

and rebuilt, the mere finding of ruins fifty or sixty feet below the present surface does not prove the age of those ruins to be 10,000 years or more. Geologists who find evidences of vegetation at a similar depth in places where only the generally slowly and silently-working natural forces have covered them up, may conclude that ages were necessary for that result. But where there are evidences of great revolutions in nature, that reasoning no longer holds good. Archaeologists generally work on sites where the events of a day or a week may have brought about results for the accomplishment of which ages would seem to be necessary under ordinary circumstances. The stupendous buildings of Babylon, its gigantic walls, hanging gardens and towers reaching into the clouds must, when all was destroyed have left immense layers of debris over the foundations of the first buildings. When, as is still often the case in the orient, new structures are reared on old ruins, the foundation described by the explorers can be accounted for without resorting to the theory of an unreasonable antiquity. However, further particulars may throw more light over the subject.

#### THE FINANCIAL NEWS ARTICLE.

The NEWS has already noted the emphatic denial of the London Financial News that it ever published such sentiments as were attributed to it in an extract alleged to be taken from its columns of March 10th last, and published in many papers throughout the country. This was in justice to our London cotemporary and to ourselves, for we had also reproduced the alleged extract. We also find on examining the London paper that its denial is correct, and that the attributing to it of the piece referred to was a gross injustice to that journal and to others that were imposed upon it in being led to believe it genuine. The article pointed out advantages to the United States from the independent free coinage of silver, whereas the Financial News has taken the stand that such free coinage would be an injury. The NEWS copied the article from the Tribune of this city and gave it credit therefor; hence it is due our cotemporary to give its correction and explanation of the source of the imposition. It says in this morning's issue:

Some days since, under the heading "Paste This in Your Hat," the Tribune published an article purporting to be from the London Financial News. We copied the article from the World-Herald of Omaha, first, because that is a reputable newspaper; it is also the quasi organ of Mr. Bryan himself; and second, because we had read something of the same kind in a News editorial, or from a correspondent of the News. The News denies the authenticity of the article and claims that it is a forgery. We have waited several days since that announcement was made for the World-Herald to make a frank and fair explanation of it, but it has not done so up to date, and we cannot any longer afford to postpone the above explanation, because the Tribune has a reputation for truthfulness which it has fairly earned, and while we are aware, and while the people are aware that with the utmost

care a newspaper is sometimes led into an error in the statement of a purported fact, there never has been a time, there never will be a time when the Tribune, if so deceived, will not make its explanation fully and fairly, and give it as much prominence as was given to the offending article. We are sorry it happened. We are sorry that after days of waiting the World-Herald has not seen proper to fully explain how such an accident could have happened in that newspaper office.

#### THE TURKISH QUESTION.

The latest outbreak in Constantinople is a reminder to the world of the smouldering embers of discontent that ever remain a danger to peace as long as the Turkish question is unsettled. The authorities seem to be unwilling to give the full facts publicly, but it is stated that thousands of Armenians were massacred, their bodies thrown into the streets, and that the Turkish authorities remained inactive while the slaughter took place. Against the conditions that make such anarchy and rule of terror possible at the very gates of the Ottoman palace there can be but one remedy—the liberation of the Christians.

A London paper speaking of the situation in Turkey, remarks that reforms are not to be expected for the simple reason that they have no foundations to rest upon. The most prominent forces in the empire are the reigning house, the army and the Mussulman mob, but neither of these desires anything but the cruel despotism that is accepted as the decree of an immutable providence. If the so-called young Turkish party had the people, or a considerable part of the people, with them, there might be hope for their cause, but they have not, and will not be supported by the masses as long as the government succeeds in rearing impenetrable walls between them and all modern means of education and enlightenment.

It is not impossible that at the present meeting of the emperors of Russia and Austria the situation in Turkey may be considered and that the practical results of that tête-à-tête will be a more definite policy in eastern Europe. Emperors do not as a rule travel across a continent merely for the sake of pleasure. The belief is justified that such a journey has political significance, and if so, its results will appear in the near future.

#### MR. CLARK'S FOREBODINGS.

According to the telegraphed report of the Denver remarks of S. H. H. Clark, one of the receivers of the Union Pacific, that gentleman takes a gloomy view of the railway situation in the West. He is discouraged as to the outcome of the Union Pacific, and believes the successful reorganization of the line impracticable for a long time at least. The light which the receivers thought they saw ahead has disappeared, and Mr. Clark thinks the company will have no option but to allow the government to take the road and sell it for the debt, which it cannot pay. Another line could be built now for

much less than the debt, but even that the gentleman regards as not practicable because it would not pay unless there was a restoration of good times and good business, which he sees no promise of.

Perhaps Mr. Clark takes too idle a view of the business prospect, and perhaps not. As a railway manager of marked ability and extensive experience, his expressions will receive weighty consideration. They show that under an efficient management, backed by every favorable condition that was available, the great railway system which has been a potent factor in developing the great West is unable to bear the burden of its own business life; and if it cannot hold up, the fact is evidence of a hard struggle on the part of other lines. Whatever may be said of "grasping corporations" and other terms freely and often flippantly applied to railway managements, if Mr. Clark's prognostications are to meet with fulfilment, the West will suffer another blow in the fate that is in store for the Union Pacific system. As time goes on there may appear another side in the interest of the people than the clamor for forfeiture of the road. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped that Mr. Clark's idea of still further and worse business depression is the result of temporary discouragement rather than of deliberate judgment, and that the sun of prosperity will soon chase away the shadows that now darken the sky.

#### NOT HERETICS.

Recently we have had occasion to refer to the practice of Protestant Christians to brand the doctrines of the Latter-day Saints, especially those relating to the Godhead, as gross heresies. Our opponents in other denominations assume with remarkable naivete that their position is as infallible and unassailable as an axiom, and that anyone who takes a different view must of necessity be intellectually or morally unbalanced. That was the burden of the criticism accorded Mormons at a recent religious gathering in Richfield, and the same statements are made almost everywhere, where theologians discuss the subject.

From the pride shown by votaries of modern orthodoxy, one would be inclined to the belief that the harmony between that system and scripture truth is a demonstrated fact. Yet, a closer scrutiny of ecclesiastical history reveals exactly the opposite. Modern orthodoxy was cradled in the age of Origen and Augustine and nursed by ecumenical councils. It does not date back to the days of our Lord and His Apostles. It is nothing to be proud of. It is at best a substitute for that faith which distinguished the first Christians, which rested on the revealed word of God and was effective of a pure life, prophetic knowledge and great power. It came as an effort to fill up with heathen philosophy the supposed lack of system in the theology of primitive Christianity. The merits of it can best be estimated after a view of the time in which it was originated.

Origen is universally considered the most influential of all the theologians of the ancient church before Augustine, and the latter is said to have left