

jokes and witticisms, but on this side of the water are liable to be mistaken for almost anything else.

There is not much intelligence in his Utah letter, neither does it contain any considerable amount of malice. It is the production of a shallow but good natured individual whose allotment of gray matter under the skull was insufficient to enable him to comprehend what he was looking at while he was in Utah, or see in it anything more than material for a few remarks intended to be facetious. That so great a journal as the Telegraph should give its valuable space to such nonsense is a matter of surprise to an American, whose practical mind would naturally incline to the opinion that facts, intelligently stated, would be far more acceptable to the reader.

### ONLY NEW MEN NEED APPLY.

If a Washington dispatch is to be believed, presidential appointees will be selected from timber which has not heretofore been used to prop up the civil service of the country. In other words, Republicans who held office under Harrison but were removed or supplanted under the Cleveland administration, will not be selected to serve their country under the McKinley administration. They are hopeless back numbers, out of date and of no use in positions of honor and emolument.

New men are to be chosen. So many of these helped to elect McKinley that the offices to be filled are insufficient in number to go around, even when all the old war horses are relegated to the pasture of the superannuated.

This announcement will bring sadness to a number of hearts in Utah. There are several nice places to be filled in this State by President McKinley; and there are a number of old friends of the Harrison administration who would like to be designated for them. But new men only need apply.

It will be observed that the truth of all this depends upon the veracity of a Washington correspondent, and that he may not have told the truth, which is sometimes overlooked by his fraternity.

### A REPLY TO INGERSOLL.

Colonel Ingersoll, in a recent number of the New York Journal, has an attack on the New Testament, which the Journal characterizes as "the best argument ever advanced against Christianity." It is replete with glaringly false statements and sophistry—exceptionally so even for an intellectual product of the noted agnostic—and if this is the best that can be advanced against the Christian religion, there is no danger in agnosticism.

Mr. Ingersoll's reasoning can be scanned with much profit. He opens with the assertion that we do not know who wrote the four gospels, to which it is sufficient to reply with another assertion: We do know who wrote them. The evidence of the early ecclesiastical writers has decided that. We can refer to Athanasius, Epiphanius, Augustin, Jerome and others, who lived in the

early ages, as witnesses to the genuineness of these books, and their evidence is historical. Until some other historical evidence has been found, contradicting theirs, it is absolute folly to deny their authorship of the gospels. It is entirely a question of evidence, not of conjecture.

Ingersoll next argues that the four gospels do not agree, and are consequently not true. This is sophistry, and does not even possess the charm of novelty. Years ago Archbishop Whately in an anonymous pamphlet met this very argument by proving that of all the histories extant of the first Napoleon, not two could be found that agreed perfectly in the main incidents. His conclusion that none of them were entitled to credit, and that Napoleon was, perhaps, a myth, encountered a storm of ridicule, but when the author announced that that was exactly the argument of the infidels against the four gospels, the ridicule was silenced. The gospels do agree. It is not true that the fourth gospel is at variance with the other three. To state that it is, is simply to repeat a falsehood, for which there is not even the shadow of excuse at this time, when biblical research has cleared up what years ago seemed to be contradictions or discrepancies. The differences existing in the statement of details are indirect proofs of the genuineness of the records, as in case of concerted fraud they would have been absent.

If Christ rose from the dead, the colonel asks, why did He not appear to His enemies? He did appear to His enemies, to one of the chief representatives of the persecuting host. And so real, so overpowering was that appearance that Saul became one of His most ardent followers, whose testimony has come down through all ages, to the reality of the resurrection from the dead. And, besides, He appeared to more than five hundred people at one time. Our Savior, then, notwithstanding Mr. Ingersoll's statement that the resurrection was "done in a secret corner," appeared after His death both to friends and enemies, both in private and public. But it is, perhaps, a prerogative of agnostics to make statements about subjects of which they are, or pretend to be, completely ignorant.

Again the colonel asks if anybody believes that the birth of Christ was attended by a celestial greeting. Why not? There are hundreds living at the present moment, members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, as intelligent and free from superstition as any professed infidel, who have heard celestial voices and music at events of importance to the human family. It is no delusion. Why should the angels not sing at the birth of the Lord, and why should the shepherds not be privileged to listen to the celestial strains?

The next question is: "Does any intelligent man believe in the existence of devils?" Yes, sir, thousands. It should be noted, however, that the "devils" to whom the colonel objects are what the authors of the gospels call demons, or evil spirits not "devils." He says:

At that time it was believed that palsy, epilepsy, deafness, insanity and many

other diseases were caused by "devils," [evil spirits] that these took possession of and lived in the bodies of men and women. Christ believed this, taught this belief to others and pretended to cure diseases by casting devils out of the sick and insane. We know now, if we know anything, that devils do not reside in the bodies of men. Is there anything in the literature of the world more perfectly idiotic? Intelligent people, no longer believe in witches, wizards, spooks and devils, and they are perfectly satisfied that every word in the New Testament about casting out devils is utterly false.

To which it is sufficient to say, that if we know anything at all, we know this, that medical science does not cover, and does not pretend to have discovered the primary causes of sickness and death. What authority is there then for designating as idiotic the belief that these effects are but links in a chain of which demons, or evil spirits, evil influences, control other links? What is there in this New Testament view that can justly be ridiculed. The recent discoveries by means of the microscope disclose the fact that there is intimate connection between the world that we see and the one that is invisible to the naked eye; but is there absolutely nothing beyond the world the existence of which has not been discovered by the aid of the microscope?

The philosophy of Christ is next the object of attack. Col. Ingersoll asserts that it is impossible to love enemies, and that if the injunction not to resist evil were carried out, vice would become the master of the world and the good become the victims of the infamous, and government become impossible. It is evidently not to be expected that an Ingersoll should be able to understand the deep philosophy of these admirable precepts, but it is nevertheless a fact that it is by the practical application of those principles that the redemption of the world from the power of egotism, of brutality, of sin, shall be accomplished to the glory of God and His Son, Jesus Christ.

It may be remarked here that it was not within the province of the first Christian Church to form a nation, or establish a civil government anywhere on the earth. The time for that had not come. The power to punish evil-doers and reward virtue was in the hands of the civil authorities. That authority Christ never questioned. The mission, however, of Himself and His immediate followers was one of self-sacrifice. They were to exemplify the principles of righteousness in all human affairs, without which the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth would be impossible. The followers of Christ so understood their mission. They gave their lives for it, and by so doing, conquered. Christ never intended to deny the necessity of the restraint of vice by the arm of the law, but he did announce that without the redeeming and regenerating influence of the Gospel, the work of the civil law would be only negative in its results. His philosophy was built upon the principle of justice on which the Moslem jurisprudence rested. And until the human family has learned the great truth that evil has to be overcome, not by mere negative