

ney from our former homes. For a number of years we had to go to Alamosa, a distance of 300 miles, for the necessities of life, flour costing \$10 per hundred delivered here.

We found that in order to irrigate the land around our settlement we would have to make a canal seven miles long. A portion of this canal would have to be made in the river and along a bank of shifting quicksands.

It required the united labor of sixty men seven months for three years to bring the water successfully to our settlement. The remaining five months of each year we had to go to Colorado and labor for the support of ourselves and our families. Allowing each man \$50 per month while working at home on the canal, this will make the canal cost \$63,000. This we consider a low estimate of the actual cost of construction, considering the price of flour and other supplies.

One writer stated that the "Mormons" were anxious to leave their homes and that Bishop (President) Hammond was with the commission and aided them all in his power in making the treaty. These statements are not true. In the first place the "Mormons" are not anxious to leave their homes, but quite the reverse. Again, President Hammond did not aid the commission only in getting a correct idea of the country and in placing a fair valuation on our improvements. The commission did not have time to visit Bluff, so they asked President Hammond to make an estimate of our claims and improvements and to place it at as low a figure as possible, promising to double it in their report, and to see that we received a fair remuneration for our trouble in moving.

The estimate was given in at one-third the actual cost. The commission cut it down two thirds more in their report, thus allowing us about 11 cents on the dollar for our property.

The commission represented to the Secretary of the Interior that our canal was a failure, and that we had no more right to claim it as an improvement than a man would have whose house was built on the bank of a river and then washed away; and that they were sorry for the people, but did not think the United States ought to pay for such improvements. This illustration was untrue for our canal has not been washed down the river, but on the contrary it has carried water to our farms and gardens every year since its completion, and has a good stream of water in it at the present time.

It is claimed that we are only squatters, and that consequently we have no claim upon our lands. This is partly true, but it is no fault of ours, for we have been trying for nine years to get the government to survey this part of the country and let us enter and secure title to our claims.

We are truly grateful to our respected representative, Hon. John T. Caine, for his faithful and successful labors in our behalf. And should the question come up in Congress

again, and no doubt it will, we hope to have a man there who is acquainted with all our circumstances to assist him in obtaining justice for us.

In regard to our seeming willingness to move, we are law-abiding citizens and willing to leave our hard earned homes if the interest of the government and country require it. But we are not willing to move without a fair remuneration for our labor and improvements. We are not, as some writers would have you believe, sitting supremely down without ambition or enterprise, waiting for government to move us, but we are still making improvements around our homes, planting fruit and shade trees, and fencing and farming not only our old farms, but new ones.

We are well satisfied with our homes, and our prospects for good grain and fruit crops have never been better. The health of the people is good, and a good spirit prevails, notwithstanding the dark cloud that is hanging over us.

Wishing you and your valuable paper success, and the triumph of truth and justice, I remain yours truly,

JENS NIELSEN.  
Bluff, San Juan County, Utah,  
June 12, 1889.

### "CHRISTIAN" IDOLATRY.

At the conclusion of an article on "Ten Great Religions," and idolatrous worship, I promised to say something more on the subject, connecting it more closely with dissenters from the Roman Catholic Church and other Protestants of today, who in turn charge the church with being idolatrous in her worship. I now undertake to redeem that promise.

Idol worship I understand to be the worshiping of any being or thing, either real or imaginary, as God, or instead of Him, which is not the living and true God, or the God who made man in His own image. Then, in order to find out who worships such a God and who does not, our best way will be, first, to get a fair and plain description of the true and living God from those who—having had a favorable opportunity of inquiring—ought to know. We will first hear what He says of himself, as recorded by the historian Moses. "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our own likeness" (Genesis 1: 26). Now we will see if they did as they contemplated. In the 27th verse we read "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." From the above we learn that man was created and consequently is in the image of God. But we will call another witness who ought to know something about the matter. Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, chap. 1, v. 3, speaking of Jesus of Nazareth, says, "Who being the brightness of His (God's) glory, and the express image of His person." Now, if Jesus was in the express image of God's person, God must necessarily be in the express image of Jesus;

and from what is said of Him by the Apostles and others who saw Him, He was in image and person the same after His resurrection as before; not differing in appearance of body or image from men generally of that age. The foregoing is sufficient for my present purpose. So when we think of Him, or His Father, who is our Heavenly Father also, we should think of them as living and real Gods, as possessing emotions like our own human emotions of love, pity, sorrow, anger, only purified from the grossness and narrowness. It is only false philosophy, and not the Scriptures, that consists in making God as different and distinct from man as possible. All professing Christians, whether Catholic or Protestant, acknowledge the authority from which I have quoted. But we shall soon see whether they keep to the law and the testimony. In this I don't wish to be uncharitable. Hence I quote from the latest published work at my command, namely, "The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," published in "Nashville, Tenn., the Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1884." "Articles of Religion, chapter 1, sec. 1" of "Faith in the Holy Trinity." First, there is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts; and in unity of this Godhead there are three persons of one substance, power and eternity—the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost." "2nd—The Son, who is the word of the Father, the very and Eternal God, of one substance with the Father." 4th—The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, is one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and Eternal God."

It will readily be seen that the above described God is very different from Him described in the Scriptures by Moses, as the God of Israel, in that he has no body nor parts, whereas the Scriptural one has a body and all the parts of man whom He made and fashioned after Himself. This is quite an important difference, though the Methodists is perhaps as good a description as could be given in the absence of revelation or inspiration, after so many hundreds of years of darkness, error and corruption in the universal or Roman Catholic church, as is claimed by all dissenting or Protestant churches. Nevertheless the description is not correct.

Speaking of churches, I will quote a little further from the same work, i. e., "Articles of Religion." "Of the rights and ceremonies of the church." 22: "It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same or exactly alike, for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times and men's manners." It strikes me that would have been a novel idea to Jesus and the Apostles. Judging from their teachings they were very particular that rites and ceremonies of the eternal law of the gospel should remain as es