

a period of nearly five centuries. The reader will find Mosiah's excellent arguments against king-craft in Mosiah xxix. The perverse demand of the Israelites for a king was also regarded by the prophet Samuel as ominous of calamity and sorrow to him.

And yet kingship belongs to the celestial order. The righteous, who through obedience and faithfulness attain to the highest glory, are promised thrones, kingdoms and crowns. A throne is a royal seat upon which sits the king only. A crown is a wreath of gold and gems encircling the head. It is a symbol of authority—the majesty and power of the Holy Priesthood. The wearer of a crown is invested with supreme sovereignty. But why should holy prophets warn their people against conferring this honor upon one of their number; and the more righteous the people were the greater the objection was that they should be ruled by one holding supreme authority in civil affairs?

Max Muller derives the term king from Saxon *cyning*, Sanscrit *ganaka*, father, from the root *gan*. This root means genus, race, tribe or family—the fountain of increase. Omit the *g* from king and we have *kin*. Greek *genos*, from *gencin* to beget. A kingdom is that which belongs to, or grows from, a king—a king's tribe or offspring. Hence a king is a father; his kingdom is his family. A person ruling with supreme authority over a people other than his own offspring is not a king in the true and original sense of the term. He occupies the unnatural position of a stranger or foreigner taking the father's place at the head of a family. His being invited to assume the position does not alter its unfitness and incongruity.

Fatherhood is the rightful source of original authority. The parent rules by natural and inherent right over his offspring; next to him stands his heir or first-born—a prince, who derives his authority to rule his principality from the king, his father. A stranger or foreigner can never rightfully possess this authority.

The father owns all, and governs all in the circle of his offspring. No member can possess any portion of the paternal estate except by donation or bequeathment. The head of the household can demand the obedience of every member, and dictate in the affairs of the family.

The idea of kingly sway has come

down from patriarchal times. The present office contains in it the shadows and shambles of fatherhood. "The king never dies." "The divine right of kings," and similar established axioms show the sacredness that "earth doth hedge about" the royal personage.

According to feudal usage, the king was the source whence all command, honor and authority flowed; and he delegated to his followers all their power and authority in their districts. When the patriarch died, his first-born succeeded him—hence the hereditary succession of the kingly office. The king, like the father, cannot be rebuked or chastised by his subjects, nor called to account for his acts. These remarks apply to those only where the kingly power is used absolutely, as in Spain and France a century ago, and as in Russia at present, and not its limited form as in England today. The highest ideal of government is this kingly or paternal rule; but such power in the hands of a bad man or a cruel despot is a fearful thing even to contemplate, and a source of infinite evil and suffering; it is therefore desirable in the absence of patriarchal organization and unregenerate times that a governing class should be chosen, composed of the best and wisest citizens, and the ruling power be divided among them. The Prophet Samuel told the Hebrews that their asking for a king was "great wickedness." I Sam. xii: 27. This great wickedness consisted in rejecting the rule of their Heavenly Father.

"They have rejoiced in that I should not reign over them."

Nephi understood the danger of entrusting a stranger with the authority of a patriarch or king, and he, although a righteous man and a splendid ruler, refused to accept the abnormal office; nevertheless Nephi yielded to the popular importunities and gave them a king. This man was called "Second Nephi," and no sooner did he begin to reign than the baneful results of the false step appeared. Jacob, i: 9-11.

JOHN H. KELSON.

(To be continued.)

LETTER FROM NORTH CAROLINA.

I notice in a late letter from Palestine, written by Brother J. M. S., that he has partaken of some of "the unleavened bread from the passover feast of the Jews," which is said to be made of flour

"Christian" child. And "despite this blood curdling tale" he finds it really excellent, and remarks, "I don't believe the Mormons have yet been accused of eating children!"

Perhaps Brother S. has not labored along the Blue Ridge among the so-called "Mountain Boomers" of North Carolina and other parts of the South, where blood curdling tales equally as horrible are circulated about the "Mormons," and which are almost too horrible to be written, to say nothing about being credited in parts of communities which pretend to be enlightened.

Nor do I mean to say that such things are believed except among those who are lost to all reason and common sense, and who wish to do all they can against the truth, by circulating falsehoods, to cause the "heathen to rage and the people to imagine a vain thing."

While laboring in a neighboring county not long since we were told (and heard it repeated several times) that the "Mormons" sacrificed a child every year, for each family in their Church, and that women who become useless through old age, for slaves and other purposes were eaten or boxed up and thrown into some river. I believe this is quite equal to eating the unleavened bread, made of the flour sprinkled with the infant's blood. And if there were no alternative, I think I should take the unleavened bread. So there is nothing that is told in any part of the world, or against any people, but there is something equally as horrible against the "Mormons."

We are asked sometimes by people who seem to know about as much of the geographical position of Utah as they do about heaven, "What sea is between Utah and the United States," and if we have a king there, and "what form of government do you have?" etc.

In some places witches are believed in. The witch doctor is sent for in certain cases. A picture is drawn and placed on a tree, and shot to pieces with a silver bullet. This is supposed to destroy the witch. Such things as these may seem absurd; but it is true nevertheless.

This country would be a fine field for some of the rev. divines who are so busily engaged trying to elevate the "deluded Mormons." That is if a lucrative position is no object with them, and they wish to teach the Gospel of Jesus Christ instead of tradition. If not, I presume they are just as well off where they are, because tradition does not go very far with a people who have tasted of the "good word of God, and of the powers of the world to come." But there is another side to the picture, much brighter than the one I have shown. If it were not so I fear the servants of God would stand a poor chance for their lives, and no doubt would not be needed in such places. It is almost a marvel that there are not more of them whipped or killed than there are, for it is so hard to reason with men, who are lost to reason, or who know