

## THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

### NOT MORMON TEACHINGS.

In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, July 31, is an illustrated article with reference to the Mormons, and their supposed intentions regarding that western portion of Missouri known as Jackson county. In the heading and in the body of the article are conveyed erroneous impressions regarding the Latter-day Saints and the Elders in Missouri, several of whom are named. One of the Elders is credited with remarks in which there are serious mistakes concerning the aims and anticipations of the Latter-day Saints.

The "News" will not assume that the Elder whose language is purported to be given in the interview has been correctly quoted. From past observation and experience, both with the Post-Dispatch and other papers, it knows that Mormon Elders are misquoted, perhaps unintentionally. This matter is referred to, therefore, not with any intention to criticize either the Elder or our cotemporary, but from a sense of duty that some of the mistakes made cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed, because of the seriously erroneous impression they convey to the people. For instance, in the language attributed to an Elder, one statement of the interview is as follows:

"Missouri is to have within her boundaries the Zion of the Mormons."

"From all the sections of the world where they abide the members of the faith will come to Missouri."

"They will remove even from the holy city of Salt Lake and from all of Utah to come to the fertile valleys and the productive prairies of this great state where they first thrived."

"Independence, in Jackson county, is the chosen spot for assembling Israel."

"Independence will be the center of Zion, which is to be a grand city and a community peopled by the favored children of God."

The assertion that the Mormon people will depart from this State is the chief mistake in the foregoing, and with it there are carried several erroneous impressions. In response, it may be stated, emphatically, that the Latter-day Saints do not intend to abandon Utah. Some of them may leave this State for special purposes, and go to Missouri, just as now they go to make homes in Canada, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and other places. But the homes, and the cities, and the temples in these valleys—in "the tops of the mountains"—are the permanent heritage of the Saints, and there is no prophetic word or anticipation among the Mormons of relinquishing it. This is as much the land of Zion, the home of latter-day Israel, as is Missouri or any part of it, or any part of the United States. America is the land of Zion.

It is the belief of the Saints that the city Zion will be built in Jackson County, Missouri; that this will be brought about by the power of the Lord; that it will be accomplished in a perfectly legitimate way, with the rights of all people to be respected to the utmost. The Saints do not all expect to crowd into the city, or into the county named, for habitation. In perfectly legitimate form they expect to "possess the land," whether within the city or outside of it, over the whole face of the country, according as opportunities come to them, in common with their fellow citizens. The work called Mormonism is the work of the Lord, and every accomplishment there-

by is on the principles of equity and fairness to all men.

Another assertion to which we are constrained to give attention is that the members of the Church will have the "law-making power in their hands." This is incorrect, both as it relates to the law of the land and to the law of the Church. In regard to the law of the land, this government—the United States—was raised up by the power of the Almighty, that this should be "a land of liberty unto the Gentiles;" the American Constitution is a divinely inspired instrument; and under it the laws of the land are made by the citizens of the nation, not by the members of any church, as church members. As to the law of the Church, the members do not make this. It is revealed from the Almighty, who is lawmaker and lawgiver. In this latter reference it is well to keep in mind the divine injunction, "Let no man think he is ruler."

Regarding the preaching and teaching of Elders, it may be well to repeat the oft-given suggestion, that there is abundance to occupy the time and attention of every missionary in promulgating the fundamental principles of the Gospel. That is the message he is sent to bear to the world, and it covers a very broad field. Methods of Church policy belong in certain lines and with certain quorums which the Lord has set as authorities in the Church. Let every man stand in his own place and calling, and in all public utterances be guided by the word of the Lord. People are liable to attach to private opinions, which may or may not be correct, an undue importance, and perhaps hurl criticisms in an entirely wrong direction.

### THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

Mr. William E. Curtis in the Chicago Dispatch gives the views of several prominent citizens regarding the proposed terms of peace, especially as to the Philippine islands. They all indicate a strong sentiment in this country in favor of extending in some form or another the benefits of liberty and civilization to the Philippines, demanded for the Cubans. Senator Lindsay of Kentucky is quoted as predicting that the Senate will refuse to ratify any treaty of peace that leaves the Spanish flag floating in the Philippine islands.

Bishop Hartzell, a prominent Methodist divine, looks upon the question from a religious point of view thus:

"God has lifted us out of our exclusiveness and isolation, and is bringing us face to face with the responsibilities of our greatness as a nation. President McKinley's instructions to Gen. Shafter that he is to protect all citizens of Santiago in their business and religious rights is the first intimation of civil and religious liberty ever spoken in Cuba since the discovery of America, and I presume that his instructions to Gen. Merritt are similar. This is not a war of conquest, but its purpose was to relieve the oppressed and to secure a liberal and stable government and the light of Christian civilization for the people of Cuba. In the providence of God it has been placed in our power to obtain the same blessing for the people of the Philippine islands, and can we as a nation decline to accept that opportunity and turn away from our duty simply because we only intended to do so much good and no more? Shall we refuse to relieve two communities from Span-

ish despotism because we expected originally to relieve only one? We cannot abandon the people of the Philippine islands. When Admiral Dewey took possession of that harbor and furnished arms and ammunition to the insurgents we became responsible for the welfare of that island, and we cannot shrink that responsibility or abandon them."

John I. Waterbury, president of the Manhattan Trust company, is not in favor of annexation, but he believes that the resources of the islands are so vast that it would be a great mistake to neglect an opportunity to cultivate such a market for our agricultural and mechanical products. He concludes:

"We have been taught to believe that we are fighting this war for humanity's sake. Its purpose was the emancipation of the people of one island, and how can we refuse an opportunity to emancipate the inhabitants of 1,200 islands by the same treaty?"

Henry Ralser, manager of the Netherlands hotel says:

"I hear a god deal of talk every day on this Philippine question and it seems to me that people are pretty much of one mind. Very few want to annex a lot of pagan Malays to the United States, but nobody wants to turn them back to Spain. I should say that the general sentiment was that the diplomatists who negotiate the treaty of peace ought to figure out some way by which we might have free trade with the Philippines and provide the people a good, honest government."

Among those interested in missionary work in foreign lands there is said to be a general desire that the United States at least exercise a protectorate in the Philippines.

Were Europe to be consulted at all upon the subject, it would probably be found that Germany alone has any objections to American protectorate over the islands. But as German objection would be mainly founded on her own desire for territory in eastern Asia, and as that cannot be gratified in the Philippines, even Germany would perhaps prefer American control to Spanish.

In the further discussion of the important question the position of Great Britain cannot but be an important factor. The United States and England have so many interests in common that they naturally must stand together. Before long Russia's efforts to divest the current of the eastern trade from the channels in which it has flowed for ages will become apparent. Should they succeed, the center of power would be shifted to the capital where absolute despotism reigns, and the effect of this upon the world would be a set-back to the progress represented by Anglo-Saxon civilization. The United States and England must stand together in the impending struggle for liberty. A coalition of the Anglo-Saxon forces would mean for all practical purposes an empire with the United States as the center reaching from the British Islands on the right to the eastern provinces of China on the left. It would mean a dominion the equal of which in wealth, power and virtue the world has never seen. It would be a guarantee of human liberty and a giant stride towards the establishment of a reign of universal peace.

### VALE SPAIN.

Spain is down at last, hopelessly, completely down with none so poor as to do her reverence. Not only this, but she is in the ashes of humiliation, sorrow and poverty, with her pride broken and her heart sore, albeit she