

### The Mormon Problem.

Mormonism has thus far proved to the government an insoluble problem. Since President Buchanan marched an army against the self-styled "Saints," in 1859, many efforts have been made to abolish polygamy among them and oblige them to pay a decent respect to the laws of the United States. Penal statutes, threats and armies have all alike failed to bring the Mormons into real subjection. Utah is nominally a territory of the United States, but has remained in fact a sort of *imperium in imperio*. \* \* Yesterday we had the news that Judge Boreman, of the District Court at Salt Lake City, charged the grand jury against polygamy in the strongest terms, denouncing it and the Mormon leaders with great severity. But the very words of his charge showed the futility of attempting to compel the Mormons by law to abandon a practice which many of them at least honestly believe in as part of their religion. He admitted that the law passed by Congress in 1862 for the punishment of polygamy had never been respected, and declared that every possible means had been used to prevent its enforcement. Persecution has never eradicated a heresy nor modified the religious or social customs of a people. It probably never will. There can be no doubt as to the authority of government to regulate the institution of marriage, so far as it is properly an affair of the State rather than of the Church. The family is the unit of the State and marriage is the origin of the family. There can be no question, either, that it is highly important to the welfare of the State that monogamy should be the established rule. But the polygamous empire which Brigham Young has established in the Rocky Mountains is in every way an anomaly. His people are numerous, compactly organized under his Church polity, and inclined to be fanatical in their attachment to all the outward attributes as well as the essential principles of Mormonism. The National Government by making a determined effort to stamp out polygamy among them would only unite them more firmly, increase their perverted zeal and intensify their rebellious feelings. The impolicy of placing them in the seeming position of martyrs to their religion is the more manifest. \* \* \*

President Grant evidently does not deem it necessary that the government should treat the Mormons with a show of virtuous wrath. On his Western tour he and his party lately visited Salt Lake City, and allowed themselves to be feted by the "Saints." He had a personal interview with Brigham Young and some of his numerous daughters, and treated them very graciously. Indeed, the head of the government was so very kind to the Mormons that the *Gentile* organ, though a staunch republican paper, has since taken him gently to task. Now that the President has personally observed the workings of Mormonism, we shall look for a luminous exposition of it in his next message.—*Philadelphia Times*, Oct. 15.

### THE PRESS AND THE PRESIDENT.

It is a fact worthy of notice in estimating English civilization as compared with our own, that the general tone of the English press in speaking of persons in authority is invariably guarded and respectful. When the London press feels called upon to censure any measure of the Government, or to criticize any public man, there is a certain self-respecting moderation in its style which might profitably be imitated on this side of the Atlantic. Even the most pronounced opposition organs speak with decorum and reserve of the shortcomings of the Government. They indulge in no intemperance of language and in nothing that can fairly be characterized as vulgar abuse. With us, on the contrary, no past services, however distinguished, and no position, however eminent, exempts a public man from the vulgar abuse of unlicensed scribblers. Ulysses S. Grant, the President of the United States, has rendered services to this Republic which ought to win for him the everlasting gratitude of every American citizen who has in his breast a single spark of genuine patriotic feeling. No matter what may have been his errors

