

EDITORIALS.

TWO VIOLENT ANTI-"MORMONS."

It appears that the condition of his recovery justifies the expectation of his recovery from the wounds inflicted by the would-be assassin, De Young, who is now at large on bail of \$25,000. The affair of the shooting has been generally discussed by the press of the country, and the character of either of the parties has not been improved by the light or the ink which has been shed upon it. We are glad to number both persons on the list of the avowed enemies of the "Mormons," and take as a compliment all the evil things which the preacher and the editor have uttered against us.

The case of Kalloch has not been helped by the fact which is now apparent, that his foul and virulent verbal attack on the De Youngs was arranged and announced before the Boston article, aspersing the character of his dead father, appeared in the San Francisco *Chronicle*. He cannot now plead as his poor excuse for defaming De Young's mother, that the *Chronicle* had maligned his father. It was a shameful thing for a professed minister of the gospel to do, under any circumstances, and the palliation offered for it turns out not to be valid.

A great deal of foolish talk has been indulged in about the justification of De Young in avenging the injured fame of his aged mother. No right-minded person can defend Kalloch in his use of the libellous language that provoked his assailant. But who can consistently sustain De Young in his cowardly attempt at willful murder? He gave his adversary no chance for defence. He sent a lying message to entrap him. Sitting in a closed carriage, holding a cocked revolver, when the deceived preacher approached the vehicle he fired at his breast, and when the wounded victim turned his back and retreated he fired at him again.

The question has been asked, "What brave man would not maintain the honor of his mother?" Another question is, What "brave" man would play the part of a sneaking assassin? Duelling has been placed under the ban in civilized countries, and a man who kills his opponent in a duel is counted a murderer. But how much more guilty of capital crime is the man who, under pretence of vindicating his honor, decoys his adversary into a position from which he can kill him under cover and without being himself exposed to the slightest personal danger?

We have no sympathy with Kalloch in his course, but De Young's whole proceedings, either as a defamatory scribe or an attempted assassin, excite the utmost detestation and abhorrence.

ORIGIN OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

A suggestion having been offered in the Cincinnati *Gazette* that Joseph Smith discovered the plates from which the Book of Mormon was written, by means of "the divining rod," a long article in relation to that instrument subsequently appeared in the *Gazette*, by Henry Reed. We do not propose to copy the article, but clip from it the following, as the opinion of an intelligent opponent of "Mormonism" in regard to the old, exploded, but recently revived Solomon Spaulding story:

"From whatever quarter the Book of Mormon may have come, no person of much critical acuteness will attach any credit to the Solomon Spaulding theory of its origin. No scholar—and Spaulding is represented as a man of considerable erudition—writing a romance of the 'ten lost tribes,' would have written it in that manner. The notion that the American Indians were descendants of the Israelitish clans which seceded from the House of David under Jeroboam was, at the date of the appearance of the Book of Mormon, very prevalent in the United States; and many books and pamphlets were written, newspaper articles printed, and sermons

preached, to give credibility to the idea of such relationship. Any one of these may have served as a hint, if hints were necessary, for the undertaking. Smith's announcement of the discovery of the golden plates and the crystal spectacles was as early as 1823, whereas his acquaintance with Rigdon who is supposed to have copied the Spaulding romance, did not commence until 1829 so that the revelation was, to say the least, projected before Smith could have had any knowledge of the production from which its substance has been putatively derived, that, to some extent, in the way of names, he may have made use of the Spaulding manuscript, is not improbable; but the Book of Mormon bears, palpably, the evidence that it was produced for the purpose for which it was used, and by those who had such purpose distinctly in view in its production. In short, the end of its creation was not literary, as was the case with the Spaulding chronicle, but dogmatic and practical. And however amenable it may be to the rules of literary criticism, there is no denying the skill and knowledge of human nature with which it was adapted to the service for which it was employed. Besides this, although the Spaulding document was sent to a committee at Conneaut for the express purpose of being compared with the book, the silence that ensued, and mysterious disappearance of the manuscript, are tolerably strong evidence that the expected identity was not demonstrated by the comparison."

It is amusing to see the shifts and twistings to which men resort in an endeavour to account for the Book of Mormon, when they reject the truth in relation to its origin. The divining rod theory only leaves the matter where the true account places it, after the plates with their hieroglyphics came into the hands of Joseph Smith, leaving the translation and object of the book to be accounted for; and the Spaulding story is too baseless and inconsistent with known facts and the nature and character of the book, to make any impression on the minds of thoughtful people. The testimonies prefacing the work give the only reliable account of its origin, and they are plain, simple, straightforward, consistent, and irrefutable.

FAINT RUMORS OF WAR.

