

EDITORIALS.

A NEW ANTI-"MORMON" CAMPAIGN.

THE Boston *Watchman* of the 5th inst. contains an editorial headed, "What Shall We Do with Utah?" It commences by alluding to a former article in which the aims, policy and future prospects of the "Mormons" had been described, and says: "It remains for us to sketch a plan of campaign against them." The *Watchman* is a "Christian" paper of the Baptist persuasion, and as the "Mormons" have suffered from "campaigns" headed by Baptist and Methodist preachers in early days, we are interested in the details of the new campaign proposed.

We are pleased to note that the *Watchman* advocates a different method of warfare to that directed against the "Mormons" in Missouri and Illinois. Its editors have probably learned by past experience that the shot-gun policy is not at all efficacious. Bayonets and bullets, the fire brand and the dungeon failed when the "Mormons" were few in number, and they are not likely to be any more successful now that we are a host. Says the *Watchman*, "We cannot imprison one hundred thousand people in a body, and such a course is as unnecessary as it would be foolish, for there are methods of operation quite unobjectionable, and far more efficacious."

This leaves us to infer that the prison argument would be endorsed by the *Watchman* if it were not unnecessary in view of some thing it considers more efficacious. All of which is truly "Christian" and fully in accord with the spirit of its co-religionists who sought to convert the "Mormons" by murder and arson.

The first proposed point in the new campaign is to prevent the admission of Utah as a State until polygamy is abandoned. And the hope is expressed that when the "Mormons" understand that there is only one obstacle to the accomplishment of their desires, they may be induced to remove it.

The second is to induce Congress to repeal the law making women in Utah voters. In connection with this, it is stated that "in Utah the supremacy of Mormonism is assumed by the law which makes every Mormon woman a voter."

The third is to induce Congress to disfranchise every man and woman living in polygamous marriage. And if this is not sufficient "to defeat the political views" of the "Mormons," "to disfranchise the offspring of all unlawful wives."

The fourth is to rescue the public schools from the control of the "Mormons," and to insist upon the establishment of free schools and prohibit the teaching of denominational sentiments in them.

The last is to increase the number and efficiency of the schools of Protestant denominations in Utah, that the children of "Mormons" may be captured and "trained under the best influences."

It will be perceived that, after all, there is nothing new in the plan of this proposed campaign. The barring out of Utah from Statehood has been tried for a great many years. The "Mormons" have been told over and over again that polygamy was the only obstacle in their way, but they have not yet been "induced to remove it," because it is one of the integral and essential principles of their religious creed, with which the State has nothing whatever to do. Utah has managed to endure the injustice of Congressional discrimination against her hitherto, and she is able to bear it still. And when she enters the Union it will be on the same footing as other free and sovereign States, without special trammels or invidious distinctions. All that the national authority is required to do in the premises, is to guarantee to the new State, in common with the old ones, "a republican form of government." If the *Watchman*

will take the pains to examine the Constitutions prepared at different times by the people of Utah as the basis of a State government, it will find that neither "Mormon" polygamy nor any other doctrine of any religious sect receives support or recognition, and that they will compare greatly to their advantage with any Constitution adopted by any State in the Union.

We do not think the *Watchman* people will succeed in their endeavors to deprive the women of Utah of the elective franchise. Vested rights may not be wrested from citizens with impunity. Congress has been repeatedly urged, but in vain, to do this unrighteous act, by the very people who once clamored for a measure giving the women of Utah the right to vote as the best means of squelching polygamy. And the *Watchman* should become acquainted with the election laws of Utah before writing about them. It is not true that "the supremacy of 'Mormonism' is assumed" in any of our statutes, neither does the law make "every Mormon woman a voter." Our laws do not discriminate in favor of any religion nor against any sect or party, and a great many "Mormon" women and men too, are, under our election laws, ineligible to vote at any election.

