

EDITORIALS.

JUDGE EMERSON'S DECISION.

We publish to-day the text of Judge Emerson's decision in the Woman Suffrage case. It is plain, pointed and conclusive. It dissolves the sophisms of the special pleaders who sought to fuse and confuse sections 1859 and 1860 Revised Statutes of the United States, till there is nothing left of them. It sustains both the act and intent of the Utah Legislative Assembly and flattens out the imputations made against them. It establishes the right of the Legislature to create a new class of voters and provide separate qualifications for them. It pronounces the whole law in dispute valid, and completely settles the controversy. Now let the "Liberals" growl again and throw out their base insinuations against the Courts, if they please. It will not alter the truth, change the law or help their cause one iota.

THE REGISTRATION.

The registration in this city, so far as the deputy registrars are concerned, gives pretty general satisfaction. These officers worked hard and extended many courtesies, for which they deserve credit. The refusal to register some persons whom the law does not debar was not their fault; they acted under instructions and are not responsible for the rules nor the restrictions which were imposed by others. Between 5,200 and 5,300 persons were registered, 540 or 550 less than the total of the former list. This is a good week's work for half a dozen men—only five for the most of the time.

In the country districts more voters were registered in many places than formerly, and the probabilities are that with the accessions of persons who never voted before in the Territory, the People's Party will suffer but slight shrinkage.

TROOPS FOR SALT LAKE.

A TELEGRAM from Omaha announces the forwarding of two companies of soldiers to Fort Douglas. The reason for this accession of troops is said to be "anticipated trouble from Mormons during the approaching election."

This is only one more piece of nonsense added to the long list of absurdities in the treatment of the "Mormon question." Seeing that the "Mormons," in spite of the wholesale disfranchisements effected by the recent law and still later rules, are immensely in the majority, it is very difficult to perceive wherein there is the shadow of a reason for supposing that they will make any trouble over the election. The only people likely to make any disturbance is the so-called "Liberal" element, and that is so insignificant in its comparative proportions as to render any difficulty from that quarter entirely improbable.

Elections in Utah are conducted more quietly than anywhere else in Christendom, and the idea of sending troops here to help keep the peace at the November election is ludicrous. However, nobody here will object. It will cause the expenditure of a little more national money in this part of Uncle Sam's dominions, and against this we presume there will be no protest from either party.

JUDGE WILLIAMS' EXPLANATION.

We publish in another column an explanation made by Judge Williams, of Ogden, before His Honor Judge Emerson, on Saturday. In addition to disclaiming any connection with publications in Salt Lake papers which, it appears, had been accused of having "gone for the court and counsel," Judge Williams said, as far as he was informed, he felt sure "that there was no just cause for any reflection on the integrity of the courts or board of United States Commissioners."

This remark we fully endorse. And those who have carefully read the strictures of this paper on the conduct of certain "Liberals" in connection with the assault on woman suffrage, are aware that we have not

said anything reflecting in any way upon the courts or the Commissioners. We have not "gone for the courts." We have not implied or insinuated ought against them in reference to this question. We exposed the plot concocted by the "Liberal" tricksters, but we made no statement which can be construed into a charge against the courts or either of them.

As soon as an application was made for a postponement of the case on which the plotters expected to get "snap judgment," Judge Emerson granted it, and when the People's attorneys desired a full inquiry before Chief Justice Hunter, arrangements were promptly agreed to for both judges to sit on the cases at the same time. We have no fault to find with the courts in reference to this matter and we have not attempted to find any. Of course we are satisfied with the result, and the decision is proof enough that any insinuation against the judges would have been unjust.

HOW FAR IS MERE RUMOR TO PREVAIL?

A CASE at South Cottonwood brings forward the question, "How far shall rumor be regarded as evidence?" Under the regulations instituted at the recent registration, judicial powers have been exercised by registering officers. They have determined whether individuals should or should not be permitted to exercise the elective franchise. If they supposed or imagined that an applicant was or had been at any time living in polygamy, they assumed to refuse the individual the right to register or even take the oath which was the only proof the party could offer in his or her own behalf. How far is such arbitrary power to extend when confronted with a denial and offer to take the oath by the challenged applicant?