WARLIKE movements have again attracted attention towards Russia, whose traditional policy embraces conquest and territorial acquisition. Not long since, a report was published of a visit to the United States of a prominent Russian official, charged with the duty of obtaining an estimate of the cost of a large number of cruisers for his Government. Now we hear of important additions to the fortifications on the western frontier of the Czar's dominions, which have stimulated Germany to a speedy completion of fortifications which at first were intended to consume four years in their construction. And two more Russian commissioners are said to have come to our shores to learn how much live stock and meat can be exported, if required, during the next four years.

These movements are recognized as indications of expected trouble. It is said that Russia is unfriendly towards Germany and Austria, and it is thought that a difficulty between those two Powers and the Government at St Petersburg is not at all improbable. These measures may all terminate in talk, but it is possible that they may be preliminary to an outbreak which will involve all Europe in sanguinary strife.

THE GOAL OF CENTRALIZATION.

THE Constitution of the United States embodies two different yet compatible and harmonious powers of government. One is to be exercised within and by each separate State organization and is local; the other is to be wielded in every part of the Federal Union by the authorities elected by all the States and is national. While the letter and spirit of the Constitution are preserved and respected there will be no serious conflict between the two

powers. Their respective spheres are clearly and distinctly defined. There is no need for one to overlap or interfere with the other. The citizens of each State are also citizens of the United States and are therefore interested in sustaining, honoring and perpetuating the national as much as the local authority. But there is a danger of one being magnified out of due proportions to the disadvantage and diminution of the other. Against either of these extremes all who desire the maintenance of constitutional liberty should set their faces like a flint.

State sovereignty is decided, so far as war can settle anything, to be a heresy. But State rights still exist and prevail and are essential to individual freedom and the continuance of American institutions. As the nation would come to naught if the extreme of State sovereignty prevailed, so will State rights be extinguished if the other extreme of national authority be pushed to the point of centralization, advocated by some, under the deceptive name of "a strong government."

There are advocates of both dangerous extremes. There is very little likelihood of the few supporters of State sovereignty and the right of secession ever converting the majority to their views, or of disrupting the nation. But it is not at all improbable that the apologists of increased centralism and national supremacy may succeed in establishing an order of things that will differ little from a veritable monarchy.

Those who evidently favor an extension of the Federal power at the expense of State jurisdiction, are countenanced by the moneyocracy, including the great corporations of the country. They declare in favor of "a stronger Government." They have many reasons for desiring the whole nation to be placed under the control of a firm hand, which will not be held back by any local force that appears to be opposed to national considerations, or may be so construed when gigantic schemes for wholesale fraud are in jeopardy from local interference.

It is believed by many shrewd observers, that the re-election of Grant will be an important step towards the destruction of State rights, the abrogation of Constitutional liberty and the establishment of an oligarchy with a Dictator at its head. Such an event may be smiled at now as absurd and improbable, but the idea is entertained, there are forces at work which will foster and encourage it, and in this fast age it takes but little time to work up simple ideas into serious facts.

We clip the following from an Iowa paper, which cannot boast of extensive influence, but the suggestions it puts forth, wild as they may appear, are not without supporters who possess the power which the paper lacks:

"Stalwarts believe in State sovereignty. A State without sovereignty is like a wasp without his stinging gear. This republic is, however, but one State—America, comprising what was formerly the United States—and it is sovereign. The North and the South can never live together as equals, on account of incompatibility of temper and difference in social and intellectual rank. But while we cannot have the Southern virago in our political house as a wife, she may do very well as a hired girl. Off to de kitchen, Dinah.

HOW TO MAKE US A NATION.

Complete the revolution of '60-'65 by

First—Formally changing the name of this republic to America.

Second—Abrogating so much of the Constitution of what was the United States as conflicts with national solidarity. For example, such clauses as recognize the individual departments as States—that gives to each State two Senators, irrespective of population—that gives to each State one and only one vote in case a Presidential election is thrown into the House—that permits each State to have a constitution of its own—that recognizes State courts—that inhibits the national Executive and his Cabinet from reviewing so called State legislation.

Third—By abrogating all State constitutions and granting to the provinces or departments thus created charters, under which the cit-

izens of each department might transact their business.

Fourth—By withholding charters from those rebellious States that forcibly resisted the revolution of '60-'65.

Fifth—By inaugurating Grant into the American Presidency, March 4, 1881, and keeping him in the Presidential chair till the nation was consolidated.

This would complete the revolution, and the stalwarts will never rest until they have accomplished their glorious work."

These are the utterances of a radical extremist, as violent and revolutionary as the ultra Democrat of the *Okolona States*, and neither of them express the acknowledged sentiments of the North or the South. But the above extract shows the ultimate point towards which centralization is moving, and exhibits something against which it is the part of wisdom to warn those who are loyal, not to mere party principles, but to the Constitution framed by the promptings of the Spirit of inspiration.

