

ligible at present, but the latter part is supposed to reflect the pantheistic philosophy of the early ages.

The sixth saying reads:

No prophet is accepted in his own country; neither doth the physician work upon them that know him.

From the fact that the manuscript here uses the word "dektos" for "accepted," and that Luke alone of the evangelists employs the same word in this passage, it is argued that Luke probably had access to the same documents as the collector of these sayings.

The seventh saying is incomplete and the eighth is undecipherable.

It is evident that the new document is not destined to play any role in determining Christian doctrine. Nor is it likely that any other early writings that may be found will ever change the faith that is founded on the accepted Scriptures. New documentary evidence will, if authentic, corroborate what has already been thoroughly tested and pronounced genuine. As for the further completion of the system of faith and the development of the Church, continual revelation is the divinely appointed means to be relied on, in accordance with the promise of the ever-present Spirit whose office it is to guide into all truth.

THREAT OF SPAIN AND JAPAN.

A London despatch of July 15th asserts that from the American embassy in Paris there has been elicited a confirmation of the rumor that the governments of Spain and Japan have arranged an offensive alliance against the United States, the terms of the understanding, which is for the protection of Cuba and Hawaii, providing that in the event of an active, aggressive movement on the part of the United States tending toward interference in Cuban affairs or persistence in the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, both Spain and Japan shall declare war simultaneously against the United States and shall make hostile demonstrations along both the Atlantic and Pacific coast lines of that country. It is also stated from Washington that nothing is known of the alleged alliance, and that the rumor of its having been perfected is not credited.

Speaking seriously, however, such a combination between Spain and Japan is not at all improbable and certainly would be an arrangement of very grave influence upon the policy of this country. Spain is sufficiently angry and desperate to enter into such an alliance with eagerness. Japan, too, evinces a decided inclination in that direction, and thereby manifests a clear determination to annex the Hawaiian Islands if this government does not prevent it. The cold proposition, then, now is, either the United States must take and hold the Hawaiian Islands, or Japan will do so. And if the latter is permitted, an alliance between Spain and Japan would become an infinitely greater menace toward this nation than it would be with Hawaii in the possession of this country.

There is no denying the fact that the union of these two second class powers under such conditions as are

named would make a serious problem for this country. Their naval power would harass and destroy, and a long time would elapse before this government could get ready to cope with them on the ocean. If there were no war, the constant menace would be galling to American interests, and would be an irritation which Americans could not long tolerate. Therefore the situation of an offensive alliance between Spain and Japan, with the latter in possession of Hawaii and the former in control of Cuba, cannot be permitted with safety to the United States.

What to do, is now a question for American diplomacy and statesmanship. Whether or not the alliance has been made, the danger that is imminent is pointed out. There are two ways to meet it. One is the complete breakdown of the administration on the Hawaiian matter and the cringing to any policy the Spanish may inaugurate towards Americans in Cuba. Will the United States consent to that? The other, and only alternative is to make a dash for Hawaii, and occupy it so that, whatever Japan and Spain might do on the seas, the former never could secure the islands. The United States has no navy to compete with the powers named, but it has the full ability to occupy the Hawaiian Islands so that Japan's struggle therefor would be hopeless. As to Cuba, this government has no desire to possess the island, at least to the extent of making any decided movement in that direction.

In any event, what is done must be done quickly. Whatever dallying may have marked American diplomacy in the past, when the time for action has come, this government has been bold, prompt and decisive. Will the present administration vary the record? The suggestion of the Spain-Japan alliance is the most cogent reason yet presented for the immediate annexation of Hawaii, and cannot be easily set aside, since it affects national safety in the most conservative and dignified policy. The situation is a decidedly interesting, almost critical, one for the United States, where promptness, pluck and patriotism are needed to secure a result satisfactory to the American people.

GIVE THE LAW A CHANCE.

Another case of lynching is added to the long list of barbarities practiced in certain sections of the country. Probably the published reports discreetly conceal some of the most revolting details of the killing, but the statements made give evidence of the savage fury in which the act was committed. The culprit was tied to a tree and tortured until life was extinct; then the corpse was filled with lead and finally burned until only the charred remains were left.

No doubt the wretch richly deserved his fate. The worst punishment the ingenuity of a frenzied mob can suggest would alter all be but inadequate. His crime was atrocious and revolting in the extreme. But the very serious question is whether such outbursts of popular rage, when not seeking the legitimate channel,

are not just as injurious to the community as the evils they ostensibly seek to correct. It cannot be denied that the problem is a serious one, but the fact must not be lost sight of that, according to all historical evidence, the frequent taking of human life does not act as a deterrent to crime, as effectively as many people seem to think. When the death penalty was affixed to a multitude of offenses, crime flourished as luxuriantly as ever. Theft was just as common when the illegal appropriation of five shillings' worth of goods was enough to send a man or a woman to the gallows. It has been asserted that excessive punishments rather stimulate crime, and the same is evidently true of the indulgence in revenge without legal process, and of discrimination in the administration of justice.

In the South it has come to this that at a conference of lawyers in Georgia, the majority of the members present expressed themselves in favor of mob law. The sentiment was that "a certain class of crimes cannot be suppressed by legislation." There is so far certainly no evidence that it can be suppressed by lynchings, and the only way to test the efficiency of legislation would be to stop the lawless methods for a reasonable length of time at least and give civilized laws in the hands of the proper authorities a fair chance to demonstrate their power for good. It is begging the question to talk of the inefficiency of the law as long as it is repeatedly set aside by the mob. It is laying the foundation for revolution to permit angry crowds to usurp the authority of the courts.

"CHRONICLE" AND POLYGAMY IN UTAH.

The San Francisco Chronicle evidently has two editorial writers who are given to discussing Utah, one being eminently fair while the other is given to telling much that neither he nor any one else knows; or if there be but one writer his changing moods would be the envy of a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde mind. A few days ago the News took pleasure in calling attention to an editorial of the fair-minded class. Now it regrets the necessity for directing notice to one of the other kind. In its issue of June 14 the Chronicle, referring to an assertion it had made previously that there was no statutory provision in this State to enforce the constitutional provision against polygamy, which assertion, with a number of other statements, had been characterized by the Oden Standard as untrue, reiterates the charge of "the neglect or refusal of the Mormons to make polygamy punishable," and adds:

If the Saints are acting in good faith with the government, why have they not given the breath of life to the constitutional provision which they adopted as a means of inducing Congress to grant them statehood? There is now no law against plural marriages in Utah, and nineteen Mormons out of twenty contend that polygamy is scriptural and right. Under such circumstances how long would it probably be if the Federal government did not intervene to punish them for breach of contract in the way we have pointed out, before