

EDITORIALS.

PROOFS OF "MORMON" DEPRAVITY.

THE Chicago *Inter-Ocean* and some other papers are dilating upon the story, credited to the Washington *Republican*, but told originally in the *Pittsburg Dispatch*, that a "Mormon" lobbyist offered a newspaper correspondent \$5,000 if he would use his paper to oppose the Edmunds bill. The *Inter-Ocean* thinks "it is hardly to be presumed that the representative in Washington of any important newspaper would be bribed in so shameless and palpable a manner," but cites the alleged occurrence as showing "to what extremes the Mormons are prepared to go in the furtherance and protection of their nefarious schemes."

Of course no one acquainted with the ordinary newspaper correspondent would believe for a moment that he would take money for supporting or opposing any public measure or political movement. Perish the thought! Such men do not work for funds, but for glory. They never write up or write down anything but from the purest of motives. They never put into the mouth of a person "interviewed" anything he did not utter, nor clothe an innocent fact with the flaunting garb of colored and frilled and feathered exaggeration and fiction. Cash is no more inducement to them than water straight, and a paltry \$5,000 would not influence one of them as much as a "smile."

And what horrible depravity is exhibited in an attempt to procure a newspaper argument against a bill introduced in Congress? Such a "nefarious scheme" is enough to give a newspaper man the horrors. No wonder the *Inter-Ocean* goes into convulsions over the outrage. The "Mormons" ought to be annihilated without judge or jury or benefit of clergy, for daring to attempt such a thing as to "oppose the Edmunds bill." When any political quack prepares a dose for them designed to kill or cure, they have no right to do anything but sit down silently, open their mouths and swallow the medicine. To protest or induce a newspaper to protest against the nostrum is a capital crime.

The wickedness of the "Mormons" who are said to "defy existing laws," seems to be aggravated in the eyes of the *Inter-Ocean* by their setting themselves "to defeat attempts at new legislation." Of course the *Inter-Ocean* never did such a thing as that. An attempt to defeat new legislation of any kind is worse than treason. The columns of a Chicago paper never contain anything by way of opposition to a bill before Congress, even if it is a democratic scheme or an alleged "job," or a partisan movement, or a political expedient. And an attempt to induce a newspaper correspondent to oppose it would show "to what extremes" wicked people "are prepared to go in the furtherance and protection of their nefarious schemes."

What a lot of trash respectable journals will print when they touch on anything relating to the "Mormons!" The story about the correspondent being offered money, was made out of whole cloth by an obscure person named Murray—ominous cognomen—who wrote that slush to the *Pittsburg Dispatch*, a paper without national influence, and a writer whose services would not be worth five cents to the "Mormons" even if they were running around with \$5,000 baits to catch innocent gudgeons of reporters. It was simply a lie, told by the inventor for the purpose of creating for himself a little fictitious importance, something new, of course, among ambitious Knights of the Faber.

But supposing that the "Mormons" were just bursting all over with over-gorged money-pockets, as they are popularly supposed to be, and are ready and anxious to cram a congressman with greenbacks or load up a newspaper scribe with glittering coin, and that neither the legislator nor the writer is accessible to the influence of "Mormon" cash, facts equally demonstrable, where is the "nefarious" iniquity of trying to induce a man or a newspaper to oppose a project for any purpose? Is a bill in Congress a sacred and unassailable thing? Or are we to understand that it is only anti-"Mormon" measures that must not be opposed, and only the "Mormons" who must not essay to defeat attempts at judicial legislation?

We challenge the proof of any "Mormon" effort to bribe a Member of Congress or to corrupt such an immaculate parist as a newspaper correspondent. It cannot be produced. It is simply talk of the most unvarnished description. And we assert the right of every "Mormon," by tongue and pen and by influencing others to use those weapons, to oppose any measure, in Congress or elsewhere, that appears wrong to him, or trenches upon his rights as a citizen, or from which he dissents as a matter of public policy. And any paper that attempts to make such conduct criminal or improper, exhibits symptoms of lunacy or leubriety.

