

EDITORIALS.

NOTHING IF NOT ILLOGICAL.

"The woman suffragists are nothing if not illogical. Their bitterest scorn in the past has been dealt out to those women who voluntarily went into polygamy and aided the Saints in perpetuating the pet institution of Utah. Now we find them protesting in Congress against a clause in an anti-polygamy bill which disfranchises the women who now vote in Utah. As these women have always voted exactly as the Church and their husbands have dictated, the idea is absurd that their disfranchisement is any blow to suffrage for the fair sex. The fact that Mormon women so grossly caricatured the right furnished one of the best arguments of the opponents of female suffrage."

We clip the above from the San Francisco Chronicle. The opinions of that paper on the question involved are not of much consequence, it is true, but the paragraph echoes the notions of quite a number of persons and papers and therefore we notice it. The gist of it is that the advocates of women suffrage are illogical because they object to the disfranchisement of the women of Utah. What reason is offered for this conclusion? It is alleged that the women of Utah vote as the Church and their husbands dictate, and it is argued therefore that they should be deprived of the right to vote, and that woman suffrage is wrong. This is "logic" with a vengeance.

It is alleged, and very good evidence of its correctness is furnished, that in many parts of the United States workmen vote as their corporate or individual employers dictate, in fear of discharge from service, and that members of parties "vote exactly as dictated" by the bosses. According to the Chronicle logic they should be deprived of the franchise, and male suffrage is wrong; and any body of men objecting to such a sweeping measure and this sage conclusion, are "nothing if not illogical." What is cause for the geese ought to be sauce for the ganders. It's a poor rule that won't work both ways.

Utah has a secret ballot. That is, the ballots are required to be enclosed in unmarked envelopes of uniform color and size, furnished by the local authorities, and elections are so conducted that no human being but the person who has deposited the ballot can tell how or for whom he or she has voted. If a woman wants to vote in accord with her husband she can do so, if not there is nothing to prevent her from voting any ticket she has a mind to prepare, and there is no way to identify it. Supposing it were true that the Church or the husbands "dictated" how the women should vote and the women did not choose to follow the dictation, how are the husbands or the Church to ascertain the fact and what could they do about it, anyhow?

The anti-"Mormons" assume that the Church dictates the voting. It is nothing but assumption. Not a particle of proof has been or can be adduced in support of it. But suppose it is true that the "Mormon" Church decides who shall be nominated and voted for at local elections. Who compose the "Mormon" Church? Why these men and women who are so dreadfully "dictated." Then they dictate themselves, do they not? Every woman member of the Church has an equal vote in Church matters with the man member.

But it may be urged that it is the leaders of the Church who are meant when dictation is alleged. Well, why do not these sticklers for logic say what they mean and lay down their propositions correctly? Suppose some leading men in the Church, then, select the candidates and tell the men and women whom to vote for. If those people of their own volition choose to accept those candidates and vote for them at the polls, should they not be allowed to do so without interference from their opponents? We think so. And we maintain that there is just as much freedom in voluntary union and willing acceptance as in factious opposition and wilful rejection.

Some people, however, cannot conceive of liberty without strife, nor of freedom in acquiescence. With them, independence is only to be exhibited in pugnacity and liberty to be expressed but in tumult or di-

vision. If they cannot comprehend union from choice and concession from principle, who is to be blamed for their lack of understanding? The truth is that our women voters as well as our men voters, perceive the necessity of avoiding the division which our opponents vainly seek to introduce among us, and feel the absolute need of a united policy in the face of the hostility of the world. They vote together because they choose to do so, and the proof of this lies in the fact stated above, that there is no means of discovering how they vote if they wish to be in opposition to their husbands or anybody else.

But let us turn it over and look at it in another way. If the "Mormon" women would vote against the Church of which they are members and against their husbands to whom they are united by, to them, the most sacred of ties, then, according to the Chronicle logic, they ought not to be deprived of the franchise, and woman suffrage is right in principle. Further, if some of the "Mormon" women vote according to the views of their husbands and the Church, and others vote against them, then the former should be disfranchised and the latter not, and woman suffrage is partly right and partly wrong. There is nothing like being logical, and the Chronicle ought to be placed on an eminence as an acknowledged authority, by the side of Locke and Bacon, Malebranche and Whately, and other masters of the art or science.

