

the altar of Jehovah for the good of the race.

It may confidently be expected that even the present crisis of Judaism will lead to the accomplishment of some such results. It will undoubtedly serve to sift out the genuine Israelites from those who merely bear the name. And when in the fulness of time the signal is sounded throughout the world, as formerly the blasts of the silver trumpets from the mountain tops of Judea to usher in the glorious year of Jubilee, the former will rally and wend their way in exultant joy to the home of their fathers. All the troubles of the Jews are due to the fact that they have broken the covenants the Lord made with their fathers when He led them out of Egypt (Deut. 29: 25). A glorious future is theirs from the day they again are willing to return and obey His voice (Deut. 30: 1-10).

#### NO APOLOGY NEEDED.

The New York Herald, noticing the fact that Congressman King of Utah delivered a discourse at a conference of Saints in Brooklyn, remarks, as if in surprise, that no apology was offered for Mormonism; on the contrary, the spirit was one of aggression. "Mormonism," Representative King is quoted as saying, "challenges the orthodoxy of today and calls it heterodoxy."

Those who know Mormonism only through the distorted pictures once so industriously placed before the public by people personally interested in that traffic, may be pardoned for believing that this particular religious system ought timidly to apologize for its existence. The writer of the notice in the Herald seems to belong to this class. Others, who have taken the pains of investigating what Mormonism really is and seen its effects on the thousands brought under its influence, know that if any apology is due at all, it is because of possible reluctance in proclaiming its truths to all the nations of the world and to all classes, so much in need of a full understanding of those truths. Mormonism, as a theory, offers the most comprehensive and consistent explanation of the great mystery of existence; in its practical application it points out the road which leads to the universal brotherhood of man. It offers the only solution to the numerous perplexing questions with which philosophers and theologians, statesmen and philanthropists so long have grappled in vain. Why should an apology be needed?

Mormonism is on the religious domain what the discoveries of Galileo or Isaac Newton were on the field of science; it is a tremendous advance in knowledge beyond the limits previously laid down. To the unbiased mind it is a perfect revelation.

It is not claimed that all its professed votaries have at all times been true to its teachings and fair representatives of its tenets. There have been Saints who were such only in name, as there have in all ages been followers of other creeds who have been a disgrace to them. No religion, however, can be held responsible for the doings of hypocrites or deceivers. Christianity itself could not escape condemnation, were it to answer for the follies and excesses of some of its adherents.

Mormonism comes to the world today as true Christianity, in contradistinction to the many systems that bear this name, in the same way as the religion of Jesus once came to the world and claimed to be true Judaism, in opposition to the various Mosaic divisions of those early days. For this reason it justly claims to be "orthodox" and challenges the world to a comparison, appealing for a just decision to the Law and the Testimony.

The interest being aroused everywhere in the efforts to proclaim its message to the world indicates sufficiently that a time is drawing near when there will be a general demand for a decision on this proposition. A spiritual battle is on which can end only with the complete victory of truth.

#### THE TRIAL OF ZOLA.

The trial of Emile Zola, the noted French novelist, is another part of the tragical farce—if the expression be allowed—of which the conviction of Captain Dreyfus as a traitor to France was the opening act. In countries where the sentiments of the people are less eruptive than in the republic by the Seine, it is difficult to understand how the fate of an army officer with no higher rank than captain can cause such commotion as to shake the whole country to its foundations. True, Dreyfus was rich and popular and had influential friends; but the passions his case has aroused, the mysterious attitude of the government and the violent outbursts of mobs in various parts of the country cannot be accounted for solely on these grounds. Below the surface must be some mighty forces at work, the true nature of which only the initiated know. All the world over, army officers have before this been court-martialed, deported and imprisoned without the slightest sign of disturbances either of provincial or national extent. The Dreyfus case is different. It has divided France in two hostile camps and awakened interest throughout the civilized world.

