

the devil. And yet the editor so acting was on the whole one of the best representatives of the movement.

Rev. Mr. McDonald and Dr. Lowery got into a controversy concerning *purity* and *maturity*. During its history, Rev. Mr. McDonald gave to the public a reputed history of Dr. Lowery, which, if true, tended greatly to compromise the Doctor's position in the controversy, and even his personal character. Dr. Lowery tells the public that, in answer to a private letter, the editor of the *Witness* acknowledged that he gave the story on second-hand evidence. But Mr. McDonald neither withdraws the story nor apologizes for thus misrepresenting his opponent before the public.

But notice, no protest comes from any members of the National Holiness Association, of which he is President. Seemingly, it is conceded by them that a man may be a representative man in this movement, and yet drive a coach and four through the laws of honourable dealing with an opponent.

The ex-editor of *The African News* starts another magazine under the name of *The African*. The editor of the *Witness*, after he undertakes the publication of the original paper, accuses Dr. Welch, the editor of *The African*, of wrongdoing in connection with the matter. The doctor replies, and apparently succeeds in completely proving all the allegations hurled against him to be incorrect. But there is no word of reply, no effort to back up damaging accusations, or to take them back with apology if incorrect. And concerning this transaction, there is no word of rebuke from members of the Holiness Association.

Need we allude to the personal attacks from the same *Christian Witness* upon ourself, in which we were alluded to by name, and our work and its results caricatured and misrepresented in many directions, and then its columns hermetically sealed against all reply. Again and again, have we, as every fresh attack against us has appeared in its columns, sent replies, but all have been refused.

And all this was done in the face of the fact that, at the beginning of his career, the editor, with the late Rev. J. S. Inship, Rev. J. E. Pepper, and others,

entered into a solemn compact with God and one another, never, in their writings, to criticise others by name.

However, it is not to single out individuals for criticism that we thus write, but to show that when the representative men in this modern holiness movement publicly exhibit defective Christian character, without rebuke from the members of the movement, the whole work which they therefore correctly represent must have something radically defective in itself; and this is what we set out to show. Both by precept and example the modern holiness movement fails to show how to keep converted.

But lest the reader should think that whilst bringing out plainly this fact we are striving to disparage this great movement, we hasten to disabuse the mind of such thought. Personally, we entertain a very great appreciation of the movement itself and the work accomplished by it. What that work really is we will show further on.

THE TRUE METHOD.

In our first article we showed that the New Testament Scriptures *seem*, at least, to teach that one might be converted and continue so by the year. But our after investigations prove that the method by which this is accomplished is a *lost art* in all the churches, including, we may add, such *ex cathedra* movements as the holiness movement, come-outism, holiness churches and the Salvation Army. Hence, as we return to the Bible to learn, "how to keep converted," it must be with the understanding that if we discover it there, it will be some process unknown, or at least not practised, in said organizations.

But so startling is this conclusion that it seems but right to still further delay and get accustomed to its meaning. Does it mean, one asks, in undisguised surprise, that during all these centuries since the times of the apostles that no representative individuals have discovered and exemplified the true method of living a converted life by the year? That is exactly what it implies. But such a conclusion, he adds, is all but in-