in the administration of the government, no matter what unwise appointments to office he may have made, no matter what personal defects he may have exhibited, it is certain that to him, above all other men, we owe it that we are to-day a nation with one flag and one government. It is certain that his name will live in history as one of the greatest men that America has yet produced. He has twice been chosen by large popular majorities to the highest office in the gift of the people, and every sneer and slur leveled at him is as much an insult to American institutions and to the American people as to the individual man against whom they are aimed. His public acts are legitimate subjects of criticism. But when his private life is invaded, when his acts as an individual citizen are seized upon and made the theme of invidious criticism and brutal attack, the feelings of patriotic, fair-minded citizens are outraged. A few days ago the President, in his capacity as a private citizen, saw fit to sell a stock farm which he owned in the neighborhood of St. Louis. A morning contemporary seized upon this fact as the occasion of a vulgar and despicable attack upon the chief executive of the nation. The President of the United States, the General who received the sword of Lee at Appomattox Court-house, is characterized by the *Call* as "an official stock-raiser," as "the Great American Traveler No. 2" taking "a little relaxation from his arduous duties by coming West to see Brigham Young." The President, owning a farm and a quantity of stock, in his private capacity as an American citizen, is attacked with coarse ridicule for disposing of his personal property according to his own pleasure, and especially for selling the "war horse upon which he rode through the Vicksburg campaign." One would think that the remembrance of that campaign would have sealed the ribald mouth that premeditated so mean and dastardly a sneer. In other civilized countries the press, when called upon to criticize politics and measures, scrupulously refrains from invading the sphere of private life. With us the wild rage of partisanship breaks through all the decent barriers of decorum, and the wanton license of journalists who ignore all the restraints imposed by a sense of justice or the instincts of propriety exhibits itself in reckless defamation. The President's public speeches, his public acts, and his administrative policy are legitimate subjects of criticism. But to comment upon his acts as a private citizen in the disposition of his property is beyond the province of self-respecting journalism.—*San Francisco Chronicle*.

### A Woman's Warning Against Fashion.

Fashion is a much more subtle temptation, because the eye and taste get gradually demoralized. Some periods are worse than others in this respect, but there will always be tendencies to be guarded against—either those that are actually to indecency, or merely to indecorum; e. g., the quietest bonnet of the fashion of 1875 would have been the most indecorous in 1830, and could have been worn by no respectable person, though now the "cottage" would be an enormity. But when, in the beginning of the century, ladies trying to be classical, wore hardly two petticoats, and backed out of the room like nixies, for fear their fathers and aunts should be horrified by the statue-like outline of their torsos, fashion went a good way beyond the simply indecorous. And the same may be said of the height of the corsage, and probably always will be, for some women will unfortunately always be found who are sufficiently lost to modesty to be willing to attract by display of themselves; and there are others who thoughtlessly imitate them, because they will not be outdone, and thus a public fashion is formed which absorbs the thoughtless and makes others afraid of the suspicion of prudery. Once for all, exposure is always wrong; whatever be the fashion, it is a Christian woman's duty to see when indecency comes in, and to protest against it by her own example and influence, though not by censoriousness. Relative indecorum should also be guarded against. The first entrance of a fashion that tends to a bold appearance ought to be resisted.

Mannish dresses are undesirable on this account; and it is well to cultivate the shading of the face as much as possible—not wearing such hats as are barely endurable because others have them. Exposure of the face is one of the great tendencies of the time, and, though it is not exactly indelicate in itself, yet the bold confronting of notice that is involved in going out with a totally unprotected countenance, thrown into prominence by the head dress, cannot be modest in itself; nor does a veil coming close over the nose materially alter the matter. Crinoline only was absurd, not indecorous; therefore it was not worth while to go against the stream. But corsage and tight skirt, and some kinds of head-gear, should be avoided at any cost of singularity. Colors, likewise, are involved in the matter of modesty. What is obtrusive is never fit to put on, for it brings eyes upon the wearer. There is no need to give instances. Most of us understand that there is a difference between brightness and gaudiness, and if, unfortunately, we are born without the eye to see what is appropriate, observation from others will generally teach it. To be conspicuous is the special thing to be avoided. Glaring contrasts, hasty adoption of fresh modes—all that challenges observation—are inconsistent with the soberness and "shamefastness" which forms part of the Christian woman's adorning.—*Charlotte M. Yonge*.

A VERY ANCIENT WALL IN MISSISSIPPI.—About eighteen miles from Port Gibson, and one mile from Brandywine Springs, on the place of Mr. O'Quin, the existence of a great number of blocks of cut stone has been known for an indefinite time, and the people in the neighborhood have used them for props for their houses. Mr. James Gage, Jr., went out there a few days ago to explore, and had a specimen stone brought into town. It is about three feet long, by about twenty inches square, resembling in shape a bar of soap. It is probably a native sandstone. Mr. Gage took this block himself from beneath the roots of a large pine tree. It formed a portion of a wall about twenty feet broad on the top, which Mr. Gage traced for a distance of two hundred and fifty yards. The inference that one would naturally draw from this superficial view is that this must have been a city wall, but deep exploration might show it to be a portion of a fort, temple or other building. Anyway, its antiquity is probably immense, antedating the history of the red men.—*Port Gibson Standard*.

