

EDITORIALS.

DO NOT BELIEVE IN
"POLYGAMY."

THE terms bigamy and polygamy are very frequently used in the discussion of the "Mormon" marriage question as though they were synonymous terms. This is made more common by the Act of Congress of 1862, which declares that "every person having a husband or wife living, who marries another, whether married or single, in a Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, is guilty of bigamy." This is intended of course as a legal definition. In any place outside the jurisdiction of the United States such a marriage may or may not be considered bigamy. The definition is arbitrary, and does not effect either the etymological meaning of the term, nor the actual facts of the case. It could be shown that the declaration is not true in principle, but it is laid down as a proposition in law, and as such governs jurisprudence within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

We have repeatedly shown that the "Mormon" system of plural marriage is not really bigamy, in that it does not contain the essential elements of that offence. We have also intimated that properly speaking it is not polygamy. Incorrect terms are in some instances used so frequently that they come into common acceptance, and polygamy in reference to "Mormon" marriage is one of them. The term "Mormon" itself as applied to Latter-day Saints, is another. It would be just as reasonable to call people "Peters" who believe in the writings of the Apostle Peter, or those "Jeremiahs" who believe in the prophecies of Jeremiah, as to give the name of "Mormons" to believers in the Book of Mormon. Yet the Latter-day Saints themselves frequently use the term, because it is of common acceptance.

In reviewing the message of President Arthur we refuted the statement made by him that polygamy is "the corner stone of the Mormon Church," and stated further that "properly speaking polygamy is not now and never has been even a tenet of the 'Mormon' faith." This has troubled some of the anti-"Mormon" fanatics and other persons who jump at foolish conclusions. In that assertion we made no attempt at denying the doctrine of celestial marriage, which is an essential part of the creed of the Latter-day Saints, although not the corner stone of their Church, nor more essential than other features of their faith.

What we claim is that the "Mormon" system of marriage is, properly speaking, neither bigamy nor polygamy. In committing bigamy, the man practices deception upon each woman whom he marries, and his offense involves the desertion or forsaking of one woman in the fraudulent marriage of another. The whole transaction is a fraud. Nothing of this kind enters into the "Mormon" system of marital relations. Polygamy is the marrying of several wives or husbands. It is unrestricted matrimony on the part of either sex. This is not "Mormon" marriage. Polygyny, which means the marrying of several wives, is sometimes, though rarely, used in relation to this subject as a more proper word than polygamy. But none of these correctly designates the system of marriage taught and solemnized by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Celestial marriage is the only proper term to use in this connection. Its essence is, marriage for eternity. It is celestial because it is eternal, and is solemnized by eternal or heavenly restrictions. It is under heavenly restrictions. It cannot be entered into indiscriminately. God is its author, director and administrator. His representative holds the keys of the power to permit and solemnize it under divine regulations. It bears with it the sealing power. What is sealed on earth by competent authority, is sealed in heaven. The marriage of a man and woman under its ordinances continues in and out of this world and after the resurrection, with its issue and connections. If a man's wife dies while he continues in the body, and he marries another by the same celestial

law, both of these wives will be his through all eternity. In the next world he will have two wives at the same time. The privilege or requirement of marrying more wives than one to be his in this life, is but the establishment here of that which will exist in the immortal state in the instance we have cited. But people who have not overcome the force of tradition and man-made customs, can contemplate the union of two or more wives with one husband in the world to come with perfect equanimity, but are shocked at the idea of a similar union in this world. Yet the immortal sphere is expected to be pure and holy, and if the reunion of the husband and wives will be righteous there, why not the union of the same persons here? The parties to a marriage in the celestial order are not permitted to form this union at will, but the whole contract is regulated according to revealed principles.

Celestial marriage is instituted for this Church and its members, not for mankind at large. It is not a matter of civil polity. It is purely ecclesiastical. There is nothing like it outside of this Church. It is *sui generis* . Therefore it is not correct to call it bigamy, polygamy or polygyny. It is celestial marriage, ordained of God for the benefit, exaltation and happiness of men and women who are under covenant to serve Him in body and in spirit, and for His own glory and the filling of His creations with His obedient children.

