

## CHRISTIAN DISUNION.

THE subject of sectarianism, or the division of Christendom into a multitude of contending sects is being discussed in many quarters. The evil of it is being better appreciated than has been common in the past. Efforts to establish Christian unity are numerous, but any practical success cannot yet be chronicled. In the *Homiletic Review* for March, Bishop A. Cleveland Cox, of the Episcopal Church, has an article on this question from which we make the annexed extracts:

"What is Christianity doing, with its immense resources and gigantic energies, to stay this plague of national decline? Alas! Christianity itself is paralyzed by sectarian divisions and by the spirit that cherishes them, repugnant as it is to the precepts of its Divine Author. Christ never authorized a divided household, nor the dissolution of what he gave us 'fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth.' Where is any promise of triumph over the world save only to the Church in its unity and integrity? Yet these divisions are kept up not only where cardinal principles are involved; they are supported by wasteful expenditure, and even by plausible argument among those who proclaim that they differ only in 'non-essentials.' If so, why differ at all, at the sacrifice of that essential unity which is a primary precept of the Gospel? Can a thoughtful Christian delight in a popular Christianity 'which shape has none, distinguishable in member, joint or limb?' Compared with the Church in its martyr ages, we are all as dead men; our habitation is a valley of dry bones. 'Come from the four winds, O Spirit, and breath upon these slain.' \* \* \*

"I hold that the first thing is the spirit to deplore and hate sectarian divisions; and further, I hold that when this spirit turns into general prayer and supplication, the Holy Spirit is able to do the rest, and to realize the Mediator's will, 'that they all may be one.' Essentially one, be it observed. Not sentimentally so, but practically, vitally, essentially; after the highest pattern in the universe, the essential unity of the holy and undivided Trinity. Mere compromises fall short of the mark, and effect nothing but failure and consequent discouragement. Of this one may find an example and a warning in the well-meant effort of Frederick William III to establish a united Protestantism in Prussia. It was entirely based on compromise, and has satisfied nobody. The unity of mere compromise aims to settle everything by alliance, and to draw up schemes for ratification by protocol and treaty. They must always prove abortive. Not such is the 'way of God.' Convinced of this, profoundly convinced that there must be root-principles to organic unity, out of which it grows and is 'not strained,' the bishops of our Anglican communion have set forth, for the consideration of their fellow-Christians, not their own views of the root-principles, but the views of the ancient Church Catholic of Christ. Such were the principles cherished by all when the Church was indeed 'at unity with itself,' and which were never forfeited till the Roman pontiff prescribed another and a novel criterion, by force of which the Latins soon severed themselves from the grand root and trunk of Christendom, the maternal churches of the East; the churches amid which the last of the Apostles lingered, till they had all received the joints and bands of unity, and a universal polity which provided 'that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care one for another.'"

This is vastly different from that sort of argument which apologizes for disunion and goes so far as to maintain that it is a benefit instead of an evil. The remedy for this disunion can only come from those "root principles" from which sprang the primitive Christian Church, and can only be effective among those who sincerely desire the truth in preference to private views and personal interests. And while men, however learned and however pious, seek for those "root principles" in the mold of earthly systems they will fail to grasp what they need.

The ancient Church of Christ having long since disappeared, it is only by a restoration of it in its original form and spirit, that a basis for true Christianity can be laid. That restoration must come from a divine instead of a human source. But as long as the ministers and members of the modern churches refuse to believe in present revelation and will reject anything that claims to have come from God in the nineteenth century, the evils complained of will continue and increase and modern Christendom will remain a modern Babel.

## NOT VERY CHRISTIAN.

THE Rev. Amos Judson Bailey, Congregationalist clergyman, of Ogden, has taken the *Christian Cynosure* to task because of incorrect and unjustifiable comments made by that religious journal with reference to the "Faulkner Home Rule Bill." Following is an excerpt from Mr. Bailey's communication:

"In the *Cynosure* of February 18, on the first page, is a short reference to Utah affairs, the first sentence of which is: 'Mormonism, afraid of defeat in its secret longing for supremacy, and anxious to perpetuate its peculiar dogmas and practices untrammelled by the restrictions of statehood, is now endeavoring to obtain, through Congress a species of 'home rule' that shall give it independent powers in its civil and religious government.'"

