

EDITORIALS.

LYING DISPATCHES.

THE misrepresentations contained in press dispatches have been commented upon severely in many of the public journals. In political affairs it is often very difficult to pick out the truth from the mass of falsehood with which it is surrounded in telegrams forwarded by men who are the tools of the Republican party. If the wires were under the control of the Democracy it is possible that they would not be any better. But it is a deplorable fact that most of the dispatches that are sent to the papers all over the world are colored and tinted with the views and prejudices of radical partisans, while they should be entirely free from bias or opinion, relating only cold and naked facts and occurrences.

The Idaho Democrat under the heading of "Lying Dispatches" says:

For a series of years there has been a continual complaint of the want of reliability in the associated press dispatches. This matter has been complained of so often that one would think the parties who have control of the matter would cease sending such stuff over the lines. During the war there might have been some excuse for claiming a disastrous route, as a brilliant "strategic movement." It may have been necessary in order to keep up the courage of the nation, to call defeat a grand victory. But there can be no kind of excuse for continuing this wholesale lying, but it seems to have become such a habit during the war that it has been continued ever since, and especially so during political campaigns.

To this we will add that for years there has been a systematic and wilful perversion of the truth in the press dispatches about Utah and the "Mormons," chiefly in those forwarded from Salt Lake City. And we wish our Democratic friends who find reason to complain of the falsification of political news, to remember that a far worse perversion of the truth is customary with despatchers of news from this city concerning the "Mormons." The telegrams to the coast papers in particular are utterly unreliable. Make a note of it.

A GENERAL JEWISH CONVENTION.

A GRAND convention of Jews is arranged to be held next month in the city of Paris. It is likely to be one of the most important gatherings which has been held for many years. In all probability it will be attended by representative Hebrews from all parts of the world.

The once despised race can boast of eminent statesmen, orators, musicians, scientists, writers, actors and men and women of remarkable talent and enormous wealth, who sway a powerful influence in national as well as local affairs. A combined effort among the Jews for the accomplishment of almost any design would be a formidable affair, and one that would be difficult for any Government to cope with.

The objects of the convention are not yet declared. But we hope some steps will be taken for the full emancipation of the Jews in all the civilized nations, and that something will be done leading to the future occupation and redemption of the land of their forefathers. Prophecy points to this as one of the certain events of the latter times, and all things seem propitious for the speedy fulfilment of their sayings. "The times of the Gentiles" are nearly fulfilled, and the beams of the millennial morning proclaim that the day of Israel is at hand.

DENY THE FAITH OR FIGHT?

THE New York Mail, which keeps up its wild but feeble thrusts against the "Mormons" says:

"There is just one thing which remains to be done before it is certain that the law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court will be rigidly enforced in Utah, and that is for the 'Mormons' to decide not to

peaceably abandon one feature of their religion, but to fight."

That is to say, in fewer words, that if the "Mormons" do not fight the law will not be rigidly enforced in Utah. This is rather a singular statement. All the "Mormons" have to do, according to the Mail's way of putting it, is to remain quiet and the law against a prominent feature of their religion as interpreted by the Supreme Court will not be rigidly enforced. As we have no intention of fighting in the way anticipated by the Mail, that is, against the Government of the United States by force of arms, we are in no danger of any trouble in the Courts.

But the Mail surely does not mean this although it says so, for it asks the following question, and offers us the following advice, which do not harmonize at all with the above assertion.

"Which shall it be, a denial of the faith or a fight? If our Mormon friends are so perplexed to know which horn of the dilemma to choose, that they can be influenced by friendly advice, we wish them to abandon one feature of their religion."

To which we answer, we see no need of doing either. And why should we, if all we have to do for safety and immunity is to keep still? The advice of the Mail is as silly as it is bigoted and un-American. We are in no dilemma, even according to its own showing, and if we were the intimation that we must "abandon a feature of our religion" is simply infamous. What right has the Republican party, the Administration through its organ, or any other power, person or paper to require a religious body to abandon a feature of its faith or be prepared to fight?

There are a great many things in the creeds of Christendom with its multifarious divisions which are as obnoxious to us as some features of our faith are to others. But we have no desire to force them to abandon anything. Our only weapons are arguments. We do not believe any other kind are proper or expedient on either side. And it speaks very poorly for the position and the ability of Christian societies, as well as the dominant political party, that they cannot put down by argument, example and the influence of, as they claim, a better creed, an objectionable feature of the religion of a people so comparably insignificant, but must resort to brute force in an effort to extinguish something which, belonging to the domain of faith and morals, should be reserved to the sphere of polemics for its attempted suppression.

But however this may be viewed, it is certain that the military power has no part in the dispute. Under "the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court," which the Mail talks so foolishly about, legal process is the only constitutional and allowable method of attacking this feature of our faith that seems to worry some pious souls so much. Therefore we need not either abandon it or take up arms. We can suffer the consequences, whatever they may be, putting our trust in God, who is the author of our faith, for the result. To abandon our faith at the bidding of those who oppose it would be cowardly, sacrilegious and shameful, and to make us fight that we may maintain it is at present entirely unnecessary, and would be disgraceful and damnable in the power or party that forced such an issue upon us.

