part of a vegetarian dietary, are, on the whole, far more easily digested than meats. Beefsteak, for example, which is ordinarily supposed to be quite easily digested, requires in a healthy, active stomach three and one-half hours' work to prepare it to pass along into the small intestines, where from ten to twelve hours more are required to finish the preparation to enter the blood to take part in the assimilative processes of the body. Oysters, which are popularly supposed to be so easy of digestion that they are able to digest themselves in the stomach, and perhaps aid in the digestion of other food, require three and one-half hours for the stomach digestion. Veal requires four hours, corned beef three hours, and roast pork more than five hours of gastric work.

Let us now note the time required for the digestion of some widely used vegetable foods. Rice for example, which forms a staple article of diet for a larger number of persons than any other cereal food, undergoes complete stomach digestion in one hour. A ripe apple is digested in one and a half hours. Beaumont's table shows that baker's bread requires three and a half hours for digestion, but baker's bread is notoriously hard to digest, and is a common cause of indigestion. Because of the half-cooked condition of the central portion of the loaf, and the multitude of germs and yeast spores, it is very likely to set up fermentation in the stomach, while the doughy masses form tough, indigestible lumps, which require hours for their solution.

Simply prepared, well-baked breads are often completely digested in one hour. Purees of peas, beans, and similar preparations baked, undergo rapid digestion in the stomach. The same is true of all the dextrinized cereal preparations, such as granola, granose, browned rice, crusts of bread, etc.

On an average, it may be said that flesh foods require three times as long a period for digestion in the stomach as is required of ripe fruits and properly prepared cereals. A fact of great practical importance should be mentioned in this connection, viz., that the cooking of flesh food greatly lessens its digestibility. The reverse is true of vegetable proteins. The gluten of wheat, for example, is much more digestible after cooking than before.

Physicians have long recognized the indigestibility of meat, and have sought to overcome the difficulty in various ways. One of the primary causes of the indigestible character of ordinary meat is the presence of a large amount of tough fibrous substance, known as connective tissue, which forms the framework of animal muscles holding the individual fibers together. By long boiling this is, in part, converted into gelatine, so that the fibers readily separate, as seen in corned beef, but long boiling so hardens the muscular fibers themselves as to greatly diminish their digestibility. Flesh meats, when boiled or fried, are extremely indigestible, because the gastric juice has no influence whatever upon the connective tissue which holds the fibers together. These masses of undigested meat may lie in the stomach for hours. After four- or five hours, however, putrefaction begins, giving rise to biliousness, headache, nervousness, and often to symptoms of acute poisoning.

The albumin, found in nuts and cereals are presented in an entirely different state. Instead of being in large blocks or masses impenetrable by the digestive juices the albuminous substances are spread out in thin films or fine cob web like threads, which are everywhere separated by masses of easily digested starch and other soluble substances. When taken into the stomach, the saliva acting upon these starchy particles leaves the proteins or albuminous elements in a condition to be most easily acted upon by the digestive fluids: the delicate, gauzy framework of the albumin left behind when the starch is dextrinised and left soluble, as a flake of granose or a well-chewed fragment of nut, for example, is digested more quickly in the stomach in the presence of the gastric juice than is a mass of broiled, stewed, or fried beefsteak, or even of meat pulp, as shaved ice dissolves more quickly than large lumps of ice when dropped in water at a high temperature. Shaved ice dissolves immediately, because each small particle of ice is brought into immediate contact with the warm water, whereas, larger masses of ice dissolve slowly, because the water comes in contact with only the surface of the ice.

Various nut butters and nut creams have also been prepared from almonds, pecans, filberts, peanuts, and other nuts. These preparations are presented in an exceedingly finely divided state, so that the digestive juice has immediate access to the proteins thus promoting perfect digestion. In malted nuts, they are presented in a state of minute subdivision, making this preparation one of high value as a means of promoting nutrition. Protose is undoubtedly the best and most perfect substitute for meat, resembling it in aroma and taste.

Nuttose and nuttolene are also valuable foods. The cereal and nut preparations above mentioned may be obtained at grocers and the Sanitarium Health Food Company, Sydney, New South Wales.

A FEW GENERAL HINTS ON DIET

Care should always be taken to have the extremities warm while taking the meals, as cold extremities indicate poor circulation, congestion of the digestive organs, and lessened secretion of the digestive juices. Hearty meals should never be taken when in a hurry, when excited, impatient, or worried. Mental influences have much to do with the digestion of food. A cheerful mind indicates cheerful digestive organs ready for work. A short period of relaxation before meals will be found beneficial. Let all business cares and anxieties be put to one side. Make the meal a joyful occasion of thanks giving.

If you feel worried after your meals lest you have eaten too much, etc., a good way to overcome this is to make before beginning the meal a mental selection of the foods you consider best for you, and determine in what quantity you will partake of each. Eat accordingly, then leave the table, and think no more about it. A short, brisk walk of thirty minutes after each meal quickens the circulation of the blood. The blood is purified by the inhalation of the pure air, improves the quality as well as the quantity of the digestive secretions as they are derived from the blood. Inactivity after meals means a sluggish circulation of impure blood through the organs of digestion, and a secretion of digestive agents inferior in quality and quantity. Overexertion after meals, however, should be guarded against, as this produces muscular weakness and fatigue, or exhaustion of every muscle in the body, including the stomach, thus delaying digestion.

In making the change from the moist foods to the foods requiring thorough mastication, some difficulty may be experienced at first in providing sufficient saliva for moistening the food, the glands from a lack of exercise having atrophied. The saliva at first is also of an inferior quality, so that the starch digestion at best is inferior. As a result, a little difficulty may at first be experienced in digestion. There may even be a loss of weight during the first week or two. Usually at the end of this time there will be an abundant flow of saliva of a better quality, the dry, starchy foods will be digested and relished, and improvement in weight takes place. It will, however, be observed that a normal diet will build up and add weight to the lean man, but reduce the weight of one who has too much fatty tissue. Normal food eaten in a normal way naturally restores man to a normal condition. Do not expect to reap the full benefit of this change in diet the first week or two. The improvement will be gradual. Personally, I have known of hundreds of cases who have followed this regimen with great benefit. It is not an untried experiment. It rests upon both a physiological and scientific basis, and is simply a return to the good old simple ways of our forefathers, and of primitive man.

There may at the beginning be disagreeable symptoms resulting from the change: but determine to control and educate the stomach in harmony with correct principles. Do not permit an abnormal stomach to control, and lead you to go contrary to what appeals to your reason as right; for often by continued abuse of the stomach, this organ has become dilated and much enlarged, which renders it incapable of digesting even good food at first. In such cases, the stomach must have an opportunity to resume its normal condition: this will often, by the use of the most favorable foods, require weeks, and in some extreme cases, even months to accomplish.

I am aware in giving up the artificially seasoned foods to which we have so long been accustomed, and using the products as provided by nature, the foods will, for a time, taste flat, and will not be relished. This is due, not to the lack of various kinds of flavors, but to our inability at first to detect them. The nerves of taste are easily perverted by high seasonings, and rendered incapable of being stimulated by nature's mild and numerous flavors. A simple test to illustrate this may easily be made. Select a luscious, sweet apple, eat a few mouthfuls, and note how sweet and delicate the flavor; put the apple on one side, and eat a spoonful of sugar or some sweet pastry; again taste the apple: it now tastes flat. Is the difficulty with the food or with the eater? Which needs correction? Would it not be more sensible to allow the palate to resume its normal condition, so that the apple can again be relished, than add sufficient sugar to bring it up to the desired sweetness to satisfy a depraved taste? There are many who have so paralyzed their palates that they can taste only a few artificial stimulants at best, pepper, mustard, cayenne, etc. Vegetables, etc., must have pepper or mustard added, and to fruits it is necessary to add sugar or spices in order to be relished. Frequently people add large quantities of sugar to fruits, which to a normal palate taste excessively sweet. Thus the natural flavors found in these foods are smothered. The blacksmith's hand, by continual exposure to heat and hard rough surfaces, loses that fineness of touch which enables one to detect delicate objects; so by constant contact with these irritating substances, the taste buds lose their power to detect the delicate flavors present in all good food, and good foods are not relished. The same cry is heard that was heard anciently, "Our souls loathe this light bread," the very bread the Creator provided to keep them free from disease. By continuing to eat that which is good without the addition of the irritating and biting stimulants, the palate in time resumes its normal state, and we shall be surprised to be able to detect flavors we never dreamed of having an existence in the various foods which we once considered so insipid, and our mouths shall again be satisfied with good things, and the harmful irritants will be promptly rejected. "Eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness."

4. Who Are The Seventh-Day Adventists?

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS date the origin of their movement from the years 1844-50. Many of the original founders of the Seventh-day Adventist faith were former associates of William Miller (a lay Baptist preacher) and many others who, previous to 1844, with great earnestness proclaimed the approaching Second Advent of the Lord to the earth. These people, who represented many Protestant denominations, were known as Adventists because of their faith in the imminence of the personal return of Jesus, and their message resounded throughout the world and claimed converts from many nations. This message produced a great religious awakening such as had not been witnessed since the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

Expectation of the coming of Christ about the year 1844 was built on a study of certain Bible prophecies containing the time element. In the exposition of such prophecies the generally accepted rule of interpretation was, and still is, a day for a year, according to Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6.

The particular prophecy which led Mr. Miller and his associates to set a date for the Second Advent was Daniel 8:14, which declares, in part: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

As pointed out in the previous chapter, Daniel 9:24, 25 furnished an event from which to count these day-years, in the words: "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." This command, or decree, went forth in 457 BC. (See Ezra 6:14.) Knowing that the earth, once destroyed and purged by water, is, according to 2 Peter 3:6, 7, to be again destroyed and purged, this time by fire, and mistakenly supposing the earth to be the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14, it was only natural for the Advent believers of that day to conclude that the end would come at the expiration of the 2300 days, which time period ended in the autumn of 1844, on the twenty-second day of October.

Profoundly convinced that the world was about to witness the glory of its descending Lord, and that all men, rich and poor, were to be summoned before the great white throne, there to face the judge and to hear His sentence pronounced upon them, Miller and his associates raised throughout all Christendom the solemn cry, 'Prepare to meet thy God.' Their message rang like a trumpet call throughout the world. This produced a great religious awakening, and people everywhere turned to God and repented of their sins.

This movement extended from 1833 to 1844. In America the message was proclaimed by some three hundred ministers belonging to many different denominations. In Great Britain some seven hundred Church of England clergymen took up the cry. Books and charts on the Second Advent were distributed intensively in Norway, and literature on the Second Advent was sent to most of the mission stations in heathen lands.

