

EDITORIALS.

"CHRISTIAN" CORRUPTION
AND HYPOCRISY.GLOVERSVILLE, N. Y.,
April 21, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

I have seen very much the last year in the Eastern papers in regard to the Mormons, but only of their faults, if one may call them faults. They say Mormons have many wives. A few of them do, but nearly all only one. The Eastern papers do not say anything of the Church people who have one wife and several mistresses. I know of a deacon in a church here who rents one of his buildings to persons who keep a house of prostitution, and many church members have one or more mistresses. The superintendent of the First M. E. Church had one wife, while living in open adultery with another woman. A prominent manufacturer here has a fine wife while he supports another woman.

All these cases are well known but the papers keep quiet for fear if they expose them or rather speak of them in their papers the circulation will be less or they will lose the support of those persons or their friends. But they will rail at the Mormons because they are far away. I heard Rev. Dr. Graham, Pastor of the First M. E. Church, Troy, N. Y., say one Sunday evening that the artillery of the United States ought to blow every Mormon into eternity. While the church people are crying, put the Mormons in prison or into eternity, those same church people are sending all the support possible to that free love colony, Oneida Community, in this State, by buying silk twist and canned goods; not that they get them any cheaper, or better goods, but they don't care who they trade with so long as they have a preference, and free love ideas agree perfectly with many of the church people's wishes. They argue that it is all right to hang a Mormon in Utah, but a Free-lover in New York is a Christian. Consistency these church people east do not possess.

FAIR PLAY.

We publish the foregoing by request of the writer, a commercial man of good standing in the East. It portrays the corruption that exists among people who desire to destroy the "Mormons" because of their adherence to the doctrine of plural marriage, and shows the hypocrisy of the pretended Puritans who attack "Mormonism" and practice free love. But the corruptions of "Christian" society are not advanced by us as arguments in favor of "Mormon" ideas on marriage. The wickedness of other people is no proof of our purity. Celestial marriage stands upon its own merits. We do not argue that a "Mormon" is justified in marrying plural wives because some pretended "Christian" keeps a mistress. There is no comparison between the two, and no plea for one because of the other.

It is not claimed, either, that the so-called "Christian" sects countenance in theory the evils of society. In practice, however, they quietly ignore them and are not too eager to discover them among their own members, unless circumstances occur to make a public scandal. But the wrong and the hypocrisy of their course is, in making such an outcry against a few "Mormons" for marrying more than one wife each, and at the same time winking at the widespread sexual evils that exist among themselves. The alleged improprieties of "Mormon" conduct, too, are, to a great extent, imaginary, and, through distance, are beyond their immediate concern and power to correct, while the corruptions peculiar to "Christian" society are rampant within reach, and abound right under their daily sight and scent. Their inconsistency is, as our correspondent intimates, indeed glaringly apparent.

The bloodthirsty sentiments of the Rev. Dr. Graham proclaim what kind of a "Christian" he is, and show that, like many other very pious people in name, he would rather fulminate anathemas against unpopular folks at a distance, than rectify wrongs that exist within the shadows of his own conventicle. Also that Methodism has no arguments that can prevail against "Mormonism," so, like other emanations from the Devil, it invokes the blasts of hellish carnal weapons to destroy where it cannot convert.

The world is in a terrible condition, and it rejects the only system which would redeem it from the dire results of its prevailing evils. But there is nothing that can save the long-faced and caustic "Christians" who cry out against the "Mormons" for practicing Biblical marriage, and who yet secretly revel in sexual sin, from the sure damnation that will overtake the hypocrite and the would-be slayer of the innocent.

WANT THINGS "ALL THEIR
OWN WAY."

The Ogden Herald gives an account of a conversation between a gentleman of that city and a Liberal cadger for dollars to pay the expenses of Baskin, the anti-"Mormon" wire-puller, at Washington. The money-beggar mistook the gentleman for one of his own tribe, and as an inducement to extract cash for the "Liberal" delegate, made the annexed remarks:

"I want you to take this letter to Mr. _____ of P_____. You know, Baskin is meeting with great success at Washington. If he can have plenty of money the Mormons will all be disfranchised shortly, and then we will have things all our own way, you bet! All we need is the funds."

