

traveled west till they came to the superb valley of Salt Lake. Brigham Young's plan was to have every man at work and every man in a home. A home a man's share. Not only that, but he overcame the isolation of agricultural life by setting a town with farms about it. He kept his people from mines, a thirst for gold, and held them to land and home. In addition, he associated his people so that they operated factories, mills, railroads, telegraph lines, stores and all that pertain to life in a community. It has become the example and pattern of the new colonial movement, and its success means hope for the city bred man as well as for the farm born. Whilst I must dissent from polygamy with all my being, I must say it is the only religion which compels every man to own his own home. It teaches that no man has a right to own one more acre than he can use, a great Christian lesson of unselfishness. They found a desert and made it a paradise, because they taught that God made the earth for all and not for a few. Necessity taught them that no man had a right to waste one drop of the precious water with which they irrigated their lands; their religion and the religion of Christ teaches that a man has a right only to so much of God's land as he can use. The Mormons are not allowed to fence in a prairie, nor are they rewarded for keeping land idle by having taxes reduced. It is a part of their religion to make the waste places blossom forth and to turn idle lands over to the industrious to improve and own what they do improve and use, but not one acre more. That religion places a premium on industry and unselfishness; that part of it is Christlike, and they live nearer Christ in this respect, far nearer, than the vast majority of so-called Christian people. Fully 98 per cent of the Mormons own their houses and the land on which their houses stand. I want to see the time when every Christian owns his home. I want to see a practical use of the Christian religion as I believe Christ intended it. I have visited the Mormons and have found them most delightful and companionable, all of them industrious, and many highly cultivated. They do not believe as we do; we have a grander, nobler religion, which we do not live up to; they have a religion which they do live up to. That is the difference.

END OF THE WORLD.

We are promised that in a few days Utah will receive a visit from Charles King, whose religious views have gained him notoriety on the Pacific coast. Just how long Mr. King will stay here or what he expects to do is not stated, but it may be presumed he will treat us to about the same kind of talk he has been making elsewhere, in regard to the destruction of the earth and other planets which he alleges is coming within a very short time. Mr. King intends to visit Jerusalem shortly, to carry on researches there; but his name is known more widely in connection with his predictions concerning the end of the world than with any researches he is engaged in. Here is what he said in a recent address:

I know from a lifetime of study that this world will end within twenty-five years, after a series of plagues, droughts, floods and disasters. That sounds preposterous, but it is a fact. The signs of the times indicate an earthquake, which is bound to come. Then will follow the second coming of Christ. I can tell you now that this and all other nations will fall. Previous to that the United States

will have had a king and suffered a great war. Every nation on earth will be destroyed—kings, queens and presidents will fall together. Then 144,000 people, chosen from among the millions by Christ, will be assembled in England under one ruler, there to exist for a few more years, only to fall to final destruction themselves. How do I know this? By revelations which have come to me from heaven.

Mr. King may think he has revelations from heaven, but it is not heavenly to be so inconsistent as are his predictions. His claim of heavenly origin for his utterances may be measured by the fact that heavenly work is that of salvation, while his predictions encompass utter destruction, even for the 144,000 which he says are chosen by Christ. The source of such "revelations" may be readily seen as from hades rather than otherwise. Their "fruit" tells the story; and Mr. King has injected a few truths that have been known to the world for centuries so as to arouse the sympathy and fears of people who place confidence in them. The gentleman's true situation is discoverable from such assertions as these made by him:

I say that I am gifted with supernatural revelations, an immortal life, and the same powers that were vested in Christ. I will not die. I will live until time itself is no more. Supposing you should take my life this minute, or that I should die in some accident. My clay would collapse and be borne to a grave, but I would be resurrected just as Christ was, and you could not hold my body. I have power to cure the afflicted and when death comes I will arise just as immortal Christ.

The very fact that Christ lived and died to the meridian of time, as related by the sacred historians, denies the possibility of the claims that Mr. King makes for himself. The name of Jesus is "the one name;" He is the one Mediator. And any one who sets up a claim as does Mr. King denies the revelations of heaven and occupies the attitude of an anti-Christ, whatever his other pretensions may be. As to judgments coming in this age of the world, these have been outlined by followers of Christ long before Mr. King took them up, hence they are not original with him. His claims as to the twenty-five-year limit to the world's existence, and others of similar character are, however, contradictory of the clear and true statements, hence they will fall unfulfilled. No thoughtful person will be deceived thereby. We apprehend that Mr. King makes them as much from a desire to alarm people by his sensationalism and to reap worldly profit thereby as from any other motive. This "end of the world" talk should not scare anybody; it is altogether out of the line of prophecy which it pretends to interpret.

THE COLLEGE BILL.

According to the provisions of a certain bill which has passed both houses of the Legislature and is now in the hands of the Governor, any individual or corporation who will guarantee an endowment of \$100,000 to a proposed or existing college or university within the State shall be granted a charter

for the said institution, which may thereupon issue diplomas and degrees to its graduates in the name of the State. While not wishing to anticipate in any improper manner the action of the Governor upon this measure, or in the least to dampen the zeal of any unselfish interest that may manifest itself in whatever quarter in behalf of education, we feel that something ought to be said in this connection to clear away certain errors that seem to beset certain minds with respect to the character of a state institution as distinguished from private business. Probably no better example could be found with which to demonstrate this distinction than the public schools. There are those who, holding to the ultra-democratic doctrine that the sole purpose of the state is to enable its citizens to work out their individual destiny without undue interruption, still contend that teaching school is not a proper business for the state to engage in. Whether in harmony with the spirit of the age or not, such views are at least consistent with themselves. This much cannot be said of the persistent effort which is made at almost every sitting of the Legislature to entangle the state in the conduct of private schools. It would be surely a usurpation for the State deliberately to obstruct the development of private institutions of learning. But it would be quite as inconsistent for the state to run to the other extreme and indulge in the solemn farce of certifying to their diplomas and degrees. It would be no less consistent for one of these private schools to demand of the regents of another private school, which happened to be more firmly established in the educational world, the endorsement of its degrees than to make such a demand of the state. The state is in the school business precisely as the Methodist or the Episcopal church is so engaged, and upon the same general plan. The denominational churches long ago discovered that the school room was the most effective of all legitimate methods to make trustworthy and desirable members of their respective societies. The state likewise discovered that the school room was the surest bulwark of liberty and that money so expended brought better returns than if spent upon guns and armies. It was fully demonstrated that while as a rule a substantially educated citizen has within himself an ample defense against all ordinary encroachments, the wholly ignorant man as a rule requires vast government paraphernalia to keep him from being trodden under foot. Upon this theory the state has gone into the school business as a means of working its salvation. To this end it has provided by law—to an extreme and excessive degree, some think—for fully equipping and officering its school system, from the lowest to the highest grade of school work. Every officer in that system is a state official and responsible to the state for the performance of his duty. When work has been performed under such auspices it is truly a proper function of the state to put its seal upon it. But these conditions in no respect correspond with the relations of the state to the private school. In order for the state to justify itself in certifying to the diplomas of such schools as are provided for in the bill under dis-