The Edmunds bill was a monstrosity when it was born; it has been operated upon until it is now a deformed and unnatural enormity, a disgrace to its manipulators and an outrage upon legislation. But even if it is the fairest product that wise statesmanship could devise, it is the right of any citizen to oppose it and lawfully induce

others to oppose it if he has reasons for dissent, whether he be "Mormon" or "Gentile," Christian or infidel, wicked lobbyist or incorruptible newspaper correspondent.

THE ISSUE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

GLADSTONE's address to his constituents the electors of Midlothian, in Scotland, is a ringing and vigorous appeal and an able vindication of his Home Rule policy for Ireland. It will not fail to secure his re-election. Whether the country will endorse his measure by returning sufficient members to sustain him in the Commons, is at present doubtful. Added to the force of the Conservatives, who are wily politicians backed by the power of the clergy of the established Church, is the influence of the Radicals of the Chamberlain order, who will make quite a split in the Liberal ranks and divert quite a stream from the tide of the Gladstone followers.

It will be a big fight. If it were simply waged on principle, we have no doubt as to the result. Home Rule would win, and Ireland would be relieved of much of the wrong which she has suffered. But trickery, misrepresentation and covert coercion will be resorted to by the Tories, and the struggles to defeat the grand old man will be desperate. Among the unsophisticated agriculturists, particularly the newly enfranchised, these tactics will be very powerful.

Gladstone has sharply defined the two policies, between which, say what disaffected Liberals may, there is no practical medium. It is either the liberty of Home Rule, or the re-establishment of coercion. Gladstone represents the former, Salisbury the latter. The Liberals are for justice, fairness, humanity and progress as applied to Irish politics; the Conservatives for harshness, cruelty, repression and restraint. The dissident Radicals make a show of liberality to Erin, but appear afraid of the effects of freedom, and while deprecating coercion, denounce what they denominate disunion, and thus stand upon a kind of neutral ground, without a defined and practical policy.

It is to be hoped that the British nation have been thoroughly waked up to the necessity as well as the propriety of taking off the neck of Ireland the yoke that she has worn so long. If the people can only be brought to fully understand the situation, their greatest living statesman will achieve a glorious victory. But dense ignorance prevails in many of the rural districts, and party connections and influence will have far more power there than abstract principles or questions of right or expediency. Right will figure very small in many places by the side of landlordism, clerical coercion and Conservative tradition.

Still, we hope for better things for Ireland, and trust that the boroughs and districts where advanced thought and independence of character are prominent, will rally round the Premier who appeals to their sense of right, and that English fairness will prevail over English prejudice, and the United Kingdom will by an overwhelming vote declare for that meed of justice to Ireland which is embodied in the grandest effort of the life of England's greatest political leader.

A PROPOSITION AND A REPLY.

WE have received the following letter with a request for its publication. It is addressed to the "Mormon Church," and we suppose the writer considered the *Deseret News* the best medium through which his views could be conveyed to that body of religious worshippers. In that perhaps he was correct, and we give place to his communication to answer his request and let the Latter-day Saints know of his proposition, although we are pretty well aware in advance how they will regard it. Accompanying the letter is a scaled miniature map of the country therein described:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 4, 1886.
An open letter to the Mormon Church:
Why don't you Mormons emigrate to Turkey? The Turks are all polygamists. Immense Christian sects have long continued to exist under their dominion and their religion has never been interfered with as long as they paid their taxes. I will explain at some length a scheme of emigration which I think it will not be amiss for the Mormon Church to consider.
The country called Mesopotamia has been the center of power oftener than any other in human history. The ancient Babylonian, the Assyrian, the new Babylonian, the Persian, the Macedonian, the Parthian and Moslem empires either originated in it or made it their center after arising on its borders. It is especially significant that Alexander the Great, perhaps the most gifted statesman of all times, who had seen the Bosphorus and had built Alexandria in Egypt, nevertheless decided to make Babylon the center of his world-wide empire. It is not difficult to see why this should be so. Mesopotamia is on the high road between Europe and India. It lies between five seas—the Caspian, the Black

