

WOMEN PURE BUT MEN LICENSED.

Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall. The editor of the *Advance*, who heretofore had some standing, is nevertheless now lying prostrate in the dust. This so-called Christian editor judges men by a much lower code than he applies to women. In other words, he permits to his own sex a much greater moral laxity than he would tolerate in the opposite. He says, "Moral purity is pre-eminently a feminine virtue; a fall from it is most fatal to woman's character."

Now why ought moral purity to be any more a feminine than a masculine virtue, and why should not a fall from it hurt a man as much as it does a woman?

Such a doctrine as this—that unchastity in a man is any less pardonable than in a woman—we regard with loathing; and we brand the man who utters it as unworthy to enter a Christian pulpit, or to conduct a religious press. It is a doctrine of damnation. It breeds lewdness and corruption. It rots the foundation of manliness and honor. It is a religious license to the almost universal immorality which is now poisoning the fountains of family life. Its fearful logical consequence stops short of nothing but a complete justification of prostitution.

We do not wonder that the man who utters such a slander against the Christianity which he is set to preach, should oppose the movement for woman's enfranchisement. The movement bears a level, swift, and overwhelming lance against the very heart's core of such an infernal morality as the *Advance* prescribes. That movement holds men and women to an equal, high, and spotless morality before God and the world. That movement is a protest against one code of morals for one sex and another for the other. The movement compels both sexes to strive together toward the common "blessedness" which belongs to "the pure in heart."

The man who could write such a sentence as we have quoted, and who could accompany it with an argument to defend its rottenness and call it sound, has not learned "the first principles of the Gospel of Christ." He is a fit, sad, and warning representative of the religious critics of the woman suffrage movement. He is worse than Mr. Greeley.

Think of the rebuke which such a woman as Lucretia Mott would visit upon him! Think of the scorn with which Elizabeth Cady Stanton would smite his cheek till it tingled! Think of the indignant feeling with which Mary Livermore must have read such a hellish theory advanced in a journal which dares to lecture her on the immorality of her views!

One-half our churches have not yet learned practical ethics. Three-quarters of the religious press of the country are a weekly affront to the Christianity which they are set to expound; crucifying their Lord afresh, and putting his beautiful religion to an open shame.

Such offences against conscience—such insults to the human soul—as the editor of the *Advance* is constantly offering to a number of representative women with whom, neither for intellectual force, nor for moral integrity, nor for Christian devotion, can he for a moment be compared, except to his disparagement, justify us in announcing, as part of the religious intelligence of the day, that Mr. Pecksniff, a well-known friend of the late Mr. Dickens, has now become a clergyman, and is settled in the office of the *Advance*.—*Golden Age*.

WHERE WILL YOU PUT THEM?—The San Francisco *Alta* concludes that all the "Mormons" who are liberally inclined on the marriage question are now in danger of fine and imprisonment under the current perversion of the Territorial law. But it promises to be a troublesome affair and the *Alta* wants to know how the problem is to be solved—

Where jails are to be found for the incarceration of the whole of them, is a question which we do not pretend to be able to answer. Probably only the leaders will be punished, and the masses will be let off on a solemn promise to reduce their families to the ordinary standard.

If they are all incarcerated, they will be an honorable company, the peer of which can not be found in the civilized world. If the masses be "let off," it will not be on a solemn promise to reduce their families to the one-horse Gentile arrangement, we are confident. The *Alta* does not say how many "mistresses" it is prepared to allow the "Mormons" who might cast off their wives. It is presumable that no questions would be asked upon that matter, not even judicially.

ing gentlemen were aliens and wanted to get naturalized. One thing is certain, if the pious officials who run, ruin we had almost said, high judicial matters in this Territory should make any disturbance over such a slight thing as a gentleman keeping a few "mistresses," the gentleman could leave Utah and go to San Francisco, or to Washington, D. C., and keep as many mistresses as he pleased, and still be a first class gentleman, fit for any society, as the judiciary in those cities are by no means so pious as are their judicial brethren in Utah. This Territory is getting to be an awfully pious place, so far as imported officials are concerned. Their piety sticks out of them all over, "like quills upon the fretful porcupine."

PERIODICAL MORALITY.

Lord Macaulay, in his review of Moore's life of Byron, speaks with withering sarcasm of the periodical attacks of morality to which the British people were subject in that day, by way of illustrating the rage into which they lashed themselves over the gallantries of the wayward bard. He depicts how, at the very moment they were persecuting Byron for his illicit loves and peccadilloes, the foremost men of England, including Lord Nelson, were notorious rakes and libertines, compared to whom, Byron was a very saint of virtue.

What was true of England at that day, is equally true of our own country at this day. We, too, have our periodical attacks of morality, and, as they occur in England, they occur here, once in about seven years. They are not visited upon individuals, because there is a peculiar sect and a peculiar institution which furnishes a standing centre, around which our surcharged virtue habitually relieves itself, like the volcanoes, with explosive eruptions. This peculiar sect is the Mormon, and this peculiar institution is polygamy.

