

DESERET EVENING NEWS

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING.
(Sunday excepted.)
Corner of South Temple and East Temple
Streets, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Charles W. Penrose - - - - - Editor.
Horace G. Whitney - Business Manager.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES
(In Advance)

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| One Year | 25.00 |
| Six Months | 12.50 |
| Three Months | 6.25 |
| One Month | 2.50 |
| Saturday Edition, Per Year | 2.00 |
| Semi-Weekly, Per Year | 2.00 |

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR:
Address all business communications and all remittances to
THE DESERET NEWS,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Entered at the Postoffice of Salt Lake City as second class matter according to the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.

SALT LAKE CITY. - JULY 3, 1906

REFLECTIONS ON THE FOURTH.

July 4th this year marks the 130th anniversary of the adoption by Congress of the Declaration of Independence. One hundred and thirty years is not a long period of time, if measured by the standards of history. And yet, what a wonderful Republic has developed under the principles embodied in that Declaration! Whether the territorial expansion is considered, or the growth of the population; whether we look at the wealth acquired, or the influence exercised upon the world's affairs, we are confronted by one of the greatest marvels in the history of nations. There have been world-powers before, from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, "the head of gold," but there never was a power that rose to the highest eminence so rapidly as the United States, solely on the strength of the justice and truth of its government principles, and not as the result of unjust wars of conquest. The position of our country is unique in this respect, in the entire range of history. The men who laid the foundations of this wonderful structure were "inspired" to do so. No other explanation accounts for the results achieved. It is the work of God, not of man.

On May 23, 1857, Lord Macaulay, in a letter to a prominent New Yorker who had sent him a copy of "Life of Jefferson," expressed the opinion that "institutions purely democratic" must, sooner or later, "destroy liberty, or civilization, or both." That was as near as could be judged by even the most observant students of history. They thought this Republic would fail, as a building reared on the sand and washed by the waves of a storm-beaten sea. So far were American government principles from the plans suggested by human wisdom alone. Macaulay argued that what happened in France would be repeated here. In 1848 a pure democracy was established in that country. The result was general spoliation, high prices, and ruinous taxation. Then came the reaction and the establishment of a despotism, and an enslaved press. Liberty had to be sacrificed for civilization. The same result will come in due time, Macaulay said, here, when the country is densely populated and the wages low. He predicted a time when, "either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be easily plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth—with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your country, by your own institutions."

It is pleasing at this time to reflect upon the fact that this prediction seems as far from fulfillment now, as at the time it was penned. The American government does not appear to be in any danger from the "Barbarians" within. The laboring classes, the common people, the great majority, are the staunch supporters of this government. They are, moreover, conservative and not easily made the victims of the agitators whose aim is destruction. If there is any danger today, throwing its shadow upon the face of the land, it comes from the side opposite to that from which Macaulay expected it. It lurks in the aggression and arrogance of the barons of Plutocracy. It is a fact that this country, in which equality in opportunities as well as before the law was to be one of the leading rules, there is now a well marked tendency to class distinctions with all its attendant evils, dependent on wealth. This menace to free institutions has come, not, as Macaulay predicted, as a result of poverty but of prosperity. It is totally different from that predicted.

The question is whether the country is equal to the task of meeting the dangers from this side. We believe it is. The wonderful awakening of the public conscience during the last few months, which has resulted in a thorough investigation of the business methods of many institutions, warrants the conclusion that the process of cleansing has commenced in earnest. The ax has been held to the root of the tree. It may become necessary to interfere by law with the growth of large estates, and provide for their distribution, as has been done in France. Or there may be some other remedy. But, whatever it is, it will be found. The Fourth of July marks the establishment of a government that is a blessing to all mankind, and that will surely endure until it shall have accomplished the great and glorious mission for which it was founded, by a special providence of God.

NO "MIDDLE GROUND."

We give place once more to a communication from Dr. Frank Fay Codman, in which he explains again the position he occupies in reference to the Bible and the claims of its historical personages to divine revelation, the manifestations of angels, the signs and manifestations commonly called "miracles," and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. We hope our readers, those of them at least who take any interest in the subject treated, will peruse the gentleman's letter before reading this brief reply. There is nothing new in it, but merely an amplification of that which we have already published from his pen. He says:

"I try to explain that I regard religion as having a natural evolution, as coming in that sense from the soul of man, but the evolution of man,

physical, mental and spiritual, conforms to and expresses a higher law, that power not ourselves which makes for righteousness." So man himself becomes a revelation as he ascends from the brute and one part of human history is as sacred and suggestive as another."