Sea, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf, which receive the drainage from the larger part of the civilized portion of the eastern hemisphere. High mountains protect it on the north and east, sending down copious streams to water the plain. These are gathered into two principal channels, the renowned Euphrates and Tigris, both navigable for hundreds of miles, and at present regularly visited by English steamers. The northern mountains contain the oldest mines known; the nation of the Chalybes gave their name to steel. Other mines, which supplied ancient Egypt, are found on the northern coast of the Red Sea. The climate presents great varieties, being similar to that of Cuba at the south, and to that of the Carolinas at the north.
Through centuries of misrule the country has become a waste of swamps; but the ancient canals of the Babylonians still exist, and an industrious population could easily restore the land to its former fertility. No force would seem better adapted for this work than the skill and perseverance which changed the Salt Lake desert into rich fields and meadows.
The present population is largely Christian. It seems probable that the various creeds in the country would soon yield to the example of a thrifty Mormon colony.
The Turkish government would be sure to favor a Mormon colony, because it would greatly strengthen its power. England will lend her assistance, because a strong Mormon state in Mesopotamia would bar Russia's progress toward the sea. The United States would perhaps furnish free transportation. There will be no difficulty about obtaining, through English influence, autonomy and practical independence from the Turkish government, such as is enjoyed by the various tribes now inhabiting the country.
I am no polygamist, nor bigamist, nor even monogamist; I am a bachelor. I would like to see the Mormon experiment carried out somewhere. It seems certain that its days in America are numbered.
Mormons, if you wish to obtain power, go to Mesopotamia. In no other place will you find protection for the infancy of your development. The Sandwich Islands are too small for you. When once you have grown strong, no one will try to interfere with your institutions. Around you there will be the Greeks, Armenians, Mingrelians, Georgians and Persians, all distinguished for physical beauty and mental gifts, from whom you may draw your proselytes. To the south, to the north, to the east, to the west, there will be 120,000,000 of Mohammedans who will unite with you in defense of your religion, and in return will gladly accept the assistance of your strong arm and fertile Saxon brain.
Casting my glance 100 years into the future, I see a grand Mormon republic, centered around historic Babylon, holding the key of the world's commerce, and stretching forth its arms to the five surrounding seas. I have tried to sketch its boundaries on the accompanying map. PACIFICUS.
We take it for granted that the writer is in earnest. But he is greatly mistaken both as to the future and objects of the "Mormon" system. It is evident that he has never studied the subject, and has similar superficial ideas in relation to it that are common among many people who imagine they thoroughly understand it.
Plural marriage is by no means the chief tenet of "Mormonism." It is only a small part of the grand system. It is an important feature, but only one of the many members of the body. It has been brought into prominence by the opposition it has excited. It is not at all harmonious with Turkish polygamy and has no affinity with Asiatic social customs or modes of government.
"Mormonism"—we use the term by which the system is popularly known—is intimately and essentially associated with this land and this nation. It was established by divine commandment on American soil for a divine purpose. It contains all the elements of that advanced liberty which are connected with genuine republican institutions. It is designed to maintain and perpetuate them in the earth. It was work to perform on this continent. Here is its native home, its basis of operations, its central point from which its influence is to radiate to all the world. The Zion which it is to build up is to be established on this hemisphere. Here are to be its temples, its oracles, its greatest trials and its grandest triumphs.
The "Mormons" as a body are well satisfied with their present location. They have neither the desire nor the necessity for removing. They have come here to stay. They are in the right place at the right time. They found this spot a desert, they have turned much of it into a garden, and they expect to continue the work of its redemption. When they or their posterity move in any great numbers, it will be to redeem the waste places which they formerly inhabited on this choice land.
It is a mistake to think that the "Mormon" system is an "experiment," or that "its days in America are numbered." It has a settled purpose, a fixed destiny; and that relates primarily to America, where it will abide and ultimately prevail. There is no doubt about that in the "Mormon" mind.
"Mormonism" is constituted to endure far more severe tests than any

