

AN OPEN LETTER.

To the Hon. Senators and the People of the United States,
BY A "MORMON."

SOCRATES, the celebrated orator of ancient Athens, at a time when the Athenians were foremost in Greece in wealth, power and influence, but nevertheless on the road leading to the abyss of moral destruction, was moved upon to address, with the whole force of his eloquence, the council of the republic in behalf of a return to ancient and safe paths.

Centuries later, Justin, the martyr, endeavored by the medium of his mighty pen to give Roman emperors and senators a just appreciation of a people everywhere misunderstood, persecuted, oppressed.

In comparatively recent times, Milton, following a happy inspiration, addressed to the British parliament a powerful argument in the defense of the liberty of the press, just then violently assailed by those who should have been its protectors and exponents.

Although making no pretensions to fame as an orator, or a philosopher, or a statesman, I trust that in addressing the most influential legislative body in the world, I shall not meet with cold indifference, as I have the proud distinction of being an American citizen, interested in my country's welfare and desirous of placing before you a matter of vital importance.

THEOLOGY IN THE SENATE.

You, honorable Senators, have, through a combination of circumstances upon which impartial history alone can shed perfect light, been placed under the necessity of passing judgment upon questions of theology, which, by the fundamental principles of American government, are entirely excluded from the domain of secular legislative assemblies. That the questions have been brought up under the form of petitions to expel from the Senate one of your honorable members, regularly elected, does not change the main fact, that the controversy is essentially one of a theological nature. For, the adversaries of Hon. Reed Smoot, having been unable to sustain their demands for his expulsion, in any overt act of his, no matter how closely they have scrutinized his life, have, like the accusers of Daniel at the imperial court of Babel, turned to his religion, in order to secure his condemnation. They have brought before you, in a lengthy investigation, the most peculiar statements concerning the belief, the ritualistic practices, and the obligations and faith of the religious denomination of which he is a member. The world has been regaled with stories of secret "oaths," Church dominion, etc., all of which, without good reason, has caused a great commotion in religious circles.

More especially it has been charged that the "Mormon" Church is an outlandish, secret society, ruled by a hierarchy. It is proposed, in the following paragraphs, to briefly consider these two allegations. And it is hoped that it will be made clear that they are entirely without foundation in fact, being the creations of the excited imagination of enemies, or pervertions of Bible truths by those who are not well informed on the doctrines they attack.

HISTORY'S WARNING.

The difficulty of judging justly, and impartially, about the religious beliefs and practices of any man, or association of men, from the statements and representations of opponents, is apparent. The writer well remembers the stories circulated about the excellent men who, years ago, under the auspices of an American Baptist association introduced the tenets of that faith into one of the northern European countries. In public print they were represented as fanatics, who, it was stated, executed the "angel dance" in their meetings, and performed other impossible feats. And so perpetually were such tales circulated by mouth and pen, that public opinion, in many instances, sanctioned the imprisonment and persecution of the preachers and their followers. And yet, there was not a shadow of foundation for the vile legends.

The history of Germany's great reformer, Luther, is another striking instance of contemporary misrepresentation. His opponents denounced him as a pledge broker and seducer, because of his marriage with a nun. They charged him with drunkenness, even intimating that some of his literary productions were written under the influence of intoxicants. What would Luther's fate have been, had such testimony, all apparently founded on fact, been admitted before any secular diet, and acted upon?

Have not the Catholics suffered under misrepresentation, under the form of "revelations by a Nun," and attacks of apostates?

But the history of the first followers of the lowly Nazarene presents a still more striking instance of the folly of judging a sect from the tales of outsiders. We know from the previous treatise of Minutius Felix that even the most zealous of the Roman emperors, who demanded the acknowledgment of Christianity as a confession of most nefarious crime. They firmly believed the Christians to be atheists, because they had no temples, and refused to worship any of the accepted gods. They believed that the most cruel, absurd, and lewd rites were observed by the Christians. One story was to the effect that the Christians, "having assembled the sexes and all the relations of kindred, they tied a dog to the stand which contained the only light, and then throwing oil beyond the end of the string, they induced the dog to overthrow the lamp, that, in the dark, the assembly might practice promiscuous lewdness." Such stories the early apostles had to meet and refute, in the interest of truth.