Dr. Joseph Wolff, a noted itinerant missionary, "down to the year 1845, proclaimed the Lord's speedy Advent in Palestine, Egypt, on the shores of the Red Sea, Mesopotamia, the Crimea, Persia, Georgia, throughout the Ottoman Empire, in Greece, Arabia, Turkey, Bokhara, Afghanistan, Cashmere, Hindostan, Tibet, in Holland, Scotland, Ireland, at Constantinople, Jerusalem, St. Helena, also on shipboard in the Mediterranean, and in New York City to all denominations. He declares that he has preached among Jews, Turks, Mohammedans, Parsees, Hindus, Chaldeans, Yesedes, Syrians, Sabaeans, to Pashas, sheiks, shahs, the kings of Organtsh and Bokhara, the queen of Greece, etc. "Voice of the Church, p. 343; cited in *The Great Second Advent Movement*, by J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH, p. 101.

Everywhere the burden of the message given was, "Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour "of His judgment is come." Revelation 14:7. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, adherents of the Church of England, and people of many other persuasions joined the movement, and helped to swell the cry. Most of these people, however, retained their membership in the churches to which they had always belonged. Mr. Miller's preaching of this doctrine apparently did not disqualify him for membership in the Baptist Church, for his biographer states:

"In 1833 Miller received a license to preach from the Baptist Church, of which he was a member. A large number of ministers of his denomination also approved his work, and it was with their formal sanction that he continued his labors."

He continued in the Baptist Church until his death. Mr. Miller had the date figured out correctly. No one from that time to this has ever been able to refute the accuracy of his reckoning. But he was clearly mistaken regarding the event, that was to take place. The Miller Adventists thought that the sanctuary spoken of in the prophecy, and which was to be cleansed, was this sin-defiled earth. They saw from other scriptures that when the earth is finally purified, its purification will be accomplished by fire, and that this cleansing work will be connected with the appearing of our Lord. They concluded, therefore, that if the time for cleansing the sanctuary was to begin in 1844, it must be that the Lord would return at that time and save His people out of the world before the cleansing of fire began.

Their failure, therefore, lay in a wrong view of what the sanctuary was. They did not, at that time, understand the types and antitypes of the Old Testament, as men have come to understand them since. They did not grasp the thought of a heavenly sanctuary, “of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man” (Hebrews 8:2), and of which Jesus, our High Priest, is minister. They did not see that in heaven there was to be a work of judgment, the antitype of the Day of Atonement solemnized in ancient Israel once each year (Leviticus 16), and that this judgment, mentioned in Daniel 7:9, 10, must be completed before the Lord’s return to earth; for at that time the destiny of all will have been decided, and Jesus will bring His rewards with Him, “to give every man according as his work shall be.” Revelation 22:12. When the twenty-second day of October of that year passed without bringing the end ‘Of all things earthly, those who had confidently looked for the return of their Lord were thrown into great perplexity. Some entirely gave up their faith in the Second Advent. Others sought to establish some other date for the realization of their hopes.

Others, and among them was Mr. Miller himself, thought that for some unaccountable reason the Advent was simply delayed, and might occur any day. To Joshua V. Himes, a devout clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a faithful fellow in heralding the Advent near, Mr. Miller wrote: “We have done our work in ‘warning sinners, and in trying to awake a formal church. God in His providence has shut the door; we can only stir one another up to be patient, and be diligent to make our calling and election sure.” Advent Herald, Dec. 11, 1844.

Discovering Miller’s Mistake

But some of these earnest Christians who had been disappointed, instead of seeking readjustment of time, or simply waiting, began a diligent study of the Scriptures, and shortly found that the earth is not the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14, and that the prophecy foretold, not the cleansing of the earth by fire in the year 1844, but the beginning of the closing work of our great High Priest, Jesus Christ, in the true sanctuary in heaven, and that Christ could not come until the completion of that work.

They came to see clearly that the sanctuary whose cleansing was to begin in 1844, at the close of the 2300 years of Daniel 8:14, was the sanctuary of God in heaven and not the earth, and that its cleansing involved the work of the investigative judgment, which was to take place immediately preceding our Lord’s return, of which we have spoken more specifically in a previous chapter.

It was in this same year (1844) that a number of Adventist believers began the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, and thus became in fact Seventh-day Adventists, although this name was not formally adopted until 1860. We do not suggest, however, that the doctrines held by the Seventh-day Adventists are new. Quite to the contrary; they have been held through past ages by both patriarchs and prophets, whose faith in them has been fittingly recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of the Second Advent of Christ, and was among those Moses was another, and the prophets and apostles were others. Even Jesus our Lord, during His earthly life, both taught and practiced these doctrines. But these truths had been largely lost sight of in the apostasy of the early centuries and the Dark Ages, and it became necessary to raise up a people to set them again in their proper light before the world that was about to meet an offended Lord over His broken law.

The acceptance of the Scriptural doctrine that the sanctuary is in heaven, opened an entirely new field to the vision of these Advent believers. They saw that there was an essential and solemn work to be wrought by our great High Priest in the most holy apartment of the heavenly temple before He could come to earth, and that during the same time a work of great magnitude and importance must be accomplished by the church upon the earth. They read in an entirely new light the striking prophecy of Revelation 11:19: “The temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in His temple the ark of His testament.” They remembered that the ark was kept only in the most holy place of the earthly sanctuary, and that that apartment was opened only when the high priest went in on the tenth day of the seventh month to make final atonement before the ark to cleanse the sanctuary and the people. Here they saw the same work revealed in heaven. Here, then, was the cleansing of the sanctuary which was to begin at the end of the 2300 days in 1844.

They now received a new view of the law of God, since its position in the antitypical sanctuary or temple in heaven was found to be exactly the same as was its position in the typical sanctuary upon earth, thus utterly and forever precluding the idea of any change in that law through all the intervening ages. It must read in the ark in heaven just exactly as it read in the ark upon earth. Vividly there came now to their minds the words of Jesus when He said, “One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law” (Matthew 5:18); and remembering that the law emphatically declares that “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work” (Exodus 20:8-11), they recognized that Christians are under obligation to keep this original Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

For some time the burden of those who had become Seventh day Adventists by embracing the Bible Sabbath was for “the scattered flock,” or in other words, for those who had accepted the message of the Second Advent as preached by William Miller and some three hundred other ministers in this country, of nearly all the orthodox denominations.

They later, however, came to see that before Christ’s coming a great reform message must go to the world, warning men of the approaching day of God, and urging them to make full preparation for it by repentance of sin and belief of the gospel. They further saw that this reform message would be similar to the work of Elijah, and would call men everywhere to the keeping of the

commandments of God as revealed in the Ten Commandments, or Ten Commandments, including the fourth commandment, which clearly enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week (Saturday) as the holy Sabbath; that while righteousness comes only through faith in the atonement made by our Lord Jesus Christ, yet that faith does not make void the law of Jehovah, nor free Christians from obligation to keep it.

Being profoundly convinced that these things were true, the few Seventh-day Adventist believers, after several years' study and adjustment, began to plan for the dissemination of what to them was a message of great importance and urgency. They concluded that the message of the soon coming of Christ and the warning to prepare for that momentous event must be world wide in its application, and since no other branch of the Christian church seemed to feel any particular burden to give it, they decided that it was incumbent upon them to carry it to the entire world, and this is what they then set out to do. Their convictions in this matter were based upon such texts of Scripture as the following:

"Behold, I will send My messenger, and He shall prepare the way before Me; and the Lord, whom you seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom you delight in: behold, He shall come, says the Lord of hosts." Malachi 3:1.

"This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matthew 24:14.

"Blow you the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in My Holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord comes, for it is nigh at hand." Joel 2:11.

"Sanctify you a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders and all the inhabitants of the land into the house of the Lord your God, and cry unto the Lord, Alas for the day! For the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come." Joel 1:14,15.

"I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Revelation 14:6, 7.

As already indicated, Seventh-day Adventists believe these scriptures clearly teach that just before Jesus comes, He will raise up messengers to prepare the way before Him, as John the Baptist was raised up to prepare the way for the first advent of Jesus. This preparatory message must be world wide in extent, going "to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." It is a warning message, and is reformatory in its nature; and as John the revelator wrote of it, he clearly indicated that it would result in gathering out of the nations a people of whom it is said, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Revelation 14:12.

Time Setters?

One of the charges urged by Mr. Canright against the Seventh-day Adventists is that they are "time setters." He says of them: "They set the time for the end of the world in 1843, and failed. They set it again in 1844, and failed." - Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 79.

We submit that this constitutes a gross misrepresentation. We have no disposition whatsoever to cover up the fact that some who later became Seventh-day Adventists were in the Miller movement and believed and preached that the end of the world would come in 1844, yet as Mr. Canright well knew, the Seventh-day Adventist movement, which arose subsequently to the 1844 disappointment, has held as one of its basic beliefs from the very outset an interpretation of prophecy that shut out the possibility of setting a time for our Lord's return and the end of the world. We refer to the interpretation given by Seventh-day Adventists to the prophecy of the 2300 days of the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel.

Seventh-day Adventism as a distinctive movement, was not launched until after the disappointment of Miller and his followers in 1844, and therefore this church cannot rightly be charged with the 1844 mistake. We would remind the reader that Mr. Canright renounced "Seventh-day Adventism," and not merely "Adventism" in general, which includes many sects and beliefs. Certain Adventist bodies have set times for the Lord to return, but the Seventh-day Adventists as a body have never done so. Mr. Canright knew that he was writing his book against a denomination which had its rise subsequent to the disappointment of 1844, and yet he boldly declares that "they set the time for the end of the world in 1843, and failed. They set it again in 1844, and failed."

He challenges Seventh-day Adventists on their denominational view of the heavenly sanctuary, which absolutely precludes time setting, and yet says that they are the time setters, and believe that the earth is the sanctuary. The very first statement in Mr. Canright's book is, half truth and half error, and is therefore calculated to deceive. This appears on page 25, chapter 1, paragraph 1, and in it he says. "Seventh-day Adventism originated about fifty years ago in the work of Mr. Miller, who set the time for the end of the world in 1843-1844."

This opening statement is intended, of course, to brand Seventh-day Adventists as fanatical "time setters," and thus immediately to create prejudice against them and their teachings. Again on page 76 of his book we read: "Miller is responsible for all the time setting done by the Adventists since his time, because they are the legitimate outgrowth of his work. He began setting time. He did it the

second time. He taught them how to do it. He fathered the idea. He inculcated it in all his followers. They then simply took up and carried on what he had begun.”

This is a gross misrepresentation of the work and teachings of Seventh-day Adventists, as anyone who had preached for them for twenty-eight years, as had Mr. Canright, would well know. These statements would indicate that William Miller, who set the time for the return of our Lord in 1844, was the founder of the Seventh day Adventist Church; that Miller and the Seventh-day Adventists believed and taught the same thing; in fact, that it was all one movement, Millerism and Seventh-day Adventism being one and the same thing. No other impression could be received from these words of Mr. Canright, “They. . . took up and carried on what he had begun,” in the matter of time setting.