In 1895 Dreyfus was accused of high treason, tried and convicted. It was claimed that he had sold state secrets to some foreign government, either Germany or Russia but the proofs were kept from the public on the pretense that the foreign relations of France would be endangered should the facts become known. Without any evidence, as far as known to the public, the unfortunate officer was found guilty and in accordance with the sentence of the court stripped of his military honors and sent for life to an island off the coast of French Guiana and there confined like a wild beast in an iron cage. From time to time as public sympathy has been aroused in his behalf, his punishment has been aggravated, it is claimed, as if the intention were to end his case by torturing him to death. The interest manifested in the matter outside of France can be explained on the ground that for humanitarian reasons it may be well to ask whether in this age, and in a republic, a man may be condemned to slow torture without any apparent evidence. That concerns the world.

The law in France appears to be that an innocently convicted man cannot be released until his innocence be proven by fastening the guilt upon somebody else. For this reason the brother of Dreyfus accused Major Esterhazy of being the real traitor. The latter was tried and acquitted. Then Emile Zola stepped on the stage and in a newspaper article accused the heads of the French army and some members of the cabinet of having knowingly convicted an innocent man. He demanded to be tried and given an opportunity to prove his accusations. This step he took in order to force the government to re-open the Dreyfus case.

Zola's newspaper article was pointed. He says he does not believe an act of treason has been committed. The whole thing is the outcome of the hysterical hallucinations of Lieut. Col. Paty du Clam. The evidence against Dreyfus he reviews as follows:

"He knows several languages; that tells against him. Not a single com-

promising document has been found in his possession; that stamps him as a criminal. He sometimes visits Alsace, the land of his birth; another crime. He is energetic, he wants to learn everything; crime! He is calm in the presence of his accusers; another crime. He becomes restless at last: more proof of his guilt. We are told the judges first acquitted him. Then the 'secret document,' that overwhelming proof of his guilt which no one is allowed to see, which renders the whole proceeding lawful, before which all must bow their heads, this divine, invisible, mysterious document is brought forward and he is declared guilty.

I deny that there is such a document. I deny it most emphatically.

"I deny that there is such a document. I deny it most emphatically."

Further on the novelist specifies his charges. He says:

"I accuse Lieut. Col. Paty du Clam of being the hellish cause of vile actions, though he may have done wrong without knowing it.

"I accuse General Mercier of weakness in becoming a party to the greatest act of injustice of the century.

"I accuse General Billot, the minister of war, of being in possession of proofs that Dreyfus was innocent; but he kept these proofs secret and committed the crime of perversion of justice in order to save the deeply compromised general staff.

"I accuse General Boisdeffre and General Grouse of being parties to this crime, the one from clericalism, the other from a mistaken sense of esprit de corps, which makes him think the ministry of war is a veritable sanctum.

"General Pellieux and Major Rovary I accuse of monstrous partiality.

"I accuse the war office of having started a shameful campaign in the daily papers in order to lead astray public opinion.

"The court-martial I accuse of violation of justice and law by having convicted the accused upon evidence contained in a secret document.

"I do not know personally the men whom I accuse. I have never seen them, am not vengeful against them, do not hate them. To me they are only representatives of a social evil. I only wish for light—in the name of humanity which has suffered so much and has so much right to be happy. My fiery protest is only the outcry of my heart.

"Bring me before the court of assizes and let my examination be in the glare of day!

"I am waiting for it."

Well, Zola has been brought to trial, not because of these terrible accusations against high officials but to answer for his denunciation of the Esterhazy jury, the verdict of which, he said, was found in accordance with "higher command." Not on the main accusation, but on the comparatively unimportant side-issue, Zola is now placed on trial.

The telegraphic reports of the proceedings in court yesterday, February 8, give an idea of the excitement that prevails in France. Vast crowds fight for entrance to the performance. Zola is greeted with cheers and with hisses. "Vive Zola!" "A has Zola!" "Death to Zola!" Such are the mingled cries of a frantic audience. Letters are read from witnesses who refuse to testify. Madame Dreyfus is prevented by the presiding judge from telling her story. A number of questions by Zola's lawyer are not permitted. Documentary evidence is ruled out. M. Casimir-Ferrier, ex-president of France, is examined, although at the outset he declares it his duty not to tell the whole truth. The court then rises and the shouts for or against Zola are renewed. A mob composed of