The Christians recognized one another as brothers and sisters, and preached brotherly love. This was by the pagans construed to mean that they were practicing and defending the crime of incest, for the doctrine of a uni-

versal brotherhood was as strange to the world then, as some of the doctrines of "Mormonism" appear now. The first Christians were even accused of cannibalism. As wild fire the rumor went from house to house, that one of the rites of the new religion was to sacrifice a child and eat the flesh and drink the blood. Thus was the holy Sacrament represented by "common repute." And the consequence was that the slightest agitation was sufficient to raise a storm in which thousands perished, by sword, flames, or wild beasts. And it is not the least remarkable feature of that age, that the pagans who reveled in atheism, drunkenness, and immorality, having practically changed some of their own temples into houses of prostitution, were most zealous in persecuting the Christians, who had abandoned such things. The remark of Salustius about the nature of persecution, "That it is its nature to make men liars and cheaters, to hide the truth in their breasts, and show, like jugglers, another thing in their mouths; to cut all friendships and enmities to the measure of their own interest."

With such awful lessons of history before us, we cannot but shrink from passing judgment upon subjects pertaining to religious beliefs, or the representations of opponents, who may themselves be misinformed, or who may even be interested in misinforming others. It is dangerous, too, to lay hold of such questions except in the spirit of absolute fairness and truth.

Mistakes may prove of far-reaching consequences. There is no doubt that the persecutions engendered by the falsehoods disseminated throughout Rome about the first Christians were detrimental to them, and facilitated the general apostasy. The leaders were taken away, by martyrdom, and the churches were often left in the care of inexperienced neophytes. Study and learning were discouraged. Apostates became numerous, and these, to show their zeal, circulated the most improbable stories. But the error of misjudging the innocent objects of popular prejudices, was still more fatal to imperial Rome herself. For, none can be so blind as not to see, that the cruelty of which unoffending citizens became victims was one of the crimes of the empire, that in due time was punished by the incursions of Asiatic hordes led by the ferocious Attila, who boasted in the significant title, "The scourge of God."

SOURCE OF ONE ERROR.

"Mormonism," if considered as an isolated phenomenon in the field of history, is perfectly unintelligible to human understanding. He who separates it from its natural connection with the spiritual system commonly known as the kingdom of God on earth, past and future, is at a loss to appreciate its teachings. They are, to him, as void of meaning as a sentence torn out of its context, or a fragmentary piece of music picked out at random from a master-piece. Because it is part of the divine plan of salvation, which has perfect unity, each part being properly adjusted and joined to the whole, it must be studied in that connection. A description of a piece of brick gives no conception of the magnificent temple of which the fragment may at one time have formed an integral part. This truth is often overlooked by the superficial observer, and as a consequence he obtains all kinds of bizarre pictures of "Mormonism" and the followers of that faith. He sees a "secret organization," with blood-curdling "oaths," and plans of "vengeance," and many other vain imaginings.

COVENANTS IN ALL AGES.

If we study the history of God's dealings with His children in the various dispensations, we find one feature common to all, and that is solemn covenants with the Almighty. He demands such covenants. They are essential to His educational methods whereby He inspires faith and love, and prompts to deeds of rectitude. They belong to every dispensation.

One of the remarkable episodes in the life of Abraham, after he had entered the Land of Promise is the covenant Jehovah made with him, that He would certainly give him the land of Canaan for inheritance. How it was made is minutely described. The Lord commanded his faithful servant to take certain animals and slay them, and divide them, and lay "each piece one against another." And then, in the evening, the divine Presence passed between the pieces of the sacrificed animals. (Gen. 15: 8-18). Commentators tell us that in this way solemn covenants were entered into at that remote age. The covenants passed between the bleeding parts, thereby expressing their willingness to be in a similar manner "cut asunder," by divine justice, if they were found to be voluntary violators of the covenant made. So prominent is this idea of covenant that the Hebrew word for it, "Bereth," means "cutting." It is difficult to imagine a more effective method of expressing earnestness and sincerity in a promise.