Now let the reader note how quickly Mr. Canright’s fertile mind could change from one side of an argument to another when it served his purpose to do so. A little farther on in his book, where he tries to show how very unpopular Seventh-day Adventists were when their work first started, he speaks of the opposition they had from William Miller, this very man who, in his first chapter, he sets forth as the founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

“He [Miller] especially points out the Seventh-day Adventist positions as utterly wrong. He knew all about their arguments on the three messages, the sanctuary, the Sabbath, etc., and yet he not only rejected them, but earnestly warned his people against them. . . . Not a leading man in Miller’s work ever embraced the views of the Seventh-day Adventists.”- Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 78.

Now, it would be utterly impossible to harmonize these two statements of Mr. Canright’s regarding Miller and his relation to the Seventh-day Adventist movement. In the one Miller is made responsible for what Seventh day Adventists have done, and in the second he as plainly declares that Miller rejected the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists and warned his people against them, and that not a leading man in Miller’s work ever embraced the views of the Seventh-day Adventists. Could two statements possibly be more conflicting?

The Miller movement, as such, ended with the passing of the time, October 22, 1844, before the Seventh-day Adventist Church was founded. It is true, also, as stated by Mr. Canright, that Mr. Miller, who was still living at the time the work of Seventh-day Adventists began, refused to accept their teachings, and continued on as a member of the Baptist Church till his death. Except-the doctrine of the imminence of the personal and literal Advent of our Lord, there was practically nothing held in common by the Adventists of Miller’s movement and the Seventh-day Adventists, who, as such, came upon the stage of action after the disappointment. The Seventh-day Adventists believe that the dates worked out. by Miller for the cleansing of the sanctuary in 1844 were correct, but they recognize that he was mistaken as to the event which was to take place on that date. Mr. Miller believed that the sanctuary was the earth; Seventh day Adventists believe it is the place where Christ ministers as High Priest in heaven.

In common with most other Baptists, Mr. Miller observed Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath; the Seventh-day Adventists hold that the seventh day should be kept according to the fourth command of the Ten Commandments. We understand that Mr. Miller believed in the natural immortality of the soul, and that people go to their reward at death; Seventh-day Adventists believe that man is mortal, that the dead are asleep, unconscious, and that they will not receive their rewards until after the judgment and the resurrection of the dead. As already pointed out, a number of those who were associated with Mr. Miller in his work were among those who later became Seventh-day Adventists. But that fact does not make the Seventh-day Adventist Church responsible for Mr. Miller’s unscriptural views. If, therefore, Mr. Miller and his followers were not Seventh day Adventists, but were Baptists, Methodists, etc., who believed in the Second Advent, how can it be truthfully said that Seventh-day Adventists are time setters simply because Mr. Miller set the time for the Lord to come? Why not say that the Baptists are time setters, seeing that Mr. Miller was a Baptist and not a Seventh day Adventist? Why should Mr. Canright, a Baptist preacher, try to confuse the issue by shifting the responsibility of time setting from members of his church to the Seventh-day Adventist Church? There could be only one reason to create prejudice against that church.

Seventh-day Adventists do believe that our Lord will return in person to this earth, in harmony with His definite promise recorded in John 14:1-3 and Acts 1:9-11. They also believe that the prophetic portions of the Scriptures clearly point to the fact that His coming is near, 4~ even at the doors.” Matthew 24:33. They are attempting, by the grace of God, to prepare their hearts and lives for that great day, and believe they should embrace every opportunity to encourage others to do likewise; but never has the Seventh-day Adventist denomination fixed a date for our Lord’s return.

Mr. Canright says on page 75 of his work that Elder James White, who became a strong leader in the Seventh day Adventist Church, was associated with Mr. Miller, and engaged in preaching a definite time for the Lord to come. Of course this is true. Elder James White was in the Miller movement, and ardently believed in Miller’s teachings. But it should be understood that Elder White was then a member of the Christian Church. He had not yet become a Seventh-day Adventist. That some lone individual or minister who became a Seventh day Adventist should have clung for a little period to the idea of time setting would be expected in the very nature of the case. And the citing of some such individual is no valid indictment of the denomination. But there is no need that we make

further answer to this time setting charge, for Mr. Canright himself, in his book *The Lords Day*, which he wrote subsequently to his *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, makes this sweeping admission:

“To their credit it should be said that Seventh-day Adventists do not believe in setting time definitely since 1844’ -*The Lords Day*, p. 38. Now, since there were no Seventh-day Adventists before the end of 1844, and since, as Mr. Canright admits, they “do not believe in setting time definitely since 1844, “ we submit that they are not time setters at all.

Began A World Endeavor

It seemed presumptuous for so small a group of people as the Seventh-day Adventists were in the early years of their movement, to undertake a world endeavor. There were only a few of them at first, and for sixteen years they had no church organization, no buildings, no institutions, practically no literature, and but little money. But they had a growing conviction that they had discovered in the Holy Scriptures light and truth which must be given to the world, and with undaunted courage born of faith in God, they began the work.

The first tracts by Sabbath-keeping Adventists were published in 1846; and in 1849 a periodical entitled *The Present Truth* was started. The first general meeting to be held by them was called at Rocky Hill, Connecticut, in 1848. This was before they fully realized what was involved in giving a world-wide message. The name Seventh-day Adventist was adopted in 1860, but it was not until 1861 that their first churches were formally organized. The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was organized two years later, with delegates present from six State conferences, which had been previously organized. In 1874 missionaries began to go out to other countries, and the work soon became established in every continent of the world, from which it quickly spread to adjacent island fields, and in all those lands converts began to appear and churches were established. Paralleling this spread of missionary endeavor was a steady growth of institutional work. Publishing houses were established, scores of periodicals and hundreds of books and tracts began to be printed; schools and colleges were built for the purpose of educating and training gospel workers who could go everywhere with the message; and sanitariums and hospitals were founded for the relief of the sick and suffering, these being operated entirely by Christian physicians and nurses. In seeking to bring their patients under the influence of the gospel, they furnished balm to both body and soul.

Taking a retrospective view of this movement during the eighty-nine years since it had its first feeble beginnings, we find that its development has been very remarkable, to say the least. In some countries Seventh-day Adventist membership has been doubling every four or five years, and today there is scarcely a land on earth where their work is not established or into which their missions are not being projected. From the very character of their message, it is only natural that their appeal is to all men alike. They preach to Jew, Christian, Mohammedan, Buddhist, heathen anybody anywhere who will pause to hear. Thousands of their converts have been made direct from heathenism, and we believe that their mission stations may be found today in more of the heathen tribes of the world than those of any other Protestant church.

At the close of 1945 they had a total of 14,874 evangelical laborers, 69 union conferences, 137 state and provincial conferences, and 197 organized mission fields. They were operating 52 publishing houses and branches, publishing literature in nearly 200 languages, and distributing the product of their presses throughout the world to the value of nearly \$10,000,000 annually. The total sales of literature during the eighty-two years since their first paper was established amounts to \$161,748,519.50.

They were conducting 3,189 primary schools and 269 institutions of intermediate grades and higher learning. Of the latter, one is an A-grade medical college, one a theological seminary granting the Master's degree, and eleven are baccalaureate colleges granting the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. The total student enrollment in primary, intermediate, and college grades is approximately 150,000.

Sixty-two Seventh-day Adventist medical institutions are in operation, employing 256 physicians and 5,757 nurses and other helpers. The total investment in all these educational and medical institutions is \$118,565,591.70. Not a dollar of earnings from any institution operated by them accrues to any individual, but any gains made from year to year are either used to extend the work of the respective institutions or are appropriated to the mission treasury to be used in the extension of the work in other lands.

The ministers of the church are supported by tithe paid voluntarily by the church membership, and the mission work in foreign lands is supported by additional freewill offerings. These offerings to foreign missions now total nearly \$8,000,000 annually. The membership, comparatively speaking, is not large. In the very nature of the case this is to be expected. The acceptance of the Seventh-day Adventist faith entails a great sacrifice in every land, particularly in civilized countries. The keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath and the non use of tobacco and all alcoholic liquors are points that bring a real test to all would be adherents. But that which has astonished multitudes in the religious world is the fact that only a few hundred thousand people should be able, under God, to maintain such an extensive work, embracing every great country of the entire globe, besides many smaller ones.

When Mr. Canright separated from the Seventh-day Adventist communion and published his “dumb founder” in 1889, he predicted an early failure of the entire movement. Speaking of the efforts of the Seventh-day Adventists to extend and support their work, he said: “It is doubtful how long they can maintain this strain without a crash.” *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 27.

On page 26 of his work he gives statistics to show the extent to which the work of the Seventh-day Adventists had grown at that time. Here he says: “In 1888 they had 400 ordained ministers and licentiates, 901 churches, 21,112 members, 31 conferences, and five missions.”

He further states that they sold that year \$90,000 worth of books, were issuing twenty-six periodicals in different languages, had seven publishing houses, three sanitariums, two colleges, one academy, and several smaller schools, with sixty-two teachers and 1,000 students. He pictures these institutions as being hopelessly in debt, and says the efforts made to meet these debts had drained the pockets of many of their people and discouraged others. It was then that he predicted the “crash.” But that was many years ago, and the crash has not come. During this time their work has increased in every land; the number of evangelical workers has multiplied more than thirty five times; their conference and mission field organizations, about eleven times; their principal institutions have increased from 13 to 510; their annual student enrollment has grown from 1,000 to 148,144. Membership gains have been made every year.

The total funds contributed annually for religious work have increased from something like \$200,000 in 1888 to \$31,540,935.24 in 1945. At the time Mr. Canright wrote, “It is doubtful how long they can maintain this strain without a crash,” the per capita giving was about \$8 per annum. This had increased to \$54.72 in 1945, and, strange to say, the crash seems as far off today as it did when Mr. Canright wrote his book. In fact, if the writer is any judge of humanity, it would be hard to find a happier and more contented people on the earth than are these Seventh-day Adventists, who are thus contributing more liberally per capita than any other people in the whole world to the support of the gospel work. The General Conference sessions of the denomination draw representatives from all over the world. Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, Africans, South Sea Islanders, Egyptians, South American Indians, Mexicans, Europeans - all mingle with their American and Canadian brethren in a fellowship that is expressed in joyful countenances as they tell of the advance of the last gospel message to the far corners of the earth. The “blessed hope” of the soon coming of the Lord to put an end to sin and suffering buoys them up in the face of adversity and discouragement. But there are so many evidences of the providential leading of God in every feature of their work that every setback and Satanic opposition is matched by overruling circumstances that only encourage them to redouble their zeal for the finishing of their world task.

