

## EDITORIALS.

## THE INDIANS AND THE "MORMONS."

A short time ago we noticed some resolutions in regard to the Indians and the "Mormons" introduced by Senator Hathaway in the Missouri Legislature. The St. Louis *Republican*, of March 10th, contains the full report of a speech made by that gentleman in support of his resolutions. It is a strong argument against the policy of "shooting civilization" into the red men and the gospel into the "Mormons."

As we intimated in our notice, Mr. Hathaway has lived among the Indians, and speaks from what he has seen and what he understands of the workings of the system by which the "Indian rings" fatten and grow rich at the expense of the savages and the nation. The plan of manufacturing bogus "massacres" which are telegraphed and published all over the land, the sending out of a few companies of soldiers, the ordering of supplies, the swindles perpetrated in furnishing forage and provisions, are all described in forcible language, and the withdrawal of the army and agencies from among the Indians is urged, on the ground that "the robber rings would then disappear and the painted man would dangle from the first convenient tree," when any depredation was committed. And he claims that "if let alone, the Indian would never bring on a war with the white men, because he believes them to be countless in numbers like the stars in heaven and, overwhelming in power."

Mr. Hathaway advocates the enfranchisement of the Indians and the dividing of their lands into severalties. His idea is, make them citizens and they will cease to be Indians; give to each a just and equitable portion of their lands and they will soon be able to support themselves. By providing that no sale shall be made and perfected to white settlers within a given number of years, they would be kept from the wiles of the land cormorant and speculator. After exposing and denouncing the villainy of Indian agents he adds:

"All that may be done in the premises and progress of regenerating the Indian and placing the ballot in his hand, one thing is imperative and must be strictly observed, and that is honor and good faith. We must not make the promise to the ear and break it to the heart, as our Republican friends did to the negro, with forty acres of land, a mule, and a freedman's bureau. It is true they obtained the bureau, but there is not a negro in the country who would not gladly exchange it for the mule."

Taking up the "Mormon" question, Mr. Hathaway vigorously assails the hypocrisy of those who are seeking to destroy the people of Utah on the plea that they are attacking polygamy. He expresses himself as opposed to polygamy on principle, but denies the right of any one on that plea to "rob them of their homes and faith." He quotes the constitutional provision against interference with religious worship, and remarks:

"The moral sense of the ministry is shocked, and therefore Congress is urgently and constantly importuned to extirpate the Mormons from their homes unless they yield up their convictions to satisfy and relieve the consciences of pharisaical Christians, because they are holy men."

Who are they, and what class of men are interested in the extirpation of the Mormons? Who is stimulating the ministers to agitate the subject but those sharks and sharpers who are watchful for an opportunity to possess the beautiful city by the lake? They are known as the Mormon ring, and are heartless cormorants who subsist upon the industry of others. They are the dangerous political scavengers who would make wreck of their country for personal gain. Already they have honeycombed the departments at Washington with appalling corruption, and seeing afar off in Utah a rich and elegant city, they long for it as others have longed for the flesh pots of Egypt. \* \* \* Think you "they are sincere in their efforts to eradicate polygamy from the land? No! As well might you look for virtue in a brazen harlot. I shall not sermonize, but speak for a purpose. These men have enlisted the

ministry in their behalf, and, although I belong to the congregation of a Christian church and believe in the genuine spirit of Christianity, I have little faith in those whom Christ condemned as hypocrites, pharisees and vipers."

He then describes the journey of the "Mormons" after being driven from their city and temple near the Mississippi, eulogizes their industry and the results of their toil and says:

"In Salt Lake City there was a happy and contented people. They believed they had a right to enjoy what they had earned. In that city there was not a dramshop, nor a gambling hell, nor a place of shame, nor an idler, nor a pauper, nor a prison till it was invaded by the Gentiles. To drive that people away from their own possessions, from the land they have enriched and beautified with their labor and sacrifice, and give it over into the hands of a shameless political ring, unless they surrender a faith as dear to them as life is to us, and at the demand of those who prostitute their sacred office with hypocrisy, is a crime. It is too great an injustice to be properly named. It is un-American, cowardly and infamous."