That this principle was still upheld during the Mosiac dispensation, is clear from the Prophet Jeremiah, who, in behalf of the Lord, pronounces this curse upon covenant-breakers: "And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof, the princes of Judah, and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, and the priests, and all the people of the land, which passed between the parts of the calf: I will even give them into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life; and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beasts

of the earth." Here the ancient method of making a covenant, and the penalty for breaking it, are both clearly set forth.

In the gospel dispensation we pause before the fact that our Lord and Redeemer, before leaving His disciples, to die for the world, instituted an ordinance which sets forth every principle of sacrifice and covenant previously revealed. In addition to the principles new to the new dispensation, for, as the Lord came, not to destroy but to fulfill and complete, so His ordinances do not destroy but complement truths previously revealed. Thus, when He instituted the Sacrament, He explained, that the broken bread was "His body," and that the cup contained "His blood," which was about to be shed in redemption of the new covenant. He who partakes of this Sacrament, according to the Apostle Paul, "shows" the Lord's death, thus taking a part in the "throne of Calvary." And inasmuch as this death was a sacrifice, He offers anew in a spiritual manner, this holy and acceptable offering to God, as was done, according to what we have seen, in previous dispensations, when a covenant was made. And therefore He also makes a most solemn covenant with God, to serve Him—a pact that is as much more sacred as the body and blood of the Lamb of God is more precious than the divided body of an animal. By partaking of the emblems of the body and blood of Christ, He passes, as it were, between the divided sacrifice, and expresses his willingness to give up his life, if he break the covenant. For this reason Paul teaches the Corinthians, that the cup is "the communion of the blood of Christ;" and the bread is "the communion of the body of Christ," and that he who shall eat and drink unworthily, "shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." That is, he places himself in the class with those who shed His blood. He still takes a part in that most awful tragedy, but as an enemy, and as such he eats and drinks "damnation" to himself. The apostle further points out that the penalty for breaking the covenants made at the Sacramental table was being suffered by many among those whom he addressed. "For this cause," he says, "many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep," in death, that is, "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." (I Cor. xi: 26-31).

The following from the article on Sacrifices in the Encyclopedia Britannica, is pertinent. The author is W. R. Smith, librarian of the Cambridge University: "Even the highest forms of sacrificial worship present much that is repulsive to modern ideas, and in particular it requires an effort to reconcile our imagination to the bloody ritual which is prominent in almost every religion which has a strong sense of sin. But we must not forget that from the beginning this ritual expressed, however crudely, certain ideas which lie at the very root of true religion, the fellowship of the worshippers with one another in their fellowship with the deity, and the consecration of the bonds of kinship as the type of all slight ethical relation between man and man."

A strong sense of the wickedness of sin can find adequate expression only in some rites that depict the consequence of sin—death. Hence the sacrificial forms of worship taught in the various dispensations. I have referred to the sacrificial rites of ancient times, instituted for the purpose of impressing upon man the sacredness of obligations entered into by covenants with the Almighty, and also the Sacrifice of Calvary, commemorated, typified and represented in the ordinance of the Sacrament. I need not say that none of these ancient rites are observed now, any more than the sufferings and death of the Son of God are literally repeated. But the truths those rites were designed to teach and impress, remain. They are eternal. The methods of teaching them change with the progress of man, just as kindergarten methods are abolished when the student enters more advanced classes. But the truth never changes. I have therefore not referred to those lessons of the Old Testament as something still remaining, but to call attention to the fact that that which some condemn in the Church is deeply rooted truth which the Almighty in all ages has endeavored to teach His children by various educational methods, and in the New Testament by ordinances setting forth the atonement of our Lord.

MORMON VOWS.

