

EDITORIALS.

WHY DON'T THEY INVESTIGATE?

THE superficial manner in which influential journals look upon and treat the "Mormon" question, which they seem to think one of great public importance, is shown in the comments of the press on the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Miles case. Nine newspapers out of ten that try to explain the matter and to moralize upon it, either mis-state the facts, blunder as to the ruling, err as to its bearing and effects, or draw inferences that are entirely unwarranted by the decision.

Here is a statement of the case by a leading eastern journal:

"Miles married a beautiful young English girl, Miss Spencer, promising her that she should be his only wife. Subsequently, against her protests, he married a Miss Owens, the last wife having been a witness of the first marriage. Miles was arrested, and his trial took place under a new code, then recently adopted in Utah, which was so construed as to exclude Mormons from the jury in this case."

We need not explain to our readers how terribly the facts are here muddled and misstated so as to make the statement entirely incorrect. And here is the conclusion by the same paper, drawn from the Court's decision:

"The other important point decided by the Supreme Court yesterday is, that a second wife cannot be made to testify against her husband in regard to his marriage with his first wife, or vice versa. As wives will very seldom consent to testify against their husbands, under any circumstances, this decision is not of much consequence. Every opinion like this is a step towards breaking down Mormonism, but the progress made is so slow that we do not wonder that good people in the east get discouraged."

The intelligent editor is as much at sea in regard to the effect of the decision as to the facts in the case. But he is not any worse than another leading writer, on a Boston paper, who says:

"The decision just rendered by the Supreme Court, under which a convicted bigamist is released because the evidence of neither of his 'wives' could be lawfully received against him, makes it, as the Court concedes, scarcely possible to convict for polygamy in Utah under existing laws. A new law of evidence making certain facts—like a second brood of children, for example—prima facie evidence of unlawful relations, is the first thing needed."

One instructor of the people tells them that a man's second wife cannot testify against him, the other says neither of his wives can do so. They are both wrong, and therefore their sage advice as to the proper course to be pursued, being based upon error, is worthless and out of place.

The editor just referred to, commenting upon the exclusion of "Mormon" jurors says:

"This is very important, since it removes one of the chief obstacles to the conviction of Mormons for polygamy, the presence of Mormons on juries and their uniform refusal to convict, no matter how strong the evidence may be."

Again he is very much mistaken. "Mormon" juries have been accused by newspaper men of refusing to convict, but the records of the Courts here prove beyond cavil that the charge is untrue. The only man that has served out a sentence under a charge of polygamy was convicted by a "Mormon" jury. "Mormons" have been convicted of various offences and "Gentiles" acquitted by "Mormon" juries, as the records show. The repetition of these stale slanders is dishonorable in those who furnish information to the public. We do not complain because editors and other persons supposed to be acquainted with public questions do not inform themselves on the subject of "Mormonism." If they prefer to remain in ignorance about it, or to be misled by designing knaves, that is their affair. But we have the right to ask that they cease from disseminating falsehoods

about the "Mormons," and stirring up popular and congressional animosity against us, all based upon misconceptions as to our true character and principles and upon the false statements of unscrupulous enemies.

And we ask them to reflect a little upon the injustice of the measures they seek to inaugurate in the trial of a "Mormon" for polygamy. In the first place all the officers of the Courts here are opposed to the accused person and influenced by a strong desire for his conviction, biased against him with the bitterness which influences opponents on blended religious and political principles. Next, the jury is to be packed against him. No one is to be permitted to serve on it unless he is opposed to the accused in the same way as the Judge and the court officials. In the very nature of things here, such jurors will be anti-"Mormons," prejudiced against the defendant. Then the evidence is not to be necessarily direct. The existence of a number of children reputed to belong to the accused is to be taken as evidence that their mother is married to him; the same with another family. How much chance for justice would be left for him? Presumptive evidence to be taken as proof, a jury picked and packed against him, all the paraphernalia of the Court on the same side, and the Judge waiting eagerly to pronounce sentence. This, in an American Federal Court! This in the Republic of the United States!