It is not the design in this article to enter into the details of the revelation, management and practice of this heavenly order of matrimony, but merely to show that it is different from any system of so-called marriage in the world, and that when we say polygamy is not a tenet of the "Mormon" Church, we but affirm the truth and do not recede from any part of the faith delivered by Almighty God to the Latter-day Saints. Polygamy as it has been practised by the people of the world, whether openly as in Asiatic countries, or secretly and surreptitiously as among professedly "Christian" people, is not that which God has revealed to this Church.

Celestial marriage is not to pander to men's lusts, or to bring women into slavish subjection. It is for the highest and most exalted objects, and must be practised in the spirit of love, patience, forbearance, self-control and resolute righteousness, or it is not what it is designed to be, and cannot be continued in harmony or with any good results. But when practised according to the law of heaven, and the spirit in which it was revealed from on high, as God Almighty promised, "It is visited with blessings and not cursings," and is as far above the groveling and sensual polygamy of human arrangement, as the calm and beautiful upper deep, in which the stars shine for ever, from the pools and puddles of earth, where noxious reptiles crawl in the ooze and corruption floats on the surface. Do not confound for a moment the ancient and holy order of celestial marriage with the bigamy or polygamy of degenerate modern times.

A LAW AGAINST MEDICAL
QUACKS.

THE evil of unrestricted medical practice by unqualified persons is recognized in most places in this great country. That the increase in the use of drugs in this community has been followed by an increase of sickness and a greater death-rate, is generally conceded, and that the sad results are due in a great measure to unskilful application we think will not be much disputed. That there should be some check on the business of doctoring humanity is not often denied, but the difficulties in the way of justly regulating the matter have deterred our legislators from taking hold of it seriously. At every session of the Assembly for some time past, legislation on this subject has been desired by a large number of our citizens, who recognize the danger to health and life of unscientific medical practice. It is likely that efforts to this end will be renewed.

Our attention has recently been directed to a law passed by the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, entitled "A Law for the Registration of Practitioners of Medicine and Surgery." Its principal provisions are that, every person who shall offer to practice any branch of medicine or surgery for gain, or who shall, di-

rectly or indirectly, accept any fee or reward for services as a practitioner of medicine or surgery, must "be a graduate of a legally chartered medical college or university having the authority to confer the degree of doctor of medicine."

The diploma must be presented, and a true copy furnished the county notary and sworn to. All names are to be registered, affidavits filed, and places of business entered. Those who, without a diploma, have practised in the State since 1871, are allowed to continue on making a sworn statement of these facts. "Any person failing in these requirements, or offering a diploma that has been obtained fraudulently, or one that is in whole or in part a forgery, shall be fined \$100, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or suffer both punishments at the discretion of the court."

The advantages of this law over the system of an examination by a local Board of Physicians are, that that no particular school of medicine is either encouraged or repressed; no local animosities or preferences have any weight in the matter; every graduate of an institution having a legal right to grant a diploma, whether allopathic, homeopathic, herbal, physio-medical, eclectic or any other of the "schools," can set up for a healer of humanity, and persons whose knowledge and skill have become recognized in the community are also permitted to continue to do good. But the pretender who has never made the human system a study, and who prescribes by guess-work for the ills that flesh is heir to, is barred out from following the profession as a business. At the same time no one is hindered from rendering assistance to a friend or neighbor by advice or practical help. It is only the business of medicine or surgery that is thus protected, as we consider it should be by some means, that quacks may not prey upon the public, and sow seeds of death through ignorance and incompetence, which are too often allied to recklessness and disregard of consequences.