As evidence of the kind of opposition the people here have to meet and the abuse they have to endure, he quotes from a vile sheet published in this city an article in which his own character and motives are attacked in its usual blackguard and venomous style, because he ventured to take a stand on the side of fairness and justice to the "Mormons," and makes the following remarks showing how the base thing is regarded:

"This needs no comment from me, but if within the limits of our great state there should ever be such a bastardy of truth or such a crime against common decency as I have just read I would vote for its punishment and offer an apology to the country for the existence of such a fraud in our midst. I now leave this matter, as the game is too insignificant for the distance."

In striking contrast to what I have just read, let me read a few lines from the *DESERET NEWS*, published in the same city, introducing the resolutions now before this senate:

Mr. Hathaway after presenting our remarks concludes as follows:

"There is always a strong sympathy between political cowardice and hypocrisy. The one fastens himself upon the body politic by dodging his own convictions; the other assumes a virtue if he has it not. Both ooze out an unpronounced and unimportant life and die never to be remembered. The worth of an honest man who acts himself and fearlessly performs what he regards to be a right, although he may sometimes be wrong, makes up the positive characters of every age. Let the Mormons alone. I have submitted my views, and hope the resolution will pass."

We have no idea that the resolutions introduced by the gentlemen will be adopted, but they will do good by causing discussion on both of the important questions which they treat upon. A different policy will have to be pursued towards the Indians, and the conviction of this is fastening itself upon the minds of the best people in the country. And it is also beginning to dawn upon the unsectarian and impartial intellect that the wild, rabid and indefensible policy pursued towards the people who have been instrumental in opening up to settlement and civilization the vast and wealth-producing regions of the Rocky Mountains, is wrong in principle and futile in practice, and that the nation has no interest in the political or social destruction of an industrious and progressive if heterodox community, for the sake of assisting the schemes of a handful of tricksters and adventurers.

## A LADY PASTOR RESIGNS.

For about four years past the pastorate of Willoughby Avenue Church, New York, has been filled by a lady. Rev. Luna Oliver has preached to the Methodist Episcopal people who belong to it and has been in spiritual charge of the flock. The lady is possessed of much oratorical ability and a devotional spirit, and has achieved good success as a preacher. But she has now announced her intention to resign. Early next month when her fourth year's term will expire she will step down and out of the Methodist ministry. Several reasons are assigned for this

the chief of which is the non-recognition of her position and church by the M. E. body. She does not believe in independent churches, but considers that organization and unity are necessary to evangelical success. We think she is right in her reason and her resolution.

The question of woman's place in church and state has occasioned much debate for several years past, and will provoke discussion for some time to come. Extreme views are entertained by the advocates of woman's freedom as well as by those who contend for woman's subjection. The happy medium will at some time be reached and woman will stand in her proper place, untrammelled by foolish and arbitrary restrictions, and without being pushed or attempting to raise herself into masculine situations.

There is no sound reason why a woman qualified for publicspeaking should not address audiences on any subject relating to the welfare of humanity. But in assuming priestly functions, woman would be invading the sphere belonging to man. Government, whether ecclesiastical or secular, belongs to the masculine portion of the race. That "man is the head of the woman" is a natural as well as religious truth, and relates to the church and the state, as well as to the family. This does not argue inferiority, it only defines position. Either sex has its "special adaptabilities" and the female is as honorable in her sphere as the male in his. But man presides, governs, directs in all properly regulated society, and nature shows that the utterances of the Church on this question are the voice of God.

But the Church—that is, the Church of God—does not require or infer the bondage of woman or forbid her participating in its affairs to the full extent of her capacities. She has a voice in everything that relates to it as a body of which she is a member. So it ought to be in the state and in the family. The directing power in the head is not incompatible with the freedom of the body. Woman is not necessarily a slave because man is the presiding authority. A man who holds no office is not a set on that account, neither is an officer because of his position necessarily of a superior race or exalted quality.

Women ought not to be debarr'd by law or custom from full liberty to take part in all affairs, secular and religious, in which the is interested, nor from acting in any capacity for which she is fitted by nature or education. The agitation of the subject of her "rights," though it develops many extravagances, will result in great benefit to the fair sex, in delivering her from many foolish and unjust restrictions; and her good is the good of the race, her elevation and development the progress of all humanity.

## OF LITTLE MOMENT.

In another part of this paper will be found a letter from the pen of Elder Jas. H. Hart which appeared in the columns of the *New York World*. A preacher by the name of Moment has been lecturing in Gotham on the subject of "Mormonism, its Doctrines and Life." At his first lecture he gave a number of statistical and other items of information, much of which was useful because reliable. At his second lecture, noticed by Brother Hart, he repeated a lot of slanders culled from anti-"Mormon" sources, and indulged in vituperation and calumny that stamped him as a plagiarist and deceiver. Some of his assertions are as new and foolish as others are old and baseless. Among his own fabrications are these, as reported in the *New York papers*:

"In 1856 Brigham Young declared that a man would be loving his neighbor who would put an apostate to death."

"Brigham Young had said that Joseph Smith was anything but a Saint, that his virtues were few and his vices many, among the least of which was gambling, drinking, horse-racing and seduction."

"Husbands have been exhorted to starve and beat their wives if necessary to bring them into submission."

"There is not a happy polygamist home out of the 20,000 in Utah."

"Mormonism gives no allegiance to the Government at Washington."

"The Mormon Church has a complete monopoly of the telegraph and the railroads of Utah—of the entire governing power."

We need quote no more. Neither need we offer anything by way of refuting these falsehoods. They bear the impress of "libel" on their face. Their untruth is too glaring to require any reply. And though uttered by Moment they are as senseless as to be of no moment whatever. If the question is asked what could be Moment's motive for stringing together such a set of transparent inaccuracies, the answer is given in the letter of Brother Hart—the usual mercenary motive of the sectarian anti-"Mormon" defamer—the desire for cash. The love of money is indeed the root of all evil, and it has prompted a great many preachers besides Moment to tell the most outrageous untruths about the Latter-day Saints and their doctrines. That people are so foolish as to give credence to such stories and hand out money to the narrator, is evidence of much popular softness as well as credulity.

## A LAUGHABLE HERESY.

A RELIGIOUS paper called the *Evangelist* seems to desire the revival of the old sectarian heresy that laughter and merriment are sinful and ought not to be indulged in by Christians. It contains the annexed paragraph:

"In the record of the life of Christ on earth, we have no intimation that He ever indulged in laughter. Not one of the Prophets or Apostles ever attempted the exercise of wit in their writings. Nor is there anything in the description of Heaven to lead us to suppose that laughter is indulged in there."

We have no intimation in the New Testament, so far as we remember, that the Son of Man ever washed his face. Will the *Evangelist* therefore argue that washing the face is wrong and should not be indulged in on earth or in heaven? And why was man endowed with the laughing faculty if he is not to use it? For what purpose is the bump of wit formed in the human cranium? Does not scripture say there is a time to laugh as well as a time to weep, a time to dance as well as a time to mourn? The gift of humor and the power to laugh are characteristics which form a wide gulf between human beings and the brute creation. "Much laughter," that is, immoderate laughter, is sinful, as is all intemperance. It is sin against one's own body, and that is sin against its Creator. But laughter in moderation is healthful to body and mind, and when indulged in at a proper time and in a proper place, is good for man, and therefore pleasing to his Maker.

We are pleased to know that although the somber views of the *Evangelist* were prevalent among sighing sectaries many years ago, in these later times more common sense obtains, and that the time is close at hand when religion will be entirely divested of the nonsense with which it has been enthralled, and the proper exercise of all the faculties and powers with which mankind are endowed, will be not only permissible by but part of that rational religion which ought to enter into and regulate all the acts and sayings and thoughts of the sons and daughters of the great God. Beware of the person that never laughs. He is either a designing hypocrite or deficient in qualities that are essential to the makeup of a genuine man.