For the last twenty years Utah has been subjected to attacks from these periodical outbursts of national morality. It is now suffering from one which is remarkable for the instruments by which it is assailed:

Although Washington itself is a notorious sink of licentiousness, degradation and sin, and although scandal surrounds the name of every third Senator and Congressman with the most abandoned practices and lives, sent out from this modern Sodom into a remote Territory we find the late Governor Shaffer, and ———, and kindred spirits, to reform religious fanatics who believe in the plurality wife system. It is conceded that, in all other respects, these people are moral, law abiding and industrious. They are the only people who have conquered the greatest evils that have afflicted civilized society all along the dead ages, and which yet defy all other attempts at reform. No houses of prostitution, no women of the town, were permitted to abide in Utah until the advent of the Washington reformers. Polygamy did not do this, because this system is practiced by comparatively few in Utah. The reform was wrought by a religious system under which adultery is counted the highest of human offenses. No gambling houses were known in Utah until the advent of the political mercenaries who now prate and shout over the terrible institution of polygamy.

The spectacle presented by the spasm of national virtue which now shrieks its indignation through the beautiful pinks of morality who are kicking up such a dust in Salt Lake is one of the most ridiculous exhibitions of our time.—*Omaha Herald*.

How it is.—At early dawn, viewed from any of the eminences on the north side, our slumbering city presents a very picture of quietude and peace, and as the sun begins to peep over the eastern mountains, gladdening the scene with genial light, one of singular beauty. The variety of color presented by the green foliage, mixed with the yellow sear leaf, showing the near approach of winter, and the generally new if not stately dwellings nestling in the fruitful orchards, tend to heighten the effect and charm the senses. Then come the curling smoke and the commencement of the hum and bustle of the day.

Such a scene cannot fail to be prolific of reflection in the minds of the thoughtful. Who produced those effects in the great wilderness of the Rocky Mountain Region? The effects are good, therefore the source must be good also. A bad tree cannot bring forth good fruit. Here is a community industrious, energetic and peaceful, whose works loudly proclaim their true character.

Why then should it be sought to sow discord among them, and destroy a system so fruitful of desirable and beneficent results? Is there reason in seeking such a consummation? Is there philanthropy or philosophy in it? Who is there but will answer no?

Yet there are those who seek the destruction of the source from which some of the best effects visible before the world to-day have flowed. In what condition was the people of this Territory found by those whose every effort is now being directed so as to militate against their peace and interests? They were in the enjoyment of peace, order and prosperity. What then shall be said of those pervertors of common justice should they succeed in accomplishing their desires, in bringing anarchy, chaos and probably bloodshed here? Even

their best friends would brand them as unworthy the name of men.

Such a drifting of matters as is now in process cannot continue very long. "It is a long road that has no turning." A crisis of some kind must soon come, in the very nature of things, and it is for the Latter-day Saints to maintain that calmness of demeanor and attitude, which has characterized them under the most trying and provoking circumstances, for they may rest assured that the ultimate development of events will result in their final triumph. By not being the aggressors we maintain the right on our side.

SHOULD BEWARE.—The *Alta California* says—

A traveler through Utah says the efforts of the officials to bring to account the heads of the Mormon Church for polygamy and lascivious cohabitation, are meeting with favor from the Gentiles, and there is great approbation in Washington at the pertinacity with which the charges are brought against the leading offenders. He says, however, that the Washington folks should beware how they encourage prosecutions under the territorial laws, since the District of Columbia has been made a territory, or there may be some vigilant official who will find that there is a field for prosecution on some of the charges in Washington City.

The current prosecution of "Mormons" meets with favor from adulterous "Gentiles," but no other that we know. As to the "great approbation in Washington" over the present crusade, we don't know about that, but the Washington people are able to speak their mind upon the subject, and if they were as well informed upon it as we are, as honest men they would view the proceedings of the ring here with great disapprobation, as all honorable men will by and by. Of course if adultery that is not adultery is punished by a straining of law in Utah, adultery that is adultery ought by no means to go unpunished by honest intent of the law in Washington, D. C., but if such were to be the case it is doubtful if Congress would ever be able to muster a quorum to do business, and then what would become of the nation!

AN ABSURD POSITION.—Judge McKean has placed himself in a very absurd and consequently unenviable position with regard to some of the cases pending before him. In alluding to the charge against President Young, he said it was not really "The people of the U. S. in the Territory of Utah vs. Brigham Young," but would be better named "The United States vs. Polygamic Theocracy." In taking this position he assumes that polygamy exists in Utah. If a man is a polygamist he must have more wives than one. In the Hawkins case the Judge asserted that a man could have but one wife. In fact the matter stands thus: The Judge assumes that a "Polygamic Theocracy" exists, that there are men who have more wives than one, tries, fines, and imprisons a man, as in the Hawkins case, for "committing adultery with his wives," and in order to so adjudicate, repudiates his former position which has been published to the world, by saying that a man can have but one wife at a time. These are facts, and we wish the public to note them.

