

We are sadly endeavoring to undo the passionate errors of centuries, especially of the last century or two; and if we had no very distinct faith of our own, we decline to commit ourselves irretrievably to any exclusive creed, or to any militant school. We hold on, obstinate if somewhat hopeless, to toleration, to a general unwillingness to let go any substantive element in human nature. We feel that theology has much that all the evolutionists and materialists cannot give us; and that they can never, in fact, take away. On the other hand, we feel that science has swept round the intellectual bases of theology till they are crumbling in mere impotence; useless solitary relics. So, too, we feel that our modern industrial life has a great deal that is very cruel, and yet a great deal that is quite indispensable. Let us face the facts. Religion, industry, morality, science do not work hand in hand together; indeed, they often work at cross purposes, each ignoring the other. And yet this age has not lost its faith in any one of these. Is it not plain that the want of this age is that which can reconcile them—some common term which can express them all?"

Mr. Harrison also says that Catholic, Protestant, Trinitarian, Unitarian, Calvinist, Jesuit and Evangelical are all obsolete, and are in our day absurdities or anachronisms. They merely extol and magnify one epoch of human history; they idealize one personage, use one book, or parts of one literature.

"From all the rest of human story, the rich and glorious roll of man's conquest over nature and his progress in knowledge, in worth, from all this they turn with a frown or a sigh. To all the theological creeds, the earlier systems of life as well as all later phases of development are naught—vanity, the corruption of nature; if not devilish and worldly, full of self-glory and self-indulgence; at most blind stumbling in the dark, wasted life; so that even to Dante the sublimest heroes and geniuses were all lost souls, sadly conscious that the best was not for them. Theology is bound to pass by in disdain or silence all that was great and beautiful in the vast ages which believed in many Gods; the polytheisms and the theocracies; the heroic growth of Rome, the thought and grace of Hellas, the complex civilization of Egypt; all that the Assyrian, Persian, Indian or Chinese teachers and prophets ever gave to the countless myriads who rose into civilized life beneath their care!"

He says that this one-sidedness is not confined to the alleged Christian theologian, to the narrow orthodox, or to the pharisaic pietist. "All the purely revolutionary schools, whether they issue from a materialistic or from metaphysical types of free thought, are even more one-sided, more blind to all but the one phase of human nature, or of history, that they select. Progress in their mouths does not mean the curve which is being traced in the entire course of man's civilization. Evolution with them

obliterates the past. The Dark Ages with their genius of beauty, their passionate self-devotion, their strength in obedience, fellowship, discipline are to these modern evolutionists a cause of offense, a shameful blot in man's history, best quieted with disdain."

Thus he says this age stands with its retrograde theology, dwarfing man's nature and confining man's light to one epoch on the one side; on the other side "with a revolutionary self-contained criticism; which is ready to solve every social and spiritual problem out of its own head, treating the vast series of phases in civilization as waste paper; and between the two the continuity in human life, its openness is lost sight of."

What this age wants, what the deeper hearts are silently and sadly yearning for is this—a key to man's whole life, complete being its entire history. In these few words Mr. Harrison puts in a nutshell the needs of the age, the relations of man and the world with religion and science. And it is here the student of what is called "Mormonism" must pause and ask himself a series of questions. The theology or philosophy of this creed is not touched on by Mr. Harrison. Though he speaks of all creeds he refers to those which centre about the Nazareth epoch. It is evident that he has never investigated "Mormonism."

But the next question is in how far does "Mormonism" go to supply the deficiency of the age as Mr. Harrison defines this deficiency. Does it ignore history? Does it ignore science? Does it ignore Godliness? Does it ignore progress? Does it ignore the intelligence of the past? Does it confine itself to the epoch of Moses? Is it content with the epoch of Jesus? Is it fenced in with a barbed wire bastion like Calvinism or Lutheranism? Is it like materialism entirely oblivious of the past and indifferent to the future? To all of these questions the reply must come that "Mormonism" is what Mr. Harrison states to be the necessity of the age; though the gentleman seems to be ignorant of its existence. It is true "Mormonism" has also a fence, but it is one which takes in the whole human race, and in its orderly way finds a place and a method for every race and every nation. It does not condemn Dante to the hell of his own creation or imagination or religion. It does not hedge all its spirituality with St. Paul or St. Peter. It does not limit its theocracy to Moses. It does not sink its philosophy in Plato or Socrates, in Sir Thomas More or in Frederick Harrison. And yet it does not ignore any. It holds that all have performed their work, and that all were necessary to the enlightenment and progress of the present, and that it is itself the proud spire in the world's temple of spirituality and intellectuality in the human family.

Does it ignore history, which the modern critic bases all progress on? On the contrary to the student history appears in "Mormonism" an

apothosized materiality. Genealogy is one of its pedestals, and it is thus that it provides salvation for Dante and Plato alike, as well as for its own President or Keyholder.

One critic of "Mormonism" whom I have read, after indulging in a severe denunciation of the faith, finally winds up as follows: "They believe that mind can travel and exert influence, even across the ocean. The locality allotted to the good and the bad after death or judgment is undecided; one tells you there is no hell but this earth we live in; another that this earth will then become heaven; while a third unconsciously, I suppose, following Dante, assured me we should be distributed among the planets and their satellites. Nor are all but the Saints to be excluded from the heaven; everyone will be judged according to his works, and those who have never heard the Gospel preached, or have rejected it from mere dullness, will be admitted, though in some inferior or even servile position into the Kingdom of some of the Saints."

Though this writer or critic distorts in a measure the tenets of the Saints, yet he speaks more eloquently of "Mormonism" than he intended. He admits enough to show that this faith in a measure meets Frederick Harrison's demands.

Another critic speaking of "Mormonism" and Joseph Smith rather inclines to the view that "Mormonism" is a necessity of the times. He says: "Now, other and more generally esteemed men than Joseph Smith—men whom the world has accepted as philosophers, have yearned, in these latter days, to supply the void which they felt to exist as a want in modern Christendom. Luther's reformation in Europe was directly opposed to the mystical spirit which lies concealed in the bosom of all religious communities, and which, though the great reformer sought to extinguish it, continues still unquenched to the present time, and, as his biography proves, was not absent in his deeper moods from his own mental operations. The Chillingworth doctrine of 'the Bible, and the Bible alone being the religion of Protestants,' had a tendency to substitute for the idolatry of the priest the idolatry of the book; and indeed it was a favorite tenet, and, strange as it may appear, the boast of the orthodox, that there was no vision in the land. The time for miraculous communication had passed forever. Emerson said of modern Protestant teaching that it was an equivalent to the admission, 'God is dead.'

"Against such teaching reasonable men would revolt, and above all self-instructed men would perceive its fallacy. Hence the development of a Joseph Smith in some part of the Christian world would be a natural result. Bibliolatory must first be destroyed. The infidel invalidated Scriptures entirely, on the other hand philosophical religionists classed the whole range of superior literature as inspired. Joseph Smith adopted a more compact method. He set up a second Bible