

EDITORIALS.

"EDUCATION IN UTAH."

THE latest number of the *Christian Advocate* contains an article on "Education in Utah." It is written by one Dexter A. Hawkins, a lawyer, who claims to have spent the astonishing period of two months in Utah, from which it is to be inferred that he is able to enlighten mankind on all things pertaining to the "Mormons." We are sorry that the gentleman did not make better use of his time while here, as, judging from his article on our educational affairs, he merely took for granted what was told him by persons who take supreme delight in misrepresentation, without enquiring into the facts himself. He appears to be no fool, and of course we must not admit the idea that he can be a knave, for who that writes for so pious a paper as the *Christian Advocate* would ever wilfully state that which is untrue?

Dexter says that President Brigham Young "enunciated as a principle of action and of social duty" that "no such thing should ever exist in the Mormon State while ruled by him as the American free public school." As the gentleman's two months' visit was made last fall, it is very clear that he cannot pretend to have heard this statement himself, the supposed speaker having then been a year deceased.

The truth is, Prest. Young never made any such assertion. It is admitted that he was opposed to the public school system, with its many defects, for reasons that were to him good and sufficient, if not to everybody else. But he was a friend to education, as can be proven from his public discourses, and as clearly evidenced by the educational establishments which he liberally endowed from his private property. President Young was a practical man, and he desired to establish a system of practical education; one that would fit the pupils for active life, and not train them all with the expectation of obtaining a living without labor. We notice that many eminent men are expressing views on this question similar to his, and they are not on that account accused of being enemies to education. Men may differ as to the mode of effecting a given object, without either of them being opposed to its accomplishment, agreeing as to the end but differing as to the means.

Mr. Hawkins thinks the "Mormon" leaders too exclusive on the subject of education. He would have them employ teachers not of their faith, and send their children to schools irrespective of the creed of those who establish them. The gentleman and those from whom he has drawn his inspiration are welcome to hold what views they please on this question; are free to establish anti-"Mormon" schools in Utah, and to endeavor, through *Christian Advocates* and other papers to obtain aid from the public abroad for the benefit of anti-"Mormon" teachers here. But we must be allowed to have equal liberty in differing with him and them, and in meeting their efforts by counter measures.

Our standpoint is this: We have a religion revealed direct from the Almighty. It is our duty to train our children in the true faith. While we desire to give them all the education our means will permit in secular knowledge—this being also a duty required of us by our religion—we are under the obligations of conscience and divine law to train them in the spirit and letter of the gospel revealed to us. Teachers opposed to our faith are not competent to be instructors of our youth. Schools conducted on anti-"Mormon" principles or established by enemies to our Church are merely traps for our offspring, introduced for the avowed and special object of leading away from our faith children whose parents can neither be persuaded, threatened nor forced into sectarianism or infidelity.

Would it not be the height of folly, inconsistency and wickedness for men and women who have endured more than death for their religion, to voluntarily place their children under the care and tutelage of persons whose main object is

to subvert and destroy that religion? Every reasonable and unprejudiced person will admit that upon the ground occupied by the "Mormon" people, they cannot possibly be too exclusive on this matter; and that every man or woman who professes faith in "Mormonism," and yet sends a child to be educated by an anti-Mormon, is open to the charge of inconsistency if not of insincerity.

Mr. Hawkins offers arguments on the elevating tendencies of education, to which no "Mormon" will offer any objection, for we all desire to see the people of Utah young and old advancing in all useful knowledge. But we do not think that our youth will be "elevated to a higher state of social existence" by persons who delight in misrepresenting our doctrines and intentions, and who would teach our children to despise the faith of their parents and influence them if possible to despise their parents also. We shall therefore use our influence as far as it extends, to induce all Latter-day Saints to avail themselves of such educational facilities as are within the purview of our own institutions, which will be improved as fast as possible, and to beware, above all things, of placing the feet of their little ones on any path that diverges from the straight and narrow way that leadeth to the lives. Every non-Mormon school in Utah is necessarily anti-Mormon, from the very nature of the local conflict, and is therefore a by-path from the one way of life and exaltation. There is no simple problem more easily capable of perfect demonstration than this. Let the wise consider and understand.

CHRIST NOT THE ONLY PRIEST.

SOME time ago we noticed a letter from a Lexington, Mo., correspondent signing himself "G. M." and answered a number of his queries and remarks in an article under the heading of "Did the Christian Church Continue?" "G. M." denied that the Christian Church had apostatized, and asserted we could not show that it had. We gave some proofs of the fact in the above named article, and now we are in receipt of another long letter from "G. M." covering seven pages, foolscap size, closely written, which we will proceed to notice, briefly, because the writer assumes a less obnoxious attitude than at first, avoiding nicknames such as "Joe Smith" and the ungentlemanly insinuations which defaced his first letter, and because it affords us an opportunity of touching on some points that will be of interest to many who are investigating our doctrines.

