

company with choleric and quarrelsome persons, for they will engage him into their own quarrels."

NORTH CAROLINANS AND MORMONS-

The attention of the "News" has been called to two letters which have been given prominence in the Kinston, North Carolina, Free Press. Ordinarily the "News" does not care to give attention to such statements as those contained in the communications referred to, since they are manifestly so unscrupulous and untrue that reasoning people will not believe any part of them. The grossness of their malicious falsity is so marked, that any intelligent person who gives the matter thought will recognize it at once. But for the reason that it may be of advantage to some people occasionally to call attention to such misstatements, to show their inaccuracy and inherent malice and that frequent reiteration does not add the color of truth, we make mention of this occurrence.

One of the communications is from Prof. E. B. Lewis, of Concord, N. C. He says Utah, Arizona and Idaho are places "where every magistrate and every officer is a 'saint,' and where no Gentile can acquire land or property;" that a Mormon "disdains science and hygiene;" that "children have no value but as prospective units in the Church, their lives are as colorless and blank as the desert prairie;" that no physician presides at their birth, and "the birth-chamber is no more secluded than the hog-pen;" that "legally, they are outlaws; ethically they are reversionary; morally, they are colorless; socially, they are brutes; politically, they are anarchists; historically considered, they have not in a half century deserved a line except to chronicle their misdeeds; in literature they are as barren as the shores of their Dead Sea;" and that "were a single individual to live in our midst [North Carolina], as a consistent Mormon, we would certainly lynch him as quickly as a rope and a tree could be found." These quotations are only a sample of Prof. Lewis's assertions; and he knows "some few things about Mormons."

If Mr. Lewis knows a thing about the Mormons, he has not told it in his letter, which never emanated from a source other than that of the vilest among men. No clean man, however misled he might be, would ever pen such a communication. And what does the Kinston Free Press editor think of his action in publishing the gross libel? He cannot but know as a newspaper man, with the slightest knowledge of national affairs, that Mr. Lewis's assertions are wholly untrue; he knows that the national record of the Mormon people contradicts every word of it; that of the three senators which Utah has had, two of them are Gentiles; that of the four Representatives in Congress during the past seven years, two have been Gentiles; that not a Mormon has been sent to Congress from either Idaho or Arizona; and he may not know it, though it is a fact, that the majority of the State officials in Utah are not Mormons, but Gentiles, and that Idaho and Arizona are more pronounced in that direction. He also ought to be aware of the fact that the educational facilities and accomplishments in Utah are a long way superior to North Carolina; that the work performed by Mormon Elders in that state is evidence of their intellectual and moral superiority as "consistent Mormons." And he ought to defend his own people from the base aspersion that they would be so lost to honor and justice as to be a common mobocratic horde of lynchers.

The other letter referred to is from Rev. W. W. Bays, and the headings to his communication indicate sympathy with its utterances on the part of the newspaper. It makes many assertions against the Book of Mormon, one of which is that it "was first written, as a novel, by a Rev. Mr. Spaulding, a Presbyterian minister." Of course every preacher in the United States with the educational acquirements which Rev. Dr. Bays appears to possess, knows that the Spaulding story was exploded long since; that the original of that story is in the library of the Oberlin College, Ohio; and that there is not the slightest connection between it and the Book of Mormon. These facts all have been brought out by non-Mormons. But to the credit of many denominational preachers, in the Southern States and elsewhere, be it said, they are not so fond of bearing false witness against their neighbors as Rev. W. W. Bays shows himself to be.

Our Kinston cotemporary should recall the adage that "evil communications corrupt good manners," and should purge itself, by presenting the truth about the Mormons, of the uncleanness that has marred its columns in giving space to the Lewis and Bays letters.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR BELIEF.

The question, What is the nature of belief, and what are the conditions under which it arises? has always been considered of great importance, both from a religious and philosophical point of view. It involves another, How can a human being regulate his belief? Is he or is he not responsible for receiving or rejecting certain propositions that claim his consideration?