Now, if "Mormonism" is studied in the light of the teachings of the Scriptures on this subject, it becomes intelligible, and full of meaning. Its harmony with the divine plan of salvation bursts forth in soul-inspiring beauty. For the very spirit of the true Gospel finds its expression in covenants with the Deity. The followers of this cult enter the circle of disciples, by a rite—baptism—typifying the death and burial of the Master. At the Sacramental table they promise most solemnly, as already explained, to follow the Crucified One. And, further, if they are faithful and sincere in the obligations they have taken upon themselves, their privilege is to enter into consecrated places and again renew these covenants. For there they agree to accept the commandments of God, which He has given for the salvation and eternal glory of His children. They agree to live pure, chaste lives; to devote themselves to the service of God and fellow-men, unselfishly, and to remain true and faithful in the performance of all that is good and praiseworthy. Such are the covenants; such are the terrible "oaths" and obligations Latter-day Saints consider binding; such are the vows which life itself, although no human being will interfere, in any way, with those who may lose faith and become infidels to

the Almighty, in whose presence they have made their covenants.

If the question is asked, whether such solemn pledges are necessary to the furtherance of a moral life, the answer is, that all nations and all peoples, in all ages, have considered some pledges part of good public policy. Kings and rulers solemnly vow, in the presence of God, to fulfill the duties of their office; citizens and subjects pledge themselves to obedience and faithfulness. Officials, on entering upon their career, give solemn pledges to do right; witnesses are pledged to speak the truth, and soldiers to give their lives. In these cases the covenants are made in the form of an "oath." In the Church, there are no "oaths," but solemn promises, or declarations, but the underlying principle is the same. Surely, there must be good and sufficient reason, in human nature itself, for a practice that has become as universal as the need of the uniting of human beings into societies. Certain it is, if experience is authority, that a solemn pact made with God in holy places has saved many from a relapse into a life of sin and shame.

It has given strength in the hour of temptation, and been an incentive to efforts for good. Every Christian minister regards his "oath of office" as a help to him in the fulfillment of his duties. The covenants of the Latter-day Saints are to them a similar help. They are a test. For he who will break his covenants, voluntarily made before his Maker, is useless as a citizen of the kingdom of God, or a soldier in the ranks of the hosts of the Lord.

THE QUESTION OF SECRECY.

Another question may be asked: If the Latter-day Saints have no other vows and obligations than the covenants to do right and live moral lives, why all this secrecy? If their covenants are in the nature of those entered into by former-day Saints at the altar of sacrifices, and by Christians generally at the Sacramental table, why are they attended to in secret?

When Jehovah, in the Mosiac dispensation, commanded His people to rear a Tabernacle in the wilderness, and later a Temple in Jerusalem, He ordained that the structure itself, and the ground upon which it stood, should be consecrated, and not a soul was permitted to enter the sacred precincts, except the consecrated priests. And even they were not given access at all times, or for trivial purposes. Exact rules were laid down, which to break was death. In one part of the sacred structure no one dared to enter except the chief High Priest, and he only once a year. So sacred was this spot, that Jews today refuse to walk upon the temple ground in Jerusalem, fearing that by so doing they might trespass upon the place over which once stood the Holy of Holies. Why all this secrecy? Why were not the people permitted to assemble in the Tabernacle then, as they do in the churches and chapels now? Why such exclusiveness?

The Jews used to regard the name of God so holy that they never pronounced it, for fear of profanation. Even in reading their Scriptures, they read Adonai instead of Jehovah. Why? Because they understood this principle: that what is the subject of daily talk must lose that which makes it sacred to us. "Familiarity," it is said, "breeds contempt." Mary, the mother of Jesus, did not talk and gossip about those sweet things which heavenly messengers communicated to her. They were too sacred to expose to public gaze. She kept them in her heart and contemplated them, and so she had strength and consolation in the hour of trouble. That which is sacred must be shielded from the daily, worldly influences. That is a sufficient answer to the question of secrecy. The Lord Himself sought the secluded places. In the mountain region, for special communication with His Father, and He enjoined upon His disciples to pray in seclusion. Can any one with Christian experience ask, Why?

THE CHURCH NOT SECRET.

And yet, the Church is not a secret society. Ancient Israel was not a secret society, although it had its Temple from which practically all the world was excluded. Any society has a right to privacy, but the exercise of that right does not make the society secret. Clubs have their private premises, where intrusions are not tolerated. Families have a right to privacy. But that does not make the club, and the family secret societies. Nor does the fact that the Church has its Temples, which are not open to the public, justify the charge that the Church is a secret society.