DEAD HALT IN CIVILIZATION.—Since the terrible murder of a school-girl in New Hampshire, the other day, there has been a general and melancholy acceptance, among the papers, of the conclusion that the traditional freedom of women in New England has passed away forever. This is spoken of as merely an interesting incident of our social experience, but, if it is true, it is a calamity of vast magnitude, and the deepest reproach to our civilization. It means, in short, that we have come to a dead halt in the process of civilization, and taken up the line of retreat. The safety of Woman on the highways and byways, the boast of New England for two centuries, is the first point to be surrendered to the advancing host of crime and rapine. If this is true, it is a tremendous admission, and, for our part, we would rather it would be said that the bank vaults of New England were all open to the robber than that the safety of women is generally and seriously imperiled.—*Springfield Republican*.

### Canadian Indians Want to Come to the United States.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs was waited upon this morning by a delegation of Iroquois Indians, residing on a tract of land six miles square, in the province of Quebec, Canada, who came to ask his permission for the tribe, which numbers 1,450, to settle with the Cherokees in the Indian territory. The delegation, which consisted of Joseph Skye (Thaderionite) and John Diome (Anasotako) were introduced by Col. Wm. P. Adair, the Cherokee delegate in Washington, who stated that his people were willing that the Iroquois, whom tradition says were really

Cherokees who wandered away from their southern home a long time ago and settled in Canada, should come down and settle among them. The delegation presented a letter addressed to Hon. Wm. P. Ross, chief of the Cherokee nation, expressing the desire of their tribe to emigrate to this country, and saying that they hoped he would recommend that the Cherokee council give them the necessary permission. They further state that they own about 23,000 acres of land in Canada, worth from \$15 to \$20 per acre, and that the money they would receive from its sale would be applied to the payment of lands bought of the Cherokees. They also had a letter addressed to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking his kind offices in consummating the arrangement. The Commissioner promised to communicate with the chief of the Cherokee nation, and would let them know the result. Inquiry developed the fact that these Indians are civilized; that they dress in the ordinary clothing worn by whites; have a school and church, and that they are all engaged in industrial pursuits. The chief, Mr. Skye, is a fine looking man, about fifty years of age. The delegation leaves for Canada to-night.—*Washington Star*, Oct. 14.

### "A Certain Duty of Girls."

Under the above head the *Springfield Republican* presents some views that are not amiss at this time, when brutal assaults upon women and the frequency of girl-murder, under the most shocking circumstances, threatens that the boasted safety of woman in this country must be surrendered to the advancing host of crime and rapine. Conceding the great prevalence of crime against the sex, that paper suspects that they must themselves bear some of the responsibility, not so much in this class of cases by any tempting forwardness of manner, as by their neglect to properly denounce and expose the first improper solicitation. It is a matter of common notoriety that where a clergyman or teacher has betrayed the girls entrusted to him, it has been through gradual approaches and through solemn injunctions of secrecy imposed upon one victim after another. Many a mother has been the confidant, years after, of attempts upon her daughter's honor which should have been exposed and rebuked at the moment, and nearly every person open to the confidence of the sex is familiar with such instances, the woman not infrequently having preserved her chastity and her silence at the expense of untold anxiety and distress. The motive to silence is the dread of scandal, of being misunderstood or not believed, and of occasioning some violent revenge upon the offender, from which the tender heart of woman shrinks. It now appears in the case of the Langmaid girl, so brutally murdered and outraged, that she had concealed from her parents previous solicitations from the man to whose lust she finally fell a victim; and by keeping silence lost her life. Another motive to concealment is the threats of the offending party, but any subjection to such threats only places the victim still more completely in his power. The young woman who passes by such an affront in silence conspires against the safety of her own sex. She should lose no time before putting the case in the hands of her next best friend—the parent, guardian, teacher or kinsman—who has judgment and sense in matters of the world. And parents also are to blame when they permit their sons and daughters to grow up in such ignorance that their first suspicion of sin is derived from its temptations.—*Washington Star*.