At South Cottonwood a young unmarried woman applied for registration, and was refused on the ground that the deputy registrar had heard that she was married to the head of the family in which she lived as help. She denied "the soft impeachment," and offered to take an oath to the contrary and that she was a *femme sole*. Still she was rejected. The gentleman said to have married the girl then appeared before the registrar, denied the rumor, and offered to take an oath that it was untrue. But the registrar still refused. An appeal was made to the County Registrar, but it was of no avail.

From what we can learn there is not the slightest foundation for the report, if such there was anywhere but in the mind of the deputy registrar, for the young lady is still a spinster and in every way eligible for registration. Yet this pretended rumor was allowed to prevail against the positive evidence offered under oath to the contrary. This is a case that ought to be tested, and in our opinion it is a good one on which to base a criminal prosecution or a suit for damages.

While this young lady was barred out from registration, strenuous efforts were being made to prevail upon the workmen at the adjacent smelters, supposed to be "Liberals," because they were non-"Mormons," to register. And as they would not take the trouble to go to the registrar, the registrar had to go to them. It is a matter of great doubt whether the names of quite a number of them have any right to appear on the registry list from which the young lady's name was arbitrarily and illegally excluded. This should be looked into and action taken accordingly. Examine the list and take legal measures to purge it if necessary. Also test the case of the rejected eligible voter.

A DISTINCTION WITH A BIG DIFFERENCE.

THE pressure brought to bear upon Congress by which the Edmunds bill was rushed through without deliberation, came from the professedly pious "Christians" whose souls were shaken with indignation at the thought of "Mormon" men in Utah having more wives than one. The cause of "morality" and "Christian civilization" demanded that something very stringent and severe should be brought to bear, lest the country's purity (?) should be contaminated.

The law was passed, at the dicta-

tion of the priests and fanatics, and under its presumed authority regulations have been established by which all persons who have at any time been connected with the practice of plural marriage are disfranchised, but at the same time the most depraved and debauched of both sexes are protected in their political liberties and given ample opportunity to join the "Liberal" clique in the raid upon Utah.

Well known and universally respected citizens are debarred from registering, while notorious profiteers and prostitutes are permitted to take the oath and have their names enrolled as voters. This is no fancy sketch; it is a statement of actual facts. We can furnish the names of ladies and gentlemen who were connected with plural marriage many years ago, but became disassociated therefrom in practice long before there was any enactment of the United States against it, and who have been denied the right to register, although they could conscientiously subscribe to the oath specially prepared to bar out polygamists. We can also furnish the names of men who are known frequenters of houses of prostitution, of men who acknowledge that they keep a mistress as well as a wife, and of women who gain their livelihood by selling their bodies to lustful males and are self-confessed harlots, all of whom have been admitted to registration.

What does this go to prove? Plainly that the pretence of morality on the part of those who procured and aided in the passage of laws against "Mormon" plural marriage is a sham and a humbug; that while they oppose polygamy they sustain prostitution, its antipodes; that while they cry out against that which builds up families, provides homes for all women who desire to "fill the measure of their creation," and cares for and protects offspring, they tacitly encourage that which pollutes families, destroys the home, makes outcasts of women and waifs of children, saps the foundation of purity and fills the land with villainy and corruption.

Their religious and political doctrine is: Make odious the faithful husband of two wives or more, disfranchise him and them, thrust them into prison and excite the populace against them; but make honorable before the law the libertine and the whore, and throw wide open to them the doors to the registry and the ballot box! They proclaim in effect: "Do what you will, wallow in debauchery and revel in iniquity; you are all right so long as what you do is not 'in the marriage relation.'"

