

EDITORIALS.

PROHIBITION IN LOGAN.

We see by the *Utah Journal* that the course pursued by the Logan City Council against violators of the prohibition ordinance is effecting its purpose. Three persons proceeded against have gone out of the business, one of them entering into bonds not to engage in liquor selling again, and the traffic is placed under the ban of popular sentiment, while it is rather dangerous and very expensive to continue in defiance of municipal authority. The Council has done well in keeping up the fight against lawlessness and has proven that it is not money, but good order and the maintenance of law which it has in view. And in the good work it has been ably and consistently sustained by the *Journal*. Logan is one of the cities of Utah where prohibition can be made to prohibit, and as the very large majority of its citizens favor the movement it ought to prevail, and will do so if the authorities remain firm and determined.

SURE TO MISREPRESENT.

An anti-"Mormon" paper can be depended upon for nothing but falsification. If an opportunity offers for the utterance of a lie or the misstatement of a fact, the thoroughgoing anti-"Mormon" sheet is certain to take advantage of it. On the list of such journals count the *San Francisco Chronicle*, a smart, enterprising paper, but a notoriously sensational and unscrupulous concern, just the kind to be a bitter opponent of anything "Mormon." The ill will of the *Chronicle* is a compliment to any person or system.

In a recent editorial that paper undertakes to tell the people of the Coast what the *Deseret News* says about the progress of the work in Scandinavia, and of course misstates the facts, leaves out others, draws inferences and makes assertions totally unwarranted by anything set forth in this paper. For example, take this sentence:

"By the falsehoods of the elders, who spread abroad the faith of Latter-day just, no less than 1,180 people were induced to come out to Salt Lake, of whom 990 were taken into the Church."

What we stated was this: "There are 4,956 members of the Church in Scandinavia. During the year 1882, 990 persons were added by baptism." We further stated that during the year 1,180 souls emigrated from that country to Utah. The *Chronicle* seeks to make it appear that 1,130 persons were induced to come here by "the falsehoods of the Elders," and then 990 were "taken into the Church." It then goes on to say:

"We look soon to see the governments of these foreign countries put an end to this vulgar imposture; for imposture of the worst sort it is, since the prospect of owning land is the bait which lures these poor people from their homes. They cannot buy land any cheaper in Utah than in the newly settled States of the west; while, once under the control of the Saints, they must pay a tenth of their earnings into the Church treasury."

The statement that "land is the bait which lures these poor people from their homes" and is offered by the Elders, is sheer assumption. It is also positively untrue, and the *Chronicle* abstained from quoting from the *News* a very important fact connected with the subject, which is the amount sent in 1882 by the Scandinavians in Utah to bring out their friends from the old country, namely \$30,000. This was no "bait" from the Elders. It was help from the "poor people lured from their homes" in years past, who had so improved their temporal condition that they could stretch out a strong helping hand to their relatives and co-religionists in their native land. If they had been so imposed upon as the *Chronicle's* falsehood would make it appear, how did they manage to scrape up so much surplus cash in one year? And why should they be so anxious to assist their friends to come here and be imposed upon also?

It may be that the writer of the article containing these misstatements really believes that "Mor-

mon" missionaries hold out the promise of land as a bait to the poor of the Old World. If so he is egregiously mistaken. The only "bait" held out by them is the promise of a divine witness to the truth of the religion commonly called "Mormonism" to all who obey the gospel of faith, repentance and baptism. The fulfillment of the promise is so palpable and real in every country where it is preached that there is no need to offer any further "bait." The converts, of their own choice, desire earnestly to gather to the home of the Church. The only difficulty is to obtain means to get here. If the object of this Church was merely to bring people to Utah, all that would be necessary would be to find the funds. There are thousands and thousands who would flock here from all parts of Europe and the United States.

But that is not the object of our missionary work. The Elders go out to convert men and women from sin and error. They have no offers of land or any other material inducement to make to anyone. "Mormon" immigrants come here of their own volition, and chiefly by their own means saved up by strict economy for years after embracing the faith, and then many of them by help from their friends who have preceded them to Utah. That sum of \$30,000, which the *Chronicle* would not mention, tells the tale. And it explodes the nonsense which that paper further indulges in about the "Mormons" here "rebellious against the tribute exacted." The Saints who come here, with now and then an exception that "proves the rule," are thankful for the change, firm in the faith, and anxious to help their relatives and associates still left abroad to come here and enjoy with them the blessings of the Church and the prospects of temporal increase, the fruits of honest industry.

The *Chronicle* and other papers which take delight in misrepresenting the "Mormons" will make nothing by their course, for the facts stand out in stronger relief than their fictions, and the truth will gain by contrast with their errors.

THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS IN TERRITORIES.

ARRANGEMENTS have been made by the managers of the Republican party for the next national convention, and among other things it has been agreed that delegates are to be elected by "the district method." The Republican people in each Congressional district are to have, if they choose to exercise their rights, the selection of the delegate who represents that district. The delegates-at-large are to be chosen by the State Conventions, of course, but the State Conventions are not to have the right, or even the opportunity, to pack a full delegation from the districts, and tie it up, under "the unit rule," for use by some ambitious and daring leader.

Too Philadelphia *American* considers this one of the measures essential to the future harmonious and efficient work of the Republican organization, but is exercised over the continuance of representation of the Territories in the convention. It objects to territorial delegates being allowed to take part and asks: "Can any one explain why this should be so? Why need the Territories be represented? They are in no way a part of the election for President. They have no electors. Their delegates are simply an extraneous and interfering element, and it is only because they are not numerous that they can be tolerated at all."

It is true that the Territories are not permitted to take any part in the election for President, but is that any reason why they should have no voice at all in the nomination, or in the affairs of the political party with which they may be connected? No solid argument can be given for the exclusion of American citizens from all participation in the government under which they live, simply because they have changed their residence from a State to a Territory of the United States. It is a great wrong to stifle their voice in the election for President. That official has the power of filling by appointment the offices with which they are immediately concerned, and which are filled by the people in the States, and therefore they are all the more entitled to a part in the presidential election. If they may not elect their own offi-

ers they certainly ought to have something to say in the choice of the person who appoints those officers. And how much republicanism is there in the system that prevents the exercise of this right? But since this despotic treatment of the Territory has passed into a part of our national system—a standing contradiction to the declaration that all citizens are equal before the law—is there any reason why the anti-republican anomaly should be incorporated into political organizations established for the express purpose of maintaining republican principles?

We consider that the members of the Republican party in a Territory have as much right to representation in the councils of that party as its members in a State. And so with the members of the Democratic party. If not, why not? Is it because they are allowed no electors in a presidential election? That appears to us to be an additional reason why their own party should give them representation in its conventions, that some little justice may be accorded them.

The whole theory and practice of territorial inequality is subversive of constitutional liberty and the doctrine of popular sovereignty. It cannot be made to appear by any argument founded upon a recognition of the principle of equal rights, why a citizen who can vote for President in a State should lose that power as soon as he attempts to aid in the progress of his country, by crossing the line of that State and helping to found or build up a new commonwealth which is to become an addition to the wealth and glory of the Union. Do citizens of the United States become less competent to manage their own local affairs, and to choose the men who are to preside over national affairs, by their change of residence? Is it not rather probable that their new experience will qualify them for a more intelligent exercise of the rights and privileges of citizenship?

The more that assumption on which the exclusion of the Territories from all part or lot in the management of national affairs is examined, the balder and more ridiculous it appears. It makes no difference to the facts or the logic that Congress has adopted the existing policy and that it has been sanctioned by a ruling of the Supreme Court of the country; it is just as wrong and absurd as though the subject were only mooted. Rules and customs will not make a wrong right. The natural rights of men and the guaranteed rights of citizens remain, although custom and judicial decisions may have arrested their exercise for a season. The inalienable rights of man are not appendages to statehood, they are universal. And they belong equally to a body of citizens outside as inside of State lines.

The purchase of lands from the Federal Government and the occupation thereof beyond the boundaries of organized States, does not and cannot properly deprive the occupants of the rights and privileges of citizenship. The system which has been adopted, no matter what tribunal has sanctioned it, is in plain violation of the basic principles of American republicanism, and is neither more nor less than tyranny. And any political party which imitates it and carries out its spirit and course towards the members of that party, is unworthy of the title either of Republican or Democrat. Either the territorial system should be changed or the Declaration of Independence should be revised so as to read, "All men in the States, but not in the Territories, are created equal, and are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, etc., but when they remove into Territories, such rights are relinquished, and the men become vassals."

The *American* says many good things, but this time it has "gone off wrong," and the Republican party has shown good sense in not casting out the delegates of its members in those singularly constituted organizations, yeelp the Territories.

ORTHODOXY AND THE BIBLE.

A SERIES of discourses on the Bible have been delivered by Rev. R. Heber Newton, in the Anthon Memorial Church, New York, and they have raised quite a flutter in orthodox circles. The preacher is a minister of the Episcopal Church and, of course, a subscriber to its

"thirty-nine articles" and the general doctrines and dogmas of that ecclesiastical organization. His views of the Holy Scriptures publicly expressed are in direct opposition to those laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, and preached by the clergy of the Episcopal Church ever since its establishment.

This would be well enough if the gentleman had severed his connection with that body. But he preaches as one of its authorized ministers, the officers of the Church where he officiates and also the congregation seem to coincide with his heterodoxy, and some other clergymen express no dissent from them, but only think it inexpedient to declare them at the present juncture.

It appears to us that either these persons should come out from the Episcopal Church, or the authorities thereof should modify the creed which it has held as its standard for centuries. To profess one thing and believe another, to occupy the position of an exponent of Church doctrine from which he decidedly dissents, is a standing that could not long be occupied by an honorable man, and the number of ministers who continue in such a doubtful situation is likely to swell the ranks of the doubters, and remove what little confidence is left in Church authority and the sincerity of its representatives.

Dr. Newton treats the books of the Bible as mere ancient contributions to literature, and their study as simply an historical exercise. He thinks the Book of Genesis has been "often worked over to answer the needs of different generations;" that the Book of Deuteronomy is "a literary forgery;" that "some genius wrote the story of Daniel, put into the mouth of the prophet predictions of events that occurred 200 years before, and made him declare that after 490 years the Messiah would appear;" that the saying in the last chapter of Revelations, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy God shall take away his part out of the book of life," is an "impotent threat," and that "a writer sure of his inspiration would not have appended such a postscript." In short, he thinks much of the Bible is "tradition and myth," and that the prophets were "men of the spirit whose pure natures mirrored the supreme laws of the earth, the moral laws, and enabled them to divine the issues of the stirring events among which they lived;" but in their predictions they were "often mistaken and nearly as often in error as in the right."

All this is as opposite to the doctrine of the Anglican Church concerning the Holy Scriptures as darkness is from light; and how men who entertain such opinions can remain priests of that church is more than we can comprehend and at the same time give them credit for sincerity or consistency.

One extreme is almost sure to be followed by another. But a few years ago the Bible was worshipped as much by Protestants as the image of the Virgin by Catholics, and as the various heathen idols by their mistaken devotees. The orthodox declaration was that every line and word of it was inspired. That it was all and singular the very word of God. That "whatsoever was not in accordance therewith and could not be found therein, was not to be received as an article of faith." It was the Protestant standard, from which there was no appeal. When "Mormon" Elders pointed out the fact that some of it was merely historical, that it contained the words of wicked men and of devils, as well as of good men, angels and the Almighty, they were looked upon with horror. When they declared that alone it was an insufficient guide to salvation, they were denounced from the orthodox pulpits as infidels and deceivers. And now ministers of the very churches that worshipped the Book, and men and women who carried it to church, gilt-edged and firmly clasped, and set it up at home as a household deity—seldom reading it, by the by—now listen placidly to discourses which seek to take away from it all sanctity, authority and divinity, and reduce it to the level of Shakespeare or the History of England.