"G. M." now says:

"The Christian Church visible pleads guilty to the charge that 300 years ago she was to all appearance hopelessly corrupt. The people in nearly all the Christian churches throughout Christendom were at that time worshipping idols as senseless as the golden calf."

This is an entire change of base on the part of G. M., an admission of that which at first he defied us to prove. But he now takes the ground—assumed by many professing "Christians," that it does not matter much about a church, so long as a person believes in Jesus Christ. He says, "The Church saves nobody." At first G. M. declared "Christ has always had a Church upon the earth," now he denies the absolute necessity for such a Church and says, in relation to the apostacy:

"All this corruption and mischief is traceable to one cause, viz., that the Church, about eight centuries before, lost sight of the fact that Jesus Christ is the only priest in the whole universe, and had saddled Christendom with a human priesthood."

He finally asks, in view of the declaration "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," etc., "What need have we of an earthly priest?"

All this turns upon the single point that nothing else is required to secure salvation except simple belief in Jesus Christ. This is not a true doctrine, unless something

is implied in "belief" or "faith" more than the naked word itself denotes. Now we are sure that neither G. M. nor those who think with him will deny that something more than this is requisite. For instance, is not repentance required as well as faith? If so, then saving faith implies works, without which faith is dead. Christ says himself, "In vain ye say Lord, Lord, and do not the things I say." And when he sent his Apostles to preach the gospel to all nations, he instructed them to baptize believers, and, said he, "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." He also told Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Now if baptism is necessary—the Apostles said it was "for the remission of sins"—it requires an authorized person to administer it. For it is to be solemnized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and here is the need of a "priest," or in other words one divinely appointed to act in the name of Deity. Jesus was a High Priest after the order of Melchisedec. Not the only priest, but one of an Order, to which he ordained his Apostles; saying, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." They were thus constituted priests as much as Jesus was. But he was the offering as well as the priest, and in that he differed from them, as well as in his birth and sinlessness. If Jesus is the "only priest in the universe," what are they whom John the Revelator saw and heard singing to Christ, "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests?" And what are Melchisedec, that great High Priest, and others upon whom was sealed an everlasting priesthood that "abideth continually?"

G. M. is right when he traces the corruptions in the apostate church to a "human priesthood," but wrong in his statement that Christ is the only true priest, and in the assumption that we need no other. There are many ordinances in the true church, necessitating a priesthood to administer them, and if they were not needful for the "perfecting of the Saints" as well as "the work of the ministry," Christ would not have placed in his Church apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, &c., nor ordained men to the authority which he had received from the Father.

But G. M. and many others are puzzled over the question of the fate of those who have passed away from earth during the time there was no true Church upon the earth; and is not satisfied with the doctrine of baptism for the dead, to which he says "there is but one reference in the whole Bible." The difficulty arises from his misconception of the plan of redemption and the condition of the departed. Immediate reception into heaven or banishment to an endless hell at death, is a doctrine of apostate Christianity, but not of Christ nor his Apostles. When the Savior died, he did not go straight to heaven in the presence of the Father, but to the spirit world, where he "preached to the spirits in prison." He "preached the gospel to them that were dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh but live according to God in the spirit." This shows that those who in the flesh do not hear the gospel preached by authority nor have the opportunity of obeying the ordinances thereof, will hear it in the world behind the veil, and the baptism for the dead, which would be just as true and necessary if there were no allusion to it at all in the Bible, is instituted for their benefit. All the ordinances needful can, in like manner, be administered to the living, acting for the dead. Spirits can hear, believe, repent and obey in all things that pertain to the spiritual state, but those ordinances that belong to the earth must be administered on earth. And here again is the need of a divinely appointed priesthood understanding by divine direction how, where and with what limits or extensions these sacred ordinances can be properly attended to. Will G. M. tell us how "all men shall be judged by the gospel," as declared by Paul, when millions upon millions of them have never heard the gospel, unless the means we have pointed out is provided for them?

A human priesthood, that is, one invented or authorized only by

man, is worse than none. Its incumbents teach for doctrines the commandments of men; they set up ceremonies and ordinances of their own fabrication; they delude mankind with their vain superstitions; and even when they perform any ordinance after the pattern shown in the scriptures, it is utterly void and worthless because not stamped with the seal of divine authority. Through the teachings of this human priesthood darkness has come upon the minds of men, in which G. M. and others are struggling and groping like blind men for the wall. But, thank God, the gospel is again revealed, the priesthood is again restored, and those who love light rather than darkness may see and learn and obtain the fulness of the blessings of the plan of redemption, and become saviors on Mount Zion. This glorious plan reaches back to all who need deliverance from death and hell, and forward to every son and daughter of our race who shall desire to see and serve God. It dispenses the gloom of a false theology, unfolds the eternal purposes of the Almighty for the exaltation of His children, and welds together the broken links of the chain of the priesthood, by which the fathers may be made perfect with the children, Satan be defeated, Christ's rule established, and the earth with its people be lifted up and clothed with the glory of the Father.