that have been brought to bear upon it or that now await its people. They do not shrink from the ordeal. They are calmly awaiting it, praying for strength to stand firm. It is not unexpected. They have been forewarned of it for many years. They expect injustice and the violation of every constitutional guaranty. But they have faith in the outcome, and anticipate performing the glorious work of saving the institutions of this government and the instrument that was formed to guard its liberties. Their hopes, aspirations and prophetic inspirations all tend in that direction. Zion is to be established on "the land of the free."
The centre of the divine work yet to be accomplished on the eastern continent will be in Palestine. Jerusalem is the appointed place for the great Jewish dynasty that is yet to arise and bear sway in the Old World. Mesopotamia is not the chosen spot, and if it were it would not be the gathering place for the Latter-day Saints. The turning point in the march of this world's power and errors is in the West. The "Mormons" have reached their place of destiny, and by the power of God at the appointed time they will begin to predominate.
The notion about a "Mormon" exodus to some distant spot has found favor for two reasons. One is because they have several times moved away from their enemies, and the other because certain conspiring individuals are anxious to see history in that respect repeated. A "Mormon" heira would mean a harvest to their local enemies. The plotters would reap where they had not sown and gather where they had not strewed. Alaska, the Sandwich Isles, Mexico or Mesopotamia, they would not care where the "Mormons" went to, if they could buy them out for a song or drive them out and take what was left. But that is not in the programme. Utah is good enough for the Saints. They may spread over the walls of the Territory for lack of room or arable land, but they have no intention and no need to run away or leave a prey for their foes.
We are much obliged for any suggestion offered in kindness, no matter how inapplicable it may be. We do not profess to be authorized to speak for the "Mormon Church" in answer to Pacificus, but we have some understanding of the principles and spirit of "Mormonism" and some knowledge of its manifest destiny, and in the light of these things we are able to say that the glories and victories of the latter-day work will shine forth and prevail from the land blessed of Jehovah for that purpose unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills.

SOCIETY AND "MORMON" MARRIAGE.

In commenting upon Judge Zane's latest construction of the Edmunds law and his discourse comparing polygamy to murder, robbery and other essential crimes, we showed the folly and dishonesty of the reasoning which attempts to place something that is simply made an offense by law, on a par with acts that would be criminal in themselves even if they were not condemned by law. We showed that anything which violates the natural rights of mankind is a fit subject for punitive legislation, but that which does not infringe upon the rights to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness, is not to be classed in the same category. And therefore that murder, robbery and other crimes *per se* could be rationally and constitutionally punished by law, even if practised under the plea of religion, while plural marriage under religious restrictions and regulations could not be proceeded against by law on the same grounds or for the same reasons.
The integrity of the position cannot be successfully assailed. There is a radical difference between plural marriage thus contracted when all the parties are agreed, and anything done by one individual that trespasses upon the inherent or acquired rights of others. That which produces life cannot be rated with that which destroys life. A mutual agreement between all the parties to a transaction, must not be ranked with any deed that deprives another of liberty or property. It was the endeavor of Judge Zane to class them all together and justify extreme legislation against plural marriage because gross and essential crimes may be lawfully punished, even though the perpetrators may claim the sanction of religion, that called forth our remonstrance and refutation.
It has been since claimed in an anti-"Mormon" article that evades this question, that polygamy is a crime against society and therefore may be legislated against and suppressed. In support of the proposition the assertion is made that "the practice of polygamy tends directly to the degradation of a people, or at least to the qualities that ennoble a people;" that its "very condition is a degradation of woman;" that "in polygamous nations the men are vindictive, treacherous and cruel," and that there "woman's virtue is not believed at all."
Every argument that we have seen in regard to the alleged effects of plural marriage and its bearing upon society, refers to something altogether foreign to the system which is called in question. The Turks and Chinese are cited as examples of the effects of polygamy,