SHALL POLYGAMY BE "PUT IN ABEYANCE?"

THE Omaha Herald has recently repeated several times the advice its clever chief editor offered to the "Mormons" some time ago. The purport of it may be best understood from his own language. It is as follows:

"We would say to these people, much wronged and persecuted as they have been in the past, believe what you please, but do not longer practice what the laws of your country, judicially interpreted by its highest tribunals, pronounce a crime. You cannot afford resistance to the law by violence or attempted evasion."

This counsel being offered in all sincerity is worthy of respectful consideration. The reasons offered

by the Herald why this advice should be adopted are given in another article, as follows:

"They should banish polygamy into immediate abeyance and hold it there, for two main reasons:

"1. It is at irreconcilable war with the public opinion and spirit of a Christian age and country.

"2. The practice of it is a crime under our laws which have been judicially interpreted."

The first of these propositions contains no argument against the feature of our religious system which we are called upon to abandon. The very Christianity to which the Herald refers was at one time "irreconcilably at war" with the "public opinion and the spirit of the age and country" in which it originated. It was also regarded as at enmity with the laws. Its founder was condemned and slain; so were his immediate disciples and followers. No doubt, friendly disbelievers in the system Christ and his Apostles advocated, advised them to cease their practice of things opposed to the spirit and customs of the age. If they had followed such well meant though feeble counsel, where would Christianity—what there is left of it—be to-day?

Every new manifestation of divine truth has been at war with the spirit of the age and country in which it was developed. Every prophet, sage and reformer who has startled the world with a doctrine or an idea novel to his time, has had to meet the opposition of the people, and particularly of the expounders and representatives of orthodoxy. To throw aside a part of a creed which we firmly believe to be of divine origin, to forsake a position which we have been divinely commanded to assume, on the ground of the Herald's first proposition, would be cowardly, inconsistent and shameful. Banish a revealed law into "immediate abeyance" because we who believe in it are a small minority! It would be the course of a set of poltroons unworthy the name of men and women, much less of followers of Christ and the martyred prophets.

So long as we are convinced that we are in the right, the numbers and power of those who are hostile to us should have no influence whatever upon our course. Noah was opposed by a world. If he had been slain by the multitude instead of being saved in the ark, it would have made no difference to the truth of his message. Galileo truckled to the bigots of his day against whose cast-iron creed his principles were "irreconcilably at war," but posterity does not honor his weakness while it condemns his persecutors. Peter the Apostle, singing in the jail at Philippi or bleeding on the cross at Rome, was a far better example for the Latter-day Saints than Peter, the fearful, denying his master in the hall at Jerusalem.

If a man or a society should relinquish a principle or a practice on the simple ground that it is obnoxious to the majority, every sect, party and organization but the one with the greatest number of disciples should be disorganized, and religion and politics, thought and action be governed and controlled by the dominant creed. Progress would then be effectually arrested, and the world would settle into inertia and stagnation. Such considerations as are set forth in the Herald proposition number one, should not and will not have any influence whatever with the people called "Mormons."

The second proposition bears more apparent weight than the first. It is true that the practice of polygamy is judicially declared to be a crime. Or rather, Congress has made it a crime for any man in a Territory to marry a wife while he has another wife living. It is no crime under the laws to marry a wife and live with others carnally; no crime to seduce women and cast them off; no crime to beget children without a claim on the father for recognition or support. The crime consists in marrying more women than one, and making them wives, instead of marrying one wife and keeping other women on the sly after the fashion of law-makers and others who raise the hue and cry against polygamy.

But this is the situation as we view it, and it is of no use to think we can see it through any other eyes than our own: God has revealed to us a law commanding and regulating the practice of plu-

ral marriage. Congress has passed a law declaring that which God has established a crime. What is our duty in the premises? Is it not clearly to respect the law of God, and leave those who have created a conflicting law to take what steps seem right to them? Why should we abandon our position, unless we become convinced that we are in error? Congress cannot make right wrong. Governments cannot abolish a law of heaven. If all the world says polygamy is bigamy, it would make no difference to the fact, we know it is not so. Governments may seek to prevent the practice of plural marriage, but if it is a divine system it will remain so, all the same.

Supposing the Administration proceeds to enforce the law against polygamy, what is our duty? Surely not to trample upon what we declare is a divine law, or to rush in haste to "put it in abeyance." If we have to suffer for the sake of right, others have suffered before us. We should not interfere with the rightful execution of the law, but we would be a set of knaves or noodles if we were to hurry in a fright to "banish" an integral part of our religious system. If the Government, incited by hypocrites and busy-bodies who want to make the regulation of public morals according to their own standard a part of our national system, proceeds with vigorous measures against the practice of polygamy, all right, so long as the rules of judicial procedure are not violated in a religious crusade. Let the law be vindicated lawfully. Prove guilt before inflicting punishment. Let the accused polygamist have as fair a trial at least as an alleged thief or murderer. Why should popular prejudice be permitted to rule in Courts where the defendant is charged with polygamy, more than if he were indicted for burglary or any other offense against the law?