Common sense and simple reason would say that the disfranchisement of women in any part of this great country, where equal rights are supposed to be recognized, is and must be viewed as "a blow against woman suffrage," and the "absurdity" is with those who pretend that it is not, especially under the flimsy pretext that the women thus threatened with the deprivation of rights long exercised do not vote as their opponents wish, but cast their ballots in favor of their dearest friends. Verily, it is the anti-"Mormons" who are "nothing if not illogical."

'POLYGAMY AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.'

THE Chicago Inter-Ocean of February 1st has an editorial with the above head-line. Starting out with the annexed resolution passed by the National Woman Suffrage Association, that paper considers the wording of the resolution "unfortunate," because it puts the Association in "an attitude not unfriendly to polygamy."

"Resolved, That the proposition to disfranchise the women of Utah, for no crime whatever, is a cruel display of power which lies in might alone, and that Congress has no more right to disfranchise the women of Utah than the men of Wyoming."

The Inter-Ocean proceeds to state that

"The leading proposition before Congress is to disfranchise both the men and women of Utah who, in defiance of law, practice polygamy. As polygamy is defined as a crime, the statement that any bill before Congress proposes to disfranchise women for no crime whatever is not true as to the main point, or the inferential ones bearing on the principle under discussion. * * * If it is right to disfranchise a man who practices polygamy, the movement which has for its purpose the weakening of the polygamist party by disfranchising the women who practice polygamy is not to be too hastily condemned."

The Woman Suffrage Act of the Utah Legislature is then quoted in this way:

"Every woman of the age of 21 years who has resided in this Territory six months next preceding any general or special election, born or naturalized in the United States, or who is the wife, widow, or the daughter of a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, shall be entitled to vote at any election in this Territory."

That the period of minority extends in males to the age of 21 years, and in females to that of 18 years, but all minors obtain their majority by marriage."

The supposed object of this measure is then described, and a great deal of nonsense indulged in on the supposition that "a Mormon Elder returning from Europe with two or three hundred ignorant converts, could parcel his girls of 15 and upward out among a number of Mor-

mons, marry them by wholesale and make them voters." Various movements against the Mormons are then related and the conclusion is arrived at that,

"The law as it stands must be annulled in its entirety as a matter of course. War is not made upon it because it confers suffrage on women, but because it discriminates against law-abiding men and women, and in favor of men and women who take pride in defying the laws. This is so plain that it is difficult to understand how the leaders of the woman suffrage movement could have made such a mistake as the adoption of this resolution seems to convict them of."

The article closes with the assertion that,

"However well it may have been intended it is plain that on this one point the Woman Suffrage Association blundered."

A proper understanding of this matter will show that it is the Inter-Ocean not the Association which has "blundered." We wish we could credit that paper with good intentions in its mistake, but from its readiness to copy anything unfavorable to the "Mormons" and disinclination to look for the facts or credit them when presented, we are led to believe that its intentions are not well meant.

Now in the first place the proposition before Congress against which the Woman Suffrage Association protests, is not to disfranchise either "men or women who in defiance of law practice polygamy." Does not the Inter-Ocean know that the Edmunds law provided for that, and that at the latest election in Utah neither men nor women who were or even had been identified with the practice of polygamy were permitted to vote? If not, its memory must be sadly defective. By searching the files of his paper the editor will find accounts of the doings of the Commissioners under the Edmunds law, and that the disfranchisement of women as well as men in the polygamic relation has already been effected. How then can the measure now before Congress to repeal the Woman Suffrage Act of Utah be "a proposition to disfranchise men and women who practice polygamy?" The Inter Ocean has thus made one big blunder. Now for another.

