

EDITORIALS.

THE MORALISTS OF MASSACHUSETTS.

THE New York World, in a recent issue, speaks in a sarcastic manner of the "moralists of Massachusetts," who have so strongly objected to General Butler for Governor on moral grounds, and of the practices which have prevailed so long among them and which he has exposed, particularly the horrible doings at the Tewksbury Almshouse.

The evidence which the Governor has elicited is conclusive that clothing was filched from the paupers, leaving them half naked, to make ragrugs; that little children were taken from their parents and the mothers punished for crying about it; that the little ones were starved or drugged to death and their bodies sold for dissection; that pregnant women were forced to work right up to the hour of confinement and some of them died because of this inhumanity; that women were in some instances chained to posts and in others locked up in cells till they were willing to eat such food as was given to them; that insane persons were choked to keep them quiet when sedatives were not effectual; that women were beaten and kicked by the attendants; that a regular traffic was kept up in human bodies, and that, in one instance at least, the skin of a negro was sent to a tannery and was tanned; pieces of it were exhibited at the investigation. These are but a few of the horrors disclosed.

Of course the trustees visited the Almshouse occasionally, but preparations were made for their coming, and one of them admitted that their business was chiefly to get a good dinner and go home. The World says that the moralists can scarcely deny that these are "objectionable practices," nor yet that for "the man of sin," as they term Governor Butler, these practices would not have been exposed, and puts it to them whether they will acknowledge that the Governor deserves their thanks, or boldly affirm that such doings as he has brought to light are not a discredit to the State institution at Tewksbury.

In this connection we would suggest that these same moralists would do well to look around home for other local irregularities that need reform, and spend less time in troubling their righteous souls over Utah and the "Mormons." Massachusetts contains a highly moral and monogamous community, famous the world over for correcting other people's shortcomings or supposed errors of thought and conduct; for missionary efforts among the colored heathen; and for high sounding sentiment, transcendental philosophy and philanthropic theory. A little self-cleansing and practical humanity at home would be more consistent than so much anxious desire for the moral welfare of the Fiji, the civilization of the Indians, or the conversion by the gospel of forces of the irrepressible "Mormons."

MISPLACED SYMPATHY.

A GOOD deal of nonsense is indulged in by many newspapers over the investigation about to be instituted in the case of Rev. R. Heber Newton, the New York preacher who recently startled the religious world by his heretical denunciations concerning the Holy Scriptures. Dr. Newton is a clergyman of the Episcopal Church. He has subscribed to the articles of faith and taken the vows of a priest of that ecclesiastical organization. He is therefore under obligations to adhere to its doctrine and discipline while he occupies the position of one of its authorized representatives.

But Dr. Newton, in the discourses alluded to, enunciated opinions and laid down propositions entirely at variance with the dogmas of his Church; he is therefore amenable to its censure, and ought of right to give account to its tribunals. The question does not turn upon the liberty of the individual to believe and promulgate that which appears right in his own eyes. It involves other than personal rights, and something more than personal freedom.

No one, we presume, would question Dr. Newton's right to preach

against the authority or inspiration of the Bible if he was acting in a private capacity. But when he does this as a clergyman of the Episcopal Church, he does violence to the rules of that church, to his own vows and to the creed to which he has subscribed. He may go outside of that religious body and ventilate what opinions he pleases, but while he remains in the position of a priest within its jurisdiction, he should conform to its doctrines and bow to its decrees, and if he does not he ought to be brought to account.

The sympathy therefore, of those papers which seek to make his case one of persecution is misplaced. Every religious society has its rights, and they ought to be respected as well as those of individuals. If a preacher or officer therein outgrows or recedes from any of its forms, ceremonies or principles, let him go outside to proclaim his private beliefs, and not declare them in an official capacity, unless he can convert his associates and the body to his own views, and thus pave the way to their official declaration. It makes no difference to the principle of the thing whether he is right or wrong in his notions.