and it is boldly concluded that "Mormon" plural marriage will inevitably lead to the same results as Turkish and Chinese polygamy. The dishonesty of such subterfuges proclaims the weakness of the cause that descends to them.
In the first place it is by no means established that the Turks would be any higher in the scale of humanity or national greatness if they were all monogamists, nor that the condition of the Chinese is attributable to any system of marriage that exists among them. It is popular to say so, but it is only a bold assumption. The most advanced, progressive and powerful of Turkish warriors and leaders in any department of Moslem rule have been polygamists, and it cannot be shown that Turkish monogamists are superior in any way to their polygamic contemporaries. We might with as great consistency claim that the condition of Turkey is due to the costume of its inhabitants in contradistinction to European and American dress, as to assert without a particle of proof that the Ottoman Porte is not as strong as the Western nations because polygamy prevails within its borders.
Why is modern Greece so insignificant among the world's monarchies? Is it because the people are monogamists? There is no polygamy in Russia, yet with its immense territory, abundant resources, vast population and variety of climate, it is not to be compared for power and advancement with much smaller and less populous dominions. There are such differences as race distinctions, and we utterly deny the common assertion that Asiatic people are inferior to Europeans because some of them practice polygamy.
Neither is the Turk the effeminate and flabby being that some people imagine. In their contests with the hordes of Russia, the turbaned Turks have exhibited a force, endurance and vigor that have frequently astonished the world. The so-called "Sick Man" is no puny invalid, but causes not in any way connected with the question of marriage render Turkey unequal to a contest with more powerful foes.
Is the decadence of Spain attributable to polygamy? Catholicism has ruled there for centuries, and monogamy, with all its unnatural enforcements, has prevailed without hindrance or change. Where is the glory of ancient Egypt? Was monogamy the cause of the complete wreck of the dynasty of the Pharaohs? We have as much right to claim that the miserable condition to-day of that once mighty and intellectual empire is due to monogamy, as to say that Turkey is not powerful among nations because of polygamy. Where is the might of imperial Rome? Founder of the modern contracted and crime-breeding restrictions of monogamous legislation, the conqueror of the world has gone down to the dust, the victim of its own licentiousness, feeble, decrepit, prostrate and emasculate. As compared with Turkey, it is like a spaniel to a mastiff, a puny consumptive to a vigorous athlete. If its marriage system was the cause of its decadence, so much the worse for monogamy.
This is the logic of our opponents: "Turkey and China are polygamous and behind the times; therefore their condition is due to polygamy." By parity of reasoning, Turks wear massive head gear and Chinamen wear cues; therefore their inferiority is due to turbans and pigtails. *Quod erat demonstratum.*
But if all that is alleged on this question were true, if the Turk is weak, cruel, infidel as to woman's virtue and everything so different to a "Christian," and all because of polygamy, it does not follow that the plural marriage of the "Mormons" will produce similar effects. Turkish polygamy and "Mormon" marriage are unlike, the people are dissimilar, the conditions are diverse, and what is predicated about one system cannot be assumed about the other.
In the "Mormon" system only men who are esteemed worthy are permitted to enter into the obligations of plural marriage. It is a religious obligation with eternal covenants and conditions. The woman is no more made subordinate to the man than in monogamous marriage. She is accorded a voice and vote in Church and State. She can hold property in her own right; whether married or single, first wife or plural wife. She is not degraded except in the estimation of those whose opinion she does not value a wilted straw. She has implicit faith in her husband's virtue and be in her's. She is free and independent in her sphere, and acknowledges no bondage but that of love nor restriction but that of righteousness and duty.
No such effects as those pretended to be the result of Asiatic polygamy have followed the practice of "Mormon" marriage. As a rule the men and the women engaged in it will compare favorably with their co-religionists who have not so advanced. Their children are at least as vigorous, bright, capable and intelligent as the offspring of their monogamous brethren and sisters. Family to family the comparison will reflect no discredit on the plural household in anything that is worthy of commendation. Individual cases of wrong-doing and lack of progress and culture may be found, but are