

and privileges, belongs to all mankind and is justifiable before me."

A writer who is engaged in the daily task of misstating and misconstruing the creed of the Latter-day Saints in reference to human and divine laws, wants to know "why it was necessary for the Lord to change His mind and modify His command." He also states that "the head of the Church and those who should succeed to his office were to be the only judges of what laws were or were not constitutional."

The answer is, there is no evidence in the later revelation that the Lord did "change his mind" in regard to the former. They are perfectly harmonious with each other. The latter is fuller than the former, as the blossom is fuller than the bud, but there is no conflict between them. And it is a carping critic that finds fault with a requirement to obey all constitutional laws.

The statement that certain individuals were to be "the only judges of what laws were or were not constitutional," is made out of the same material from which the author of it manufactures other falsehoods. There is nothing in either revelation which justifies such an assertion. And the fact that in all the great controversies that have occurred between the Latter-day Saints and their persecutors, the Supreme Court of the United States has been appealed to for final arbitrament, is proof positive that no such idea is entertained by the Church.

The same writer finds a big bugaboo in the words, "that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges belongs to all mankind and is justifiable before me." In doing this he misquotes the words twice, giving them differently in each case and both being different from the text, and then says the language is "turgid." This is usual in his perversions of "Mormon" doctrine. He never states the position fairly, and rarely makes a quotation correctly. But passing that, what is there in the foregoing words from the Doctrine and Covenants that is really objectionable? It simply upholds such law or principle as maintains rights and privileges, says it belongs to all mankind and that it is justifiable. Why, he says, "That opens the door to anything the First Presidency of the Mormon Church may declare to be a revelation."

Well, we do not believe there can be found another writer on this question on earth who would at-

tempt to draw such an inference in print. Just compare the language of the premise and of the conclusion, and judge of the kind of logic that made the deduction. A command to uphold constitutional law which maintains rights and privileges, opens the door to anything that certain persons may declare to be revelation! Such reasoning is beyond reply because it is beyond comprehension.

There is another paragraph quoted from the later revelation as follows: "And as pertaining to the law of man, whatsoever is more or less than these cometh of evil." This he says was "an obscure way of telling the Saints, that they were not under the slightest obligation to obey mere man-made laws."

When an unprincipled opponent starts out to garble and misinterpret, of course he can find fault with anything, no matter how right and true and commendable it may be. We believe that any person of fair mind and common understanding who reads the words quoted from the revelation, will obtain the very opposite impression from that sought to be conveyed in the comment. Has it not been demonstrated, not only in the experience of the Saints but in that of this whole nation, that any law which is not constitutional and does not maintain that freedom which belongs to all mankind, cometh of evil? The history of the Church and the history of the United States, furnish numerous instances in proof of this and establish its truth beyond rational dispute.

Instead of telling the Saints that they were "not under the slightest obligation to obey mere man-made laws," it placed them under the most sacred obligations to obey and support all laws of man that are constitutional. What more in this direction could be desired? There is nothing "obscure" in the language of the command. The obscurity is all in the mind and the misstatements of the writer, who endeavors to pervert its meaning, for the purpose of invoking force and compulsion to bring the most law-abiding people on this continent into his way of mind and purpose.

This manner of attack on the principles and order of the "Mormon" Church serves to aid in more firmly convincing its members that its doctrines are divine. Error may be met and overcome with truth. But truth cannot be successfully opposed by truth, and so falsehood is brought to the front. To those

who have eyes to see, it serves to make the truth more clear and beautiful, while for the perverters and maligners they are filled with sentiments either of pity or of contempt.

MISREPRESENTATION.

We are under the necessity of again, referring to the misstatements of an adversary who is so grossly untruthful and vulgar in his attacks that it is a degradation to notice them. Having made a plain and unequivocal assertion that a certain revelation was contained in the Doctrine and Covenants, and being unable to produce it because it is not there, as he well knew when he made the pretended reference to it, he now attempts to cover his wilful untruth by some general attacks on the system and principles which perpetually excite his malice and bad blood.

This is a much safer and more congenial course for him to pursue. He can pour out expletives like a flood; he can rave like a lunatic; he can void billingsgate like a flash-fag; and no one with self-respect will reply. And on this reluctance to notice his vituperation he banks to a large amount.

But added to this are some more attempts to quote from the Doctrine and Covenants and to misinterpret them and twist them into a meaning they were evidently never intended to convey. And it is this that we feel called upon to pay some attention to. His personalities, abuse and villification count for nothing except to show his breeding.

To prove that the "Mormon" Church is "an absolute despotism," and that it "takes in charge the consciences of its people," he quotes the following, and proceeds to comment upon it:

"The Twelve are a traveling, presiding High Council, to officiate in the name of the Lord, under the direction of the Presidency of the Church, agreeable to the institutions of heaven, to build up the Church and regulate all the affairs of the same in all nations."

The inference he draws from this is that these men are "delegated direct from God to rule" and that "there can be no question of their power." We need make no reply to this, the language of the book is sufficiently explicit, and the whole comment made upon it is utterly unwarranted by the text. The inference is also utterly and purposely false.