ANOTHER DODGE OF THE RING.—Every move made by the anti-Mormon "ring" in this place, only reveals how utterly contemptible they are, and to what mean, petty, paltry shifts they will stoop to show their spite to the people and government of Utah Territory. Another little trick in their game was brought to light in the Third District Court this morning; it is too contemptible to notice, but as the new move was treated with derision by the members of the bar present we mention it here just for the purpose of exposing it generally to the contempt it so well merits.

Some months ago the City Council passed an ordinance by which public draymen were restricted to a certain locality for their stand; for the violation of this ordinance a man named Heilbruner, a drayman, was arrested, taken before Justice Clinton, and fined five dollars. Although several months have passed since the fine was assessed, it has never been paid, and now this man, Heilbruner, who, by the way, as stated in court by his legal adviser, is a "Gentile," anticipating, probably, that an attachment to compel the payment of this fine may be issued at some time, commences a counter action, the first step in which was taken this morning by a brilliant luminary of the bar, who gave notice, before his honor Chief Justice McKean, of a motion to stay proceedings in the case, the ground being, forsooth, that Jeter Clinton, the justice before whom the case was tried, is incompetent, under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to discharge the duties of any office, he having been "an officer in the Mormon rebellion of 1867." The learned gentleman who made this startling announcement has, so far as we have been able to judge by a pretty close attendance at Court for the past three or four weeks, had a very small share of business; but a case of such immense magnitude as this will no doubt be worthy of his transcendent abilities, and he will likely make a tremendous splurge over it.

UTAH and her institutions are the great topics of the day. *Every Saturday* seems pretty well satisfied with the situation. Though not sure that conviction will follow in the noted cases under judicial consideration, yet it is evidently pretty well satisfied that courts in Utah now-a-days are organized with a special view to conviction at all hazards in a certain class of cases. *Every Saturday* says—

The jury has been temporarily released from duty, and the trial jury is now engaged with its work. We have no right to assert that it will convict the persons named on the bills which have been presented by the proper authority; but there is ample assurance that Law is in a serious grapple with Polygamy, and will wield against it every available resource. We have heretofore expressed the opinion that the passage of the Cullom force-bill was not needful to the purification of Utah, and the further opinion that the plural-wife system would find it expedient to retire from sight at a comparatively early day.

Very likely "Law" of every sort, Federal and Territorial, common and uncommon, relevant and irrelevant, perverted and unperturbed, will be brought to bear in the cases in question, and "if the thing can be done, it will be done." At least that is the universal belief hereabout, as well as elsewhere. As to the "purification of Utah," the infamous Cullom bill was never intended nor fitted to purify any place or people, it was itself the essence of impurity, both in its inception and progress, and it is creditable to Congress that such an atrocious bill was not suffered to become law, for it was itself of most adulterous pater-nity.

Like many other papers, *Every Saturday* thinks that the Congressional act passed a few years ago will yet be fallen back upon—

Of course, the persons on trial will plead that the women with whom they have cohabited, as alleged in the indictments, are their wives, and we presume the prosecution may ultimately be compelled to call in aid of the act "to prevent and punish polygamy," passed by Congress in 1862.

That paper speaks thus of Judge McKean's remarks upon setting aside some men summoned to act as jurors—

This ruling is a lamp by the light of which the subsequent course of the Court is rendered clear. The Chief Justice arraigns the plural-wife system at the bar of modern civilization, and pronounces it a crime against common law and good morals as to which the shield of religious belief is inadmissible. His words are not less an edict of emancipation than a sentence of judicial condemnation.

Isn't it rather premature for a judge to give "a sentence of judicial condemnation" before a case has been tried? As to the idea of "an edict of emancipation," we should like *Every Saturday* to tell us who is to be emancipated. We have heard rumors of this emancipation several times before, but for the life of us we can't discover who it is that wishes to be emancipated, or what any one desires to be emancipated from. *Every Saturday* might detail names and circumstances, and enlighten the public upon this matter.

As to arraigning "the plural wife system at the bar of modern civilization," the plural system will appear to remarkable advantage so arraigned, for we know well enough that it is infinitely superior to what we have seen of the developments of "modern civilization," and we have seen much. It is an insult to the plural wife system to compare it with "modern civilization." "Comparisons are odious" frequently, but in this instance they are peculiarly and expressly so. Indeed, there can be no comparison between the two systems.

Common law is held to have no application where statute law is established, only so far as statute law provides, so we have nothing to say upon that point. As to Judge McKean pronouncing the plural system a crime against good morals, that is nothing more than his opinion, by no means a weighty one, and not a bit better than any other man's opinion. We have known far better and more moral men than Judge McKean is, who have held an exactly opposite opinion to what he professes to hold.

WHY NOT?—The *Omaha Herald* asks, "Why did not the virtuous McKean, when in Congress, do something to reform the morals of his own State in the course of his life?"

Voltaire, in conversation with Gretry, the musician, while speaking of fame, said, "Oh, I'd give a hundred years of immortality for a good digestion, any time."