And what are all these departures from the regular proceedings of law to be established for? Simply to procure the breaking up of family associations entered into on conviction of their rightfulness, which do no actual injury to any one, but which are distasteful to certain meddling persons and to divers pretended Puritans affected by their own distorted imagination. What good would be the result of such a course? A few men, some of them just as likely as not innocent of the charge preferred—for no "Mormon" would be safe—sent to the penitentiary, leaving the families unprotected for, and unprotected. Will it convince the "Mormons" that they are in the wrong and tend to break up their system? No, never! It will not in the very nature of things. It will naturally confirm them in their views, and stir up every power within them to resist such unrighteous and unjustifiable proceedings, and to help each other in a struggle for strong and lawful defence.

The whole plan, with the theories on which it is based, that is being devised against the "Mormons," is wrong in principle and shameful in its conception. It is in violation of all known rules of law and equity, and just and thoughtful minds should be able to perceive its iniquity and needlessness. At the same time those who think the "Mormon" question of any real importance to them or the country, should endeavor at least to understand it before forming conclusions or making suggestions. For there is no topic of the times on which people of general information are more deplorably ignorant than this subject on which they all imagine they can give competent advice. The quotations we have made are samples out of many that might be cited.

THE BETTER WAY.

A SHORT time ago fifty sets of harness made by Indian boys at the Carlisle school workshops, were accepted by the War Department for use in the United States army. This is a much better employment for Indians than begging, loafing, stealing and marauding. It is evidence that the natives of the land can be turned to habits of industry, and made useful if not ornamental to society. It would be greatly to the credit of the Government if the policy of training and improving the red men were followed instead of the policy of extermination. Large numbers of the Indians by fair and honest treatment, by kindness and firmness, by patience and Christian charity can be brought into subjection to law and habits of usefulness. Surely this would be better for the nation, leaving out of consideration the question of righteousness, mercy and justice, than the policy of force, of might over right, of disregard to the claims of the aborigines to the soil, and of utter selfishness and dishonor. We hope the new method—the "Mormon" way with the Indians, will become general.

PEN-PICTURE OF PENNSYLVANIA PREACHERS.

THERE are no anti-"Mormons" in the world who are so bitter and violent in their opposition as the professed ministers of the Gospel. Like their prototypes who were the real cause of the popular outcries against the Prophets and the Savior and His Apostles, they have been at the bottom of every movement designed to destroy the believers in the religious system known as "Mormonism."

Any estimate we might place upon them would naturally be open to the charge that we do not regard them in a favorable light. Here, however, is a description of many of them given by one of their number, Rev. Uriel Graves, a Pennsylvania clergyman of distinction and energy, who ought to know whereof he speaks. He says concerning the people of that State:

"They are duped and betrayed by long-faced pretenders, who seek only to get their bread and living by their preaching, while they care not for the flock, beyond the question of the prospective fleece. We would not be understood to make the above remark in any wholesale manner, for there are many who—like ourselves—still are serving their people in that narrow sense of which we have already spoken; but who, nevertheless, are doing their work honestly, yet ignorantly. But having said this much explanatory, we wish to assert that by far the larger number, through ignorance or downright villainy, are serving their flocks irrespective of the good or ill they may do them, so they only get the milk and enjoy the shelter. To prove this, our bold assertion, we challenge the reader to find us six popular ministers in Pennsylvania who dare preach the whole truth of God to their respective congregations, just as Christ commanded them to, and not at once bring on the sorest troubles in their charges and among their supporters. And that there may be no mistake, I will ask them to take the words of Christ, in His sermon on the mount, and giving them their true and legitimate interpretation, speak out boldly the word of the Lord. Such preaching would transform or empty ninety per cent. of all the pulpits of this land in less than six months."

