

be even earlier. The worth of the fragment is additionally enhanced by its excavation at a place where, tradition says, Noah buried the records. Not improbably there was a common origin for these stories of the flood, and there was evidence that the Babylonians regarded the Assyrian God Aa, who, as previously observed, gave the order for the building of the ark, as identical with the God of the Hebrews. There is likewise proof that another fragment disclosed by Smith, relating to the deluge, is really part of the third tablet of the Schell series, leading to the interesting conclusion that we have here the beginning of a second Babylonian account of the flood, which further discoveries may make as complete as the Gilgames legend, to which the precious British museum tablet belongs.

"Unquestionably, special interest attaches to the language of the tablet under review. That used in the Hebrew narrative was manifestly the most ancient in character; this, belonging to the Smith and Schell tablets, was much more modern in style. On this important feature, a writer accurately observes that the table text agrees not with the so-called 'Elohist' or 'Yahvist,' writer in Genesis, but with the supposed combination of the two documents in that book as finally edited. Since one at least of these writers is stated by the higher critics to be of the seventh century B. C., it is difficult, as the discoverer remarked, to see how the 'literary analysis of the Pentateuch can be any longer maintained.' The discovery shows the minute care and accuracy with which the literature of the extreme past was handed down. Edition after edition had been publishing the story of the deluge and yet the fact of the Abrahamic age and that of the seventh century B. C., agrees even to the spelling of the words. It is clear that many of the hasty conclusions of scholars will have to be revised."

#### THE PEACE COMMISSION.

The work of the American peace commissioners at Paris was commenced yesterday, October 4, the first business being a conference with General Merritt on the conditions prevailing in the Philippine Islands. The reception given to the representatives of this country by President Faure is described as satisfactory in every respect. The exchange of greetings between the two republics was cordial.

The Spanish commissioners have also arrived, and judging from an interview with one of them, published in *La Patrie*, the Spaniards are going to try their best to complicate matters by creating European prejudice against the Americans. Gen. Rafael Corero y Laenz is quoted as saying that peace between the United States and Spain will complicate all the eastern questions, already causing European statesmen so many sleepless nights. He is further represented as saying that the war was brought on Spain by the United States; that the latter country is responsible for the Cuban rebellion, which was instigated for the purpose of furnishing a *casus belli*.

It is true enough that this talk was of a private nature only and that it will not be repeated under circumstances where the Spanish government might be called to account for it, but it still shows the spirit in which the Spanish representatives approach the work of peace entrusted to them, and it indicates that our representatives possibly may some day find it necessary to remind them and the world of the Malme "Incident," which seems to be so strangely forgotten by the Spanish people.

Spain seems utterly incapable of realizing her situation. Her plenipotentiaries come to Paris with false accusations against the people of the United

States. They are ignorant of American motives and sentiments. Even the events of the war and the courteous treatment of their soldiers in the hour of defeat have taught them nothing. They meet with a stubborn determination to resist with all arguments at their command the reasonable demands of their opponents. Under the circumstances it is difficult to see how the labor of the commissioners can result in a speedy settlement of the difficulties. Perhaps a naval demonstration off the Spanish coast must be resorted to before Spain realizes her position.

It is believed that French sympathy is still largely with Spain. If so, France ought to urge on the Spanish commissioners to acknowledge the defeat of their country and to appeal to the magnanimity of the American people for the best terms possible. Such a course would secure a more satisfactory result to their country than resort to diplomatic tricks and stubborn resistance to the dictates of reason.

[COMMUNICATED.]

#### STRAWS THAT TELL, ETC.

Salt Lake City, Utah, Oct. 3, 1898.

The New York Herald of Sunday, Sept. 25, contains a communication from "Rev." Arthur T. Rankin, of Brigham City, in which among other misrepresentations the following appears:

"Straws tell the direction of the wind. G. A. Iverson, a lawyer and a Mormon, addressed the Presbyterians upon the situation in Utah. He said of polygamy: 'Every honest, intelligent Mormon will admit there is a general return to old relations in Utah.'"

Mr. G. A. Iverson is a "Mormon," but is not a lawyer and does not make any claim to such a profession. That inaccuracy, however, is but slight compared with the untruth concerning his alleged remarks at the meeting in Manti. Desiring to know the exact truth of this matter, I wrote to Mr. Iverson, Sept. 30th, and this morning received the following reply, for which I respectfully request space in the "Deseret Evening News."