That Seventh-day Adventists are not unappreciated in other church communions is in evidence from the following excerpt taken from a sermon preached by the pastor of the Tenth Avenue Baptist church as a broadcast some time ago over Station KTAB:

“Seventh-day Adventists have become accepted members of the community. Their little churches are nestled among the hills and the valleys. Their hospitals bring welcome ministrations to the sick. They are good neighbors, good comrades, good citizens. . . . They have given to the world the ministry of healing. They have gone forth, not as fanatics or theorists, but as empiricists, adopting the purest findings of medical and surgical science and reinforcing all this with the sweet spirit of Jesus of Nazareth. These are the men who unweariedly follow the footsteps of Him who went about doing good. In every case they have striven to blend the healing of the body with the healing of the soul, God bless them. To be a Seventh-day Adventist is to know anew the meaning of the cross. They possess adequate funds to carry on the Master’s work. Why? Because each member obeys the law of the tithe. Their churches are filled with worshippers because they insist on loyalty to the Lord. To the Seventh-day Adventist the peace of Christ, and not the madness of sinful pleasure is the great quest of the soul. You don’t find them in passion-polluted show houses. Their women are not to be seen amid the shameless nudities of the modern ballroom. These men and women are to be found in places where prayer is wont to be made. These people expect the coming of Jesus’, they are waiting for Him, and when the Master comes He will find them where Christians ought to be.”

5. The Work Of Mrs. Ellen G. White

ONE Of Mr. Canright’s most bitter attacks is launched against the life and work of Mrs. E. G. White, who, until the time of her death, was a respected, beloved worker in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. He devotes an entire chapter to her, and frequently attacks her in other chapters. Besides, there was published under his name, just about the time of his death, a volume of 201 pages devoted entirely to an effort to discredit her work.

We do not hesitate to say that Seventh-day Adventists recognize in Mrs. E. G. White’s work a special manifestation of the gift of the Spirit spoken of in the Bible as the “Spirit of prophecy.” (See Revelation 19:10.) Nor is this a strange or new doctrine, since among the spiritual gifts promised to the church, and ranking with apostles, evangelists, teachers, etc., is the gift of prophecy, and its work has been recognized by the church in all ages.

Thus Paul speaks of these gifts as follows: "Now you are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." 1 Corinthians 12:27, 28. In speaking of the last stage of the church of Christ, John the revelator describes it and the experience of its members thus: "The dragon was wroth with the woman [the church], and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Revelation 12:17.

The church of God, here spoken of as a remnant, and against whom the dragon (Satan) will be especially angry in the last days, was foreseen as a commandment-keeping company who would have the "testimony of Jesus Christ." if we inquire as to what is meant by the "testimony of Jesus," we find an answer to our query in Revelation 19:10, where the angel, (Gabriel) clearly explained to John that "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy." These two characteristics will therefore distinguish the true remnant church of God in the latter end of the history of the world. Its members will be commandment keepers, and the Spirit of prophecy will be manifested among them.

To this also agree the words of Paul' recorded in 1 Corinthians 1:54: "That irk everything you are enriched by Him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: so that you come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let it be noted that as the church waits "for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," she is to come behind in no gift. Therefore, all the gifts of the Spirit are to be found in her. And lest there should be a question about the gift of prophecy, this is especially mentioned by the inspired writer: "Even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you." Verse 6. And "the testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy," or the prophetic gift. Seventh-day Adventists believe that this gift of the Spirit was early manifested among them through the work and writings of Mrs. White. They believe that just as in past ages God raised up prophets and messengers to perform a special work for the church, and to counsel and warn God's people in times of special peril and need, so He raised up Mrs. White and bestowed upon her the gift of prophecy; and that He has used her life and work to bless and unify the church.

Someone perchance may be ready to say, "Then you have another Bible." We answer, No. That God sends special counsel, admonition, and help through some specially chosen servant is no evidence that the Bible is thus added to or taken from. Were there not prophets and prophetesses in the apostolic church who gave counsel and instruction to the church in their day, but whose writings did not become a part of the Bible?

Luke tells us of one 'Philip the evangelist,' and says of his family, "The same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy." Acts 21:9. Here, then, in the early church, were four prophetesses from one family. And while it is definitely stated that they exercised their gift and "did prophesy," yet no prophecy of theirs is recorded in the Bible. In 1 Chronicles 29:29, 30, we read of two other prophets whom God raised up to do a work of local import, who wrote books, and whose influence extended over Israel and over all the kingdoms of the countries round about, and yet whose writings form no part of the Bible, which was handed down to succeeding ages. "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer, with all his reign and his might, and the times that went over him, and over Israel, and over all the kingdoms of the countries."

Why should Nathan the prophet or Gad the seer have written books under inspiration of God, and then the books be allowed to be lost? We answer, Because God desired to give to the church in that day special counsel and instruction, warnings and entreaties that applied especially to that time and age, and that would not be "present truth," to succeeding ages.

The Bible contains the revealed will of God, and if followed, is sufficient to furnish men thoroughly unto all good works. (See 2 Timothy 3:16,17.) It contains all the instruction necessary to salvation. But the difficulty is that men are so prone to wander away from the written word and ignore its silent witness, that it has been necessary from time to time for God to raise up an Elijah to call the people back to the worship of the true God and the keeping of His commandments, and to destroy the heresies brought into the church by the priests of Baal. (See 1 Kings 18:17-41). Such is the work God has done through Mrs. White, and for this cause she was raised up. Her appeal was ever to the Bible. Her entire life was spent in a supreme effort to lead men to a clear understanding of the Book of God. She never claimed verbal inspiration for her writings; but she claimed that through the gift of the Spirit special light was shed upon the written word, and this has been written out in her own words and given to the church and the world for their edification.

We dare say that no candid person can read through one of the many volumes from her pen without being constrained to admit that thus many old familiar Bible texts are made to shine forth with new brilliancy and that many obscure passages have become clear and understandable. New rays of light are thus received, not because they are found in Mrs. White's writings, but because they now clearly shine forth from the Old Book. It is not a new or additional Bible that the church needs today, but inspired counsel that can help the befogged minds of the people of the world to grasp the glorious truths of the Bible we have. Does someone reason that this gift is no longer necessary to the church? We inquire then, What mean the words of Peter when he said: "It shall come to pass in the last days, says God, I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see

visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on My servants and on My hand maidens I will pour out in those days of My Spirit; and they shall prophesy”? Acts 2:17, 18.

Here is a positive statement that the gift of prophecy will be seen in the church in the last days. And why not? Has God entirely removed Himself from His people? Is He not as able today as in former times to give them needed counsel, reproof, and encouragement? Has the channel of communication between heaven and earth become so obstructed that nothing more can flow through? We think not, for in these last days of abounding iniquity God will have, as He has had in former ages, “a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but. . . holy and without blemish” (Ephesians 5:27), and He promises to enrich it with “all utterance,” and “all knowledge,” through the full bestowal of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Thus the church will “come behind in no gift,” as it waits “for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (See 1 Corinthians 1:5-7.)

When Mr. Canright was preaching for the Seventh day Adventists, he was well aware that they made a distinction between the Bible and the writings of Mrs. White. And while still among them he wrote a clear testimony to that effect. Here it is:

“Right here let me say that we do not throw away the Bible, and take Mrs. White’s visions instead. No; if there is a class’ of people under heaven who believe the Bible strongly, who love it devotedly, who study it and go to it for everything, it is Seventh-day Adventists. Here is our storehouse of doctrine and truth. We preach this everywhere and always. We have no other authority. We go to this to test and prove the genuineness of Sister White’s labors and visions. If they did not harmonize with this in every particular, we would reject them. It is wicked for men to cry, ‘The Bible, the Bible, the Bible,’ and profess to follow that implicitly when they reject one of the plainest doctrines of the Bible, -the doctrine of spiritual gifts. Of course, I have no time here to take up an argument on spiritual gifts, or enter into a lengthy statement of her [Mrs. White’s] labors, their nature, etc. We believe, however, that no doctrine of the Bible is plainer than that of the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, and particularly that these gifts are to be restored in the last days. Joel 2:28-32; Rev. 12:17; 19:10; 1 Thess. 5:1-21, etc.” D. M. CANRIGHT in Review and Herald, April 19, 1877.

In his later statement that “they [Seventh-day Adventists] have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons have” *Adventism Renounced*, p. 136), Mr. Canright stands convicted by his former testimony. It seems difficult to believe that he was not willfully misrepresenting the facts as to the distinction well understood by the Seventh-day Adventists between the Bible and Mrs. White’s writings. Mrs. White has published to the world her own estimate of the absolute and final authority of the Scriptures, and of the ‘relationship of her writings to the Bible. The following is from her pen: “In His word, God has committed to men the knowledge necessary for salvation. The Holy Scriptures are to be accepted as an authoritative, infallible revelation of His will. They are the standard of character, the revealer of doctrines, and the test of experience. ‘Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.’ 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, R.V. “Yet the fact that God has revealed His will to men through His word, has not rendered needless the continued presence and the guiding of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, the Spirit was promised by our Savior, to open the word to His servants, to illuminate and apply its teachings. And since it was the Spirit of God that inspired the Bible, it is impossible that the teaching of the Spirit should ever be contrary to that of the word.

“The Spirit was not given-nor can it ever be bestowed -to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. Says the apostle John, ‘Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are, gone out into the world.’ 1 John 4:1. And Isaiah declares, ‘To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.’ Isaiah 8:20.” *The Great Controversy*, p. vii.

Mrs. White always emphatically declared that her writings were not to be, considered an addition to the Word of God, and that anyone who claims this for them puts them “in a false light.” Her Testimonies were intended to bring men to “a clearer understanding” of the Scriptures. On one occasion she wrote: ‘Brother R. would confuse the mind by seeking to make it appear that the light God has given through the Testimonies is an addition to the word of God; but in this he presents the matter in a false light. God has seen fit in this manner to bring the minds of His people to His word, to give them a clearer understanding of it.’ ‘The word of God is sufficient to enlighten the most beclouded mind, and may be understood by those who have any desire to understand it. But notwithstanding all this, some who profess to make the word of God their study, are found living in direct - opposition to its plainest teachings. Then, to leave men and women without excuse, God gives plain and pointed Testimonies, bringing them back to the word that they have neglected to follow.’ ‘The word of God abounds in general principles for the formation of correct habits of living, and the Testimonies, general and personal, have been calculated to call their attention more especially to these principles.’ *Testimonies for the Church*, vol. 5, pp. 663, 664.

Mrs. White's Character And Work

In his book Mr. Canright makes damaging statements regarding the character and personality of Mrs. White. Before quoting some of these, let us note a former statement regarding her character and work, written by him before he left the ' Seventh-day Adventists. The following was written by Mr. Canright in 1877, while he was still an Adventist:

“As to the Christian character of Sister White, I beg leave to say that I think I know something about it. I have been acquainted with Sister White for eighteen years, more than half the history of our people. I have been in their family time and again sometimes weeks at a time. They have been in our house and family many times. I have traveled with them almost everywhere; have been with them in private and in public, in meeting and out of meeting, and have had the very best chances to know something of the life, character, and spirit of Brother and Sister White. As a minister, I have had to deal with all kinds of persons, and all kinds of character, till I think I can judge something of what a person is, at least after years of intimate acquaintance.