The Utah Woman Suffrage Act contains no such clause as that printed by the Inter-Ocean and which we have printed in italics. We do not suppose that the editor attached it with knowledge that he was grossly misrepresenting the case. He simply blundered. He doubtless took the word of the unscrupulous attorney for the unfortunate holder of the Murray fraudulent certificate of election, as Delegate, as the clause alluded to was first attached to the Woman Suffrage Act by that untruthful person, in a collection of slanders published to aid his client but which accomplished a solemn nothing. We ask the Inter-Ocean editor to look up the Statutes of Utah and see if he can find any such clause as that which he has published as part of the Woman Suffrage Act, and when he finds that he has made blunder number two, will he be fair enough to acknowledge it and apologize for wrongly blaming the women?

That there may be no misunderstanding of this matter we will give the exact facts. The clause we have printed in italics is not and never was any part of the Woman Suffrage Act or any election law of Utah. But it is to be found in an act defining at what age majority shall be reached, for the purpose of being able to make legal contracts by which the individuals, male or female, may be legally bound. This was passed February 6th, 1852. The Woman Suffrage Act was passed February 12th, 1870, about eighteen years after, and provides that a woman must be 21 years of age to be entitled to vote. There are other qualifications specified, such as residence for a certain time, and she must be either a citizen in her own right or the wife, widow or daughter of a citizen. There is another law connected with this which the Inter-Ocean did not quote. It is the registration law, and under its provisions a woman cannot vote until she has first sworn, among other things, that she is twenty-one years of age. And, under the rules established by the Edmunds law Commissioners, she cannot vote until she has sworn that she is not and never has been the wife of a polygamist or bigamist, nor has cohabited with a man who

is or has been cohabiting with more than one woman in the marriage relation.

Thus the whole foundation of the Inter-Ocean's argument is swept away, with its super-structure of ridicule and blame. Its entire article is composed of blunders, and to use its own language, "it is difficult to understand" how the editors "could have made such mistakes." It appears then that the Woman Suffrage Association is right in declaring that, "the proposition to disfranchise the women of Utah for no crime whatever is a cruel display of power which lies in might alone." For it is not aimed against the polygamists who are already disfranchised, but entirely and wholly against the non-polygamist women, for no crime whatever. What then is the object of the bill? Simply to reduce the number of "Mormon" votes, to play into the hands of their local enemies, the men who misled the Inter-Ocean and other influential papers with their falsehoods. This needs no argument. It is plain on its face. The polygamists, both men and women, are disfranchised by the Edmunds law, and still further by the Commissioners' rules, and this proposed legislation is not against polygamy but against monogamio "Mormons" in the interest of a clique seeking for political supremacy and consequent plunder.

If the Inter-Ocean chooses longer to be the cats-paw, or echo, or advocate of a handful of adventurers lusting for opportunities of pillage, we have no objection, but we take this opportunity of informing it of the facts, and hope that its editors will take our exposure of its errors as cheerfully as they expected the woman to swallow its strictures as to their supposed "blunder."

FRIENDLY NON-"MORMON" CORRESPONDENCE.

THE Ashton Reporter, an English Journal which circulates extensively in Lancashire and Cheshire, contains lengthy letters from its American correspondent over the signature of "S," and entitled "Two Notable Religious Sects in the United States." The subject of "Mormonism" is discussed in the issue before us, from which we will make an extract or two, because the correspondence shows how the subject is viewed by many intelligent persons who neither believe in our faith nor endorse the crusade against us. The letter opens with the annexed paragraph:

"Surely we may search in the annals of time in vain for anything that will bear comparison with the sudden rise and progress of Mormonism in the United States; and this new religion has spread and flourished abundantly in spite of persecution the most cruel and fierce, which began at its birth and is yet continued in a certain form."

Then comes a succinct relation of the rise, travels and persecutions of the Church from Ohio to Missouri, thence to Illinois and on to the valleys of the Rocky Mountains, occupying too much space for reproduction in these columns. The letter concludes as follows:

Behold now the desert of 35 years ago. Blooming orchards and gardens greet the eye everywhere, comfortable cottages and farmsteads as well. Further, Utah has a city unrivalled for its sudden growth. This city of the Mormons has a tabernacle which will comfortably hold 12,000 people, or 3,000 more when standing room is taken up; and the great temple when finished will probably be the most stupendous ecclesiastical edifice on the whole continent.