We must defer notice of other points in G. M.'s letter till a future time.

REVISION AND REJECTION OF SCRIPTURE.

It is expected that the revised New Testament, the work of a number of English and American scholars and theologians, will shortly be published to the world. Of course no critical opinions can be justly given of the merits or demerits of the work until it is placed before the public. But it is asserted as a positive fact that many changes and omissions occur in the new volume, and that among the latter are the last twelve verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark.

The effect of these alterations of the standard version are much dreaded by many conservative persons, who fear that skepticism will be reinforced, by the tact admission of the fallibility of the Scriptures which have so long been appealed to as the very word of God. The fact that many passages hitherto relied upon as inspired declarations will now be pronounced spurious, and that others will be so changed that their signification will be altogether different from the accepted interpretation, will no doubt prove a heavy blow against the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of holy writ. And it is not likely that the new version will be accepted as absolutely correct any more than the old. The consequence will probably be, greater contention and wider confusion, with less confidence than ever in the sayings of those who wrote "as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost."

No doubt the learned revisers will offer very plausible reasons for the omission of the twelve verses in Mark. But the Latter-day Saints will be able to discover the true motive without much need of assistance. Those verses contain the promise made by Jesus that certain signs should follow them that believe. The signs not having been among the professed believers in Christ for centuries, the natural conclusion is that either Jesus was not a true prophet or those professing Christians are not true believers, in the scriptural sense. This has been an argument of skeptics for many years. By declaring these verses spurious, the churches will be saved from this imputation, and the obnoxious texts will no longer stand forth as an indication of something lacking in their man-made systems.

The Latter-day Saints know that these rejected texts are true. The same promise contained therein has been renewed in this dispensation. The signs did follow believers in the early Christian Church; they do follow believers now. So the learned revisers may expunge as much as they please, but the promise is still good, and the inferences which may be legitimately

based upon the absence of the signs will be just as strong as ever.

It is a matter of great congratulation that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is not dependent upon the letter of ancient Scripture, in any version, old or new, but is in possession of the truth as revealed direct from the Father of Lights, and that when further knowledge is needed on things that pertain to the salvation of mankind, the living oracles are in our midst, and the Spirit by which Scripture was written is restored to the Saints, so that they may be guided, not by the enticing words of man's wisdom, but by "the living word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

IDAHO LEGISLATURE.

THE following dispatch to the San Francisco *Chronicle* shows that the legislative affairs of our northern neighbors were still in the condition described as a deadlock, up to the 19th inst:

"Boise City, January 19.—The deadlock in the legislature is still unbroken, and the prospects for a compromise between the two wings of the lower house are as remote as ever. The Democrats having assumed to effect an organization before the hour set by law and without having a legal quorum present, it is now asked by the Republicans that this organization be abandoned as illegal, and that they start in anew and organize according to law, and they claim that it should be so recognized, not only by the Council but also by the Governor. Conference committees having been appointed by the two wings of this body, A. Leonard Meyer, chairman of the Republican committee, submitted a proposition to leave the question of the legality of their organization with two leading Democrats and one non-partisan, but even this fair proposition was discarded by the Democrats, who have thus placed themselves in a very bad light before the public and their constituents. Both committees have been discharged, and the deadlock is likely to last to the end of the session."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Boston *Sunday World* of the 5th inst., contains an account of a pretended interview with a "Mormon" Elder engaged in "the introduction of polygamy into Philadelphia." As the real name of this person is said to be "Robert Smith, brother of the Prophet Joseph Smith," and as no such person is known either to history or to the Church in Utah, it is very easy to see that the whole "interview" is bogus, and originated in the brains of some impecunious reporter desirous of turning an "honest penny."

Gum chewers beware! A young lady in St. Louis who was an inveterate gum chewer, after working away for a long time at a piece of "wax" concluded to take a rest. But after hiding her gum for another effort was unable to stop moving her jaw. It kept wagging in spite of her desire to quit. Surgical assistance was procured, after bandages were tried in vain, and she was put under the influence of morphine, which quieted her nerves, and she finally recovered and was able to hold her jaw without help. Girls take warning!

The Bradford (England) *Advertiser*, of December 28th, 1878, contains an interesting letter from Elder Thomas Child, of Springville, Utah, now on a mission in Great Britain. He gives a brief and succinct history of the rise, travels and persecutions of the Church, shows the cause of the hostility against it with the source of the false reports circulated about the Latter-day Saints, and bears testimony to their honesty, sobriety, virtue and devotion to the gospel. The *Advertiser* has exhibited more than usual liberality in publishing the letter in full. It is calculated to remove much prejudice.

The following from the *Mission Mirror*, a Republican paper published in San Francisco, expresses the views of a great many non-"Mormons" on the polygamy question as now presented: "The women of the country, Mormon and otherwise, have petitioned Congress to pass an Amnesty Act, providing: