

those questions and arguments which agitated the religious and irreligious community in their days.

These are some of our facts. Who then can say he is an imitator of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises, and yet is unwilling to give his hearers and readers both sides of all questions! Brethren and friends, can you inform us why it is that nearly all the religious publications of the different denominations endeavour to keep the people ignorant of every thing beyond the pale of their communion? It is said they hate controversy! *Hate controversy!!* Those who frame this excuse are, generally, persons who have the most to say in defence of their own systems, and against others, in the absence of their opponents. And those the most loud against supposed heresy, are the most unwilling to give both sides of a controversy. Again, we ask why is it so? Are opposers of the truth worse than Satan? for the Lord permitted him to exhibit his arguments; or are modern religious publications more immaculate than God's divine word? Ah! brethren and friends, these are not the causes! A conscious weakness—a fear that the system will not stand the test of rational and scriptural investigation. “Our churches will be divided, our readers will be displeased, or the public will be distracted,” is the cry of some. Churches not built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets ought to be divided—the sooner the better. If readers are not pleased with the truth, we cannot help it; they shall have the other side; they can then prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. Those whose minds are not settled on the truth *should* be distracted and perplexed, until they can settle down into the pure air of the Gospel. He who endeavors to please churches and individuals, and is ever fearful of disturbing the mind of some fastidious sou', will do but little towards advancing the truth as it is in Jesus. We, therefore, friends and brethren, shall endeavor to please our Master—to imitate him. Intentionally, we shall not seek to displease any person living—much less any sincere seeker of truth and righteousness. But from laying down the sword of the spirit, covering over any error, or seeking to please men by keeping back unpalatable truths, we pray God to preserve us.

Friends, we may rest assured that, where churches or individuals get enraged, and exhibit much unholy opposition, by endeavoring to traduce and calumniate those who are endeavoring to introduce reform among them, they are in a deplorable condition. Such a state of things would bring on a prostration of the mental energies of the disciple of Christ; and soon (in the words of Dr. Clarke), “Mother Church would assume her ascendancy, and feed us with latin masses and wafer gods.”

What we mean by fair open discussion, is not personal recrimination, nor an effort to see who can say the most, have the last word, or can write the most sarcastic; but calmly and honestly admitting all you can of an opponent's theory, and the remainder stating your reasons for rejecting, and leave the conclusions to be drawn by the reader. The superiority of this mode of procedure cannot be better illustrated than the following narrative of facts:

Some time previous to 1820, the celebrated ROBERT OWEN, Esq., of