Well, there is some satisfaction in this: That the "Liberal" and "Christian" assailants of "Mormon" marriage, place themselves on another plane from the supporters of that system. They go into the voting place cheek by jowl with the harlot and the pimp, and seek for the aid of the strumpet and the adulterer in their holy war against the plural marriage relation. They are in fitting company, "hail fellows well met." But the husband of plural wives, who has been faithful to his marriage vows, stands aloof from the mingled throng on a plane far above the filthy pool in which some of the lower crowd have dabbled, and from joining hands as the others do, with the workers of iniquity. The distinction is sharply defined, and it is one with an immense difference.

A SPECIMEN OF ANTI-"MORMON" LOGIC.

WE clip the annexed from an anti-"Mormon" paper, as a specimen of the logic in use by our "Liberal" opponents:

"It is a well known physiological and psychological fact that if a man or woman marry with a lower grade of intellect, instead of raising the lower, the case is invariably the sinking of the higher nature to the level of the one beneath it. And so it is with religion and politics—apart, each goes on its way and does its duties, but unite them and do you elevate the latter or degrade the former. History has answered the question over and over again for us, and never in favor of the union.

Then rise, oh! citizens of a free country who desire to be free, and declare the divorce between these two in Utah!"

Let us examine the "physiological and psychological fact," which is here said to be so "well known." A superior man marries an inferior woman, and as a necessary consequence of this "physiological, etc.,

fact," he becomes degraded to her level. But if he had married a woman of a higher grade of intellect than himself, he would have brought her down to his level. According to this, the tendency is to deteriorate, all the time and in every case. There can be no improvement by marriage. The superior male does not elevate the inferior female; neither does the superior female elevate the inferior male. The course of married humanity is downward, inevitably, and unless marriage is discarded entirely, mankind of both sexes will soon get down below the level of the brutes, and through the invariable "sinking of the higher nature to the level of the one beneath it," there is no telling what the end will be.

But is this "a physiological and psychological fact?" If so it is certainly not "well known." On the contrary it is generally considered by thoughtful folk that the higher nature raises the lower, and that the association of inferior with superior natures tends to elevate the former and not at the expense of the latter.

If the writer of the paragraph we have clipped means anything, it is evident he would have each nature "go on its way apart;" in other words he would have no marriage at all. He is a nice kind of a *Pilot* on the sea of society. But these are just the kind of fellows who cry out against "Mormon" institutions and talk about "elevating Utah."

And so, as a logical consequence of this bogus "physiological fact," there must be no religion in politics and no politics in religion. Marriage is all wrong, therefore there must be no union between religion and politics. Convincing, is it not? But suppose it is Methodist religion which undertakes to regulate politics? Ah! that is a different matter. The union is all right then. It is only when the "Mormon" religion attempts to have anything to say about politics that the wrong comes in, eh?

Now we are of the opinion that it would be a great deal better for the country if there was a little real religion introduced into politics. We believe that the higher would elevate the lower. That if the men who dabble in politics would regard the obligations they are under to "obey God and keep His commandments," it is likely that the "filthy pool of politics" would be somewhat purified. Office-seekers would not lie so much about each other and their own qualities; voters and wire pullers would not take so many bribes; passion would not overcome principle; honor would not be trampled in the mire; virtue would not be scoffed at in deed while lauded in word; good men and wise men would be sought for and sustained, and the vicious, venal and villainous would not so often crowd their way into the upper places.

But note the conclusion: Marriage always brings down the higher to the level of the lower, therefore, "Rise oh! citizens," etc., and "declare divorce" between religion and politics in Utah. Fustian and fiddlesticks. Rise oh! sensible people and tell these pretended *Pilots* to learn something before they attempt to give lessons in social or political navigation. They are really pirates on the ocean of this world, that seek to destroy instead of save, to wreck instead of guide to the harbor of safety.

"SUPPRESSING MORMONISM."