### How Poor Girls Are Tempted.

*Editor Woman's Journal.*—I should like to add a line on the "Social Evil" question, which is being discussed in our papers. The *Globe* has had a number of articles claiming that the women are the ones most to blame in this matter. Now I, for one, know better. I know that poor girls in our city who act as clerks in establishments where they are employed are tempted in such a way that "an angel from heaven" could hardly resist. For instance they are often ruined by their employers. I know of two large stores in this city whose proprietors make unlawful love to

every pretty, stylish girl whom they employ. They are supposed to be gentlemen, and, in this disguise, they accomplish their purpose; first by flattery of the poor girl's ability; next comes an invitation to lunch; then to take a ride with the nice span of horses these men have just purchased, &c. So it goes on until they gain the entire confidence of the poor victim, and the rest is an easy matter.

What shall I call these men? I know of no name too bad. I want your readers to understand that I am relating facts which have occurred under my very eyes. I am only writing what I know. One poor beautiful girl told me with her own mouth that she had loved her employer as she had loved her life, and that he had ruined her for this world; that he had taken step after step as I have told you, and had gained her confidence. After that love came easily, and she said:

"I should have done anything he told me to; I seemed to be in a trance. He told me he would not harm me, and to keep quiet and no one would ever know it. When I woke up from this trance, which I did by seeing him acting the same thing over with the next clerk whom he fancied, I found out that he had no less than seven clerks whom he had befuddled and bewitched as he had me. Then I hated him so deeply that if I had not immediately left his store, I should have been his murderer. I told him to his face that I would kill him if I thought he was fit to die."

Now I ask all decent people who believe in human nature—Do you think this poor girl alone to blame in this matter of her downfall? Her conscience was deeply stricken. Why the poor thing would no more sin now than the babe unborn; she mistrusts every one, and can you blame her?

Let me add, with this case as an illustration, that women, as a rule, sin through love, and not through desire cultivated as in the case of many men, till they go about "seeking whom they may devour." I write this, hoping it may be a warning to some of our poor ignorant and innocent girls, who are constantly thrown in the way of these bad men. Beware, my dear girls, of any little sweet attentions on the part of those who have no right to give them. C. J. Boston, Mass. —*Woman's Journal*.

WHY EDITORS DON'T COMMIT SUICIDE.—While speaking of suicide as a feature of human experience, I am led to the remarkable fact that editorial life exhibits so general an exception. While we have had instances of self-inflicted death among lawyers, bankers and mechanics, such a case has never occurred among the journalists of this city. One may reasonably inquire what is the cause of his exemption? They labor intensely, and are generally ill-paid, and they have a full share of life's hardships which they endure till their change comes in course of nature. I can give no other reason for this except that the profession is constantly busy and works with an approval of conscience, since its labors are for the public weal. Editors, in fact, are so occupied with range of thought embracing public interests that they have little time to think about themselves. Walter Scott made the remark after he had reached bankruptcy that nothing saved him from insanity but his habits of writing. His mind was thus led away from the contemplation of his miseries. Journalists are so engaged in chronicling the woes of others that they lose sight of their own.—*New York Cor. Cin. Gazette*.

Says the *Louisville Courier-Journal*: "In walking about through the Exposition a few nights ago, we couldn't help noticing the 'fair sex,' and thought what a sad commentary upon our boasted civilization that the women of our times have degenerated in health and physique until they are literally a race of invalids. They are pale, nervous, feeble and back-achy, with only here and there a few noble exceptions in the persons of the robust, buxom ladies characteristic of the sex in days gone by. Fashion, folly and foolishness have rather got the best of them, and it now remains for them to die old maids, or let no-account husbands get the worst of them."