The proposition to disfranchise "Mormon" men and women on account of polygamous marriage is much easier to suggest than to enforce. Trial and conviction must precede any penalty, and as the *Watchman* already perceives the impossibility of imprisoning a whole people, it should also be able to see the foolishness of attempting their disfranchisement. The succeeding suggestion—the disfranchisement of all the children of polygamous wives, is simply infamous, and would never be thought of by any mind not exceedingly "Christian." But it is as puerile as demoniac, for the law of the land makes them all citizens, if born in the United States, and none but the most extreme of bigots and fanatical "Mormon"-eaters would ever think of hinting at such legislation.

We should like the *Watchman* to point out the mode by which public schools can be "rescued" from the control of the "Mormons," even if a free school system were "insisted" upon by the government. If Congress or the *Watchman* people will supply the necessary funds, we should be pleased to see a school system in Utah under which every child could receive free education. As it is, we think that for a time we must continue the present method of part payment by parents and part by taxation, and are of the opinion that the "Mormons," being in the great majority, will elect "Mormon" trustees in spite of the *Watchman* and its crazy "campaign."

And how just and sensible the *Watchman* appears in its last proposition: Prevent the "Mormon" schools from teaching denominational sentiments, and encourage the establishment of the schools of Protestant denominations, that "Mormon" children may be taken in and taught the doctrines of those various and conflicting sects. One law for the "Mormons" and another and different law for the Protestant denominations! Truly statesmanlike and piously "Christian!"

Surely such wisdom as developed in the proposed new campaign against the "Mormons" did not originate in Boston, nor evolve from the brains of the *Watchman* staff. We thought not. Here is the secret. The *Watchman* admits that the sketch of the campaign is not wholly its own, but "is in part the suggestion of various gentlemen resident in Salt Lake City." We venture to say that if their names were disclosed, they would prove to be those pious denomination preachers and teachers who are making a living by working upon the sympathies of religious people in the East, for the "Christian" purpose of raising money. Cash is the object of the campaign to "increase the number and efficiency" of schools, to catch the children of unreflecting "Mormons." The *Watchman* is merely their catspaw, and the dimes and dollars of people who want to see the "Mormons" repressed are the chestnuts. The Boston Baptist journal may do the publishing work of the new campaign, but those cunning Salt Lake suggestors of worn out and broken weapons will get all that comes of it, for they will quietly gather in the spoils, not obtained, however, from the "Mormon" enemy, but from the foolish souls deceived into

giving money to aid in fighting against a system which will never be destroyed, but will prevail and endure forever.

VIOLATIONS OF SENSE AND DUTY.

THE Chicago *Tribune*, a paper that cannot be credited with any favor towards the "Mormons," has this to say in relation to the recent refusal of Judge Schaeffer to naturalize a woman alien, of good character, who had lived eleven years in the United States, simply because she was a plural wife:

"As much as we desire to see this particular phase of Mormonism, and its most offensive one, brought into disrepute, we do not believe that the decision of Judge Schaeffer is founded in good law or in common sense."

We believe this will be the view entertained by most people possessed of a sound mind. Marriage does not enter into the question of naturalization. Neither judge nor attorney has any right to ask an applicant whether he or she is married or single. The course pursued in relation to supposed "Mormon" aliens seeking to become citizens, is foreign to the genius and policy of our government, which makes no discrimination in religious affairs, and interposes no barriers of prejudice or sectionalism in the way of the candidate for the rights and privileges of naturalization.