"The government of the United States is now engaged in suppressing Mormonism, and has appointed a salaried commission for that purpose. It is also engaged in preventing the introduction of contagious diseases into its territory, and has quarantine and sanitary officers for that purpose. When diseased cattle or diseased persons arrive at our seaports from abroad they are taken care of so that the people and their property may not suffer harm; and when criminals or paupers arrive they are sent back to the place they came from at the expense of the owners of the vessel which brings them. Six hundred and fifty persons arrived at New York Tuesday from Europe with the intention of violating the laws of the United States, and yet they were permitted to land and go on their way to Utah to practice crime without an act of interference or a word of remonstrance from the government or any of its officers; six hundred and fifty Mormons, under the care of twelve Mor-

mon missionaries, and the New York papers say that 'Mr. J. H. Hart, the agent of the Mormon Church for the reception of Mormon immigrants, went down the bay in a tug-boat and welcomed them at quarantine.' The party was composed of 300 English, 292 Scandinavians, and 54 Swiss and Germans. Suppose a party of 650 counterfeiters or pickpockets or prostitutes should arrive in New York with the intention of settling in the United States and practising their crime, what a row would be raised throughout the entire country! And yet these people come with the avowed purpose of engaging in a crime just as basic and they are welcomed by the agent of the colony of criminals which they come to join. This is a land of liberty with a vengeance."

The foregoing is from the *Inter-Ocean*, which has undertaken the task of assisting the Government in the task of "suppressing Mormonism," and knows as much about it as an Illinois porker does about the ten commandments.

In reference to the suppression of "Mormonism," hear what the Rev. Dr. Thomas said in a discourse against polygamy, delivered at the People's Church in Chicago a short time since:

"Accepting our Scriptures along with their own, their beliefs in very many things are common to nearly all orthodox Christian churches. Indeed they may be said to be strictly orthodox. They believe in the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the fall of man, total depravity, blood atonement, the resurrection of the body, and endless punishment. They believe in baptism for the remission of sins, and in laying on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. They believe in a divine call to the ministry; in ordination by laying on hands, and they recognize, as in the early church, the orders of Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers and Evangelists."

Holding then in common, as Mormons do, the great doctrines of Christianity, to talk of crushing out Mormonism as a religion would in this sense be the same as to repudiate the doctrines of all other churches."

If the government is "engaged in suppressing 'Mormonism'" it is engaged in unlawful and unconstitutional business. But we do not think any prominent officer of the Administration would admit that the government is doing anything of the kind. Neither do we believe for a moment that the Commissioners consider the suppression of "Mormonism" any part of the duties required of them; they are empowered with authority to regulate certain matters pertaining to the conduct of elections, but "suppressing Mormonism" is neither expressed nor implied in the law defining their functions.

It is true that some officials appointed to certain positions in the Territory of Utah have imagined that "suppressing Mormonism" was part of their official business. But they have only exhibited their ineptitude, like the *Inter-Ocean* does, and have never achieved any success except to make themselves ridiculous. And present incumbents of Federal office in the Territory have sense enough, while anxious for the "suppression of Mormonism" to say that this is not in their line, and to avow that they have nothing to do with the "Mormon" religion but are only desirous of extirpating polygamy.

The *Inter-Ocean* is much exercised over the arrival of "six hundred and fifty Mormons, without interference, or a word of remonstrance from the government," and feels dreadfully chafed because "the agent of the Mormon Church went down the bay in a tug-boat and welcomed them at quarantine." But why should the government "interfere?" It would have been ridiculous to "remonstrate" almost as silly as the vapors of the *Inter-Ocean*. And why shouldn't the Church Agent go out in a tug-boat and welcome the immigrants? Would it have suited the Chicago paper better if he had gone in a row boat or a wash tub? Or if he had met them with a long face and a melancholy countenance? Why, he was there on purpose to welcome them and see that they were comfortably forwarded on their journey. And he had just as much right to do so as if they were *Mormonites* instead of "Mormons," and he was the agent to facilitate their colonization.

But the Chicago "Mormonism" suppressor says they came "with the intention of violating the laws of the United States," "with