

DESERET NEWS: WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.
CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1888.

THE ANTI-MORMON PLANK.

It was to be expected that the Chicago Convention would make some reference to the "Mormon" question, as that would be in line with the policy of the Republican party. We do not think, however, that the ambiguous and erroneous utterances in the platform of '88 will prove satisfactory to the radical and fanatical element, which fosters and feeds on inflammatory matter and the most extreme and rabid expressions.

The statement that the "Mormon" Church has exercised in the past any political power which can be construed as a menace to free institutions, is entirely untrue, and even if it were correct it has no bearing upon living issues. Every voter, wherever the "Mormon" Church has any influence, is perfectly free in the exercise of the franchise, so far as that Church is concerned, and the language employed to convey a different impression is nothing but empty sound.

As to legislation "asserting the sovereignty of the nation in all the Territories where the same is questioned," that is the weakest kind of flabby verbiage. "The sovereignty of the nation" in all things national, as defined in the Constitution, is not questioned either in the States or the Territories, and it requires no legislation to "assert" it. Utah recognizes that sovereignty, as much as any other Territory at least.

Legislation is not required anywhere in this country that we know of, "to divorce the political from the ecclesiastical power." There is no marriage between them, therefore there can be no divorce. But if such a union existed and it could be divorced by legislation, which is by no means clear, what effect that would have upon polygamy is not apparent to the naked eye.

It is evident that the framers of this plank in the Chicago platform did not understand the timber they handled nor the shape it was required to be put into. They were not familiar with the matter, and their manner of treating it exhibits remarkable lack of skill. However, except for the erroneous references to the Mormon Church in which they have indulged, we have no disposition or reason to be displeased with them. The fault-finding is more likely to come from the anti-"Mormon" faction—the irrepressible exterminators.

A PROPER CELEBRATION.

The City Council decided on Tuesday night to contribute three hundred dollars towards the expenses of a public celebration of the anniversary of national independence. We believe in these gatherings of the people, as a means of promoting patriotism and of educating the masses in the doctrines of free government. We will endorse any fraternal movement that has for its object a Fourth of July celebration which shall unite all classes in honor of the day that brought liberty to the nation, if sectional feelings and expressions are to be entirely excluded.

While we have very decided opinions on certain matters religious and political, we desire to recognize the fact that other people may honestly entertain views entirely opposite from those we cherish, and that they have an equal right with us to the holding and expression thereof. We have no wish to muzzle free speech, nor to force our convictions upon others in any way. But we think that on a day like the "Glorious Fourth," all lovers of their country and admirers of its institutions can afford to sink individual dissensions and stand together on the broad platform of human rights, political equality and universal love of liberty.

If there is to be a popular and not a class celebration, there should be no invidious distinctions in the formation of committees, the choice of speakers or any of the arrangements for the day. No man's religion or politics should be taken into account to the preliminaries, but only his fitness for the post to be filled. And in sounding the praises of our republic and giving honor to its chief founders, supporters and defenders, no references ought to be made to topics and incidents calculated to wound, insult or disparage any class or any citizen. The object should be to amalgamate, not divide; to fraternize, not offend; to soften asperities, to break down the

walls of separation that promote clannishness, and to foster that splendid spirit that inspired the Declaration of Independence.

If there is a day in the year when citizens of the United States of differing views and sentiments on any question, should meet each other half-way and be silent on subjects about which they have not yet learned to agree, it is the anniversary of the birth of the nation which is to be the evangel to the world of the doctrines of popular government, and the exemplar of the grand truths that all men are born politically equal and that all rightful government proceeds from those who are governed. Let us have a celebration that will be worthy of the day and will leave neither a reproach nor a regret.

IN GOOD COMPANY.

GOVERNOR GRAY of Indiana lost the nomination which he coveted for Vice-President of the United States. The "Old Roman" and the red bandanna were too much for him. Since his defeat his enemies have continued to assail him and give reasons why the St. Louis convention did a wise thing in dropping his name. Among them is a disclosure made by Col. Maynard, the former superintendent of printing of his State, with whom he has had a quarrel, to the effect that a number of addresses and documents supposed to be Governor Gray's were written by the Colonel for which the Governor paid him in all \$130.

If this is to be urged against the Indiana Executive, what prominent public man will be free from reproach? It is well known that most of the written speeches which burden the pages of that lively periodical, the *Congressional Record*, and of the brilliant essays with which Presidents and Governors and other officials enlighten the country, are the work of comparatively obscure individuals and are paid for by the page when they are paid for at all.

Speeches on any public question can be bought at the seat of government at reasonable rates, as sermons can in the large cities of the world, and many a proud statesman and grandiloquent preacher has gained popular applause, for the brain-product of some poor private secretary or unknown scribe who writes for a bare living.

If Col. Maynard furnished Governor Gray with certain matter at a stipulated price and received his pay, what has he to complain of? He should think himself lucky that he has received compensation and that the gray matter of his brain has not been worked for nothing. The Governor of Indiana is in good company, and his enemies must be reduced to small resources for missiles to fling at him if they can do no better than this.

SOMETHING TO REMEMBER.

The platform of the Republican party is a much more lengthy document and attempts to deal with many more questions than the Democratic platform. It is a politic and cunningly devised appeal to the prejudices and desires of people in different localities, and is a desperate effort of a waning party to obtain a new lease of life.

We do not intend to review it in detail. It is of course outspoken in favor of protection and denunciatory of the Administration. Indeed it is chiefly composed of diatribes against the party in power and extreme criticisms of Democratic doings and policy. It offers a sop to placate many factions and spreads many springes to catch political woodcocks.

There are some expressions in it which are new to Republican utterances. It speaks of devotion to "the personal rights and liberties of citizens in all the States and Territories of the Union, and especially in the supreme and sovereign right of every lawful citizen, rich or poor, native or foreign born, white or black, to cast one free ballot in public elections, and to have that ballot counted." How does this comport with the doctrine advocated by many Republicans and made practical in special legislation against Utah, that every political right in a Territory is conferred by Congress and may be taken away by that body at will? Let it be remembered that the Republican party now announces, as one of the principles to which it pledges "unswerving devotion," the "supreme and sovereign right of every lawful citizen (in the Territories as well as the States) to cast one free ballot in public elections and to have that ballot counted."

Further, let it be noted that the Republican party declares that: "The government of the Territories by Congress is based upon necessity only, to the end that they may become States in the Union," and that "the people of such Territories (those having the necessary conditions) should be permitted as a right inherent in them to form for themselves constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union." These inherent and supreme and sovereign rights thus belong to the people in the Territories and are not conferred by Congress or any other national authority.

Also the Republican party, contrary to its practices heretofore, now com-

mits itself to the policy that: "Pending the preparations for Statehood, all officers thereof should be selected from the bona fide residents of the Territory wherein they are to serve." This is quite refreshing coming from that source and will do to lay by for future reference.

Somewhat contradictory of the doctrine contained in these utterances is the declaration that "bills in the Senate for acts to enable the people of Washington, North Dakota and Montana Territories to form Constitutions and establish State governments should be passed without unnecessary delay." If they possess the "inherent right" to themselves to do this, why should acts of Congress be passed to "permit" and "enable" them to do it? There is no such Territory as "North Dakota," for which an act is recommended to "enable it to exercise an inherent right," nor is there any such Territory as "South Dakota," which the platform declares should "of right be immediately admitted as a State in the Union." The arrangement, therefore, of the Democrats who have opposed this division of Dakota is simply clap-trap. The special reference to Utah has already been noticed in these columns.

There are many points in the platform which will commend themselves to voters who regard their local interests as of paramount importance—superior to the welfare of the nation as a whole, and its unanimous adoption by the Convention stamps it with the authority of the great organization the sentiments of which it speaks with no uncertain tones. We commend its Territorial doctrine to the consideration of all people in the political dependencies which have heretofore been viewed and treated as the "property" of the United States.

WHY DAKOTA IS NOT A STATE.

THE recognition of Dakota's ten delegates to the Chicago Convention, as though the Territory they represent were admitted into the Union, is significant of what the Republicans intend to claim, during the presidential campaign, as Democratic obstruction to Statehood for Dakota.

No one, whatever may be his politics, disputes the eligibility of the largest of the Territories to the dignity and rights of a sovereign State. That she has sufficient population, wealth, resources, intelligence, provisions for popular education and capabilities for expansion into a magnificent commonwealth, cannot be questioned. What, then, is the actual reason why she is not admitted into the Union without delay?

The obstruction is wholly political. That is to say it is a party dispute. It is far-reaching in its consequences and relates to national more than local affairs. It is certain that Dakota is Republican in politics. The vote of the whole people there, if taken today, would undoubtedly prove this. The admission of Dakota, then, would add two Republican Senators to the upper house of Congress. It is popularly supposed that the Democrats, for this reason, are opposed to the admission of Dakota, and that it is by their obstruction that that Territory is kept in political bondage. But this is not true. An enabling act for the admission of Dakota has been introduced by Senator Butler, a Democrat of the Democrats. It is the Republicans who oppose this, and therefore they are the real obstructionists, while they lay the blame, for political effect, upon their opponents. The object in this case is readily explained.

The Republicans have a bare majority in the United States Senate. This, however, gives them the control in appointments requiring the consent of the Senate to presidential nominations, and enables them to block legislation by the Democratic House of Representatives. The addition of two Republican Senators through the admission of Dakota, could be easily offset by the admission of another State of opposite politics. It is not probable that any single Territory will be endowed with the powers of Statehood. Those dependencies of the nation will most likely be redeemed in pairs, a Republican Territory with a Democratic Territory. So the Republicans have determined that Dakota shall be divided into two States, which will give them four Senators and perhaps five Representatives, and thus continue their hold on the Senate and reduce the Democratic majority in the House.

That is the Republican scheme; that is the barrier in the way of Dakota's statehood. The Democrats are willing to admit Dakota as a whole, as witness the enabling act in the Senate, and the omnibus bill in the House which leads with the name of Dakota; the Republicans are not willing to accept this, but insist on making two States out of the Territory. Between the two party stools Dakota sits upon the ground, where she is likely to stay, for the present at least.

Perhaps the controversy would soon be decided if Dakota politicians were united among themselves on this question. But they are not. One faction is in favor of division, another is for unity. Each have held conventions and both have sent delegates to present their views to Congress. Internal discussion thus works with Congressional opposition, and the result is the exclusion from the Union of a large and prosperous commonwealth, having all

the essential qualifications for free and constitutional government.

Arguments, no doubt, can be made on either side of this question. Dakota covers a very large area, amply sufficient for two separate States. But so does Texas. And the plan adopted in the admission of that State could be followed in reference to Dakota. It was stipulated in her enabling act that Texas should be divided into four States, whenever Congress and the people of the State should so determine. Dakota could be admitted with a similar understanding. Statehood is not a question of area. There is no rule as to acreage as a qualification. Rhode Island cannot be compared with Pennsylvania, nor New Jersey with Kansas. Size is not a tenable objection.

During the campaign, then, we may expect to hear Dakota shouted at each other by opposing orators, and to see her play shuttlecock between the Republican and Democratic battle-vores. But it is very clear that if it were not for the Republican opposition to the admission of Dakota as one State of the Union, the way would have been opened for her admission soon after the presidential election. Neither party desired to change the present number of States before that event, because of the effect it would have upon the electoral college, in which each State has the same number of votes as of Representatives in Congress.

This will explain the situation to those who have not examined the matter closely, and will show how much truth there is in the Republican charge, that Dakota is kept out of the Union by factious and party opposition on the part of Democrats in the National Legislature.

THE ERRORS OF INGERSOLL.

THAT eloquent and witty Pagan, Robert G. Ingersoll, has a characteristic reply to the Christian statesman, W. E. Gladstone, in the June number of the *North American Review*. While it may afford some satisfaction and further objections to carping critics of the Bible, it is not likely to remove conviction from the mind of any true believer in God or weaken devotion in any really religious soul. To persons halting between two opinions it will furnish quibbles and catch-queries which will puzzle theologians and give excuse to skeptics. At the same time, the telling blows aimed at what Ingersoll calls Christianity and what he asserts to be religion, will do good in breaking down systems that men have made and dubbed divine, and in destroying creeds which have nothing Christian about them but the name.

Herein is both the weakness and the strength of Ingersoll's arguments, if such they may be called. To a large degree they are but clever interrogations, sometimes they are mere assertions, often they are palpable errors. But wherein they are strong in ridicule or refutation of sectarian dogmas, they are weak as to their application to the religion of Christ. For the doctrines of the sects are the inventions or deductions of men, while the principles taught by Christ bear the stamp of divinity and have exercised an influence of more than human power.

He speaks of "vicarious virtue" and "vicarious vice," of "natural depravity," everlasting torment for unbelief, the salvation of a few and the eternal loss of the many, the indissolubility of marriage and other comparatively modern notions as though these were principles of the Christian faith. He alludes to the torture of heretics, "the violence of mobs and the whirlwinds of war," the hatred of wit and of laughter, the punishment of men for opinions, and other atrocities of vicious, brutal or mistaken men as Christian doings, the result of Christian teachings.

All this, and much more in the same strain, show that what Ingersoll attacks, after all, is not the religion of Christ, but the perversions of it which have been made by those who have departed from the faith, and have introduced human theories, doctrines of devils and practices condemned by the very word and spirit of the founder of genuine Christianity. And it is against these that most of the taking arguments of infidels generally are directed, while they have no bearing upon that which the Bible declares to be the word of the Lord. Thus while Ingersoll and such as he successfully attack the absurdities and cruelties of ecclesiastics and their institutions, they do not touch the pure and undefiled religion of Christ which they vainly imagine they are demolishing.