We hear of still further departures in the Third District Court, from the strait and narrow way of law and justice, in relation to this matter. The attorney who is making himself so officious in his impertinent interrogations, not content with asking men whether or not they have more wives than one, questions them in regard to their belief in polygamy. Now the most strenuous opponents of the "Mormon" system of marriage declare their perfect willingness to allow the Mormons to believe just what they please on this subject. This is extremely generous on their part, seeing that a man's faith is scarcely a matter under his own control, much less of theirs. But it is argued by them that it is only the practice of that portion of our creed relating to matrimony that the law may touch, belief or disbelief being placed beyond the jurisdiction of legislatures or courts by the Constitution. Why then should an officer of the Court be permitted to ask questions in regard to a man's belief, refusing to proceed unless his improper and irrelevant queries are answered? A judge who performs his duty faithfully, according to the tenor of his oath, would call an attorney to order who so far allowed his religious, or rather irreligious bigotry to run away with his sense of decency and propriety, and would protect an applicant for citizenship from such arrogance and impudence.

Our position on the Constitutional provision forbidding any law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," is, that it relates to the practice of religious precept and doctrine. A law permitting or forbidding a person to believe or disbelieve any religious tenet would be simply absurd. Laws cannot control the action of the mind. If religious liberty means anything at all it means freedom of action. "Faith without works is dead," and legislation might be as well passed to restrain a corpse as to regulate lifeless, actionless belief. That marriage is a question of religion the history of the world, ancient and modern, abundantly proves. Plural marriage comes under its jurisdiction equally with monogamy. It is not a crime *per se*. Its expediency and adaptability to the age is an open question. It is essentially "an establishment of religion," and legislation for or against it is barred by the supreme law of the land.

But apart from this view of the subject, it is certain that courts have nothing to do with matters of faith. If it be claimed that there is a statute—constitutional or unconstitutional—against the practice of polygamy, no one will surely have the hardihood to assert that there is a law forbidding any person to believe that polygamy is right. The attorney, then, who tries to prevent an alien from swearing

allegiance to the United States and thus adding to the strength of the nation, and the judge who sustains him in his unlawful and impolitic course, are both outside the limits of the law, are acting in violation of their oaths of office, and are only deserving of denunciation and contempt.

AN ILLOGICAL ATTACK ON PRAYER.

THE continuance of the terrible plague in the South has moved the sympathies of all classes of the community in nearly every State and Territory in the Union. It has also stimulated devotion and faith in Divine Providence. The governors of several States have issued proclamations calling for a day of prayer and supplication for the interposition of Almighty God to stay the progress of the pestilence.

The Sacramento *Record-Union*, which, though an able paper, is evidently conducted on anti-Christian principles, stiffly berates the Governor of Ohio for what it called his "insolent blasphemy," in making such a proclamation. That paper takes up the matter from a logical standpoint. Its argument is that Governor Bishop makes God the author and originator of yellow fever, because the Governor states that his "object in commending a day of prayer was simply to secure a united invocation to Almighty God by all who believe in and recognize His goodness and mercy, that He would interpose His omnipotent power which alone could stay the progress of the terrible scourge which was devastating a large portion of our common country."

We think the *Record-Union* in its zeal against plety and prayer has overreached itself. Human wisdom, and those means within the reach and knowledge of mortals having failed to stay the spread of the epidemic, the aid of the Supreme Being is invoked. Now if this proves that God made yellow fever, then similar reasoning will prove that the doctors made it. When the disease first appeared, the friends of the sick did what they could to relieve the sufferers. Being unable to effect a cure they applied to physicians. If the doctors proved to have more knowledge and skill than the nurses, did this make them responsible for the epidemic? And if they fail and God is implored to stretch forth His omnipotent hand to arrest its further progress, does this logically make Him any more responsible than the doctors for the outbreak?

But it may be argued that the Almighty could have prevented the plague, and therefore may be charged with its continuance. This is, indeed, part of the *Record-Union's* logic. There are certain fixed laws or conditions governing all material as well as spiritual things. God acts through and by them, with a perfect knowledge of their existence and a complete comprehension of their principles. Man's understanding of them is imperfect, but to become acquainted with such of them as govern in this lower sphere is a part of the object of his probation here. And the Supreme Being makes it an inviolable rule not to interfere with the agency of his creatures. Man is left free to obey or disobey. But the violation of natural laws brings inevitable penalties. Man learns this, often by the things which he suffers. It is part of a necessary education to prepare him for implicit obedience to higher laws when he reaches a higher sphere. Law preserves and sanctifies as well as rules. Without it or in defiance of it, there is no progress, no happiness, no life.