Instead of putting this feature of our faith into immediate abeyance would it not be far more consistent to put up with the consequences? And we would like to ask the Herald what men are expected to do who have married two or more wives by mutual consent, under the sanction of Church covenants which all the parties hold sacred, who has lived with them in love and is the father of their children, who retains their affection and esteem, and is held as their provider and protector. Shall he put from him all but one wife, brand the others with a vile name and admit that their children are bastards? And all this to satisfy the demands of a corrupt and adulterous generation, aided by ignorant and unthinking sectaries, filled with prejudice and Phariseism? We would regard any man who would thus repudiate the wives who cling to him and the fruit of their union as a cringing, cowardly scoundrel. He should be despised of God and man, and become the scorn of angels and the derision of devils. If this is what the Herald means by the banishment of polygamy by the "Mormons," we can assure its editors that such counsel will be not only rejected but detested. If this is not implied, what does the Herald or any other adviser of the same thing mean by our ceasing to practice what the law and public opinion denounce?

The future marriage relations that may be contracted will be individual affairs. The way is plain. If a man who has a wife marries another during the life of the first, he does so in violation of a statute of Congress, which the supreme judicial tribunal declares to be valid. He takes the consequences. He stands in jeopardy of the law. If he is detected and his offense is proven, he is liable to fine and imprisonment. That is all there is legally in the matter. Why then this tremendous pother about it? If the law is broken, establish the fact and inflict the punishment. But let a nation steeped in sin, black with social corruption, and rank with offences against heaven, cease its howling against a people who, while practising a form of marriage distasteful to the majority, are seeking to establish a system for the regeneration of society, and who, however mistaken they may be considered, are at least earnest and sincere.

FALSE CHRISTS.

WE learn from the Walla Walla Watchman of a pretended Christ, who is worshipped at the foot of

the Blue Mountains in Washington Territory. He is still a child, and the offspring of an impostor calling himself Michael the Archangel, who came on earth as Adam, afterwards as David, then as Joseph the husband of Mary, and now appears as Jehovah, the Standard of Israel. Converts have gathered to the place above named, expecting that when twelve years old the re-incarnate Savior will perform wondrous miracles. An old gentleman who had lost his sight was induced to go there and to donate a considerable amount of money. Instead of gaining his eyesight he lost his cash, and when the child came near dying with the measles he lost his faith also, and now wants to sue for the recovery of his dollars.

A warning by the Messiah concerning "false Christs and false prophets" was given while he tarried on earth more than eighteen centuries ago, and has been renewed in these latter times. Still there will be many who will be deceived by impostors doing great signs and wonders. There is one key that all who read may understand, by which such second advent impostors as frequently decoy foolish people may be detected. The angels who stood by when Jesus ascended to heaven from the Mount of Olives in presence of certain of his disciples, said to them as they looked eagerly upward while the cloud received him out of their sight; "Ye men of Galilee, stand ye gazing up into heaven. This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1:11)

Those who place any belief in the pretensions of false Christs also profess to believe in the scriptures, from which they obtain their information and upon which they found their faith in the true Savior. It seems a little singular that they do not "search the scriptures," as enjoined by the Master, and by the guidance of the word, save themselves from gross delusion and the snares spread for their feet by the wicked and signing. But, after all, unless the word of Christ is read by the spirit of Christ, it gives but little understanding.

We are living in the times when deceivers will abound, and when, if it were possible, "even the very elect" will be led astray. But, in reference to the coming of our Lord, which is nigh at hand, there are means that "the wise" understand, by which all false Christs, false prophets, and false spirits may be detected, and this knowledge is more precious than fine gold, and of far greater wealth than the so-called wisdom of a boasting world. And this is the heritage of all faithful Latter-day Saints.

A STARTLING PROJECT

THE most daring project of modern times, and one that will excite the greatest derision from the despisers of innovation, is a scheme proposed by M. Gamon. The reader is informed, before reading further, that the gentleman is a French engineer of great intelligence, and his name is not spelled with m's.

Monsieur Gamon proposes to bridge the Atlantic! Or in other words to construct a causeway from Newfoundland to a point yet to be selected in Great Britain. The distance is about fifteen hundred miles along a plateau, which soundings and surveys have demonstrated to be from continent to continent, a depth of about two miles. The amount of earth required for the causeway is estimated at 12,000 cubic miles. Where is it to come from? M. Gamon proposes to take it from the almost worthless island of Newfoundland, which has an area of 42,000 square miles, and would have to be excavated to the depth of about a third of a mile. Where is the labor to be obtained? The projector proposes to the nations to utilize their convict labor in this way, and to declare a truce for a certain number of years and set their armies to work on the embankment, thus preventing war, establishing peace, and turning forces designed for destruction into instruments for commercial and universal benefit.

We give the proposition to our readers as it is put forth; they can laugh at it or consider it gravely, as they choose. But supposing