The Pennsylvania divines may be fairly taken as average samples of the fraternity elsewhere. If these are the kind of preachers who occupy the pulpits of the orthodox churches, what wonder is it that public worship is so poorly attended and that there is a general complaint of a rapid "decline in religion?" And who should be surprised at this kind of "Christian" clergymen advocating the policy of settling the "Mormon" problem by military force?

POPULAR BELIEF FALLACIOUS.

THE San Francisco *Bulletin* has a long leader, under the heading of "A Representative Man," reviewing the article by our Delegate in the *North American Review*. Several quotations are given, and it is admitted that some telling points are made, and that the statements uttered "certainly conflict with the popular belief."

The fact is that the popular belief is often entirely erroneous. In the case of the "Mormons," it is based on rumor and the misrepresentations of their bitter enemies. The old adage about "giving a dog a bad name" may be with propriety applied to them. It has not been the fashion to accord them a hearing through the public prints, but to accept as true all the absurd and horrible stories that have been "made out of whole cloth" by designing persons or that have been woven with the slightest thread of truth in an entire warp and nearly a complete woof of falsehood.

The *Bulletin* seems rather doubtful over the statement of Hon. Geo. Q. Cannon that the "Mormons," besides viewing "the Old and New Testaments as the word of God" and looking for salvation to "Christ the Redeemer as the Savior of the world," also hold that "chastity in man is a virtue which should be maintained as rigidly as in woman," and as an offset to this, cites as facts that Delegate Cannon at home has been "defiant in defense of poly-

gamy," and that "it is well known in Congress and out of it that he was a polygamist, having just as many wives as he chose to maintain in defiance of the law."

Here is one point on which the popular belief is just as much at fault as it was in relation to the early Saints, and indeed in regard to the prophets and people of God in every age of the world. It was the popular belief and the popular voice that condemned the men who came with "the burden of the word of the Lord," that nailed Christ to the cross and proclaimed the primitive Christians "a little sect everywhere spoken against."

It is popularly supposed that if a man marries and lives with more wives than one, he must be a depraved person. Sensuality is so wide spread that the average individual can conceive of no other prompting than animalism as an inducement to plural marriage. People naturally judge others by themselves. And yet the truth is that those who enter into this family system are, as a rule, people who govern their appetites and passions and are under special religious obligations as to chastity. They consider that intercourse outside of the marriage relation is a deadly sin. They must be guided by principle rather than feeling, or they could not possibly practice plural marriage in any degree of peace and perpetuity. Families organized under its form could not exist, or rather continue, if led by a spirit of licentiousness. If either men or women enter into it for lustful purposes, they do not and cannot remain in it. Unless influenced by religious motives and objects, it would be impossible for them to maintain their relations. The doctrine of celestial marriage is not understood by the world, neither are the people who believe in and practise it. The grossest and most indecent inventions of bestial minds concerning it are accepted by the public as facts, and the prejudice thus aroused shuts the ears, and eyes, and hearts of the people against any investigation of the truth. Those who either lie about it, or talk of that which they do not understand are heard, those who know the truth and are willing to testify to it are despised and unheard, or if listened to at all are treated with distrust and disdain.

People are not only in error as to the principles involved in this matter, but are ignorant of the law relating to it. Here are the *Bulletin* and other papers talking every now and again about men living with wives "in defiance of law," when the situation is, that there is no law in Utah against a man living with any number of wives. The objector will smile and point to the law of Congress against polygamy. Well, read it. Now say what provision there is in it against living with wives. The offense is in the ceremony. The crime is to contract a marriage. It is a law framed specially and entirely against a religious ordinance of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Under it, if Abraham—whom Christians call the Father of the Faithful and the Friend of God—lived in this Territory and associated in family life with Sarah and Hagar and Keturah and his concubines, the law could not touch him; but if it could be proven that he had been joined to them, or more than one of them, in any ceremony or contract of marriage, no matter whether the Almighty or Melchisedek or any other person officiated, and no matter whether he lived with them or not, then the law of Congress would clap him into the penitentiary and Christian people would rejoice over his incarceration, while they would sniff and say nothing about mistress-keeping congressmen, libidinous church-goers, and the terrible social evils of their own cities, or the slaughter of the innocents and the prevention of increase, which bring the centres of Christian civilization as near as possible to a par with the doomed cities of the plains, which God burned with fire and then blotted out of His sight by the waters of the Dead Sea.

