

"In the silver dollar there is about 78 cents worth of silver. Under the present silver law the government only pays 78 cents for it. But under the free coinage the government would have to pay the silver speculators a dollar for every 78 cents of silver."

As to the theory that silver would be unloaded on us, that is something that goldites can not very clearly demonstrate. And as to paying one dollar for every seventy-eight cents under a free coinage law, the *Mail and Express* is grievously wrong. Unless we misunderstand the aim of free silver advocates, there is no such thing as paying for bullion for coinage purposes. Every owner of bullion could take his metal to the mint and have it handled on the same principle that gold is now handled. But what the value of a silver dollar from an outside standard might be under such a law, is a question yet to be determined. The fact is, the free silver advocates do not clearly define themselves on this point, but the logic of the issue suggests that it does not involve the buying of bullion for coinage.

THE UNPARDONABLE SIN.

We find the following in a recent issue of the *Helena, Montana, Journal*:

"The Salt Lake Tribune is not very eulogistic of the late Samuel B. Axtell, once governor of Utah. It concludes a short article on his death with this language: 'It is an old saying that only good words should be spoken of the dead. It is true, however, that the dead man is no more sacred after the soul has passed out of him than he was before, and it is justice not to forget after death, when through the public acts of a public servant, he in life betrayed his trust and violated his solemn oath.' Brother Goodwin is not one to let the grave cover his resentment toward a man whom he suspects of partiality toward the Mormons; hence this exhibition of post mortem bitterness."

Quite correct. Anybody his sheet suspects of even trying to do justice to the "Mormons," is a "scrub," a "Jack-Mormon," a "hired liar," a "paid perjurer" or something that takes still viler language to designate and is not fit for any other columns than those of the *Salt Lake Tribune*.

NEITHER ELDER NOR AGNOSTIC.

To the Editor:

In your issue of August 24 I find reproduced a letter sent by me to the *New York Evening Post* disclaiming the honor of being a Mormon Elder, which title had been most lavishly bestowed upon me by the *New York press*. You say I am "what is popularly known as a freethinker, though why an agnostic should be considered more of a freethinker than a believer in the Bible we fail to see."

There is, of course, a censure in that, but I want to show that the coat does

not fit me; and as I have never had an opportunity to say a word on this topic let me use the present.

I never chose for myself the name "Freethinker" any more than you chose the name "Mormon." In a general way un-churched people are called "Freethinkers." The majority of the "Liberal" party in Utah is made up of "Freethinkers." You know what I think of them and what I have done to oppose them as a party. It is my opinion that they have much more "free" than "think" and that many of them are—but you will not let me say it.

Speaking for myself I most cordially concede to believers in the Bible all the "free" and ask from them only liberty to exercise my God-given right to "think" according to my ability. We can never quarrel on that point.

In the common use of language "freethinker" and "infidel" are synonymous, and of late the term "agnostic" has been added to the other two. I disclaim all three and am content to be a thinker. Having lived a life of some devotion to what I saw to be my duty, I do not consider myself an infidel. The agnostic says he does not know. I think I do know, and hence am not an agnostic.

If not believing as you believe makes me an "unbeliever," then I am not to be condemned because I cannot believe otherwise than according to the actions of my reason and the dictates of conscience. Names amount to little, yet I have called myself a rationalist. Being that, I insist that all should have equal rights to think for themselves and believe as they can, without censure. What is rational in your faith is mine, and if there is anything rational in the other sects it is mine also, because truth is rational and is or becomes universal.

I have known several Mormons who thought my humble effort in behalf of fair play for their sect was wrong, because I was not a church member. I have known a greater number of alleged Mormons who thought my work wrong because it might turn a "Gentile" dollar from them. To both I would say that I have not been working for Mormons, but for the rights of man denied to Mormons. But I suppose human nature is much the same now that it was two thousand years ago. The man who agitates an unpopular truth or right is misunderstood now as then, and though he cannot be forced to drink the hemlock or bear the cross to Calvary, he is none the less martyred by the million tongues of envy, malice and falsehood. Your "Joseph" even found death, and you yourself are daily a victim to the strokes of a fangless old rattlesnake whose contortions make us all laugh.

Do not think for one moment that I, outside of the church, assume that I possess any more freedom to think than you have inside. Believe me that your rights are sacred to me and I trust mine are to you and yours. I want no freedom that cannot be shared by all—if they want it. I want no salvation that does not belong to me. A good old Mormon said to me yesterday: "God will take care of you and save you whether you want Him to or not." To which I replied, "That is all right. If God deems me worthy of His favor I certainly shall make no opposition."

I may be wrong, but it strikes me that the man or woman who does his duty where he stands unconcerned for the consequences is the one who is doing the will of God in a rational way, and soon or late will see the sun of success strike above him the shining hills of day.

Yours for the Truth and the Right at all times and under any name,

CHARLES ELLIS.

We give place to the foregoing, because we respect the views of the writer and acknowledge his right to define his own position, especially if he thinks we have in the slightest degree misrepresented it. We do not think his definition of it is essentially different from ours. We are of the opinion that a believer in genuine "Mormonism" is just as much of a rationalist as one who does not believe. Also that a disbeliever in Christianity has no more right or title to the name of Rationalist than a true Christian has. Observe, we did not say that Mr. Ellis called himself a Freethinker or an Agnostic. Those names are commonly used in reference to people who hold views similar to those of Thomas Payne, and Robert Ingersoll, and B. F. Underwood, persons whom Mr. Ellis regards with favor and some of whose opinions at least he has defended with vigor and ability.

Mr. Ellis has stated through our columns that he was engaged, shortly after his arrival in this city, to lecture for a society of people who were either "atheists and infidels" or were classed among the "Freethinkers" and Agnostics. So we thought we were doing perfect justice to him in placing him among the latter class, which includes such illustrious names as Huxley and Spencer, and other great thinkers who say there are some things which they do not know and therefore they are Agnostics.

Mr. Ellis says he "does know" and therefore he is not an Agnostic. We are happy to hear it. But he does not tell us what it is he "does know." If he knows those things which Huxley and others say they do not know, he is ahead of them and, so far, he cannot be justly called an Agnostic. There are some things, however, that few mortals know, but in which many of them verily believe, and believing, they are not properly numbered among the Agnostics. It is those who neither know nor believe in what they cannot scientifically demonstrate that are called Agnostics—a term which they usually accept, and which carries no "censure."

We do not think there is anything offensive in the name of "Freethinker," no matter by whom adopted or applied. But we do not concede that any disbeliever or unbeliever in re-