We are under the impression that we have stated the substance of this explanation as coming from him more than once, and that we have contrasted it with the Biblical doctrine of revelation which is actual communication from God to man, either by the voice of Deity, the ministration of angels or the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. There is a radical difference between the gentleman's idea about revelation and that entertained by the world ancient and modern. He practically denies the truth of the Biblical accounts of the manner in which religion has been established among mankind. He also denies the doctrine of the creation of man and the universe, and claims that intelligent, responsible humanity has come up "from the brute."

This is a theory without demonstration. Of course he has a right to believe it, if it seems true to him, but so have we to disbelieve it, when we find no reliable evidence to establish it. The theory of evolution of religion as the mere opinions of men is as imaginary as the evolution of man from the brute. The doctrine of revelation from God to man and of the organization of the universe and of man by divine power, is established by facts and occurrences that are as thoroughly authenticated as matters of a different nature, and are attested by witnesses whose words are as reliable as any that appear in history.

The gentleman says that this physical, mental and spiritual evolution that he believes in, "conforms to and expresses a higher law, that power not of ourselves which makes for righteousness." That is to us expresses a contradiction. It confesses a higher law than that exhibited in the evolution in which he believes, and that is above the power that is in ourselves.

Our correspondent may consider himself rational in taking that middle ground in which he delights, but we cannot accept his notion and he should accord us the same liberty of thought that he claims for himself. Such individuals as have made the positive assertions to which we have alluded, appear to us either as impostors and charlatans and frauds, or as genuine and sincere proclaimers of actual facts and divine truths. We are not ignorant of the delusions which have led away many persons into error and folly, but they were of a different character to the divine manifestations which are believed in and have been credited by millions of human beings, whose powers of criticism and analysis and logical deduction may be considered as almost equal to those great gifts of mind claimed by the evolutionists of the latter days, and who call themselves "liberal Christians" while they deny the vital principles of the Christian faith.

It is quite likely that, as he says, "so as his knowledge goes, he tries to be logical." We do not doubt that. The question is, how far does his "knowledge" extend? In his argument his logic appears to be based upon his mere belief and not upon actual knowledge, and we think he is very much mistaken when he asserts that "probably nine-tenths of the educated and thoughtful men and women among the Anglo-Saxons accept the evolution theory of the universe, including man and all his problems." So far as evidence goes, the believers in that theory as expounded by him constitute but a minority of the thinkers of the age, and many of them who once espoused the notion have changed their opinions in the light of advanced information and intelligence.

We concede, as we have done all along, the right of individuals and organizations, great or small, to occupy the point of view which the gentleman stands upon, but we do not see how it "broadens our old thought of revelation." On the contrary, it puts upon it a clamp which narrows it and in effect crushes it out. It utterly excludes belief in any divine communication, and admits of no revelation but that which is human and proceeds from the notions and opinions and diverse thoughts of fallible man. This is the parting of the ways between us and the expounder of what he seems to think is a modern concept of religion. As a matter of fact, it is but a revival of ancient Greek scepticism and vain philosophy, that has been discarded by the great thinkers of more modern times.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

Our correspondent advances the suggestion that Jesus of Nazareth simply shared the prevailing ideas of his age and "probably did not know the earth was round or understand the law of gravitation." That is simply one more bit of opinion, without any solid basis on which to build it. We have a right to the opinion that the great Master knew just as much about gravitation as the professedly "scientific" disputer of Christ's divinity. Indeed, if the latter understands the law of gravitation, he is farther advanced than even St. Isaac Newton, or others, who recognized the law and its operations without really understanding what force is. But Jesus did not attempt to state anything concerning the rotundity of the earth or the theory of attraction and repulsion, and so the attempt of our Unitarian friend to belittle the great Nazarene is both needless and perverse.