In Macedonia there exists a government, whose members are not publicly known, but who nevertheless exercise all the functions of a government. They meet in secret; they administer laws; they levy taxes. Their hand is felt everywhere, but no one knows where the brain that directs that hand. They are spoken of as the Macedonian committee, but they are really a secret government. Now, that is a secret society. Other secret societies have been known to exist, with secret meetings, where plots have been hatched. But the Church is not secret. She is like a city upon a mountain. Her officers are known all over the world. Her doctrines are proclaimed in every land. Every soul is invited to the fellowship of the Saints, and even the Temples are open to all who conform to the rules of the Church. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is no more a secret society than is a business organization that happens to have a private office, or a family that may have apartments to which the general public is not always invited. Privacy and secrecy are two widely different characteristics. Even legislative bodies have their reserved space and executive sessions, to which the general public is not admitted. But it would be folly to accuse them of being secret societies.

NO HIERARCHY.

A great deal has been heard lately of the "Mormon" hierarchy, and its tyrannical rule. This is not new. It was the complaint of the late Governor Eli H. Murray, over twenty years ago, in an interview with a representative of the New York Herald, that the "Mormons" were forming a hierarchy within a republic. It was a false accusation then, and it is false now. Periodically this cry is raised, and it is by many regarded as ominous as the hooting of owls.

And yet, the Church has no hierarchy. It has no clerical caste, no class of priests, no prelates. It does not need any. The questions upon which that class of men in all ages have spent their thoughts and energies, to the exclusion of useful labor, have no importance to "Mormons." Whether Eve was formed out of the left side of Adam or not; whether the world was created in the spring or the autumn; whether twenty angels can dance upon the point of a needle; whether trinity can be mathematically demonstrated to be identical with unity, and whether a son can be as old as his father; are all profound queries which only a priest caste can deal with. It takes long training in hair-splitting to discuss them at all. But when they are discarded for questions of practical bearing upon the everyday life of the individual and the welfare of the community, the caste is out of employment. It is as needless as an aristocracy, in a republic.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is governed somewhat after the pattern of the United States. Both governments were inspired from the same divine source, and there is some resemblance. Both are different from the despotic rule manifested in secular circles as imperialism, and in ecclesiastical associations as hierarchy. The despotic conception is that government is a power to which man is subject, noisens volens. But this idea does not obtain in this country. Here government is understood to derive its "just powers" from the consent of the governed. Officials are, therefore, the servants of the public, executing their mandates. They are entirely different from emperors, kings, governors, princes and rulers of despotic countries. They are, as is well understood, nothing but citizens, temporarily entrusted with a commission to act for fellow-citizens. We have no emperors, no monarchs.

The situation in the Church is somewhat similar. There are no hierarchies, no prelates. There are officers, selected, as we believe, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, but acting with the consent of the people. They have their various functions to perform for the Church, not as rulers but as servants. For, in the kingdom of God the rule is, that he who would be the greatest must be the servant of all. Nearly all the male members of the Church hold the Holy Priesthood in its two-fold division—one administering in the secular affairs of the Church and one in its spiritual affairs. But when all hold the Priesthood, there can be no class distinction. It is as illogical to speak about hierarchy, or prelate in the Church, as it would be to speak of an oligarchy, or imperialism in the United States. Very few Church officers are even supposed to devote all of their time to the service of the people. They are engaged, as all other citizens, in their daily occupations, and cannot become hierarchs, on that ground among others. It is impossible to think of the Prophet Elijah, fed by ravens at the little brooklet that furnished him with clear water, as a hierarch, or a prelate. Nor can we think of the Galilean fishermen, though they were Apostles, holding all the keys of authority in ecclesiastical affairs, as hierarchs. They were humble servants of God. Paul was an Apostle, but also a tentmaker, and no prelate. Neither are "Mormon" Church officials hierarchs. They may be Apostles, presidents, Bishops, etc., but they are also farmers, manufacturers, merchants, bankers, etc., and are, consequently, far removed from the class that is known as prelates.

AN ILLUSTRATION.

