

shape the fate of the covenant people in accordance with His plans and purposes.

This narrative may, or may not, be authentic. It is in perfect harmony, though, with the brief historical statement of St. John (Chap. 8: 15): "When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain, Himself alone." It also agrees with the public course of our Lord, who, although conscious of the fact that His mission was to obtain as His inheritance not only Palestine but the whole earth (Psalm 2), yet knew that the means to this end were not of a revolutionary nature, but the contrary. "Blessed are the meek," He said, "for they shall inherit the earth."

But although Jesus declined to join bands with the conspirators of His age, He inaugurated a movement that has revolutionized the world in almost every respect. He declared the supremacy of the Almighty by announcing the principle that the first commandment of all is that which requires undivided devotion to Him. Christianity as explained by our Lord's followers, is built upon this principle. In the epistle to the Romans, the duties of the followers of Jesus, individually, socially, as Church members and as subjects of civil governments, are all set forth. The first is to love, reverence and submit to the Almighty; to imitate His perfections and qualities, and then devote the gifts and graces thus acquired to the unselfish service of our fellowmen. And this distinctively Christian doctrine is sound and philosophical. Everybody owes to his fellow-men justice in all things and to respect their liberty, their rights, their property and their character. But nobody is capable of doing justice in these respects, unless he himself is humble, unselfish and pure, and these qualities can be obtained in no other way than through the regenerating influence of the sincere service of God.

Christ's relation to His time was therefore this: He opposed the revolutionary tendencies which He knew would lead to destruction, but He originated a moral revolution, that finally will bring the whole human race peace and happiness through submission to the divine will. And on this platform His followers have always stood, and will stand until Jesus shall have been established King upon the holy hill of Zion.

THE "NEWS" AND MR. THATCHER.

Both the morning dailies in this city today (Monday) contain a letter from Mr. Moses Thatcher, criticizing the News because this Journal, in its daily issue of Friday last, took up the gentleman's prediction, made in a speech before a public body, that "the day must come in Utah when he who holds a higher allegiance than that which belongs to the State must not be a lawmaker in the State," and we showed that his position was violative of the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the national Constitution, and by such great men as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson

and Andrew Jackson, wherein is recognized the fact that in this nation there is understood and upheld a higher allegiance than that which belongs to the state, namely to the God of the universe. In the recognition of this fact is the guarantee to religious liberty in this land.

Now the gentleman claims that in our remarks we had resort to "special pleading, sophistry and misrepresentation." We must admit that the gentleman takes the palm for anything of that nature yet presented. The proof is in a comparison of the News article and the letter; the article was a direct exposure of the fallacy of his prophecy about higher allegiance other than that "which belongs to the state;" the letter is an adroitly worded evasion of the point under discussion, as barefaced an illustration of "special pleading, sophistry and misrepresentation" as is often seen. The point of the whole thing is that Mr. Thatcher was coerced in the position he took, and, in order to fool the public, resorted to "special pleading, sophistry and misrepresentation." The public would have thought much better of him if he had been like a man and stood up for his position, or finding it inconsistent and untenable, had withdrawn therefrom.

In the first place he says that the sentence we quoted did not convey the meaning carried in the whole paragraph. The meaning which the News took was the point of higher allegiance. The whole paragraph conveys no other meaning; and there is no prediction outside of the sentence quoted. It was the gist of the whole thing. But he says "it has no meaning other than that which is expressed in the accompanying phraseology." Was I to have it no meaning in its own phraseology? Will a man of honor and sense claim that for his own language? But here it is, as he said it should be with it meaning injected between brackets:

The day must come in Utah when he who (being an officer in the State) holds a higher allegiance [to the chiefs of any alien or church organization] than that which [under his solemn oath] belongs to the State, must not be a lawmaker in the halls of the State.

That does not help his case in the least; for if God be the chief of any organization which the gentleman may call "alien," still the Supreme Being is entitled to the higher allegiance, and such allegiance is not incompatible with the obligations of the citizen, or a cause to turn out the citizen from the "halls of the State." The simple question in this whole business is whether man has a right to hold his allegiance to Deity above that to anything formed by man. We insist that he has that constitutional, inalienable right. The News neither misunderstood nor misrepresented. Its readers were not misled; they knew exactly what was meant. The gentleman's specious denial of the right of God to claim the highest allegiance of man was exposed; that is all there is to his complaint.

There is another fallacious idea which the gentleman presents in his letter. He says that church and state are co-ordinate. That is true under certain conditions only. If the church

be organized, officered and directed by God, and the state be the same, they might be classed as co-ordinate in a certain sense, being under the same immediate direction; or if both church and state have their origin and power in men, they are "co-ordinate" in their source. But if the church be of God, and the state of man, although allowed by Deity and thus ordained of Him, yet He being given no voice in its government so far as men's views are concerned, then they are not co-ordinate. There is a Supreme Governor of the world, but co-ordinate powers presiding over each country. In the inferior sense the government of Great Britain was ordained of God. But the American revolution was not an act of treason against Him, though it was so denominated against the king. But if the government had been ruled directly by the Almighty in the administration of affairs, rebellion would have been treason against Him. Rebellion in His Church is treason against Him, but in churches not His, it is not. There is now no direct government by the Almighty in the affairs of state, through officers appointed by divine ordination, hence there is no co-ordinate relation between His Church and the governments of man, be they monarchical or republican; and the very fact that there is no such divinely directed government says that His Church is not authorized in its capacity to conduct such a government. But Church members have a right to participate in a government according to the regulations of the latter; and if the state or any individual attacks the Church it has the right of self defense.

Mr. Thatcher says a "struggle for freedom, for liberty," etc., is now inaugurated in Utah. Who is struggling? Who are the contending parties? Is he one, and who is he fighting? Is it the Church? And if so, has not the Church the right to defend itself? The Church has touched the liberty of no man. It has defined the rules of discipline of its members. If any do not choose to abide those rules they know how to be released from obligations thereto. Does the gentleman say that because a recalcitrant Church officer has been dismissed from his position that the State must take up his side of the struggle and interfere to overthrow the discipline of the Church? Does he say that dismissal for cause from a Church position, or from membership, is such an infliction of pains and penalties that he can call upon the State to "carry its protection beyond the field of argument into the domain of action?"

The gentleman refers to Utah continuing "redeemed from a thralldom as obvious as that of African slavery or Russian serfdom." If Utah has been redeemed from such "thralldom" and "serfdom," when did those conditions exist? Was it during the thirty years from 1847 to 1877 when the gentleman, so far as the public knew, was doing all in his power to uphold the Church of which he was then an honored member; or was it during the decade which followed when he was one of the chief officers of that Church? Was it Brigham Young, or John Taylor, or Wilford Woodruff, or the Twelve Apostles,