“I know Sister White to be an unassuming, modest, kindhearted, noble woman. These traits in her character are not simply put on and cultivated, but they spring gracefully and easily from her natural disposition. She is not self-conceited, self-righteous, and self important, as fanatics always are. I have frequently come in contact with fanatical persons, and I have always found them to be full of pretensions, full of pride, ready to give their opinion, boastful of their holiness, etc. But I have ever found Sister White the reverse of all this. Any one, the poorest and the humblest, can go to her freely for advice and comfort without being repulsed. She is ever looking after the needy, the destitute, and the suffering, providing for them, and pleading their cause. I have never formed an acquaintance with any persons who so constantly have the fear of God before them. Nothing is undertaken without earnest prayer to God. She studies God's word carefully and constantly. I have heard Sister White speak hundreds of times, have read all her Testimonies through and through, most of them many times, and I have never been able to find one immoral sentence in the whole of them, or anything that is not strictly pure and Christian; nothing that leads away from the Bible, or from Christ; but there I find the most earnest appeals to obey God, to love Jesus, to believe the Scriptures, and to search them constantly. I have received great spiritual benefit times without number, from the Testimonies. Indeed, I never read them without feeling reprov'd for my lack of faith in God, lack of devotion, and lack of earnestness in saving souls. If I have any judgment, any spiritual discernment, “I pronounce the Testimonies to be of the same Spirit and of the same tenor as the Scriptures.

“For thirty years these Testimonies have been believed and read among our people. How has it affected them? Has it led them away from the law of God? Has it led them to give up faith in Christ? Has it led them to throw aside the Bible? Has it led them to be a corrupt, immoral people? I know that they will compare favorably with any other Christian denomination. One thing I have remarked, and that is, that the most bitter opponents of the visions of Sister White admit that she is a Christian. How they can make this admission is more than I know. They try to fix it up by saying that she is deceived. They are not able to put their finger upon a single stain in all her life, nor an immoral sentence in all her writings. They have to admit that much of her writings are excellent, and that whoever would live out all she says would be a good Christian, sure of heaven. This is passing strange if she is a tool of the devil, inspired by Satan, or if her writings are immoral or the vagaries of her own mind.” Review and Herald, April 26, 1877.

This earnest tribute to the character of Mrs. White, based on an intimate acquaintance of eighteen years, was written by Mr. Canright in 1877. In 1885 he again bore testimony to his confidence in the integrity of Mrs. White's work:

“The tendency and influence of the Testimonies is not, like the teachings of Spiritualist mediums, to lead away from the Bible, away from God, and away from faith in Christ; nor, like Mormonism, to lead to sensuality, dishonesty, and crime; but they lead to faith in the Holy Scriptures, devotion to God, and a life of humility and holiness. Can a corrupt tree bear good fruit? Jesus said not. What is a tree known by? Its fruit. Here is a tree which has been standing among us for forty years, and bearing fruit. What has been the nature of that fruit? What have been its effects upon those who have partaken the most of it? “It seems to me now that no one who has ever felt the power of the Spirit of God upon his own heart can candidly read through the four volumes of ‘Spirit of Prophecy’ without being deeply convicted that the writer must live very near to God, and be thoroughly imbued with the same Spirit that inspired the Bible, and animated the apostles and prophets. Such lofty thoughts of God, of heaven, and ‘of spiritual things cannot come from a carnal heart, nor from a mind deceived and led by Satan...”

“You certainly know that our people hold all the cardinal doctrines of salvation, -faith in God, the Bible, Jesus Christ, repentance, a holy life, etc. Isn't this safe? You know that Sister White and all our ministers not only so teach, but exert all their influence to have our people live lives of devotion, of honesty, of purity, of love, of plainness, of sacrifice, and of every Christian virtue. You know that every sin is condemned among our people, and the most solemn warnings are constantly given against even the appearance of evil. You know that in almost every church of our people there are at least some who are living blameless Christian lives. You know that there is not one immoral doctrine taught or practiced by our people. Bad men and poor examples there are, to be sure; but they are such in spite of all our efforts to make them better. You know that if any man will strictly live up to the teachings of the Testimonies and our people, he will certainly be saved.” Ibid., Feb. 10, 1885.

These testimonials regarding Mrs. White and her writings express the sum of ' his convictions resulting from twenty-six out of the twenty-eight years of his labors among the Seventh-day Adventists. What shall we say regarding the consistency of entirely opposite statements, when we are asked to accept his derogatory caricature of this same individual, written just a few years later? At that time he declared: "I long studied Mrs. White to determine for myself her real character till her case is clear to my mind." Seventh day Adventism Renounced, p. 137.

Let us note a few of his most flagrant contradictions on this point. From his volume under review we quote the following statements published in 1889. Mr. Canright the Baptist speaking: "She has a harsh, uncharitable spirit.... Her severity and harshness have driven many to despair.' Ibid., p. 160.

In 1877 Mr. Canright the Adventist said: "I know Sister White to be an unassuming, modest, kindhearted, noble woman. These traits in her character are not simply put on and cultivated, but they spring gracefully and easily from her natural disposition."

In 1889 he said she "is simply a religious enthusiast, and a fanatic," and "is always telling what great things she has done." "Hear her laud herself." In 1877 he testified of her:

"She is not self-conceited, self-righteous, and self-important, as fanatics always are. I have ever found Sister White the reverse of all this." Of her writings he said, in 1889:

"These inspired 'Testimonies' now embrace ten bound volumes. Thus they have another Bible, just the same as the Mormons have.' Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 136.

In 1877 he said of these same writings that there is "nothing that leads away from the Bible, or from Christ"; and in 1885, just four years before he wrote his renunciation of Adventism, he added: "The tendency and influence of her Testimonies is not, like the teachings of Spiritualist mediums, to lead away from the Bible, away from God, and away from faith in Christ; nor like Mormonism."

Now we submit to our readers that Mr. Canright could not have been sincere in both instances when these conflicting statements were made about the character and work of the same person. If he was sincere in his published utterances regarding Mrs. White in 1877, when he claims to have had eighteen years' acquaintance with her, and in 1885, at which time his acquaintance had lengthened to twenty-six years, then he could not have been sincere in 1889 when he clearly contradicted all that he had previously written of her. On the other hand, if he was sincere in his later statements, it surely proves insincerity on his part in what he had formerly said. Mr. Canright, after renouncing Adventism, also said of Mrs. White:

"Mrs. White received no school education, except a few weeks when a child. She, like Joanna Southcott, Ann Lee, and Joseph Smith, was wholly illiterate, not knowing the simplest rules of grammar." Ibid., P. 35. What he failed to tell in connection with his portrayal of Mrs. White's gross ignorance, is how such a person managed to produce "ten bound volumes" which he calls the Seventh-day Adventist Bible. Usually persons in such a terrible state of mind and body, and with only a few weeks' schooling, do not become great authors.

After Mr. Canright published his book, this same woman continued to write and publish until the number of volumes produced by her increased to thirty-six, besides hundreds of articles published in religious journals, and many tracts and pamphlets. Her published volumes include some enlarged revisions of earlier publications, and when laid flat and stacked one on top of another, make a column higher than a man's head.

Many of her writings are highly regarded by Christians of all denominations. Her little volume Steps to Christ ranks among the best sellers of religious books published in modern times, and has been translated into more than a score of languages. Her large Conflict of the Ages Series-Patriarchs and Prophets, Prophets and Kings, The Desire of Ages, Acts of the Apostles, and The Great Controversy -are studied by many ministers of other churches, and pronounced by them to be among the most helpful commentaries. Her work Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing, has brought blessings to thousands. Her volume Gospel Workers insists upon a standard of purity and holiness for the ministry unsurpassed by any other publication, and the volumes of counsels to the church, of which Mr. Canright speaks, have brought light and courage, as well as instruction and reproof, to their many readers.

Mrs. White's books on the principles of Christian education, written for the guidance of teachers in the denominational colleges and schools, have been commended by educators of the world. The head of one training college for teachers, in one of the world's greatest cities, gave many copies of the book Education to his graduates, recommending it as the best book he knew on educational principles. In one country the staff of the university brought out the book Education in part, translating it from the English, and the university issued it for the benefit of educators.

Strange, this! An ignorant, sickly woman, with a bad temper, starts on a mission of deception, gets a following of People as illiterate as herself, and then, behold, she becomes a well known author, producing some of the most prized religious books; goes on long lecture tours through many countries of the world, where thousands hang on her gracious words and are led to Christ through her labors. And stranger still, these ignorant followers of hers start colleges in all continents, conduct a Grade A medical school, operate sanitariums and large publishing houses in many lands, become noted for their piety, and extend their missions to nearly all countries of the earth. One would hardly have expected such excellent results from such an inauspicious beginning. Shortly before Mr. Canright's change of church affiliation from the Seventh-day Adventist to the Baptist, he gave the following unsolicited testimonial for one of these books: "I have read many books, but never one which has interested me so intensely and impressed me so profoundly as Volume IV of 'The Great Controversy,' by Sister White. . . . The historical part is good, but that which was of the most intense interest to me, was the last part, beginning with 'The Origin of Evil.' The ideas concerning the nature and attributes of God, the character of Christ, and the rebellion of Lucifer in

heaven, carry with them their own proof of inspiration. They moved the depths of my soul as nothing else ever did. I feel that I have a new and higher conception of the goodness and forbearance of God, the awful wickedness of Satan, and the tender love of Christ. I wish everybody could read it, whether of our people or not. Get it, brethren, and read it care fully." Review and Herald, Jan. 6, 1885, P. 9. We believe that to the unbiased reader it will already be apparent that in his eagerness to deal Seventh-day Adventists a fatal blow, Mr. Canright has caricatured the picture of Mrs. White. The things he says of her now, and the facts of her life work and influence as recognized by himself in earlier years, cannot be harmonized.

The "Mistakes" Of Mrs. White

In 1882 Elder Canright voluntarily left his ministry for the Seventh day Adventists and retired to a farm. Of his attitude of mind at this time we have a description in a handwritten letter written from Otsego, Michigan, December 9, 1883, addressed to "Dear Brother Long":

"I am farming now, which keeps me very busy and hard at work. This is what I naturally love to do the best of anything, and so I feel well contented. I have entirely given up preaching, and have no intention of ever engaging in it again."

"My faith in the whole thing has been shaken. As far as I can see at present much of it may be true or it may not be. I do not feel positive about any of these speculative points as I used to."

"I am a member of the church still, and do all I can to help it. But if I were situated differently, would just as soon join some other church."

In November, 1884, a general meeting was held at Otsego, during which Elder Canright's faith was renewed, and he bore the following testimony:

"It seems to me, dear brethren, that my whole soul is now bound up in this present truth. I have told my brethren that if the world were before me, the truth is so dear that I know I could make them see it. I have also said that I do not believe any man takes as much pleasure in worldly pursuits as I do in this. I have tried to analyze my feelings, and I have reached some conclusions. Sometimes an individual gets started on a wrong train of reasoning, and he sees it when he is far away. Then he finds it hard to get back again. This was my case exactly. I did not see as the brethren did, and so I concluded I would leave the work for the time being. So I went to farming....