## GENERAL SATISFACTION.

The removal of John B. Neil, commonly called Pee Wee, from the Governorship of Idaho Territory seems to have given general satisfaction. We have not seen or heard of any adverse criticisms of the change, from our northern neighbors. But Republicans join with Democrats in rejoicing over the deliverance of the Territory. The following, under the head of "Slipped His Wind," is from the *Lewiston Teller*, and tells the story of the popular sentiment on the event:

"The telegraph announces as follows: 'Washington, March 1st. — John N. Irwin, of Iowa, is confirmed governor of Idaho Territory.' On Saturday last we were advised from Dayton that Neil had been superseded by a gentleman from Iowa, and on receipt of the *Oregonian*, of March 2d, on Monday, we find the above dispatch. We don't

suppose that we are to have two governors at the same time, unless one is for North Idaho and one for South Idaho, and hence we infer that Governor Neil has slipped his political wind. Since the news reached here we have failed to see the first person who regrets his decapitation. What causes brought about this change no one here seems to know. But little over half of his four year term had expired and hence he does not go out by reason of the lapse of his term of office, but either by resignation or removal for cause. We had not been advised that charge had been preferred against him in Washington, except such charges as had appeared in several newspapers, the most serious of which was his bad faith towards the people of the north on the annexation question. In that matter his double dealing and duplicity have been too apparent to be unnoticed by all who have taken interest in the question. Again his bitter opposition to the Mormons of Southeastern Idaho had led him to sacrifice, as is claimed, much truth about the real state of things respecting them, and his misrepresentations must have recoiled on him, and shown him to be an unwise and unjust governor of any people. 'Farewell Brother Watkins', and the little fishes in the brook seem to say 'farewell Bro Watkins.'"

## WHAT THEY THINK OF HIM.

THE new Delegate to Congress from Idaho gained his election partly through gross frauds at the polls, and partly through promising to obtain a division of the Territory by which Northern Idaho should be annexed to Washington Territory, thus gaining the support of that section where the desire is general for such a change. He was full of promises of what he would do if elected and it appears that he simply fooled his supporters. The following from the *Idaho World* is an indication of how the "Mormon" eating fraud is regarded by his constituents:

"Singiser loudly boasted immediately following his election that he would redeem every promise made by him. He hasn't redeemed any of them. Didn't even have influence enough at Washington to name his successor as territorial secretary to keep Gov. Neil in place; to have a voice in the formation of the new land district; to have passed annexation memorials, or gain a single point in the Idaho legislature. In fact he was forced to resign the secretaryship a month sooner than he at first intended, to prevent his own removal. Said an old moss-back Republican the other day, and one of his strongest supports in the campaign: 'Singiser has the cheek of the devil or he'd never again put his hoofs on the soil of Idaho.' Citizens of North Idaho, what is your opinion of the low-voiced fraud, now? You thought we lied about him last fall when we gave you the truth. Will you still allow him to further deceive you with promises and plausible explanations?"

## SERGEANT BALLANTYNE ON THE "MORMONS."

UNDER the above heading the St. Louis *Globe Democrat* of March 15 has the following, concerning the celebrated English lawyer who recently honored Salt Lake City with a visit:

"Sergeant Ballantyne, the eminent English barrister, accompanied by Stuart Downing, arrived at the Lindell last night. The Sergeant has just made a prolonged visit to Salt Lake and has made a thorough study of the Mormon question. While in Salt Lake he was entertained by the leaders of the Church. He believes that the Edmunds anti-Mormon bill is unconstitutional and inoperative. In the relations between the imperial Government and the interior State, he says, it is not intended that domestic affairs shall become subject for legislative reform or direction. Such a law as the one recently passed could not be applied in a State. There is not a sufficient reason for its application in a Territory."

The Territory should be as free from unconstitutional restraint as the State, and the Edmunds law cannot be enforced in Utah when it comes to a test. The Mormons have good and strong argu