

ONE SIDED STATEMENTS.

The following letter was refused insertion in the *Guardian*. One sided statements is all they apparently wish their readers to see.—H.D.

To the Editor of the *Guardian*.:—

AS YOU in a leading editorial in to-day's *Guardian* use extracts from articles written by me to condemn the editor of the EXPOSITOR OF HOLINESS for "erroneous published teaching," permit me the use of your columns to say a few words by way of defence.

All that I called in question in said articles was the "immaculate conception" of Christ. Are you prepared to stake your hope for eternity on the immaculate conception being the pillar that both Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity hold and have held it to be? Because I question the immaculate conception must I be read out of Christendom? Because Mr. Burns fearlessly publishes what I have to say regarding this matter, must his magazine become a foot ball to be kicked by denominational publishing houses at their pleasure?

You charge me with attacking the character of Christ and quote four extracts in proof thereof. In the first extract our statement summarized is that the divinity of the man Christ Jesus may depend upon the Holy Ghost "coming upon Him" at His baptism instead of, as generally believed at His birth.

The second extract simply emphasizes a scriptural statement that "As He is so are we in this world." In third extract which you quote I say that "in the sense that He did the will of the Father He was Divine and in no other." This is simply reiterating my repudiation of the immaculate conception. And in the fourth as to His "having no divinity that you and I cannot possess," I make Jesus what the Scriptures make Him, viz., the first born among many brethren. In what way do these four extracts affect the "character of Jesus Christ?" I affirm His character was faultless during the three years of His

ministry. He did the will of the Father.

Let me give you another extract or two from the same articles. "He was the first man who discovered the secret of how to do the will of God continuously." "We believe Jesus was the first man who fought out to the end the spiritual conflict without flinching." "There is a divinity attributed to Jesus that is full of mysticism." "We believe Jesus had for His spiritual Father the Holy Ghost." "He was born of the Spirit." "Jesus' brethren must be conformed to the image of God's Son, the complete image, just what that image was on earth, no imaginary image, no unreality, no creedist's idealistic myth." "Conformed to be one with God, even as Jesus and the Father are one, one in aim, one in desire, one in thought, one in action, not one in substance." I further said "it will be in order for dogmatic theologians of a past and present age to give their pronouncements as to what constitutes the difference between the divinity of Christ and the Holy Ghost. We went on to question if it was not possible that the immaculate conception may have been an error. We question the possibility of the writers of the New Testament interpolating the heathenish idea that all Gods must be immaculately conceived. I stated that it was as easy for tradition to creep into the New Testament as error into our secular histories. I know this is severe on verbal inspiration. I further stated that the misty gauzy thing called Christ's Divinity of birth was used as another of the many substitutes for the Holy Ghost.

And here let me correct the erroneous impression you seek to create when you state I am a Unitarian. Unitarians as their name implies, believe only in one person in the Godhead. I believe in the personality of the Holy Ghost, co-equal with and omnipotent as the Father, and I place no limit upon the omnipotence of the "man Christ Jesus." When Jesus says "I and the Father are one," I believe this statement, not possibly as you may be-