"Now I want to say that I have been changed right around in my feelings and convictions. I do not say I am fully satisfied in everything; but I believe the truth as I used to believe it." Review and Herald, Dec. 2, 1884.

Soon after this he contributed to the Review and Herald an article addressed "To Those in Doubting Castle." As to his personal experience he testified:

"Twenty five years ago I embraced this message. The complete system of truth which it presented seemed to me something wonderful and very glorious. The study of the Bible was a continual feast to me. To preach it to others, and see them embrace it, filled my heart with gladness and peace. But at length things came up which threw me into doubt on some points, and finally were the occasion of my ceasing to preach the message. As the same things have affected others more or less and will be liable to affect still others in the future, I wish to give a few of the reasons why I still think that the work is all right, that the Lord is in it, and that these doubts are not well founded." Ibid., Feb. 10, 1885.

In explaining his doubts regarding the Testimonies and his renewal of faith in them, he lays down the following general counsel:

"Are there not difficulties in these writings hard to explain? passages which seem to conflict one with another, or with some passage in the Bible, or with facts? I freely grant for myself that there are some passages which bother me, and which I do not know how to

explain. But I believe them for all that, just as I do the Bible. There are many passages in the Bible which I should have to admit I could not explain nor harmonize. If any man says that he can explain and reconcile all the statements of the Scriptures, he simply shows his self-conceit and ignorance. Yet I profoundly believe the Bible for all that. . . . “Peter admitted that there were some things in the Scriptures hard to be understood. 2 Peter 3:16. He says that some wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. And that is just what some are doing with the Testimonies.

When we consider how extensive these writings are, extending over a period of nearly forty years, embracing ten bound volumes besides many smaller works, it would be a wonder indeed if in all these there should not be anything in the wording, the sentiment, or the doctrine, hard to understand and explain, or on which a sharp opponent could not make a plausible argument. We know that God’s revelations in the past have not been given free from all obscurity and difficulties. Neither will they be now.

“If a man reads the Bible on purpose to find objections, as Tom Paine did and as Ingersoll does, he will find plenty of them to satisfy his unbelief, and confirm him in his infidelity. But if, like thousands of others equally learned and intelligent, he goes to the Scriptures to find light and God and salvation, he will find them full and clear, to the joy of his soul. I am profoundly convinced in the depths of my soul, after an experience of twenty-five years, that the same is true of the Testimonies. “-Ibid.

It is well to consider these principles in dealing with some of the passages in the writings of Mrs. White that are later given by Mr. Canright as evidence that the Testimonies are unreliable and faulty. Considering the vast number of pages combed by the critics of these writings, there is a surprisingly small number of points that can be brought forward in the effort to belittle the work of their author. The reader of that part of Mr. Canright’s book dealing with the teachings of Mrs. White will note that there are many quotations of a line or two here and a brief sentence there, woven together by arguments in such a way as to make them serve the purpose of the critic. Most of the supposed difficulties would disappear were the context of the quotations given.

Striking examples of this are seen in a number of garbled sentences taken from their setting, which he lists under the heading, “Her Predictions About the Rebellion a Failure.” We will notice these in order. He cites first the words of Mrs. White: “The system of slavery, which has ruined our nation, is left to live and stir up another rebellion.” Then our critic comments: “Was slavery left to live and stir up another rebellion? Now we know that that statement is utterly untrue.” *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 148. In its setting, this sentence quoted from Mrs. White will be seen not to have been intended as her prediction. It is a statement of the thoughts of others, as expressing their feelings at that time. Here is the entire paragraph, a reading of which will remove all grounds for listing this as a mistake”:

“Those who have ventured to leave their homes and sacrifice their lives to exterminate slavery, are dissatisfied. They see no good results from the war, only the preservation of the Union, and for this thousands of lives must be sacrificed and homes made desolate. Great numbers have wasted away and expired in hospitals; others, have been taken prisoners by the rebels, a fate more to be dreaded than death. In view of all this, they inquire, If we succeed in quelling this rebellion, what has been gained? They can only answer, discouragingly, Nothing. That which caused the rebellion is not removed. The system of slavery, which has ruined our nation, is left to live and stir up another rebellion. The feelings of thousands of our soldiers are bitter. They suffer the greatest privations; these they would willingly endure, but they find they have been deceived, and they are dispirited. Our leading men are perplexed; their hearts are failing them for fear. They fear to proclaim freedom to the slaves of the rebels, for by so doing they will exasperate that portion of the South who have not joined the rebellion but are strong slavery men.’ *Testimonies*, vol. 1, pp. 254, 255 (dated Jan. 4, 1862). Thus it is seen that Mrs. White was simply expressing the fears of others as to what the outcome of the Civil War might be, rather than predicting that it would surely be so.

“Again,” continues Mr. Canright, as an instance of a failure of prediction, “ ‘It seemed impossible to have the war conducted successfully.’ Another failure, for it was conducted successfully.” *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 148.

The setting of this sentence also shows that it was intended not as a prediction, but merely as a statement of fact as it existed at the time of writing, which was during the Civil War. Note the statement with its context: “A great share of the volunteers enlisted, fully believing that the result of the war would be to abolish slavery. Others enlisted intending to be very careful to keep slavery just as it is, but to put down the rebellion and preserve the Union. And then to make the matter still more perplexing’ and uncertain, some of the officers in command are strong pro-slavery men, whose sympathies are all with the South, yet who are opposed to a separate government. It seems impossible to have the war conducted successfully, for many in our own ranks are continually working to favor the South, and our armies have been repulsed, and unmercifully slaughtered, on account of the management of these pro-slavery men.’ *Testimonies*, vol. 1, p. 256 (dated Jan. 4, 1862).

In its setting the statement quoted cannot be criticized. Isolated from the obvious reason contained in the latter part of the sentence, and with even the tense of the verb changed in order to make it appear like a prediction, it gives a meaning not intended by the writer. “Here is another, ‘This nation will yet be humbled into the dust.’ Was it? No.” *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*, p. 148.

Considering the long, sorrowful record of defeat and disaster of the Northern Army during the first year of the Civil War, before the tide of victory turned to its side, it is hardly a stretch of language to admit that it was then humbled in the dust, though it later rose to triumph. Mr. Canright further challenges Mrs. White in these words: "Again, 'When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war.' Did anything of this kind happen? No." Ibid.

The following statement taken from one of Mrs. White's books and from which Mr. Canright has extracted the above sentence, can hardly be said to be a prediction. It was written during an early period in the Civil War, was simply picturing conditions as they existed at the time of writing, and reference is made to the influences which were at work among the outside nations. She says:

"England is studying whether it is best to take advantage of the present weak condition of our nation, and venture to make war upon her. She is weighing the matter, and trying to sound other nations. She fears, if she should commence war abroad, that she would be weak at home and that other nations would take advantage of her weakness. Other nations are making quiet yet active preparations for war, and are hoping that England will make war with our nation, for then they would improve the opportunity to be revenged on her for the advantage she has taken of them in the past, and the injustice done them. A portion of the Queen's subjects are waiting a favorable opportunity to break their yoke; but if England thinks it will pay, she will not hesitate a moment to improve her opportunities to exercise her power, and humble our nation. When England does declare war, all nations will have an interest of their own to serve, and there will be general war, general confusion. Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 259.

It seems to us that the context here shows clearly that it was still a question whether or not England would declare war. "If England thinks it will pay, she will not hesitate." England was represented as studying whether or not it would pay to make war upon America. She was "weighing the matter, and trying to sound out other nations." She was fearful of weakness at home, etc. But it is stated that should she finally decide to launch upon a war with America, all nations would then have an interest of their own to serve, and there would be general war and confusion. But even granting, for the sake of argument, that this was intended as a prediction, and that at the time when Mr. Canright wrote his book nothing of the kind had happened, if he had written his book this side of 1914, when England and Germany declared war and threw the civilized world into a death struggle,

would he so flippantly have held this prediction up to ridicule? Or had he written at the beginning of World War II, would he have written as he did? For with both world wars came experiences like that which was here foretold. The prediction was literally fulfilled in all its details. "Once more, 'Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided it must fall.' How it did fall!" Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 148. Here again the context shows that this statement quoted by Mr. Canright is expressive merely of the view point of other nations, and is not a prediction by Mrs. White at all: "The weakness of our government is fully open before other nations, and they now conclude that it is because it was not a monarchical government, and they admire their own government, and look down, some with pity, others with contempt, upon our nation, which they have regarded as the most powerful upon the globe. Had our nation remained united, it would have had strength; but divided it must fall. Testimonies, vol. 1, pp. 259, 260.

This entire chapter, from which these few quotations are garbled by Mr. Canright, may be found in Testimonies for the Church, volume 1, pages 253-260. The utterances stand today just as they were written early in the Civil War, and Seventh-day Adventists still put this forth, confident that those who will read it in its entirety, and with its obvious meaning, and compare it with history as it has been confirmed by later records, will find nothing to criticize. Instead of predicting final failure for the North in the Civil War, Mrs., White clearly intimated when and by what means the tide of victory would be turned. Here it is in this same chapter:

"The manner in which the poor slaves have been treated has led them to believe that their masters have told them the truth in these things. And yet a national fast is proclaimed! Says the Lord, 'Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that you break every yoke?' When our nation observes the fast which God has chosen [i.e., liberating the slaves], then will He accept their prayers as far as the war is concerned; but no they 'enter not into His ear.'" Page 258.

At the lowest ebb in the fortunes of war with the South, President Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation. From that time began the successes of the North, soon, resulting in victory. Can it be possible that Mr. Canright overlooked this prediction, which certainly was fulfilled? It must be so, for he says:

"I could give scores of such quotations all through her writings, showing how they have failed, always and everywhere" [italics ours]. Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 149. In an attempt to arouse patriotic indignation against Mrs. White, Mr. Canright quotes one other isolated sentence from an article on "The Rebellion." This perversion of her meaning and misrepresentation of her loyalty should be noticed:

"Again, 'Blood has been poured out like water, and for naught.' Was it for naught, you brave soldiers? you liberated slaves? You freed nation?"- Ibid., pp. 148, 149. The context shows that Mrs. White was here referring to blood that had, been needlessly shed by the

mismanagement of certain men in the Northern Army who were in sympathy with slavery. No one rejoiced more over the “liberated slaves” and the “freed nation” than did she. This is what she wrote: “Many professed Union men, holding important positions, are disloyal at heart. Their only object in taking up arms was to preserve the Union as it was, and slavery with it. ‘they would heartily chain down the slave to his life of galling bondage, had they the privilege. Such have a strong degree of sympathy with the South. Blood has been poured out like water, and for naught. In every town and village there is mourning. Wives are mourning for their husbands, mothers for their sons, and sisters for their brothers.’” Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 367.