This fact should have a practical bearing upon the question ostensibly before the Senate. It is contended that a "Mormon" official must not hold a political position, because of his ecclesiastical office, and it is argued that no prelate of any other church would be permitted to aspire to the highest political honors. But "Mormon" Church officials are not in that class, and the argument is without force, because it cannot be applied to them. One illustration will make this clear. In a monarchy, the king is supposed to belong to no party. He is expected to be above parties, and to represent the entire people. It would be considered inappropriate for him to express sympathy even for party measures. But in a republic, where there is no monarch, except as every citizen is a monarch, there are no such considerations. It is quite proper for the president and members of his cabinet to take sides in politics and belong to whatever political party they prefer, because they are citizens—plain citizens. That illustrates the situation. A church that has a prelate, or hierarchy, and is a spiritual monarchy, should demand of its spiritual kings and princes to keep themselves above party division and politics. But churches that are as free as republics, need have no such consideration for their officers, since these are, with reference to the Church, what political officials are with reference to the republic. There is no reason whatever for excluding them from the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, any more than there is for the exclusion of any other member of the Church, who also holds the Priesthood. And this is true, not only of the "Mor-

mon" Church but of every church that has been emancipated from the rule of a hierarchy.

ORIGIN OF HIERARCHY.

Hierarchy is a comparatively late growth upon ecclesiasticism. Originally every church was an association of "salute" under the charge of officers properly appointed and sustained. By and by influential and wealthy bishops assumed control over neighboring branches, and appointed deputies to fill the places of the former bishops. The usurpers called themselves bishops, and their annexed territory became dioceses. But this unscriptural process was further carried out, and the result was archbishops, popes, etc., of which there is not a word in the Scriptures. Thus came prelate, or hierarchy. It was the result of usurpation and annexation. And it was done openly and in broad daylight. "By a synodical decree, to enhance the honor of the bishops, the poor ones were put out of the way." (Theology of the Early Christian Church by James Bennett, D. D.) Christ pointed to the domination of earthly kingdoms and warned His disciples, saying, "It shall not be so with you." But those who introduced prelate took a view different from that of the Master, and said, "It shall be so with you." And so came the gradations in priestly dignity, foreign to the kingdom of God. The true Church, with her officers, stands entirely outside that arrangement. Church officers perform their functions, as presidents, as counselors, as judges in Israel, as missionaries, etc., as brethren among brethren, as Saints among Saints. This fact must not be lost sight of in this discussion.

TESTIMONY AS TO CHARACTER. "Mormonism" and "Mormons" are best judged by the fruits they have produced. The Church has been before the world for over half a century, and it has never hidden its light under a bushel. Hundreds of testimonies have been given to the world on the industry, honesty, integrity, and patriotism of the Latter-day Saints. I will quote only one, which should have some weight. It was given by a member of the British Parliament, Hon. James W. Barclay, in an article in The Nineteenth Century. He came to Utah with strong prejudices, but he changed his mind, and felt under moral obligation to give to the world the benefit of the information he had obtained. He said, in part:

"There is nothing peculiar in the Mormon creed to account for the great influence which Mormonism exercises among its followers. Its doctrines do not differ essentially from those of other Christians."

"There is no religious caste or class. From the President downwards, the officebearers of the Church are selected by the voice of the Mormon community; they require no special qualifications."

"There is no compulsion on any Mormon beyond the public opinion of his fellows, and none is possible. Apostasy even does not appear to be attended with serious consequences to the apostate's material interests. Some of the

largest merchants in Salt Lake City have apostatized from the Church, and although the population of Utah is about nine-tenths Mormon, their business appears to prosper as before."

"The Mormons, as a people, are tolerant, temperate, peaceable, and industrious."

"Hostile Gentiles living in Salt Lake City, of whom I inquired the grounds of their hostility to the Mormons, referred only to polygamy and exaction of the tithes, to which, however, they do not contribute. They admitted that the 'Mormon' people were honest, straightforward, and fulfilled their contracts fairly."

"The men of position I met compared favorably with the same class in the eastern states. I was much impressed by their ability, courtesy, and general intelligence."

"In morality, as far as shown by statistics, the Mormons greatly excel the Gentiles in their midst, and the general population of the States."