Any man who poses as a suffering hero because he is brought before a church tribunal for violating its rules and undermining its formulated creed, is either very weak, knavish or stupid, and those who seek to surround him with a halo of martyrdom exhibit a singular disregard for the rights of religious societies and the suggestions of common sense.

THE "TIMES-STAR" IN A MUDDLE.

ONE of the most ridiculous attempts we have seen for some time to explain the affairs of the "Mormon" Church, appears in a recent issue of the Cincinnati Times-Star. The confusion of mind exhibited by most eastern editors when they undertake to descant on "Mormonism," is food for frequent merriment in Utah. This instance of an effort of a journalist to explain something that he knows nothing about, is more than usually diverting.

The first statement is to the effect that "Mormonism" is being assailed by its "non-polygamous followers outside of Utah," the next that it is being attacked by "Saints even in Zion itself," and that "a controversy is going on in which it has been developed that Brigham Young was not the originator" of polygamy; the "conceiver" is said to have been "Sidney Rigdon, who founded his church before the Prophet's revelation was published," that "Rigdon found no difficulty in impressing Young with his celestial wifery," and that now "Brigham's son Joseph rejects as stuff and nonsense, visions, dreams and prophecy, the gift of tongues, or healing, plural and celestial marriages, etc., etc., and has 'evidently backslidden from the faith of his father,' but he is, 'notwithstanding, the leader of a large minority of Mormons.'"

This is getting things mixed up with a vengeance. The idea of "Mormonism being assailed by its followers" is a contradiction in itself and is more than ordinarily stupid, even in an anti-"Mormon" newspaper. But the controversy among Saints in Zion as to the origin of polygamy is worse. Why, it was never claimed by the Saints that Brigham Young originated the doctrine, and there has been no controversy among them over the question at all. The revelation on celestial marriage including the plurality of wives, was given to Joseph Smith, and is dated July 12, 1843. There is no question among the Saints about this. It is so well known that Joseph Smith the Prophet introduced this system of marriage and practiced it himself, that the statement made sometimes by ignorant or untruthful persons that Brigham Young originated it, is treated with the contempt it deserves.

As for Sidney Rigdon, he was once a prominent man in the Church, but was cut off many years ago for his transgressions, indeed almost immediately after the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. He has never been recognized as the originator of anything connected with "Mormonism," but was simply a spokesman or explainer, defender and preacher of the doctrines revealed to the Prophet, as he was an able

public speaker. There never has been any controversy in the Church on this point, and the attempt made in early times of the Church to connect Sidney Rigdon with the origin of the Book of Mormon—which, most likely the Times-Star editor has in his mind—fell to the ground not only for lack of evidence in its support, but for its complete refutation by well established facts.

Then the Times-Star has fallen into another error: Brigham Young has no son Joseph living. The person meant is doubtless the son of the Prophet Joseph Smith. But he does not "reject as stuff the visions and dreams and prophecy, gift of tongues," etc. He tries to make it appear that his father did not practice plural marriage, and when confronted with proofs stronger than holy writ that he is wrong, resorts to sophistry and subterfuge. But he is not a member of this Church. He has no connection with it whatever. He is the head of a sect which has gained some little notoriety because of its supposed relationship to this Church, and without which it would scarcely be noticed, but it is no more a part of it than the Southcottians or Mugletonians or Shakers are a part of the Episcopal Church.

We do not care how much the Times-Star may ventilate "Mormonism," either in a friendly or antagonistic spirit. But we object to the misinformation which it occasionally gives to the public on this subject. If "Mormonism" is worth talking about at all, it is worth treating upon intelligently and with some regard to the facts.

But the average eastern editor thinks himself competent to dilate upon it without taking any trouble whatever to post himself, and so exhibits the most deplorable ignorance and at the same time deceives a great number of his readers. And when his object is to suppress or prevent the spread of "Mormonism" he fails completely, because he is shooting at the wrong mark. And we can afford to laugh at his folly, while those whom he may have temporarily deceived, find out on investigation that he has been making a fool of himself and dupes of them.

Read up, editors, from authentic works, and find out something about this matter before you attempt to write about it for publication.

