

A process is said to have been perfected by Professor Vogel, a distinguished German chemist, by which skilled artists can reproduce the natural colors of both animate and inanimate objects by the photographer's art. He is awaiting the summer light of Berlin for a complete demonstration of his discovery, and all lovers of the beautiful will indulge in the hope, if they have not the faith that what he claims will prove all that he anticipates. If he is thoroughly successful it will be another instance of theory being overcome by practice and of "It is done" smiling in triumph over "It cannot be done."

Nature in colors is the great desideratum of all artists of the brush. What beautiful effects will be produced and what labor and time will be saved when color photography becomes a perfect art! We say "when, advisedly;" for we have believed for a quarter of a century that this "impossible" thing will be accomplished, and that means will be found to fix the colors upon the camera and thus lift art to her true place as the companion and interpreter rather than the handmaid of Nature.

THE POWER OF PREJUDICE.

It is remarkable how prejudice lingers in the human mind and how it colors all it touches. When once it gains away the soul that it enthalls is often unconscious of its power, and is bent and biased by its influence even when desiring to be upright or to lean in the opposite direction. The editor of the Salt Lake *Tribune* offers a striking illustration of this. And an article on the first volume of the History of Utah, which appeared on Sunday morning, is one of the most recent proofs of it.

Commencing with a well deserved eulogy of the book as a magnificent specimen of the printer's and binder's art, the writer proceeds to confess the difficulty of the task before him in reviewing the work in its literary aspect. He commends the style as "beautiful," acknowledges that it is written with "care," but permits his prejudices against the "Mormon" people and their faith to arise and tinge all he has to say about the incidents the book relates.

He recognizes the evident intention of the author to "make history" in such a way as not "to throw any light upon it except that of everlasting truth," and yet asserts that he "puts down the ideals which his own fancy has awakened;" that he has done so "all through the book;" that "he has taken the rough boy Joseph Smith and made him walk the earth a second Christ;" that he has made charges of "direct cruelty upon the men of Missouri, the men of Illinois, and the Government of the United States before the Saints came here;" that he has "intruded into the book" the history of the Mormon Battalion "in a form to show that a mighty hardship was inflicted upon the Mormon people;" that he has "displayed the same spirit in the description of the Mountain Meadows massacre;" that he has made criticisms of Judges and Governors in the same spirit that we have seen them

year after year in the *DESERET NEWS*;" that "there is not one place where any man who opposed the Saints in a public or private capacity was right." And the work is summed up as "magnificent reading but not history except as to the dates and events and the bare fact stated."

We fear that in addition to the effect of prejudice upon the critic's mind, is the weakness that comes through lack of proper attention to his subject. He has evidently only skimmed the book he pretends to review instead of diving into it. Some things he objects to are not in the work but merely in his imagination, and he is dissatisfied with it because it is not colored to harmonize with his anti-"Mormon" animosities and *Tribune* versions of important occurrences, the participants in many of which are living witnesses to the unreliability of that paper's attempts at narrative.

The author of the History of Utah has indeed presented this portion of his work in such a way as to impress the reader that his intention is not to throw any light upon it except that of everlasting truth, and his critic has not given us evidence of anything to the contrary. If this is only "history as to the dates and events and the bare fact," is not that history enough? And these are what Bishop Whitney has gathered into his book, in consecutive order, and in such language as to force the confession from his critic that it makes "magnificent reading."

We consider the book singularly free from the "ideals" of the writer and from rhetorical flights and theoretical comments. He gives, not his own opinions, but the impressions produced upon the people of the times he refers to, and these the critic confounds with the author's views and sentiments.

Instead of making Joseph Smith "a second Christ," the history exhibits his follies and mistakes as well as his "successes and labors."

There is no word in the book that charges "cruelty upon the Government before the Saints came here." But the cruelty of the men of Missouri and the men of Illinois is stamped upon their inhuman acts, and requires nothing but the relation of "the dates and events and bare facts," which the *Tribune* admits the author gives, to brand those men as bloodthirsty ruffians and inhuman assassins.

The story of the enlistment of the Mormon Battalion is simple history. It is not *Tribune* perversions nor anti-Mormon apologies. Neither is it an attack on any person or party for what was done or left undone. There is not a line in the narration that is not true, as attested by eye witnesses and persons now living who passed through the scenes described.

The story of the massacre at Mountain Meadows excuses no one who was engaged in the awful crime. It is told with strict fidelity to the facts developed, but not in accordance with the imaginary horrors and invented incidents, manufactured for the purpose of implicating the innocent and blaming persons to whom the wickedness of that tragedy is as abhorrent as it is to the angels.

There is no criticism of Governors

in the work. The critic has once more drawn upon his imagination for an objection instead of on the book. What is told of the Judges in the early days of Utah is the simple truth. It cannot be controverted. No attempt is made to dispute what is said. The *DESERET NEWS* has had occasion, year after year, to tell some of these facts and has expressed opinions concerning them. The History of Utah relates the occurrences but does not indulge in invective. Without this narration it would not be a history of Utah.

It is not true that the author has failed to recognize the good or the right, where it existed, in persons private or official who opposed the Saints. We could prove the contrary if we had space to quote from the volume. The assertion of the critic is rash and shows, as we have said, that he has not read the book [but only given it cursory attention. For, is he not the editor of the *Tribune*, and is he not therefore too exact to wilfully mistake and too generous to an adversary to intentionally misquote him?

The article is all dyed and tinted with the stains of prejudice, and exhibits a mingled desire to say something pleasant as to the historian and disposition to be bitter and spiteful as to his people and their history. It is a great misfortune to the bright mind so warped and biased and, unfortunately, the infirmity appears to be incurable.

TO ABOLISH THE UTAH COMMISSION.

It appears that the Committee on Appropriations of the House determined, after all, that they would not furnish any more money for the Utah Commission. They therefore recommended that the useless Board be abolished, and the duties which they performed be devolved upon the Governor, Secretary and Chief Justice of the Territory, without compensation, and that a sufficient sum be appropriated for secretary work and other necessary expenses.

Of course this will not abolish the Utah Commission unless the House adopts the report, which is quite likely to occur, and the Senate agrees, which is not likely to occur. It is barely possible that both Houses will be of one mind as to the uselessness of the Commission and that it will cease to exist. It is probable, however, that it will be continued until Utah becomes a State.

This consummation we believe is near at hand, and therefore the people of Utah can afford to view with equanimity the continuance of the Commission as long as Uncle Sam chooses to pay for the expensive and needless incumbrance. All the same, however, there would be very general acquiescence in the action of Congress, if it relieved the gentlemen who compose the Commission of any further neglect of their important and lucrative professions at their respective homes.

Nothing is so sweet as to feel sure that our children are inside and outside healthy. Upon mothers rests the sublime effort to create a noble generation. The future is ours.