

IV.—EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

The Danger of Excess in "Charity."

The editors of this REVIEW, mindful of the fact that it is not simply a record of current intelligence, but a *review*, in which large liberty of discussion upon topics germane to missions is allowable, have been as tolerant as possible of opinions which were not accordant with their own. An editor of a review cannot without arbitrary and often discourteous treatment of a contributor remodel another's paper to suit his own habits of thought, and must either reject a contribution altogether or else allow the writer's individuality to have free play. Accordingly the Editor-in-Chief has been wont to admit to these pages articles not entirely in accord with his own sentiments, disclaiming responsibility for the writer's opinions.

During the absence of the Editor-in-Chief in Great Britain, a few articles have found their way into these pages which he could not have admitted had he been acquainted with their contents before they appeared in print; inasmuch as, with all his disclaimers of responsibility for such opinions, the general reader will construe their publication in the REVIEW as equivalent to the sanction of the views they propagate; and no affront is intended to any who have furnished papers for these pages in the present statement that in future the editor will be compelled to decline even a *solicited* article when the sentiments therein expressed seem to him at variance with the teachings of Scripture. And he would have all contributors to understand that such will be the attitude of the REVIEW in future, so long as the present Editor-in-Chief remains in charge of these pages. The utmost charity cannot justify the admission into these pages of any opinions, however sincerely held, which in his judgment contravene the teachings or spirit of the old Gospel. "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." And while having no de-

sire to repress freedom of either opinion or utterance, it is certainly within our province to determine within what limits such freedom shall be exercised in this REVIEW.

That many of our readers sympathize with the editor in this position may be seen from the accompanying protest of one of our most valued friends, son-in-law of George Müller, who writes to the Editor-in-Chief disapproving the "principle, adopted by the editors, of admitting papers of the most opposed teachings, upon *rital* points of Christian doctrine. Instances of this have much increased," he adds, "during the last two years. As an illustration of my meaning, I refer you to the paper on 'The Probable Future of Buddhism,' in the May number, pp. 354-59, which propounds the following opinions, among others, viz.:

"(a) That every religion is inspired of God. (b) That 'man *craves* an incarnate God.' (c) Christ could not come any sooner than He did, *for* the world could not have understood His doctrines any sooner (which can only mean that, in the writer's opinion, when He did come the world *was* able to understand His doctrines). (d) That God has chosen the *Anglo-Saxons* to be the world's religious teachers. That the time when *they* shall possess the whole world seems not very distant—that *they* are fitted to undertake this difficult task to-day. (e) That Judaism was preparatory to Christianity, so likewise are Hinduism, Islamism, Buddhism!!! (f) That 'Gautama' was one of God's saints! (g) That Buddhism will powerfully contribute toward the fulfilment of such passages as Isa. 11 : 8-10 and Rom. 8 : 19-22!!! (h) That 'It was *only* to *Avah* (Gen. 60 : 3, 4) that God gave distinct permission to eat of animal food'!!! (i) That the human race is engaged in a '*mighty endeavor* to know its Creator'!!!

"It is not needful, for my present purpose, to show that every one of these