"MORMON" MISSIONARIES.

QUITE a number of New York papers notice the arrival at the Grand Central Hotel on April 16th of sixty "Mormon" Elders and five ladies from Utah on their way to Europe, and give fair descriptions of them and the object of their journey. Information obtained from Elder James H. Hart, the Church agent at New York, is given to the public pretty accurately. The ladies are, of course, objects of interest to the reporters, and are thus described in Truth:

"There are Mrs. Pixton, a widow, and her daughter, Miss Susan A. Pixton, who go to England to visit friends; Mrs. H. L. James; Mrs. E. Robinson, a woman 60 years old, who goes to England to nurse her husband until he recovers, and then accompany him to Utah, and Mrs. Middleton, who was sent there by her husband from England to ascertain what life in the Mormon settlement really is."

An interview being requested with Mrs. Middleton, it was granted, and following is the report:

"The lady, who is a pleasant featured woman of about 30 years, said: 'My husband is a well-to-do mechanic in England. We became interested in the doctrines of the Mormon Church some time ago, and last summer my husband sent me to this country to ascertain the facts of the matter from practical experience, as he did not wish to give up his position until fully assured of the truth of the statements made by the missionaries. I have lived in Salt Lake City ever since my arrival here, and am now on my way home to report the result of my investigations to my husband, and to bring him back with me.' Mrs. Middleton expressed herself as being highly pleased with Mormon life and customs, and said she expected to return to her friends in Salt Lake City in the course of a few months at most."

The company was to sail in the steamer Wisconsin on the 17th of April, for Liverpool.

"ONE DAY IN UTAH."

VICOMTE d'HAUSSONVILLE, a French nobleman, recently published in Paris a book entitled, "A Travers les Etats Unis," (across the United States) which contains an account of this country and particulars of his meeting with a "Mormon" Elder on the train, by whom he was invited to spend the night in Ogden and make a trip to Salt Lake City. The Elder was a young missionary, Lorenzo Farr, just returning from England. The Vicomte staid over night, with another gentleman, at the residence of Hon. Lorin F. Farr, where he was introduced to the family and held an interesting conversation with Judge Aaron Farr. He came to the city, conversed with prominent "Mormons," and also a Federal Judge and other "Gentiles," and has written an account of what he saw and heard and his impressions. His relations of fact are mainly correct, some unimportant inaccuracies occurring, and his description and views are well worth reading. That part of his work has been translated by Leo Haefeli, Esq., of the Ogden Herald, and is now published in pamphlet form with the above title. The work of translation is done in most excellent style, the pamphlet contains forty-one pages of reading matter, and can be had at the office of the Ogden Herald for 25 cents. It is good; get it and send it abroad.

A PR N LESSON FOR THE UNITED STATES.

M. EUGENE SIMON has just published in La Nouvelle Revue an article entitled "La Famille Chinoise," based on his ten years' experience as a French Consul in China. He finds that in many respects France is more in need of missionaries than the Celestial Empire. He especially makes a strong point against infanticide, which is so very much commoner in France than in China; and he finds that children as a rule are better looked after among the Chinese than among the French, while the murders, suicides, and "accidental" deaths are less in proportion.

The Boston Herald remarks, "This is a comfortable nut to crack." We think it would be a rather uncomfortable nut for the molars of French social scientists, and still more so for the religious and moral reformers and heathen-converters of the United States. France finds it necessary to encourage family increase by legislation. It is proposed to reward the parents of given numbers of children in this way: Every head of a family who has more than four children shall be entitled to a reduction of 15 per cent. in his annual taxes and to an additional reduction of 5 per cent. for each child in excess of five. In case the head of the family pays no taxes, or if his taxes do not exceed 100 francs a year, then he shall be entitled to a premium of 200 francs for his fifth child and to another premium, in each case larger by 100 francs than the preceding, for each additional child he may have.