"The 'home-rule' scheme for Utah is Democratic rather than Mormon. The man who drafted the bill, and to whom all agree belongs the honor, if such it be, of that plan of legislation for Utah, never was a Mormon. He was once a member of the Idaho legislature, and one of the foremost men to push through the Idaho 'test oath,' by which all Mormons in that State were disfranchised. When he came here he put himself at the head of the Liberal party, and was one of the political managers who secured for Ogden the first anti-Mormon municipal government. He has always been known as an anti-Mormon, and his law partner is often called 'a Mormon-eater.' But this plan was a Democratic scheme to push through Congress legislation which might give a limited statehood, because there was no hope of getting statehood, and they referred half a loaf to no bread. This measure is engineered by the Democrats, and opposed by the Liberals."

The *Cynosure*, instead of standing corrected upon this subject, challenges the truthfulness of the statements of its own correspondent. Its discourtesy to the gentleman is in no way disguised by the following remark:

"With all due respect for the opinions of our esteemed correspondent in Utah, whose letter we print on page 6 of this issue, there is evidently more Mormonism in the proposed 'Home Rule' for that Territory than he is disposed to admit."

It will be observed that the assertions of Mr. Bailey are not given as matters of opinion. What he says is given as a matter of fact. It is insultingly implied that he is covering up the existence of "Mormonism" in home rule for the Territory. This amounts to an accusation of deceit. Besides the intimation being exceeding un-Christian it is conspicuously absurd. What interest could Mr. Bailey have in misrepresenting such a matter in favor of Mormonism, in which he is an unbeliever, and to which, even according to the full text of his letter to *Cynosure*, he is opposed?

The position taken and insisted on by the *Christian Cynosure* is based on an article which appeared in the *Christian Standard*, from the pen of R. F. Clay. The remarks reflecting on Mr. Bailey's veracity and sincerity states that Mr. Clay gives "an apparently truthful version of the political situation in Utah." This apparent truthfulness is evidently due to the fact that the gentleman whose article is approved goes out of his way to attack the sincerity and motives of the "Mormons." That is the kind of pabulum, which the *Cynosure* wishes to feed the public upon; hence its apparent truthfulness. If the positions had been reversed and Mr. Clay had been the writer who told the truth about the "Home Rule" measure, and Mr. Bailey had said it was a mere "Mormon" scheme to gain political control of Utah, then, in the eyes of the *Cynosure* the latter gentleman's statement would have borne the stamp of truth and Mr. Clay would have been the objective point of insinuations of untruthfulness and hypocrisy. It is what it wants to be true on this question, not what is true, that the *Cynosure* endorses.

It is needless for us to reiterate the truth that even the "Liberal" anti-"Mormons" have repeatedly asserted the fact that the "Mormons" had nothing whatever to do with the framing or production of the "Home Rule Bill." It was, as is well understood here, the work of Democrats who favored the division of the people of Utah on national party lines and who were at one time in the ranks of the "Liberal" party.

## ARID LANDS BILL IN CONGRESS.

A BILL for the reclamation of the arid lands of the United States was introduced by Hon. S. W. T. Lanham of Texas in the House of Representatives and referred to the committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands. That committee agreed to report favorably on the bill (H. R. 6790), so that it will be placed on its passage. The text of it is as follows:

"Whereas the proper irrigation and reclamation of that portion of the public domain of the United States known as the arid regions, and lying west of the ninety-seventh meridian of longitude, present many difficult questions relating to the location and demarkation of catchment areas and basins, the construction of reservoirs for the storing of storm and other waters, and the equitable distribution to the greatest advantage of such waters for agricultural purposes, which difficulties can only be surmounted by laws, rules, and regulations made by those who are best acquainted with and