It is not true that Hon. George Q. Cannon has been "defiant at home in defense of polygamy." We utter no defiance on this question. We have views on the subject founded on what we are firmly convinced is divine revelation, and on what we consider to be our rights under the Constitution of our country, and we break no law and transcend no privilege when we advocate our convictions by argument and scripture and legal precedents. Every one has the right to do this. We seek to deprive no one of that right, we shall claim

it and exercise it for ourselves, and no one can reasonably call this defiance.

The people who have settled in and built up this Territory, and their co-religionists who gather here from all parts of the world, have not been drawn here specially by any motives or system of family arrangements. Plural marriage is only one part of their faith. It is not a primary doctrine. It is an addition to its first principles. Our creed is progressive. We are members of this Church because we have become convinced by evidences that we could not gainsay or resist, that God has revealed Himself in these times and established again the true Church of Christ on earth. By obedience to its first principles we have each received a personal testimony of the divine character of this work, and have accepted other doctrines and principles as they have been manifested from the same source. We were just as much opposed and abused before plural marriage became a part of our religion as we have been since. Indeed our greatest persecutions with their attendant mobbings, burnings and bloodshed, were suffered before the revelation of that doctrine, and since our acceptance of it we have been measurably free from such afflictions. We are here to carry out the purposes of God. Our mission is to preach the "Gospel of the kingdom in all the world as a witness to all nations that the coming of the Savior is hand; to build up Zion; to administer for the salvation of the living and the redemption of the dead; to raise up a generation free from the vices and evils of the world; to kindle living faith in the souls of men, that communication may be free between the heavens and the earth; and to work in harmony with Jehovah and the heavenly hosts, until the Kingdom of our God shall come in its fullness and His will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Against us are the powers of darkness in and out of the flesh. The vile and corrupt, the hypocrite and the Pharisee, the debauchee and the rogue are hostile to us and we are glad of it. If the men who unite and plot and stir up strife against us were to cease their falsehood and their animosity, we should begin to think that we had transgressed and lost the favor of heaven. Popular belief is no more against us than it always has been against those who have been under the direction and spirit of the Almighty, and it is no guide as to the truth or falsity of any doctrine, or system or practice. If truth-loving persons and papers would cease to be influenced by unscrupulous preachers and sensational writers, and become acquainted with the facts in our case from the proper source, general opinion would soon change, and the world would marvel at the manner in which it had been deceived about the "Mormons."

SWEET FACTS, FIGURES AND REFLECTIONS.

THE consumption of sugar in modern times is of wonderful magnitude and many nations contribute to the supply. The total annual product in round numbers is about five million tons, including both cane and beet sugar, the former mainly growing in tropical or semi-tropical climates, the latter being cultivated most in temperate regions, including that part from California to Maine in the United States, and from France to Russia-Poland in continental Europe. The total product of beet sugar in round numbers annually is one-and-a-half million tons, or near one third of the entire sugar product of the world. Great Britain is the largest sugar consuming nation anywhere, seventy pounds per capita being required for her supply, while the United States, with new world extravagance and new world wages, only reach the average of thirty-eight pounds per capita; and still more strange, the crowded population of Britain can purchase their supply for thirty-three per cent. less than the citizen of this most favored land. The free-trade policy of the mother country contributes to this result, no doubt; and the tariff rule of this country doubtless contributes measurably to the meagre consumption indicated.

Hon. David A. Wells states that the value of the annual sugar imports is one seventh of the whole, and so we need not wonder that with an average duty of sixty per cent., the revenue from it is nearly one-third of the whole customs receipts