Recently this subject has been discussed in a highly materialistic way by a writer in Popular Science Monthly. He says man is mainly an organism through whom the various forces of the world flow, just as the sponge is subject to the different currents of the ocean in which it has an existence. Belief, he says, is only one of the human functions dependent on environment.

In illustration of his position he states that mental operation is accompanied by an increased flow of blood to the brain, and that this gives a key to the condition under which belief arises. Not calm reasoning but feeling is the essential requisite. Anything, even a stimulant, may, according to the author, be expected to quicken belief. Coffee, he thinks, awakens doubts as a general rule, while alcohol dispels skepticism and enthrones belief. Love, particularly disappointed passion, is another stimulant of faith, as is joy, while sorrow, remorse and melancholy, strangely enough after what has been asserted of disappointed love, are conducive to doubt.

Enough has been selected of the author's views on this subject to show their general bearing. They are substantially one with those of the agnostic who said he was no more responsible for his belief than for the color of his hair. To both man is only a machine, an instrument accidentally turned by circumstances and responding to the winds that may happen to strike the various strings. The loftiest hymns of adoration that ever were composed by Hebrew poets were but echoes of the vibrations of excited nerves; the songs of praise, the sweet harmony of which daily ascend to the throne of grace like the incense from the altar in the ancient sanctuary are but the offspring of stimulation, excitement. Can this be in accordance with facts?

It is certainly not the scriptural view of the question. Here faith is the as-

urance or the giving substance to things hoped for, the evidence or the test of things not seen. It is the gift of the Almighty, but obtainable by all through attention, or "giving heed" to the facts on which it depends. This is the scriptural doctrine. Man is so constituted that if he honestly and humbly will apply his mind to the contemplation of truth and error, he cannot but believe the former and reject the latter. He is therefore justly under condemnation if he does not believe the truth, if deliberately he chooses darkness in preference to light.

Those that take the view of the writer referred to above, and of the agnostics, always ignore an important fact in relation to man. Man's physical frame may be a machine, wonderfully conceived and executed, but within this is a personality, the ego, the center of self-consciousness, in accordance with whose volition the various parts, with certain limitations, operate. Man is not, like a vessel on the sea without a guiding hand, doomed to be tossed about by waves and currents and finally wrecked on a rocky shore. Within is the rational mind endowed with power and knowledge to counteract the adverse forces that surround him. Man is therefore held accountable for the wonderful craft entrusted to him, not only for its physical parts but also for its mental powers, including that of belief, just as a pilot is accountable for the vessel he guides, and all that pertains thereto.

SPAIN IS TEMPORIZING.

The tenor of the dispatches for some days indicates that Spain is temporizing in regard to Cuba. Gen. Blanco, who succeeds Gen. Weyler as captain general of Cuba, and is represented to have been sent from Madrid to Havana with authority to inaugurate local self government on the island, has been in command a week, yet is not reported to have made any offers to the insurgents even looking to autonomy. This fact confirms the assurance contained in the statement by Hon. Hannis Taylor, ex-minister to Spain, made public yesterday, to the effect that the pretense that Gen. Blanco was authorized to propose autonomy was false, and that in reality he neither possessed nor would attempt to exercise any such authority.

That is, Spain is trying to humbug both the insurgents and the United States government, particularly the latter. Such a game cannot possibly last long. A few days' time inevitably must disclose the truth, and if the disclosure sufficiently proves that the Sagasta administration is dealing in subterfuge, with no real intention of submitting proposals of a reasonable character to the insurgents, the government of the United States has only one thing to do, which is to intervene and stop the war.

On Wall street yesterday government securities fell on account of the growing possibilities of war between this country and Spain, due to the evident duplicity and vacillating conduct of the latter country. It is impossible for this government to recede from the position it took, at least by implication, in the message that Minister Woodford delivered to the Spanish court; and it therefore follows that Spain must do something right away, looking to the end of hostilities in Cuba, or else this government will. The matter is approaching a highly interesting stage.

The dispatches give particulars of a manifesto addressed to the insurgent government which originated in New York city, and is being signed by Cubans all over the world. It gives reasons why the insurgents cannot