Manti, Utah, Oct. 1, 1898.

Elder C. W. Penrose:

Dear Brother—Your kind favor of the 30 ult. at hand. I assure you it is with genuine pleasure that I make this reply, particularly as it gives me an opportunity of defending myself against the unwarranted, untruthful accusations of certain members of the Utah Presbytery. You refer to an article in the New York Herald of Sept. 25 from the pen of Arthur T. Rankin, of Brigham City, stating that I made this remark in the Presbyterian assembly at Manti:

"Every honest, intelligent Mormon will admit there is a general return to old relations all over the State."

That statement contains not a shadow of truth. It is absolutely false in every particular. No reference was made in my remarks to any subject whatever, such as is intended to be displayed in the above.

I attended the last session of the presbytery here as a newspaper reporter. When I came in (the meeting had probably gone on an hour or more) there was in progress a rather animated discussion of the resolutions about to be adopted, "Church influence" and the polygamy question coming in for the greatest solicitation. While the heat was yet on, it was moved and carried unanimously that as there was a member of the Mormon Church present, he be asked to speak. I explained to the reverend gentlemen that I was not there representing the Mormon Church, but simply in the capacity of a news-

paper reporter. As to what I did say, the following statement made and signed by a prominent member of the Presbyterian church of Manti, the superintendent of the Sabbath school of that denomination, will probably throw the necessary light upon the situation:

Manti, Utah, Sept. 4, 1898.

As it appears that in the remarks made by Mr. G. A. Iverson at the meeting of the presbytery on Monday, Aug. 29, 1898, he has been misquoted, in justice I make this statement:

I was at the meeting and heard all that was said. Mr. Iverson did not "acknowledge that many of the charges made against the Mormon Church were true." As I remember it, he only referred to two of the charges, one as to the Church control in politics, which he emphatically denied, and the other on the question of polygamy. As to the latter, the speaker noted with pleasure that the resolutions did not claim that any new marital connections had been made since the issuing of the manifesto against that principle, but he did not deny that the practice of polygamy was maintained among people who had entered the polygamous relationship before the issuing of the manifesto. The speaker further stated that while, perhaps, the resolutions were perfectly consistent from a Presbyterian point of view, they were not from his.

GEO. R. BRAITHWAITE.

Very truly, your brother,

G. A. IVERSON.

To every one who is acquainted with G. A. Iverson his own statement will be sufficient. It is supported, however, by the testimony of Mr. George Braithwaite, a Presbyterian Sunday school superintendent, who was present when Brother Iverson was said to have made the remark published in the New York Herald, and their united evidence proclaims the character of the pretended quotation and of the individual who fabricated it.

My attention has been called to a letter, also from Arthur T. Rankin, in the Brigham City Bugler of September 24th, in which he says:

"I wrote to C. W. Penrose requesting 325 copies of his Reply to Presbyterians, that I might send the antidote out with each dose of poison to that many Presbyteries. After time to counsel, he telegraphed at my expense (as I requested) declining to send them."

The truth of this matter is that I received a letter from Arthur T. Rankin, which required a reply in a very short time after it reached me, and I immediately went to the "Deseret News" office to learn whether I could obtain 325 copies of the paper containing my article, and was informed by the business manager, that every copy had been sold, and the only way by which it could be reproduced was to make it in the form of a pamphlet, to print and publish which would have taken more time than that allowed by Mr. Rankin for its reception. I so informed him, according to his request, by telegraph. I did not "decline" to send them.

This is a very small matter, but to use that person's own quotation, "Straws tell the direction of the wind." An air of falsehood is breathed through both his statements in the Bugler and that in the New York Herald. I should perhaps have refrained from noticing either the Brigham City preacher or his statement, neither being of any great importance, but for the desire that my friend Iverson should not remain under the cloud which had been temporarily cast over him by designing persons. Every man is entitled to freedom in the proper expression of his opinions, religious or otherwise, but no men or assembly of men have the right to support such opinions by misrepresenting and traducing their fellows.

Yours for the right,

C. W. PENROSE.