The Pennsylvania law leaves it with the courts to decide whether a diploma disputed to be genuine has been obtained fraudulently or not. Thus the mere possession of a piece of sealed and lettered sheepskin is not deemed proof of medical qualification. It is only a genuine document from a legally chartered institution that is considered a valid diploma. Forgery of a diploma, wholly or in part, is made punishable by the law and the prosecutor is given half the fine while the forger gets all the imprisonment.

This subject is worthy the attention of our territorial law-makers, and is quite likely to be brought to their attention during the approaching session of the Assembly.

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.

PROHIBITION does not seem to work well in Kansas; that is if statements from leading men there are to be relied upon. Ex-Governor Robinson, himself an advocate of temperance, says it is a failure; that drinking is commoner there than ever; and that money raised ostensibly for temperance purposes is used for political and personal objects. It is also stated that "drunkards are as thick in Maine as in any State in the Union when the character of its people and towns and cities are considered."

There are two sides to this question as well as many others, and it is rather difficult to determine the facts. But this is certain; there are a great many people in the world who have contracted the habit of using intoxicants, until it is a part of their very nature. A large number of them do not use alcoholic stimulants to the extent of intoxication. They take their usual drinks and no more. Others have the alcoholic craving till it amounts to a disease. One taste of the fiery liquid but adds fuel to the fire of appetite, and nothing short of intoxication satisfies. In all probability they contracted the disease from their ancestors by heredity. Such persons will obtain drink by some means, so long as it is manufactured, and it will be manufactured so long as there is a demand for it, either openly or surreptitiously.

Viewing this subject in a broad sense, in its application to general humanity, we believe prohibition by law to be impracticable. To use a now common phrase, "prohibition does not prohibit." As a general

plan the regulation and restriction of the business of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic stimulants, seeing that it is recognized by national law, is more likely to work to general advantage, than attempts at prohibition which cannot be enforced, and which are all the time evaded or defied. And in communities where vigilant officers are sustained by incorruptible and impartial judges, regulation and restriction will accomplish a great deal towards depriving the traffic of its most objectionable features.

In Utah, however, there are many cities and towns where the great majority of the citizens are "Mormons," whose religion inculcates temperance and forbids the use of intoxicants as a beverage, and where prohibitory laws are not only practicable but beneficial. Instances might be cited where the license system has been tried for a time, because prohibition was not fully carried out, the law being evaded in some cases, and where a return to prohibition has been found necessary, the licensing of the liquor business proving an encouragement to intoxication and its long train of evil consequences. In those places, the relative numbers of cases of drunkenness, assault and turbulent conduct show unmistakably in favor of prohibition.

In Salt Lake City and a very few other cities in this Territory, it is not probable that prohibition would prohibit, even if the chartered powers granted to the respective municipalities permitted it. You cannot legislate away the alcoholic appetite bred in the bone, fostered in the flesh by habit, and rooted and grounded in the system by long indulgence. And it is an open question of public policy whether it is right or expedient to try to prevent, by legal force, the partaking of that which some people regard, however mistakenly, as a necessity to their health and comfort.

This appetite cannot be ignored. It is an existing and deplorable fact. The evils that grow out of it are equally patent. The question is, what is the remedy? Does it lie in stringent enactments or in moral force? We are of the opinion that both may be used as means to the desired end, but that it requires the exercise of the greatest wisdom, with a recognition of differing circumstances in different localities, to devise a legislative policy that will be practical without being oppressive, and that will be beneficial to the general public while the rights of individuals are not invaded.

Extremes are usually bad. Moderation is generally commendable. And this applies to moral influences as well as legal. The intemperate advocacy of temperance has greatly damaged the cause. Common sense and a strict regard for truth and consistency are requisite in the discussion and repression of the strong drink evil, as much as in anything else. In too many instances, temperate people have been too ridiculously intemperate in their assertions and attacks. Home education and good example will be found the most potent influences against the drinking habit, and the plain manifestation of public sentiment is a strong aid in the same direction. Added to this, such restricting laws as wisdom and experience suggest, carried out and enforced, not played with or allowed to become a dead letter, and much may be done towards stemming the dark tide which is overwhelming the land and filling the homes of thousands with lamentation and misery. Let the strong-minded strengthen the weak. Let abstinence shine forth among the influential of all classes, and let wholesome laws be known as certain to bring the prescribed penalties for their violation, and our community may be saved from most of the ruin which is wrecking the happiness of countless families and making woe and hell where there might be joy and heaven.