When the reader reflects that this statement was made during the war, and not after, the true meaning is clearly understood. Again Mr. Canright quotes from Mrs. White: ‘The nations are now getting angry.’ Early Writings, p. 29.” He then remarks: “That was thirty-eight years ago. It takes, a long time for them to get fighting mad.” - Seventh day Adventism Renounced, p. 146.

Here again Mr. Canright spoke too soon by several years, and was too optimistic that “peace on earth and good will toward men” was to be the order of the day. We ask, did they not get fighting mad before and during the recent world wars? And is there yet any assurance of lasting peace among the nations? It would appear that in this matter, as in very many others, Mr. Canright, instead of Mrs. White, was the one who made a mistake and figured things out wrongly.

The Reform Dress

“One of the worst blunders Mrs. White ever made,” says Mr. Canright, “was the move she made on dress.” -Ibid., p. 149.

The issue thus raised is due to the fact that at a time when tight corsets were worn, when hoops were in fashion, and when women’s dresses were dragging behind and mopping up the filth of the streets, Mrs. White, like some other reformers, advocated a reform dress for women. She urged that women’s dresses should “clear the filth of the streets” at least an inch or two, and that nine inches would be better; that for warmth an appropriate undergarment should be worn to protect the lower limbs - pantalettes, these were sometimes called. Now to Mr. Canright this “was a shame and a disgrace.” “Think,” says he, “of a modest woman on the street with pants on, and her dress cut halfway up to the knees!” - Ibid.

And yet a little later the shears in the hands of fashion leaders began to work, and inch by inch the skirts were clipped until they were six to nine inches from, the ground, then just below the knee, then above the knee. True, conservative and modest women did not carry the clipping process quite so far, but stopped at about nine inches from the ground-just where Mrs. White and other reformers of her day advocated that the skirts should stop. And today a modest woman can go about the streets with her “dress cut halfway up to the knees” and not have her modesty questioned in the least degree. In fact, the length of skirt is of the conservative style, and is taken as an evidence of modesty on the part of the wearer. The reform dress, therefore, only slightly modified from what was originally advocated, is now the prevailing style, minus, however, the protection to the lower limbs suggested by Mrs. White.

Without giving undue space to this subject, we think attention should be called to the most glaring misrepresentations, made by the use of garbled quotations, in Mr. Canright’s treatment of this question. As an instance of direct contradiction, Mr. Canright quotes two sentences from Mrs. White, out of their setting, thus: “God would not have His people adopt the so-called reform dress” (Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 421), and a statement written four year later, “God would now have His people adopt the reform dress.” Ibid., p. 525. And here is Mr. Canright’s explanation of this seeming contradiction:

“What occasioned this change in the mind of the Lord? The answer is easy: In the time between the two revelations Mrs. White had spent some time at Dr. Jackson’s Home, Dansville, New York. Here a short dress with pants was worn, and she fell in with the idea, and soon had a vision’ requiring its adoption as above.” - Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, p. 149.

The whole question becomes clear when it is stated that there were two distinct styles of dress referred to. In the first quotation let the reader notice that it is the “so-called” reform dress, that was condemned by Mrs. White. The one referred to thus is what was known as the “American costume.” In this costume the dress was very short, and the pants worn made the wearer look mannish. That Mrs. White was consistent in condemning this, even while recommending another style of “reform dress,” is indicated by the following quotation from a report of meetings written by James White:

“During the meetings up to this date, Mrs. White has taken the opportunity to explain and harmonize her Testimonies on the dress question, showing the difference between the reform dress and the ‘American costume,’ that while the first mentioned style of dress reaches to about the top of a lady’s boot, the ‘American costume’ does not reach to the knee.” Review and Herald, Jan. 15, 1867. Although Mr. Canright was, as we shall prove, familiar with this distinction, and with Mrs. White’s consistent attitude in condemning the one while recommending a better, yet he sets out as an apparent contradiction two statements, one referring to the “American costume,” and the other the reform dress as it was later developed. That the reader may be assured that it was this ultra-

short “American costume” that was condemned, it is necessary only to consider Mrs. White’s words in their setting. Here is the quotation as it stands:

“I saw that God’s order has been reversed, and His special directions disregarded by those who adopt the American costume. I was referred to Deuteronomy 22:5: ‘The woman shall not wear that which pertains unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment, for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God.’ “God would not have His people adopt the so-called reform dress. It is immodest apparel, wholly unfitted for the modest, humble followers of Christ.” - Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 421.

Elder Canright’s plausible explanation as to Mrs. White’s change of mind-though in fact there was no change-is that she adopted a style that she-saw at the “Home” in Dansville. We are fortunate in having in her own handwriting a letter written by her during that visit to which Mr. Canright makes reference. Here is what she wrote regarding the dress as she saw it worn there: “They have all styles of dress here. Some are very becoming, if not so short. We shall get patterns from this place, and I think we can get out a style of dress more healthful than we now wear, and yet not be bloomer or the American costume. Our dresses, according to my idea, should be from four to six inches shorter than now worn, and should in no case reach lower than the top of the heel of the shoe, and could be a little shorter even than this with all modesty. I am going to get up a style of dress on my own hook, which will accord perfectly with that which has been shown me. Health demands it. Our feeble women must dispense with heavy skirts and tight waists if they value health.

We shall never imitate Miss Dr. Austin or Mrs. Dr. York. They dress very much like men. We shall imitate or follow no fashion we have ever yet seen. We shall institute a fashion which will be both economical and healthy. “From a letter to “Brother and Sister Lockwood,” dated September, 1864. From this letter it will be noted that all that Mrs. White claimed as being given by revelation regarding dress was the principles that should prevail. It is evident that she was seeking a style which she should recommend, a style that should be modest, healthful, becoming, and economical. She, with others connected with the Health Institute in Battle Creek, worked out the details of a costume that was adopted by the ladies at the health institution, and so recommended itself by its good sense that some of the patients adopted it, and took patterns away with them upon their return home.

Regarding some of the details connected with the introduction at the Health Institute of a reform dress in harmony with the principles of health and modesty, we have the following statement:

“When the Health Reform Institute was established, the physicians decided that a better style of dress for women than the long, dragging skirts, was desirable.... ‘The physicians declared it was not only desirable, but necessary in the treatment of some cases; and that being so, it would be useless and wrong to receive such cases without adopting what they were assured was essential to effect cures. Again, it seemed to be understood and conceded by all health reformers who had investigated the subject, that a reform dress was necessary, and if it was not adopted at the Institute, a class of patients would surely be driven to other institutions, where something different from the prevailing fashion was adopted. Therefore to neglect this reform would be to sacrifice the best interests of the Institute, and of a certain class who most needed its benefits....

“As might be expected, when it was first being adopted at the Institute there was not complete uniformity, but the taste and choice of the wearers had much to do with the length and appearance of the dresses worn....

“At my request the physicians at the Institute named a number of its inmates whose dresses they considered as nearly correct in make and appearance as could be found to that number among the varieties. I measured the height of twelve, with the distance of their dresses from the floor. They varied in height from five feet to five seven inches, and the distance of the dresses from the floor was from 8 to 10 inches. The medium, nine inches, was decided to be the right distance, and is adopted as the standard.’ – Health Reformer, March, 1868.

It is true that positive testimony was borne by Mrs. White regarding the need of dress reform, and certain principles that should be adopted; yet it was the physicians and others at the sanitarium, as shown above doubtless in collaboration with Mrs. White, who was then living in Battle Creek-who experimented, designed, modeled, and recommended it as a dress that conformed to health principles. She urged its adoption, as being consistent with the principles she had been shown.

At the time when the dress reform was agitated by Mrs. White, it was impossible to devise any sort of healthful costume that would not be so far from the prevailing fashions as to arouse ridicule from the devotees of fashion. In later years, when more healthful styles were adopted, Mrs. White expressed her pleasure that Christians could wear healthful and modest clothes without appearing singular. Mr. Canright says of the reform dress:

“It created a terrible commotion. Husbands swore, brothers refused to walk with their sisters, men sneered, and boys hooted.” Seventh-day Adventism Renounced, pp. 149, 150. Mrs. White, however, was not responsible for any trouble in families created by the reform dress for she distinctly cautioned her sisters against taking a course to which there was opposition on the part of their husbands:

“Sisters who have opposing husbands have asked my advice in regard to their adopting the short dress contrary to the wishes of the husband. I advised them to wait. . . The opposition which many might receive should they adopt, the dress reform, would be more injurious to health than the dress would be beneficial.” Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 522.

But not all husbands were, as Mr. Canright intimates, opposed to the new costume recommended by Mrs. White. Here is the testimony of one husband:

“The modesty of the short dress is not the smallest thing to be considered. Any one that has traveled as much as I have, can bear testimony with me to the immodesty of the hoop skirt. A lady with one on very seldom enters a carriage, omnibus, car, and such places, without immodestly exposing herself. But with the reform dress on, all exposure is entirely avoided. After seeing it worn, I think it is the most modest dress I have ever seen, and I am not alone in this opinion.” -Review and Herald, June 18, 1867.

This husband was D. M. Canright, who expressed this opinion before he severed himself from the Seventh day Adventists. And we have the most positive evidence that Mr. Canright, understood the difference between the American costume, which Mrs. White from the first condemned as immodest, and the reform dress which was adopted. In a report of a meeting, in which he set forth the advantages of the reform dress, he says, immediately after the paragraph just quoted: “Nearly all decided in favour of it, and others had but very slight objections to it. . . . The reform dress and the American costume are two very different things. All could readily see this.” Ibid.

In giving the history of the reform dress agitation, it should be recognized that good judgment was not always used by those who made the change. And no one more than Mrs. White deplored this fact. Thus she says: “In some places there is great opposition to the short dress. But when I see some dresses worn by the sisters, I do not wonder that people are disgusted, and condemn the dress. Where the dress is represented as it should be, all candid persons are constrained to admit that it is modest and convenient.” Testimonies, vol. 1, p. 521.

The reader who desires to judge for himself as to the good sense manifested in Mrs. White’s advocacy of a health reform dress, is referred to a chapter entitled “The Reform Dress,” in Testimonies for the Church, volume 1, pages 521-525.

Was Mrs. White Illiterate?

Was Mrs. White an illiterate fanatic as she is pictured by Mr. Canright? We answer: Ask anyone who has ever heard her speak or who has ever read her five large books in the Conflict of the Ages Series. Let any candid man or woman take up one of these volumes and read it through, and then answer the question. These books, while written in simple language, are elegant in style and profound in their teaching. They appeal to both the intellect and the heart. Preachers from other denominations have often quoted from her writings because of the richness of expression and clarity of thought found there. Is this the work of an illiterate fanatic? The question answers itself.