"Among the Mormons all are equal. It is the duty of every man from the President downwards to labor for his living. There is no special or privileged class or caste. The people in Utah exercise sense govern themselves, and every man is eligible for any office in the Church or state. The only difference between individuals is in their inherent qualities and capabilities."

Mr. Barclay accounts for the hostility to the Church thus:

"It is not easy to discover the grounds of the hostility—I might say antipathy—towards the Mormons manifested by Americans in the eastern states. The farther distant from Utah the greater the animus."

"But I apprehend that the animosity to Mormonism is principally due to the efforts of the host of hungry office-seekers who would find lucrative posts in Utah were the Mormons disfranchised; and by the missionaries from the eastern states who come to turn the Mormons from peaceful devotees of their ways, and whose incomes depend on the strength of the feelings they can excite in their supporters."

Viewing the origin of the persecution as Mr. Barclay does, he does not hesitate to say:

"The treatment of the Mormons by the people of the United States is already a blot on the fair fame of the greatest republic the world has seen, and I firmly believe that, if the citizens of the United States could only visit Utah, investigate and judge for themselves, there are very few who would not be ashamed of what has taken place in Utah under their authority."

"There are many rabid anti-Mormons in Salt Lake City, including a daily newspaper, who are only too anxious to find anything against Mormonism or Mormonism, and any cause of oppression or hard treatment would be eagerly proclaimed."

This is a view of Mormonism more in accordance with facts. Bigotry in the past stained the soil of great states with the blood of martyrs. The spirit of bigotry is still active. Shall it be triumphant even in this age of liberty and reason? It is for the honorable Senators of the United States and the generous American public to furnish the answer to that question, by upholding, even against pressure, the principles embodied in the Constitution, and symbolized in the flag.

Throw your old Clock
Away and
'Phone 63 for the correct time.

Leyson's
JEWELERS.
236 MAIN ST.
SALT LAKE CITY.

Dentistry
Painless
While every person should have the very best dentistry it is possible for skilled dentists to produce, it is not necessary to pay such high-toned, fancy prices as most good dentists charge.
Every piece of work we do is guaranteed for ten years and this guarantee is in writing. Should, at any time during the next ten years, your work fail to become unsatisfactory, we would be more than pleased to repair it free of charge.
The Boston Dental Parlor is right here and always ready to back up every statement made.
Painless silver fillings \$4.50 up
Painless cement fillings \$3.50 up
Painless gold fillings \$5.00 up
Painless gold crown \$6.00 up
Painless porcelain crowns \$5.00 up
Painless bridge work per tooth \$5.00 up
Full set of teeth \$5.00 up

A New Year Resolution
Like the one suggested in this picture, will insure you a prosperous and happy new year. Write or call and we will be glad to tell you how its done.
UTAH COMMERCIAL & SAVING BANK,
22-24 east First South St.,
Salt Lake City.

Woman's Crowning Glory
In her hair, if it is gray, it can be restored to its original color, or if bleached, made any shade desired, from black to the lightest. Ask blonde for one application of the
Imperial
Hair Regenerator,
the acknowledged standard. It is a hair coloring for gray or bleached hair, which is absolutely harmless. It is fast, does not wash out, and one application lasts months.
Sample of your hair colored and restored free.
Privacy assured.
Sole manufacturers and patentees,
Imperial Chemical Mfg. Co., 135 W. 23rd St., N.Y.



Write for Beautifully Illustrated Souvenir.

Dentistry
Painless

While every person should have the very best dentistry it is possible for skilled dentists to produce, it is not necessary to pay such high-toned, fancy prices as most good dentists charge.
Every piece of work we do is guaranteed for ten years and this guarantee is in writing. Should, at any time during the next ten years, your work fail to become unsatisfactory, we would be more than pleased to repair it free of charge.
The Boston Dental Parlor is right here and always ready to back up every statement made.
Painless silver fillings \$4.50 up
Painless cement fillings \$3.50 up
Painless gold fillings \$5.00 up
Painless gold crown \$6.00 up
Painless porcelain crowns \$5.00 up
Painless bridge work per tooth \$5.00 up
Full set of teeth \$5.00 up

Boston Dental
Parlors,
126 South Main Street.