It has been predicted by the leaders of the latter-day dispensation that the time will come when the Saints, or the people commonly called "Mormons," will save the Constitution from utter destruction. This is evidence that it will be brought into imminent danger. Already the disposition to ignore its provisions when any party measure is at stake, or an unpopular practice or people is an object of displeasure, is plainly manifest in the high places of the government. Even the Supreme Court of the United States has shown its tendency in this direction, and the recent feeler thrown out by the Administration in regard to the "Mormon" immigration, exhibits the growing disposition to warp the Constitution or trample it under foot when it stands in the way of a party project.

The people who, under Divine Providence, have been blessed with an inheritance in these mountain valleys should keep in view the sacred obligations which they are under to sustain the Constitution of the country. Little by little it will be encroached upon by demagogues and corrupt politicians until only a mighty hand, nerved by the power of Jehovah, will be able to save it from the doom of obliteration. And the Latter-day Saints must contend for their rights and the freedom guaranteed by the supreme law of the land, for their own good and the benefit of posterity. They must also teach their children the principles embodied in that instrument, and train them to a veneration and love for those God-given guides and decrees. And when the day comes that this people, after weathering the storms and vicissitudes of the sea of troubles on which their vessel is now tossed and buffeted, arrive at the position for which they are destined by Jehovah, and power and dominion fall into their hands, they will bear aloft the Constitution pure and undefiled as the true palladium of human liberty, and invite the brave and the just of all nations to join with them in spreading its influence to the uttermost parts of the world.

THE LONDON "TIMES" ON POLYGAMY.

THE article from the London *Times* which we published in our last issue, and on which we made some comments, contains some more points to which we desire to draw attention:

"And it may be added that as long as there are persons, and masses of persons, so imperfectly educated, intellectually and morally, as to accept with facility and even with eagerness, creeds that put back the dial of time at least two thousand years, we are not likely to extirpate the errors thus willingly embraced by the adoption of any measures that savor of persecution. Mormonism is more likely to die out than to be crushed out. With the growth of more just ideas on the relation between the sexes, the adoption of polygamy as an article of faith will become as odious and as impossible as any formal adoption of polyandry could be. It must, however, be remembered that polygamy was not a part of the original gospel of Joseph Smith; and it may come to pass that the practice will be dropped as it was introduced, leaving Mormonism surviving."

There are three things in the above to be considered. First, the assumption that creeds two thousand and year old must necessarily be erroneous; second, the probable effect of the growth of more just ideas on the relation between the sexes; third, the position occupied by the doctrine of polygamy in the gospel system promulgated by Joseph Smith.

We take the ground that truth is aged. Every principle of the gospel taught by Jesus when on earth, that is accepted by the various "Christian" denominations of to-day is more than a thousand years old, and was taught by Him and His Apostles. It originated no truth, but only enunciated doctrines taught previous to the revelation of the law. The eager acceptance of a creed crowned with the halo of antiquity is no evidence of a perfect moral or intellectual condition. On the contrary, one of the arguments frequently made in favor of a religious doctrine is its political principle is its acceptance from ancient times. No matter to what period any tenet may be traced, its weight does not detract from its value, renders it, if anything, more able and authoritative.

The age or youth of a custom should not affect its value in the mind of the intellectual investigator; its age and rightfulness should be the objects of inquiry. "Mormon" polygamy, although not ancient and practiced on account of an example of the early patriarchs because it has been revealed by God in our own times, does not any of its recommendations to a thoughtful mind because it is a social custom among the leading races of the world in the days of Abraham lived upon the plain of Mamre. "Christian" believers that God revealed the patriarchs and that they lived under his guidance, made known to those who were made true before they were made it, and will remain true through all the ages of time and the unnumbered ages of eternity. And he who teaches a doctrine or a custom because it is two thousand million years old, has no grounds for claiming any extraordinary powers of intellectual fecundity of education.

"Mormon" doctrine does "put back the dial of time" a little second. It embraces all of modern manifestation and does not reject those of antiquity. Old or new to the day of to-day, it matters not, true principles and regulations are the objects of "Mormon" faith and practice. The fact that they were adopted by the wise men of old, if anything, is a recommendation to them, not a reason for their rejection.

We do not agree with them that the "growth of just" the relation between the sexes will make "Mormon" polygamy either odious or impossible. We are of the opinion that the system of plural marriage is fully understood in connection with the laws of physiology, the principles of human progress, the relative powers, rights and capabilities of the sexes, and matters necessarily associated with the subject, it will not come the reverse of "odious," be possible of adoption by the advanced minds of the age, recognition as a purer, more and in every way superior system than the monogamous system outgrowths of corrupt morality, and crime.

It would be useless to argue any one who would assume any illiarity between polygamy, its grossest form, and polyandry, voice of nature as well as the revealed law cries out against the latter as filthy, unnecessary, calculated to subvert the main object of the union of the sexes, to destroy the family relation, and not to arrest the increase of the race, to make doubtful the posterity of its offspring. They have been opposing upon each other, but have been opposite as life is to death.

Polygamy as believed in by the Latter-day Saints is little understood in the world, and its purposes and effects are generally misrepresented. This is in consequence