It is true that Mrs. White did not have the advantage of a college education; neither did Abraham Lincoln, nor Professor Butler, president of the University of Missouri, who stopped school at the age of thirteen, neither did James nor John nor Matthew. Were they therefore ignorant fanatics? If her scholastic attainments were meager, then all the greater glory attaches to God for the mighty work He accomplished through her. She was probably one of the best educated religious leaders of her day, not in technical, worldly wisdom, but in an understanding of the Scriptures. Like Apollos of Alexandria, she was “eloquent.... and mighty in the Scriptures.” Acts 18:24. The fact that she had been handicapped in her schooling and yet produced such marvelous volumes filled with truths so deep and sublime as to stir the very souls of untold thousands, is one of the strongest testimonies that can be borne to the fact that God was with her.

Of Jesus we are told that as He taught in the temple in Jerusalem, “the Jews marveled, saying, How knows this man letters, having never learned?” John 7:15.

There is an education that comes through personal study, close application, prayer, and meditation, that may far exceed that to be had in the schools of the world, and this is what Mrs. White had. And besides this, those who were best acquainted with her life and work, and who are the closest students of her teachings, have no hesitancy in saying that, through the gift of prophecy she had access to stores of divine knowledge that enabled her to flood the Scriptures with a light and radiance hitherto unseen since the papal apostasy of the Dark Ages all but obliterated Bible truth from the minds of men.

On one occasion the leading citizens of Battle Creek, Michigan, arranged a meeting for her to speak on some subject of her own choosing, and publicly invited her in the Daily Journal to do so on the occasion of her visit there after a camp meeting which she had attended in Grand Rapids. She complied, and spoke to a large congregation. This shows clearly whether she was considered a fanatic, or one unworthy to speak in any pulpit. The following report of the meeting appeared in the Battle Creek Journal of October 5, 1887:

“There was a good attendance, including a large number of our most prominent people, at the lecture of Mrs. Ellen G. White, at the Tabernacle, last evening.

“This lady gave her audience a most eloquent discourse, which was listened to with marked interest and attention. Her talk was interspersed with instructive facts which she had gathered in her recent visit to foreign lands, and demonstrated that this gifted lady has, in addition to her many other rare qualifications, a great faculty for attentive, careful observation, and a remarkable memory of details. This, together with her fine delivery and her faculty of clothing her ideas in choice, beautiful, and appropriate language, made her lecture one of the best that has ever been delivered by any lady in our city. That she may soon favor our community with another address, is the earnest wish of all who attended last evening; and should she do so, there will be a large attendance.” Quoted in Review and Herald, Oct. 11, 1877.

Years later, after Mr. Canright’s book was in circulation, in which he so shamefully maligned Mrs. White, branding her as a fanatic, a deceiver, an impostor, etc., this same man attended her funeral, and as he stood by her casket with his brother, B. J. Canright, with tears in his eyes he said, “There’s a noble woman gone.” This statement is attested to by his brother in writing. Mr. Canright was under no obligation of any kind to be present at the funeral of Mrs. White, much less to offer any eulogy of her life or character. In view of this, his spontaneous statement, “There’s a noble woman gone,” stands in striking contrast to the defamatory statements he made concerning her after he left the denomination, and which he published both before and after her death.

The Shut-Door Question

Mr. Canright launches a thrust against the Seventh day Adventists, and particularly against Mrs. E. G. White, because for some time after the disappointment of 1844 they believed in the “shut-door” theory, that is, that probation for sinners had closed.

Everybody acknowledges that the followers of William Miller believed Jesus was coming in 1844. And believing that, how could they have thought otherwise than that probation for the whole world would close at that time? That Mrs. White and her associates at one time believed thus we do not deny. Indeed, she herself frankly admits that fact. Prof. M. L. Andreasen, general field secretary of the General Conference, contributes under date of January 17, 1933, this word confirming the statement made by B. J. Canright:

‘I was one of the guards of honor when the body of Mrs. E. G. White lay in state in the Tabernacle in Battle Creek, Michigan, and was on duty at the time Mr. Canright approached the casket. I heard the above words uttered by Mr. D. M. Canright, and testify to their correctness. (Signed) “M. L. ANDREASEN.”

In the troubled period that immediately followed 1844, when they were endeavoring to understand the prophecies more fully in order to discover where their mistake was, various views were set forth by different leaders of the former Advent body. A full knowledge of God’s truth did not come in a day, nor even in a year. But gradually, as they continued to study the Bible, mistakes of interpretation were discovered. It was seen that while Christ’s coming is indeed near, “even at the doors,” the day and the hour of that coming are not revealed in the Scriptures, and that the task before them was a worldwide one of preaching that soon-coming Advent to “every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.”

Their view concerning those who could still be saved was broadened as God’s plan for these last days became clear to their minds. God did not see fit to make them incapable of any error in their early endeavors to learn what the Bible taught regarding the Advent. God has never seen fit to do that. The disciples of Christ had to pass through a period of sadly mistaken ideas regarding Christ’s first advent and the number who were to be afforded opportunity for salvation. They thought that Christ would set up His kingdom on the earth at that time. They held this view even after the resurrection, so wrongly had they interpreted the prophecies regarding the Savior. And when they began to preach the gospel they so definitely held that it was only for Israel that they took Peter to task for preaching to the Gentiles. Peter himself had gone to preach to them only after the Lord had specifically instructed him to go.

And when Peter related how the Holy Ghost had fallen upon the Gentiles, the apostles exclaimed with mingled surprise and joy, “Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.” Acts 11:18. According to the chronology in the margin of the Bible, this particular preaching by Peter occurred about eight years after the apostles began to proclaim the gospel message of a risen Christ! We may regret that they, the pioneers of the Christian religion, were so “slow of heart” to understand God’s purposes regarding the first advent of Christ and the founding of the Christian religion; we may even marvel that those men who had been tutored by Christ Himself for three years did not more quickly learn, yet we find in all this no reason for doubt as to the divine origin of Christianity or the divine guidance of the apostles. Then why should anyone attempt to frame a charge against the Second Advent Movement simply because the pioneers of that movement held at first a faulty and limited view of the Second Advent of Christ?

“But,” someone will say, “we will grant that no charge should be brought against the Seventh-day Adventist denomination because the pioneers in general held, for a time, the belief that their message was only for a limited number, and that the probation of the world at

large was closed. But Mr. Canright brings the more serious charge that Mrs. E. G. White, whom you declare had the prophetic gift, also believed and taught for a time those same faulty views regarding the close of probation. How do you answer this?"

We would answer by dividing the inquiry into two parts: First, did Mrs. White believe, in common with other pioneers, the faulty view of the Second Advent doctrine regarding the close of probation and the salvation of sinners? We answer, Yes, even as the apostles, whom God used to write much of the New Testament, held, for a time, faulty ideas regarding the first advent and the salvation of sinners; second, did Mrs. White, in those writings that she declared were revelations from God given in vision, set forth a wrong view of the close of probation, or the "shut door," as it was called? To this last question, which is the only one that has any proper bearing on the claim of divine leadership in the Seventh day Adventist movement, we answer emphatically, No.

Away back in 1874 Mrs. White wrote in a letter an answer to the very charge we are examining. The portion of her letter dealing with this matter is here reproduced: "BATTLE CREEK, MICH., Aug. 24, 1874.

"DEAR BRO. LOUGHBOROUGH:

"I hereby testify in the fear of God that the charges of Miles Grant, of Mrs. Burdick, and others published in the Crisis is not true. The statements in reference to my course in forty-four [1844] is false.

"With my brethren and sisters, after the time passed in forty-four I did believe no more sinners would be converted. But I never had a vision that no more sinners would be converted. And am clear and free to state no one has ever heard me say or has read from my pen statements which will justify them in the charges they have made against me upon this point.

"It was on my first journey east to relate my visions that the precious light in regard to the heavenly sanctuary was opened before me and I was shown the open and shut door. We believed that the Lord was soon to come in the clouds of heaven. I was shown that there was a great work to be done in the world for those who had not had the light and rejected it. Our brethren could not understand this with our faith in the immediate appearing of Christ. Some accused me of saying my Lord delays His coming, especially the fanatical ones. I saw that in '44 God had opened a door and no man could shut it and shut a door and no man could open it. Those who rejected the light which was brought to the world by the message of the second angel went into darkness, and how great was that darkness.

"I never have stated or written that the world was doomed or damned. I never have under any circumstances used this language to any one, however sinful. I have ever had messages of reproof for those who used these harsh expressions."

Turning to a more detailed statement concerning Mrs. White's teachings in the early days of the movement, we find these facts, as set forth by A. G. Daniells, who has made an exhaustive study of her writings:

"So far as I can learn from the documents in our possession, I have given the correct citation to everything that came from the pen of Mrs. White from 1844 to the close of 1851, and I have given every line of her statements regarding the shut door and the close of probation questions. Here is what we find:

"1 That during that period of six years there were printed in various forms twenty-five separate messages, articles, and letters from the pen of Mrs. E. G. White.

"2 That in only five articles or letters of this number is there any reference made to the shut door and the close of probation.

"3 That in not one of the five references to the shut door does Mrs. White state that the door of the second apartment of the sanctuary in which Christ ministers as High Priest or Mediator for a lost world, was closed in 1844. Nor does she once state that there was no salvation for any sinners after 1844.

"4 That in all that was printed from the pen of Mrs. White during the eight years - 1844 to 1851 we find three statements so worded that two different and conflicting interpretations can be placed upon them. But this is not to be counted as strange, for we find the same perplexity in certain passages of Scripture. The views here maintained make the statements harmonious with the general tenor of the messages of which they are parts, and with all the rest of her printed messages.

"The writer believes that any one who will study this subject impartially, with only the desire to arrive at the truth, must come to the conclusion that while the early Adventists - i.e., those who were disappointed in 1844 believed for a time that probation closed on the tenth day of the seventh month, and even if Mrs. E. G. White for a time shared personally this view in common with those with whom she associated, there is no evidence to show that she ever put it forth as revealed to her from the Lord. The statements relied upon by spine to show this, do not prove it. And it is certain that other things she wrote between 1844 and 1851 are entirely inconsistent with such a view."

We would call the reader's particular attention to the last sentence of this quotation. During the very years that she wrote certain statements which opponents have insisted must be understood as teaching a false view of probation, she also wrote certain other statements that are entirely inconsistent with this false view.

But to her opponents this can mean simply that her writings contain not only errors but contradictions. Yet those very opponents, in meeting the Bible skeptic's charge of errors and contradictions, would contend that if the skeptic was only willing to place another interpretation on certain Bible statements, the supposed errors would vanish and also the contradictions. And their contention would be just. On this very principle that a writer's statements should, if possible, be interpreted so as to be harmonious one with the other, we remove the majority of the so-called contradictions and difficulties of the Bible. And this principle is a sound one to employ, not simply on the Bible, but on any literary work. Is there any just reason why we should not invoke it in examining the writings of Mrs. White? When we do, the charges against her collapse.

www.CreationismOnline.com