Another error of Ingersoll is in jumping to the conclusion that every act of some Biblical personage or people, not specially disapproved in the text, was directed of Jehovah and chargeable to Deity. For instance the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, the slaying of the Prophets of Baal, the hewing to pieces of Agag, etc., there is nothing in the account of these acts to prove that they were either commanded or approved by the Almighty. He is also reckless in his assertion, such as that, in "the government of Jehovah" "death was the penalty for hundreds of offenses," including "the expression of an honest thought." Only about a dozen crimes were made

capital in the Mosaic code, and there is nothing in the Old Testament or the New that punishes with either spiritual or temporal death the belief in or utterance of an honest opinion. It makes Jehovah the author of a religion "in which every temple was a slaughter house and every priest a butcher," when the facts are that the typical rites directed under Moses were modifications of the sacrificial practices of all the contemporary nations, and were stepping stones to a still more advanced system which the Hebrews, just brought out of Egyptian bondage, were unable to grasp and which they had practically rejected "because of their unbelief."

He makes much of the death penalty for idolatry under the law, ignoring the fact that under a theocracy that offence was treason, and that it comprehended at that time and with the then surroundings, practices both revolting to purity and destructive of virtue and the social life of the Hebrew nation. A fair and reasonable mind would take into consideration the age and the conditions when laws were given for the government of a people, and not attempt to criticize them as though they were for a nation having the advantages of the growth and progress of the nineteenth century.

Ingersoll thinks it contrary to reason "that an infinitely good and loving God would drown a world that he had taken no means to civilize—to whom he had given no Bible, no gospel." Here again is evidence of his recklessness and inaccuracy, faults which his critics have had occasion to point out. The flood destroyed people for the most debasing corruptions, and that after they had been preached to for a hundred and twenty years. Noah was "a preacher of righteousness," and Col. Ingersoll's assertion is based either upon ignorance or misrepresentation. So with other of his equally inaccurate statements and conclusions.

His discussion of the question whether Shakespeare was intellectually the greatest of the human race and whether Epicurus or Aristotle was the greater Greek, has no application to the superiority of the Christian religion or the question of the inspiration of Christ. And it does not follow that if Jesus was inspired, Shakespeare, Mohammed, Confucius, Buddha and other great minds be mentioned were not Divine light may flow to any number of minds according to their capacity to receive it, and their influence for good upon the world may be in proportion to their power to reflect it. God may have moved through all of them and yet have been manifest more fully in Christ than in any. And it is not true that Christianity asserts, as Ingersoll states, either that all other religions are entirely false, that the prophets and priests of all others were impostors, or that the Bible is the only inspired book and record of the word of God. Some men calling themselves Christian teachers may have claimed this, but neither Christ nor the Bible have said anything of the kind. On the contrary, they both proclaim the great truth that God enlightens "every man that cometh into the world," and that "every good and perfect gift" proceeds from Him who is the Father of all.

Ingersoll says: "The idea that belief is essential to salvation—this ignorant and merciless dogma—accounts for the atrocities of the church." In the name of common sense, which he affects to worship instead of Deity, how can any system or principle have any saving power without belief in it? He says: "Intelligence, the development of the mind, the discoveries of science, the inventions of genius, the cultivation of the imagination through art and music, and the practice of virtue will redeem the human race. These are the saviors of mankind." Supposing this to be true, of what good are they to anyone who does not believe in them? Faith is the moving power that leads to intelligence, that precedes all the discoveries of science, that stimulates the mind in every effort. Who will practice virtue, or anything else, that does not first believe in it? All those that he calls the "saviors of mankind," are comprehended in and congenial to the Christianity he opposes and are from the Divine Being, faith in whom must of necessity be essential to salvation. It is not a "merciless" nor an "ignorant" dogma, and has no more to do with the cruelties of men pretending to be Christians than have the "discoveries of science" or the "inventions of genius," all of which have had enthusiastic and bigoted opponents as well as devoted and persecuted believers.

He asserts with his usual recklessness that: "If the Old Testament proves anything it is that death ends all. And the New Testament by basing immortality on the resurrection of the body, but 'keeps the word of promise to our ear and breaks it in our heart.'" Here again is evidence that he is but a superficial reader of the books he attempts to explain. The doctrine of the resurrection is plainly taught in the Old Testament, and it is not made the basis of immortality in the New. In both, the life of the spirit after the death of the body is proclaimed, and it is only the immortality of the body, not of the spirit of man, that is "based on the resurrection of the body."

The brilliant adept in the use of words takes up considerable space to establish the irresponsibility of man for his opinions. His arguments are very ingenious, and some of his tak-