As to the Apostle Paul and other scripture writers who claimed to have received divine communications, they either told the truth or they uttered falsehoods. The notion that Saul of Tarsus, bent on suppressing and punishing people whom he regarded as dan-

gerous heretics, imagined he saw the Savior and heard His voice while on the way to obtain authority to crush the Christians, simply suffered from "sunstroke," may be satisfactory to the gentleman who is such a stickler for scientific evidences and logical deductions, but it strikes us as the very height of absurdity, and entirely out of harmony with the character of the man as set forth by our correspondent, and with his whole life and education, "heroic character" and "dauntless energy."

But the question why quote from his epistles, if he was either a brazen impostor or a deluded fanatic, is not logically answered by the preacher who counts himself "an liberal Christian," and goes to the scripture accepted by Christians as divinely inspired for a foundation for his sermons to other "liberal Christians." We have no objection to quotations from Ruskin, Carlyle, or any other great communicator of valuable thought, whether in poetry or prose. We regard all truth as coming from Deity, and believe that a great many other persons were and are inspired of God for the benefit of mankind, than those whose names are of record in the Old or the New Testament.

We maintain the position we have occupied from the beginning of this little controversy, that when any man claims like Moses to have received tables of stone from the hand of God, or to have had, like Daniel, conversations with angelic beings; or like Jesus of Nazareth, to have come forth from God, to have talked with God while on earth; or like Paul, to have seen the resurrected Christ, and received special revelations and marvelous powers; or like Joseph Smith, to have obtained from the hands of an angel metallic plates, engraved with hieroglyphics which he translated into English by the gift and power of God, that such claims are either true or false. They are of such a nature as to be out of the domain of the mere imagination, or religious excitement or phantasy.

Our correspondent may consider himself rational in taking that middle ground in which he delights, but we cannot accept his notion and he should accord us the same liberty of thought that he claims for himself. Such individuals as have made the positive assertions to which we have alluded, appear to us either as impostors and charlatans and frauds, or as genuine and sincere proclaimers of actual facts and divine truths. We are not ignorant of the delusions which have led away many persons into error and folly, but they were of a different character to the divine manifestations which are believed in and have been credited by millions of human beings, whose powers of criticism and analysis and logical deduction may be considered as almost equal to those great gifts of mind claimed by the evolutionists of the latter days, and who call themselves "liberal Christians" while they deny the vital principles of the Christian faith.

It is strange that any one will claim as his knowledge goes, he tries to be logical. We do not doubt that. The question is, how far does his "knowledge" extend? In his argument his logic appears to be based upon his mere belief and not upon actual knowledge, and we think he is very much mistaken when he asserts that "probably nine-tenths of the educated and thoughtful men and women among the Anglo-Saxons accept the evolution theory of the universe, including man and all his problems." So far as evidence goes, the believers in that theory as expounded by him constitute but a minority of the thinkers of the age, and many of them who once espoused the notion have changed their opinions in the light of advanced information and intelligence.

We concede, as we have done all along, the right of individuals and organizations, great or small, to occupy the point of view which the gentleman stands upon, but we do not see how it "broadens our old thought of revelation." On the contrary, it puts upon it a clamp which narrows it and in effect crushes it out. It utterly excludes belief in any divine communication, and admits of no revelation but that which is human and proceeds from the notions and opinions and diverse thoughts of fallible man. This is the parting of the ways between us and the expounder of what he seems to think is a modern concept of religion. As a matter of fact, it is but a revival of ancient Greek scepticism and vain philosophy, that has been discarded by the great thinkers of more modern times.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has been established as the truth by the modern so-called scientific preachers and teachers? The very fact that they have to fall back on the Bible for texts from which to draw subjects and arguments for their discourses, is evidence of their dependence for religious ideas upon divine revelations and inspirations.

We do not dispute for a moment that his theory makes the Old Testament nothing but "part of the revelation of growing humanity," and that is one vital objection to it. For the great value of the Holy Scriptures to people in the present age is their declarations of divine manifestations, laws, commandments and precepts. These come with authority. They are a distinct and comprehensible guide to human thought and action. And it appears to us that everything of value to mankind that is brought out for reflection and advancement by those who reject the inspiration of holy writ, is drawn from and but an amplification of those very revelations, the authenticity of which these modern non-believers deny is not that the reason why they quote from them? What great principle not conveyed in the writings claiming to be inspired, has