

brethren, could only see in the editorial referred to, "exaggerations, misrepresentations, untruths," &c.; and some of them, very soon after its publication, rushed in hot haste to the office to order their paper to be stopped. Indeed, they have manifested a spirit of vindictiveness in the matter, utterly at variance with their loud professions of Christian love and liberality.

You go on to say,—“but we detest a criticism mainly composed of exaggerations, untruths, misrepresentations and vile sarcasms against the unpretending simplicity of babes in Christ, and although we speak by permission we must speak plainly.”

This is a very easy, convenient, and summary way, truly, of disposing of obstinate and disagreeable facts!!!

I have solemnly declared, *under oath*, that the statements made by me in the "*People's Press*," anent your Camp-meeting, are true. You assert that they are mainly composed of exaggerations, untruths, &c. Now, if what you say be true, then I have sworn falsely, and hundreds more are guilty of the most shameless lying; for hundreds, on reading my letters, have declared, and do declare, that the statements I have put before the public, are as true as the Gospel.

But what is my oath—what the testimony of five hundred credible witnesses—when weighed against the simple *ipse dixit* of the Rev. J. Draper, Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church?—a grain of sand against a mountain!

I do not know that I ever met with a specimen of lying, so cool and impudent as this. Desperate diseases, however, require desperate remedies: you felt that you had a bad case in hand, and that your only hope of relief lay in bold and shameless mendacity.

If, Mr. D., your cranium were subjected to a phrenological examination, you would be found singularly defective in the regions of Caution and Conscientiousness. No man with a grain of caution about him, would have ventured to have made the statements you have made in your letter. You lay yourself open to attack at every point. It requires neither learning nor ability to expose the weakness of your arguments, and your total inability to reason correctly on any subject. I do not blame you for this inability, however: what God has not given, God does not require. What I do blame you for, is your total want of moral honesty—your glaring lack of conscientiousness. Unable to *reason* down your opponent, you attempt to *lie* him down. People, outside the circle of your adherents, are astonished at your audacity. I met a person the other day, who had attended the Camp-meeting, and who was anxious to see your letter. He asked me what you had said. When I told him that you had asserted that my statements "were mainly composed of exaggerations and untruths,"—"Oh," he replied, with a look of incredulity and astonishment, "he doesn't say that, surely; how can he? why, there are hundreds who saw and heard everything you have related." No, Mr. D., you may continue to write letters until doomsday, but you will fail to convince one unbiassed mind that I have made a single false statement.

You take very great care, in your pretended review of my letters, to avoid particularizing. You don't tell your readers how many of my statements are false, and how many are true. It would not have suited your purpose to take up my arguments and statements in detail. This course would have opened the eyes even of your own dupes. You have taken a shorter and easier way—you *lump* them, label them "exaggerations, untruths, misrepresentations, sarcasms," and then pitch them overboard!

May I ask, Mr. D., what you mean by the "unpretending simplicity of babes in Christ?" Do the shoutings, laughing, whistling, stamping with the feet, &c., at the Camp-meeting, constitute this "unpretending simplicity?" Who are the babes you refer to? Do you include yourself in this category? If you don't, I fear a great many people will be wicked enough to do it for you.

You gravely tell your readers—

"We wish not to use words of disrespect toward any, and yet it is difficult, in coming in contact with utter disrespect itself, to treat it in a manner steadily respectful; to attempt it is like casting pearls before swine."

I sympathize with you, friend D., in the difficulty you feel in treating in a manner "steadily respectful" a person who has been guilty of the crimes, with which you charge "Spectator." I feel a similar difficulty with regard to yourself. When I had read your five columns of "symphonious confusion" and "babbling," I felt strongly tempted, in my reply, to follow Solomon's advice—"Answer a fool according to his folly;" and you will excuse me if I occasionally do so.

In the next paragraph, you allow that Camp-meetings may be, and sometimes are, the occasion of serious evils; "but shall they," you ask, "on this account be discontinued? If so, then, by the same rule, political mass-meetings, &c., must be given up."

If, Mr. D., religious meetings or political meetings become a public nuisance, they ought