

that this Christ is now in the mountains of the Big Horn, where he wants all the Indians to come and join him. He will then put the Indians behind him, and having all the whites before him, will roll the world over on them (the whites) and destroy them. This Christ is a white man. The Indians have told me all about him, and the Shoshonee Indians have seen him. He showed his hands to the Indians, and his feet, and they were marked with scars; he also has a spear wound in his side. He wants all the Indians to come to him, giving up all their firearms and using only bows and spears."

The General himself said:

"In all my experience in the west, extending nearly over a quarter of a century, I have never seen anything like this hallucination among the Indians, and excitement is becoming widespread. My interpreter at Fort Custer is a white man named Cecely, who has lived for many years among the Indians and has an Indian wife. I asked him if there was any truth in the coming of Christ, and he said he thought it was true and that Christ had really come again. He said: 'Christ has told all the Indians that the people across the great ocean were their consins.'"

A dispatch to a Detroit paper stated that one special feature of this excitement among the Indians could not be accounted for upon any known hypothesis—that information in relation to this person claiming to be Christ "had appeared simultaneously among several tribes located over a thousand miles apart."

There is one feature connected with this subject against which we enter an emphatic protest and denial. This is probably our leading object in alluding to the subject. General Brislin has, according to statements that have appeared in the public journals associated with his name, expressed the belief that the person claiming to be the Savior is a "Mormon" Elder. This utterance is being taken up and accepted as a veritable fact. This is done without a shadow of reason, and has not a particle of truth as an ingredient. The idea is advanced simply on the basis, we presume, that it is common, when there is no other centre or source upon which to fasten a theme of almost any character, to attach it to the "Mormons." Whoever this person may be who is creating the existing stir among the Indians, it may be taken as an unadulterated fact that he is not a "Mormon" Elder, and if the investigations that are now afoot on the subject be pushed to such a degree as to enable those in search of the facts to ascertain them, the correctness of our assertion will be made plainly apparent. Any Elder that would attempt to perform such an act of sacrilege and

fraud as that implied by General Brislin would not remain connected with the Church any longer than would be necessary to subject him to excommunication.

### CHURCH ABOVE STATE.

THERE is a great deal of nonsense in the furore frequently excited over the alleged preference in the "Mormon" mind for the laws of man. The assertions of anti-"Mormons" concerning this matter are generally accepted, while the views of the "Mormons" themselves are usually ignored. "Mormonism" teaches that the laws of the land are supreme in their sphere, and the law of God are paramount in theirs. The revelations of God to the Latter-day Saints require obedience to the constitutional laws of the land, and declare that the commandments of God are simply the laws of His Church, and that the Saints are to be subject to the powers that be until Christ comes to reign.

Notwithstanding these plain declarations, it is represented that the Church sets itself above secular law and treats man-made laws as not binding upon its members. There is no reason for such a statement, and though many persons who repeat it no doubt believe it, the origin of the falsehood may be traced to artful and intentional perverters of the truth.

In this connection it is pertinent to notice one of the articles of the United Presbyterian Church of America. We do not hear charges of treason, or rebellion, or setting the Church above the State, against the Presbyterians. But the following quotation, if it appeared as one of the tenets of the "Mormon" Church, would arouse a tumult that would sweep through the land like a tornado and threaten to tear up the "Mormon" system, root and branch. This is part of the *Presbyterian Testimony*:

"Article 13—That the law of God is supreme in its authority and obligations, and where commands of church and state conflict we are to obey God rather than man."

Now, is there anything alleged against the "Mormon" creed, in this direction, that is more emphatic as to the superiority of the divine law to human law than this integral part of Presbyterianism? We do not wish, at present, to enter into the merits of the question involved in this declaration. To many minds the proposition will appear beyond controversy. Others may view it in a different

light. Whatever may be said on the supremacy of "the law of God," it is clear that the Presbyterian creed puts the "commands of the church" above those of the State. This places the Presbyterian church on a level with Deity and demands from its members their "first allegiance."

The President of the United States is an ordained Elder in that church and is understood to be a consistent and devout votary at its shrine. Will some anti-"Mormon" Republican show the difference in the doctrine enunciated in this article of the President's creed and the alleged principle of the "Mormon" Elder's faith which creates so much agitation?

"Mormonism" nowhere puts the Church above the State. It recognizes the independence of each in its own sphere. The "Mormon" Church, no matter what may be said by its maligners, does not attempt to enact civil laws or inflict civil penalties. Its extreme punishment for criminal conduct or any infraction of its rules and covenants is exclusion from its fellowship. It does not say that any law of the land shall be violated, nor does it expel any person for obedience to any law of the land.

Men belonging to the Church have stated, some of them in open court, that they regarded the law of God as superior to human law. But they have not claimed that the Church or any of its edicts is contrary or superior to the established laws of their country. If a man sincerely believes a purported revelation to be a commandment of God to him, it is reasonable to suppose he will endeavor to obey it, no matter what may be the earthly consequences. But the Church is not the Almighty, neither is any man in it considered to be the Deity.

Contrast the articles of the two faiths, the "Mormon" and the "Presbyterian," and the latter will be found far more emphatic and pronounced as to the exalted sphere of the Church and to place it, in effect, above the civil law.

How can a Presbyterian judge or other secular official, or preacher or editor condemn a "Mormon" who regards what he considers a divine law as superior to human law, and at the same time endorse the Presbyterian *Testimony* with its thirteenth article, as given above? But consistency rarely enters into any denunciation of "Mormonism" or proceedings against the "Mormons." Comparisons are said to be