Nature has been the steady friend of the Mormon since his entrance into Utah. She has given him mineral wealth, as well as lavishly repaying the agriculturist, who has added unwearied industry and energetic enterprise on his side. The result of all is summed up by a reliable Gentile when bearing testimony for the Mormons on a special occasion: "Except for the good counsel prevailing among the Mormons, and the control of Brigham Young over them, the \$70,000,000 worth of property (personal and real), the accumulation of 22 years might to-day have been ashes and a desert, and the suppositious wealth in this territory would have lain hidden in the mountain ores for over half-a-century." So said G. A. Townsend in 1870.

Every ninth Mormon, it is said

owns the house he lives in. The Mormons care for their own poor, and their women have the suffrage. Education is well supported, and in Utah all religious sects are tolerated. About one-tenth of the inhabitants are Gentiles, worshipping God in their own way. Always a loyal people, the Mormons, on being told they were expected to furnish a battalion of soldiers for the Mexican war, did so, although the young colony could ill spare the 500 able-bodied men required at that time; but they went, while on the wives and children of many devolved the heavy labors of the farm while the head of the farm was absent.

As a reward for the moderation and loyalty of the Mormons, the Gentiles are preferred before them and appointed to all offices of emolument and trust, such as secretaries, marshals, judges, prosecuting attorneys, land registrars, recorders, surveyors general, clerks of the courts, commissioners, post-office mail contractors, postal agents, revenue assessors and collectors, superintendent of Indian affairs, Indian agencies, Indian supplies, army contractors, and a governor, with absolute veto power; in fact, all offices in the power of the United States Government to bestow are filled by Gentiles from the small minority of one-tenth.

Surely such treatment as the Mormons have been subjected to must be pronounced by all thinking, reasoning people to be unjust; yet more of the same yet remains behind. By the provisions of the Edmunds bill, five commissioners of the United States, appointed by President Arthur, and with the advice of the Senate, have been sent to Utah to crush out the plural marriage system, which is to be done by disfranchising all polygamists. What a subterfuge and a sham on the part of the President, the Senate, and all concerned in carrying out of the Edmunds Bill—crush out polygamy, yet make it legal by the easy compliance of the American Divorce Court. What a piece of duplicity is this thin cloak of a moral conviction and severely virtuous sentiment, when such stems as the Onaida community and other branches of the same exist, where omnigamy has for years been winked at, unchecked by the laws of the United States Government.

The real object of the United States Government in thus interfering with the polygamist is an insatiable desire for plunder. Ring robbing is the order of the day in this great country, and ringsters are openly allowed to accomplish their ends without let or hindrance. The evil grows and grows; and Utah is wealthy, therefore a fair mark for the law-protected swindler. Utah is too tempting a bait to be resisted, and depriving the Mormons of the rights of citizenship—outlawing them, in fact—is the means to an end which gives a fair open field to the legalized robbers.

But a day of reckoning is yet to come. Wealth is power; the Mormon is wealthy. Numbers give weight to power, and Utah had in 1880 120,253 Mormons, and their numbers have largely increased since then; yet, for all this, she may be obliged to bend to the power of persecution for a while. But for how long?

Mormonism is a power in the United States. Catholicism is a power in the United States. The last have thriven by fostering; the first has grown and spread under persecution. This seems paradoxical, yet it is a living fact; and both these religious sects are destined ere long to become independent powers in the great Republic of America.

THE OGDEN CITY ELECTION.

THE Ogden municipal election is to take place on Monday next, Feb. 12th. It will be a lively affair. Two tickets are presented to the citizens for their suffrages. One is called the "People's Ticket" and the other the "Liberal Ticket." The first contains the names of gentlemen, most of them representative men, nominated at a regularly called convention of delegates chosen in the primaries by the great body of the people, after full, free and animated discussion over the merits of a number of candidates whose names were presented. The other bears the names of several citizens of Ogden who have been known for a long time in business circles, and who have a good reputation. Which ticket is likely to prevail?