SUGGESTIONS ON LIQUOR
LEGISLATION.

WE received this morning the annexed communication on the liquor question from an intelligent gentleman connected with a prominent drug establishment, and give it space because the subject is an important one, and is now a special subject of local consideration:

Editor Deseret News:

Your excellent remarks on "The Temperance Question" and "Pro-

hibition" in your issue of the 22nd inst., were perused with pleasure and hearty endorsement. It has been a source of constant regret and deep mortification to me that the sale of liquor should have become so indispensably connected with our business, and were I the only interested party, that part of it—except for medicinal purposes—would long since have been discontinued regardless of the consequent "loss or gain." As it is, my personal influence is always exerted against the use of intoxicating liquors though the result has often been only to divert to others the money formerly paid to us.

If prohibition were practicable—which it is not—I should decidedly favor it. There is, however, a practicable method of dealing with this evil, which I think all right feeling people would endorse. It is to levy as high a tax or license—or whatever it may be termed—upon the sale of liquor as it will bear without rendering the business so unprofitable as to force honorable men out of it and dishonorable ones into illegal and desperate measures. Out of the revenue thus derived let there be reserved for ordinary City or County purposes only what is actually just and necessary, and the remainder—which should be at least three-fourths—be appropriated under the control of the State to the education and support, if necessary, of the children of inebriates.

In this way their families would receive a large portion of the benefits to which they are justly entitled, but of which they are now deprived by the uncontrolled appetites of one party and the greed of the other. If it be objected that such benefits would savor too much of the "charity school" or "poor house" system, it must be remembered that were it desirable it is not possible to entirely deliver even innocent children from the consequences of their parents' transgression. And the fact that "the sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children to the third and fourth generation" is not an arbitrary expression of a vindictive, though Divine will, but simply the enunciation of a natural law which there is no power in the universe to annul. But it would be easy, by wise provisions, to render all painful publicity unnecessary.

I believe that a legislative enactment with some such basis would receive the endorsement of a majority of those engaged in the liquor traffic in this city, and that if submitted to the people at large would become a law in every State in the Union.

JUSTICE.

We agree in the main with the views expressed by our correspondent. We do not think, however, that anything like so large a proportion of the returns from taxes or licenses on liquor is needed in this Territory—nor even in this City—for the education and maintenance of the children of inebriates. The consumption of intoxicants in this Territory outside of the few cities is very small. Salt Lake no doubt contains a number of persons who may be properly classed among the inebriates—unfortunates, who are chronically diseased with the alcoholic appetite to an uncontrollable or reckless degree. A few may be found in some other places. But the whole number, in our opinion, is not anything so large as to require three-fourths, or even one-fourth of the revenue from a high liquor license to support and educate their children. This, however, does not affect the principle set forth by our correspondent; it is merely a question of facts and figures.

The great difficulties in the way of appropriate legislation in Utah are: First, the despotic and un-American power vested in a Government appointee, by which he can render void the measures enacted by the Legislative Assembly. A good liquor law passed at the session of 1880 was vetoed by the then Governor. An Executive, favorable to the production, sale and consumption of whisky, can bar any attempt on the part of opponents of the traffic to restrict or regulate the business; by a stroke of his pen or simply by withholding his signature. Second, if stringent laws are enacted and signed by the Governor, they can be hindered or nullified in action by the stupidity or venality of appointed Judges. The recent rulings of Judge Hunter are illustrations of this deplorable fact. Ridiculous and unprecedented interpretations of law are the cause of the muddle that has confused our local affairs. No statute or ordinance that could be framed can be