

the eastern question without consulting England, but probably they would change that opinion were there any foundation for Russian surmises relative to an offensive and defensive alliance between England and the United States.

At all events the reply of Secretary Olney to the Russian minister when seeking information as to the treaty may be regarded as one of the most significant ever made by a secretary of state of this country. If not based on pure imagination, it signifies that henceforth American diplomacy may be launched into the seething pool of European politics.

ANCIENT SCIENCES.

One of the tendencies of the present age is to self-glorification on account of the enormous progress made in the domains of arts and sciences. The supposition is that this generation is a far advanced intellectually as to render all comparison out of the question. Once in a while rays of light from the dim antiquity reveal the existence of civilizations in remote times, of which but a faint idea can be had now, and it is certainly curious to find from these is certainly curious to find from these is that the ancient saying "There is nothing new under the sun," conveys more literal truth than some might imagine.

An East Indian sage has recently issued a historical review of the Arian medical science, and in this he makes some assertions considered rather startling. He claims that some of the great modern discoveries in medicine were known to the Hindus centuries ago, and among these are vaccination and the use of anaesthetics. He claims that in Ayur Veda, one of the oldest books on medical science, all the modern methods of diagnosis are set forth. The circulation of the blood, the discovery of which is attributed to Harvey, he claims was known to the author of this Veda, and he adds that delicate operations supposed to have been unknown until fifty years ago were performed in India thousands of years ago.

Naturally these and similar assertions will be received with caution, but it is well known that some of the ancient nations had attained a high degree of civilization and that much of Western science was known in the earliest days of men. Emperor Nero is said to have had a ring in which was set a gem through which he watched the contest of the gladiators in the ring—a kind of opera glass, evidently. The microscope must have been known long before our era. A precious stone, once the property of Michael Angelo, is said to have engraved on it several human figures which can only be seen plainly through a microscope. From the ruins of Nineveh, a stone has been recovered, twenty inches long and ten inches broad, on which a treatise on mathematics is engraved, impossible to read—and consequently also to write—without the aid of a magnifying glass. In architecture some ancient buildings are yet impenetrable mysteries. Egyptian architects knew how to handle blocks of rock weighing from 100,000 to 300,000 pounds and to place them in position and fit them one to another with such a de-

gree of precision that not a knife blade can be inserted between them. Such testimonies from antiquity would seem to go far towards disproving some of the wild fancies of modern philosophy regarding the barbarous condition of our early ancestors.

They should also suggest the necessity of using great caution in the criticism of the sacred literature on the ground that it contains allusions to modern arts and sciences. A few years ago a lecturer against the Book of Mormon, in true infidel style, stated that the law of the circulation of the blood was not known till after the time of Harvey and that the pores of the skin could not have been discovered until after the invention of the microscope, and that therefore a certain sentence in the ancient record must be a fraud. Should it, however, be capable of demonstration that already the ancient Vedas contain reference to these modern discoveries, skepticism is, as usually, unarmed before facts.

NO CHURCH INFLUENCE IN IDAHO.

Scheming politicians regard the use or misuse of any influence, to make it gain their own ends, as perfectly legitimate, hence it is not to be wondered at that the game is being worked in the senatorial contest in the Idaho legislature, as it was at the election. Then, as now, it was alleged that Mormon Church influence was being used to affect voters; and then, as now, the allegation was without foundation in fact. Sometimes the use, by politicians, of Church influence, is sought direct; at other times it is aimed to obtain it in negative form, by asserting that the opposite party is using it, and by getting denials of authorization thereof, for political purposes. Just where the blame is to be placed in this instance we are not prepared to say; but that there is blame attached to somebody is apparent from the following dispatch, which it was necessary to send from this city on Saturday, the message being directed to a Democratic member of the Idaho legislature, and also a Mormon:

SALT LAKE, Utah, Jan. 16,

Hon. Thomas E. Bassett:

We have received the following dispatch from Senator Teller:

"Word reaches us here that local leaders of your people in Idaho are opposing Senator Dubois under real or affected authority of the Church. Myself and others of your friends earnestly represent to you how unjust to your people is such a report. We trust that you will be at least fair enough to Dubois to state by wire to your legislators at Boise that the Church is not opposed to his re-election."

For the information of yourself and fellow legislators of our faith, we desire it distinctly understood that we as a Church are not opposing Senator Dubois' re-election, and that Church influence must not be used for or against the senator. WILFORD WOODRUFF.

The position stated, that the Church is not seeking to be detrimental to affecting the result in Idaho one way or the other is, we believe, pretty well understood. At least it ought to be. When a church is assailed, then it must use such measures of defense as are at its hand; but there is no such assault in the Idaho senatorial proposition itself, although there is in any effort

to use Church influence to affect the result there—hence it is a measure of defense to forbid the use of that influence. All Church members have the right as citizens to their choice between candidates, and no church or other society has the right to combine and act in relation thereto unless the constitutional rights of such organization are involved, which latter emergency is not the case in Idaho.

SUNDAY AND LEGISLATION.

The matter of legislating against Sunday being a working day has received considerable attention in discussion of late, and in some instances the debate has grown rather warm. The point of the most heated discussion has been one that does not really belong to the question—that of prohibiting work on Sunday solely because very many people regard that as a day of sacred rest. The fact that the majority of the people so regard it is an important consideration in deciding which day to select as that of the seven on which to rest, since thereby Sunday is ascertained to be the most acceptable to the majority. But the argument for Sunday on the sole basis of its being a Sabbath for Christians is as effective for Saturday on behalf of the Jews; still, if the choice were between the two, the majority would be for the former, and so settle it as a state question. On the other hand, the opposition to Sunday as a rest day because it is the Christian Sabbath smacks of bigotry, and really is no argument to affect the state, since in this country the latter knows no distinction between churches.

The real question for legislators in a government like this is whether one day's rest in seven is beneficial to the people; and that being answered in the affirmative, the choice of day is properly that which agrees with the sentiment of the majority of the people, which in this case is in favor of Sunday. As to the main proposition, one day's rest in seven from regular labor, the enlightened legislation of the world has given emphatic endorsement to that idea, and has gone farther in saying that even that is not sufficient, but there should be holidays as well. So far as local enactment by modern civilized nations is concerned, the system had its inception in that fountain of jurisprudence, the law-giver Moses, who received it as a divine command. And to those who recognize the omniscience of the Supreme being, the thought is ready that He knew what was a necessity for man in this regard, therefore made it binding that no man should be required regularly to labor more than six days consecutively.

Labor organizations and leaders have been giving some attention of late to this subject, and the expressions of some of those leaders as given in the Christian Endeavor this month are of interest as showing the aim of the workingmen, and of weight as being backed by force of logic and fact, from an ethical, practical, and secular standpoint. These point out that labor unions, in their movement to reduce the hours of labor, also seek to limit the labor of workers to six days per week; that in many industries they