

date assigned to the revelation is 96 A. D. while others (and more probably) give it the date of 87 or 88. The three epistles were written 88 and the gospel 97, so that there is no possibility for thinking that God did not intend to add anything to the existing records.

The gospel of John is the last book of the New Testament. And in this very book we have the comforting promise of Christ recorded: "He (the Spirit) shall glorify Me: for he shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father has are Mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you." (Joh. 16. 14, 15.)

Here is a promise of continuous revelation. J. M. S.

OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

The following clipping from the *Chicago Tribune* will speak for itself. It will be seen that there are a pair of papers of the same name and nature, or, as we say here, *Fibianes*. Two donkeys braying in-unison make good music. This is a case of mutual scratching. The Salt Lake brother copies from its Chicago fellow, and comments; then comes the Chicago brother and reproduces the whole. Here is the clipping:

STILL HATE ABRAHAM LINCOLN.
MORMONS KEEP ALIVE THE SPIRIT INCULCATED BY THEIR OLD LEADERS.

The *Chicago Tribune* has this: A singular thing occurred the last anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday in this city. Several German societies banded together and went to Lincoln Park. They strewed evergreens and flowers about the Lincoln statue. Speeches were made in German and German songs were sung. Not a line about these observations was printed in any English newspaper in this city. The Germans could find time from his business to honor the memory of the martyr President, but the American was too busy hustling for the mighty dollar down town to bestow any thought upon that day—at least so far as I have been able to learn.

We copy the above simply to show the difference between alien-born men and aliens. Those Germans in Chicago by that one act showed that they were as good Americans as American-born men. If Chicago were to become a Mormon city the sons of 10,000 years would rise and set before any Mormon would lay a wreath at the foot of Abraham Lincoln's monument. The reason is that when Abraham Lincoln lived the head of the Mormon people taught them that he was their enemy, and that teaching will go down through all the ages as long as any Mormon lives on earth. That little fact alone makes it clear that the Mormon people do not belong to the Union States. Their fealty is to another government, and Congress should pass the Oullom bill simply as an act of justice and of reasonable national self-preservation.—*Salt Lake Tribune*.

Some of the Mormon eating politicians of Utah join in this cry, and throughout the land the vile, wicked, malicious falsehood is heralded, and the Mormon is pronounced disloyal because a few fellows who are ashamed of their origins say so, and a few whisky-soaked tramps with perjured tongues come up to confirm the charge.

What are the facts in this case? They are few and simple. They are incontrovertible, unassailable, irrefragable. First turn to Tullidge's *History of Salt Lake*. In the chapter devoted to the story of the *DESERET NEWS* will be found the following paragraph, page 14, in the appendix:

"Willard Richards' death, in 1854, gave the paper (the *DESERET NEWS*) into the editorial hands of Albert Carrington, under whom it was continued. Judge Elias Smith succeeded Carrington. Under Smith's control the *NEWS* manifested much character and independence. His retirement was caused by the publication of an editorial in 1863, which seemed to breathe the tone of the Southern cause, and, though the article was written by a subordinate, Judge Elias Smith was too much like his cousin Joseph, the Prophet, to shift the responsibility from his own shoulders."

Will the slanderer of Utah, or his counterpart of Chicago contradict this? Can they do it? No, they can not, nor can the hireling literary perverters who do their vile work do it. The Washington politician has all the war records of both sides at his command, but not a line, nor a document can be produced showing that one word was ever uttered in Utah against Lincoln, while there is ample historical evidence to show that overtures were made to the Utah delegate in Congress during the war to espouse the side of Jeff Davis. Even Powers and Anderson join in the cry of disloyalty against the Mormons. As between Jeff Davis and Abraham Lincoln it is hard to determine which was the nobler type of American. In all that constitutes grandeur, sublimity and heroism in a man, Jefferson Davis was the peer of Mr. Lincoln. Nature adorned him physically and mentally with attributes almost divine. He was a soldier, a statesman, a patriot, an orator. He had the courage of his convictions, and he had the good fortune to be supported by as brave, as chivalrous (though mistaken) a people as ever graced the records of history, ancient or modern. But from our point of view it is matter for rejoicing that his cause did not triumph, his side of the conflict being grounded on error.

Abraham Lincoln was a man in every sense of the word. He had a clear head and a bright intellect, both of which were supplemented by industry, energy and indomitable perseverance. In all his career he never uttered a word against Utah, and there is not on record a word uttered by Utah against him. In our own day our vilest traducers are to be found among his own party. It is only a short time ago that an Illinois man named Herndon wrote a biography in which it is stated that Abraham Lincoln's mother was the illegitimate daughter of a Southern slave owner. And what is more, the biographer states that Lincoln gloried in this ancestry and considered it a kind of patent of nobility. For my part I believe Herndon is a consummate villain. Even if the facts were correct as regards ancestry, that Lincoln would boast of it with pride is something that no admirer of Lincoln can ever believe. The story was reproduced in all the Chicago papers. I remember reading in one particular paper additional matter supporting Herndon. This paper is the *Evening Journal*. It will be remembered that the aged editor of this paper died suddenly here a few weeks ago. He was counted a good Christian, a model American, a noble man—but he died in a low den on Quincy Street.

These are the men who blacken the memory of Lincoln and who traduce Mormons and charge them with disloyalty and impurity.

In relation to the recent Supreme Court business I must relate a rather strange experience of my own. You know that this august body is coming in for some severe criticism lately. The fact is, it is on trial for its own life. The Farmers' Alliance is pretty vigorous in demanding the abolition of the Supreme Court. Now the prohibitionists are attacking it with violence. Of course, in my humble way, I was backing and sustaining the court. I even tried to find justification in the Dred Scott business. The "Original Package" decision I unreservedly upheld as conformable to American nationality. The Idaho Test Oath decision I looked upon as the result of misinformation which time would revoke. But now comes the Church case decision, and I find myself in a strange predicament. I can't find anything to justify in that case, and if I were to express myself plainly, my language might be deemed intemperate. Above all things control language. Owen Meredith says in *Lucile*.

"Words, however, are things, and the man who records
To his language the license to outrage his soul
Is controlled by the words he disdains to control."

It is a pity the U. S. Supreme Court did not remember this and control itself accordingly. It certainly must have outraged its own soul when it uttered the words of that decision.

But speaking of myself, I felt a good deal like the man in Pennsylvania who died last week. It appears this man had a mule which was made a subject for much torture by unruly boys. One day last week the owner of the mule drove a lot of urchins away who were as usual torturing the mule. Then the man returned to condole with the mule, and to comfort it, but the mule actually kicked its benefactor and owner to death. Now, you see, I was defending the Supreme Court from Prohibits and Hayseeds, and after routing them as I thought the Supreme Court comes and kicks me. Like a mule, it does not know its own friends. But it is still the Supreme Court and as such it commands respect and support. The Mormons can stand this decision if the Roman Catholics and German Lutherans can. I feel about it as does the *Chicago Herald*. That paper just expresses my sentiments on the question. Here is what it says:

The other decision of the court affirming the validity of the Edmunds anti-polygamy law does not deserve the same commendation, and we are glad that the Democratic justices filed a vigorous dissenting opinion. Even if the law be constitutional in its suppression of polygamy, the same cannot be said of its high-handed confiscation of the property of the Mormon Church. If the Mormon Church may be suppressed in that way, so may any other church, and therefore religious liberty and all liberty is more or less threatened by such a decision. Both the law and the decision are undemocratic, un-American and subversive, as far as they go, of free institutions.

JUNIOR.

CHICAGO, May 20, 1890.