The yellow fever, as well as other epidemics, comes into action through violation of hygienic rules and sanitary regulations, based upon known natural laws. If the Almighty should interpose His omnipotence in mercy, after just has claimed its own, and should touch a key by which the germs of the pestilence are transformed or dissolved into innocuous elements, answering the united prayers of a humbled people, all would be done by superior knowledge of nature's laws, and would exhibit the loving kindness of the great

Father Heart. But this would not prove that He was the originator of the calamity, any more than that a skilful and successful dentist is the author of the toothache. Christ stilled the winds and calmed the waves, but he did not raise the tempest nor bring forth the storm. He opened the eyes of the sightless, but did not smite them with the blindness which he cured. He cleansed the lepers but did not generate their disease. Yet according to the *Record-Union's* logic, those who importuned Jesus to heal their sick, were guilty of "insolent blasphemy," and made Christ the originator of their afflictions. When sceptics and scoffers start in to overwhelm faith with logic, they should at least be logical, and when hurling a weapon against a Christian adversary, should take care that it is not a boomerang.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Excellence of the American Mechanical Collection at the Exhibition—American Inventions—The Type-Writer—The Electric Pen—A Machine that will Make a Pair of Shoes from the Hide in Fifteen Minutes—Recent Improvements in Military Firearms, etc., etc.

PARIS, Aug. 24th, 1878.

Though the American section at Paris is not large compared with those of other manufacturing nations, there are present so many of the contrivances which illustrate subtle mechanical genius, so well recognized already, that "Yankee" is almost a synonym of inventor, that the little railed off spaces of the American collection is to amateurs in mechanism, a most fascinating stroll. Few of these contrivances occupy more than a few square feet, but many of them are already widely known. The writing machine, by which the operator touching a series of keys, like those of an accordion, prints his thoughts, or anything that he may desire to copy, more rapidly than they can be written legibly with a pen; the sewing machines, whose name is legion, and which here are illustrated by new variations for special work, a little device attached to one making it an embroidering machine. The telephone and phonograph are here, and besides them an electric pen by the same inventor—a pen which, carrying a tiny electromotor at the top, drives a needle through the paper 10,800 times per minute, forming a stencil sheet through which, with an ink roller, copies may be produced more rapidly and economically than with a lithographic press, and of an excellence that must be seen to be appreciated.

One of the finest types of American invention is the flexible shaft for transferring power around corners and to out of the way places. One sees the operator holding what at first sight, seems to be a small hose, but furnished with an auger at its extremity, with which he thrusts and bores in every direction—over his head, under his feet, to the right, to the left—it upsets all one's ideas of regularity in machinery. Pharaoh could not have been more surprised at seeing Moses' rod turned into a serpent than some of the spectators were to see this rope-like device eating into the planks set on all sides for it to work on. It is as good as a piece of legerdemain. It is really a "flexible shaft," a cable of steel wires wound coat over coat, each successive coating in the reverse direction of the preceding, until the strength required is attained, and in which longitudinal flexibility is combined with circumferential rigidity.

Close by stands a "wire corkscrew machine," which catches a straight piece of steel wire and throws it out a corkscrew of such temper that it may be driven through an inch deal plank and not yield a hair's breadth. The dearest waiter will take as long to pull a cork as this machine to make a half dozen corkscrews of an exceptionally good quality. Here is a screw-cutting machine. One tool cuts the rod down to the dimensions of the screw, another cuts it off, having the head the full size of the rod, another takes it from the last and passes it on to have the thread cut, a cutter passes by and leaves the head slotted, another, with four iron fingers, takes it to a fifth cutter where the head is finished, when still another tool comes to push it