The reason offered by M. Playre, the author of the measure, which he introduced into the Chamber of Deputies, is that the population of France is at a standstill if not actually diminishing. According to authentic statements, the pernicious example of limiting the number of children is set by the upper classes of society. Among the wealthy and middle classes large families are looked upon as misfortunes—not so much on account of the immediate expense attendant upon the birth, support and education of children, as on account of the necessity of making the provisions for their future that the social customs of this nation enforce. Two, or at most three, children are admissible, and there are very few families in easy circumstances that exceed that number. So deeply has this feeling become rooted in the social life of the nation that parents who have large families are looked upon as being culpably and indecently improvident.

It is the custom in France for parents to set aside a certain sum annually to provide a dot or dowry for each girl, as without it there is difficulty in finding a husband for her, and it is also necessary to make provision for the boys, to give them a start in business. It is therefore a question of economy whether it is easier to pinch and save for a number of children or take means to prevent increase.

Now it is well known that while the French dot custom does not prevail in the United States the French methods of family limitation are being widely adopted in this country, and the motives that prompt these measures are of the lowest character. Selfishness is the moving cause. And it is in refined and educated circles that the infamous and unnatural custom chiefly obtains. Right in the very heart of religious communities where immense sums are collected for the purpose of sending Bibles and preachers to the heathen, and called Christian women practicing this horrible and ungodly thing, their husbands connive at it, while the professed ministers of the gospel wink at or condone it. These are they who would stamp out "Mormon" plural marriage, by the rough-shod heels of violence or the unyielding provisions of arbitrary law. If they do not urge sterner measures, they affect great concern for the souls of the benighted "Mormons," and desire to convert them to the "Christian civilization" which permits these evils.

We would like them to know that the "Mormon" women whom they look down upon, or pretend to pity, would rather suffer any trial of mind or body than get down to the level of their degradation. Better to drudge and toil in honorable labor for the dear little ones that are at once the offspring of natural affection and precious gifts from the Eternal Father, than to revel in luxury and fritter time away in idleness and practice the loathsomeness of French and American high-toned society. When our pure-minded wives and mothers with their numerous progeny stand in the presence of the Holy Ones, they will shine fairer and brighter than the angels, and join with Sara and Rebecca and Deborah and Hannah and the honored women of old, while the tainted and spotted creatures who have sinned against God and their own bodies, denuded of paint and powder, fashion's fripperies and art's hypocrisies, will be overwhelmed with shame and contempt.

Both France and the United States had far better look to the weakness and rottenness lurking under the thin polish of their social systems, than to yearn after heathen conversions or burn to smite other people for daring to introduce innovations and to depart from the ways of an effete civilization.

SAHARA AND PANAMA.

COUNT DE LESSEPS, the successful engineer, is in earnest apparently, in the two gigantic enterprises with which his name has been recently identified. He has personally explored the country over which a canal is proposed to be built, to carry the waters of the Mediterranean into the great desert of Sahara, and expresses no doubt as to its possibility. It has been stated that to do this he would have to accomplish the difficult feat of making water run up hill. But he denies this and proposes to cut a channel through the narrow neck of land which separates the salt marshes south of Tunis from the Gulf of Gabes, and thus pour an ocean into the vast basin of sand whose farther rim is the border of the Soudan—a land "of the riches of India and the population of the United States."

He wants a hundred machines equal in digging power to a hundred thousand men, and the amount required for the work is \$15,000,000. This is but a trifle when the object to be achieved is viewed in its full magnitude. It is no less than the creation or restoration of a vast inland sea, and the consequent immense aid to the civilization of a continent whose capabilities are yet undeveloped and whose people without the light of religion and civilization.

The Panama Canal, to join together the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, he is equally sanguine about. Work is really progressing on this important project. The total length of the canal will be 73 kilometres, and for about 50 kilometres the depth of the cuts required will be moderate, ranging from 5 to 15 metres only; but for a distance of 20 kilometres the cuts must be from 30 to 110 metres in depth. Cuts 110 metres in depth will be 120 metres wide at the top. A French metre is 39.37 English inches, and a kilometre is a thousand metres. M. Lesseps estimates the cost at \$120,000,000 and fixes the