The "Mormon" teaching in relation to the Bible is that Moses and the Prophets wrote their books by divine authority as well as by inspiration; that the inspiration was not verbal except that the language was exalted by the force of lofty ideas and divine sentiments; that much of the history related is given according to information naturally

acquired, and is therefore not on a par with the authorized utterances of God's servants; that the predictions now fulfilled have had a literal accomplishment, and that foretold events which have not yet transpired will also come to pass literally; that though the language used abounded in metaphor and hyperbole, yet the occurrences pointed to were real, and not merely figurative or what is sometimes mysteriously denominated "apiritual" in contradistinction to "literal." That the writings of some of the prophets have been re-written while all have been translated, and that the translation has been done by uninspired men who did not always grasp the full meaning of the text, and therefore their work was somewhat imperfect; that many prophetic books have been lost, and that plain and precious things have been omitted from those books which are called canonical; that the Bible is an imperfect collection of works of different kinds, written in different ages, principally for the benefit of the people living at the period when they were given, but preserved providentially for the good of all people in the latter times, as evidences of the character of Deity, His ways and works in former times among a certain race, and as a support to the testimony of His servants in other lands and down to the latest age.

In order to fully understand the ancient scriptures it is necessary to have the spirit by which the men were inspired who wrote the scriptures. If holy men are divinely authorized to write the word of the Lord in the latter-days, their writings will be of equal authority to Biblical books, and will be of greater and more binding force upon the people of this age because given direct to them for their special guidance. And alone, without any present inspiration, the Bible is insufficient as a guide to mankind. Witness the multifarious and conflicting sects which have been built upon different interpretations of the ancient scriptures. And look at the wide departure that is now taking place from the devotion and awe which the Bible used to inspire not many decades ago. The living word of God through His authorized and inspired servants, and by the illumination and power of the Holy Ghost, is the true guide to mankind on the way to eternal life, yet the written word is profitable for doctrine, history, testimony and corroboration of present communications, and ought not to be set aside or counted as a common thing.

A SPECIMEN ANTI-"MORMON" BILL.

We publish to-day the text of a bill introduced by Mr. E. A. Wall, in the Council of the Idaho Legislature. It is not likely to become a law. The legislators of the Territory north of us have not yet reached to the point of making laws specially against a religious society. Mr. Wall may think he will gain some notoriety and the applause of the religious and political fanatics, by his transparent assault upon citizens of Southern Idaho, but he will find that his expectations will not be realized. A little transitory applause may be the result of his effort, but that will be all; there will be no lasting effect to his benefit or the injury of the "Mormon" population of Idaho.

The measures desired by the anti-"Mormon" legislators are supposed to be in the interests of morality. Their projectors pose as moral reformers. They wish to be thought strictly virtuous and models of exemplary life. In most instances their private characters of the worst. Usually they are libertines and debauchees. And while they protest loudly against plural marriage, their secret liaisons are shameful and abominable.

It will be observed by the reflecting that none of these anti-"Mormon" measures really strike at licentiousness. They are leveled at plural marriage, not at unbridled lust or either male or female prostitution. In Mr. Wall's bill that kind of vice which is common in the world and is not unknown at Boise during the sessions of the Legislature, is carefully guarded. Under its provisions Mr. Wall, Johnny Nell, and other pretended champions of morality can freely indulge in those peccadilloes which frequent rumors credit or debit them with, and no ill results will follow from the law. We do not accuse them of anything of the kind, neither will