The conspirators who are dragging the sponge around among the non-"Mormon" elements have endeavored to keep their financial movement as quiet as possible. But those who are approached understand pretty well what is required of them, and the consequences if they do not respond. The awful epithet of "jack-Mormon" will be applied to them, and if they are in any way connected with a Federal office their removal will be demanded by the ring organ, on the ground that they are "disloyal." The strongest proof of "disloyalty to the government" in the code of the conspirators, is failure to endorse their petitions and to furnish funds to pay their emissaries.

The gist of their whole movement at Washington is conveyed in the remarks of the "Liberal" coin collector at Ogden. "When the Mormons are all disfranchised we will have things all our own way." This is the hope and the motive in every lie about the "Mormons," and suggestion to Congress, and speech to committees, and cry against "polygamy." The political adventurers and office-hunters and bar-room bums and pettifoggers and pimps and "resorters," are reaching out to grab the control of the Territory, and expect through the prejudice against polygamy to work their purpose.

This is what the silly signers of the "Liberal" petition are after. They proclaim themselves either liars or slaves. They put their names to the declaration of their own degradation. They say they are slaves. If that is true, why do they not burst their shackles and be free men? If it is not true, why do they set their signatures to a lie? The truth is, the framers of the petition and the cadgers for cash, want the local offices and the local treasury and to have things in Utah "all their own way," and they have cajoled and intimidated a number of non-"Mormons" who take no active interest in the question, with signing their names to a paper whose purport they understand little and care about less.

How much money can they draw from their victims is a matter of much doubt. We do not think Baskin will wax fat over what he will get outside of a limited circle of speculators, who will risk money on the possible result as they would on any other gambling game. The clique have not yet managed to have things "all their own way," and prospects at present are not very favorable to their sweeping in the stakes.

A PLEASANT VARIATION.

A DECENT article in the Tribune to-day shows the return of the brains of the organ. If we do not fully agree with all the sentiments it contains, the style and matter are in such pleasing contrast to the ravings of the inebriate in other columns, whose effusions have disgusted the public of late, that the change must be apparent to all who pay any attention to the paper.

As to the blackguardism of the other articles, there is nothing in them worthy of a reply. They do not contain an idea, and to answer strings of droll, scented with stale whisky, would be as much a waste of time as a needless condescension.

CONFISCATING CHURCH PROP-
ERTY.

THE Lancaster *Intelligencer* publishes the article from the New York *Volkzeitung*, a translation of which recently appeared in the News. The socialistic article advocated the section of the Edmunds bill which proposes to confiscate the property of the "Mormon" Church, as a preliminary to the general confiscation of all church property of every denomination. The *Intelligencer* remarks:

"No doubt these sentiments will find a responsive echo in many minds. There is an increasing growth of feeling against ecclesiasticism. It will eagerly avail itself of any attempt, however unconstitutional, to intermeddle with the religious beliefs of any part of the people, and especially to seize the property of a religious denomination. The proscription of the Mormon to-day will be the overture of the Jew's synagogue to-morrow and the torch and sword for Catholic and Lutheran, Methodist and Episcopal temples of worship and temporal possession."

That is the question, tersely put. If "Mormon" Church property may be seized under any pretext, by the hand of the State, so may the property of any other church. Establish the principle, the pretext is easy to make and likely to follow. However, we do not think that the plots of the "Mormon" eaters or the hopes of the Socialists are at all likely to be realized.

UTAH COMMISSIONERS AND
THEIR POWERS.

GENERAL MCCLERNAND, the newly appointed member of the Utah Com-

mission, has arrived and is ready to enter upon the duties of his office. We bid the gentleman welcome to this thriving Territory with its clear skies, pure mountain air, lovely lakes, glorious climate, fertile soil, thrifty and peaceable people and grand opportunities for a quiet, leisurely and healthy existence. He has been received by persons anxious to enlist him on the side of aggression against the majority of the citizens. It is to be hoped that he will take time to inform himself in regard to the position, principles and intentions of the people on the other side. But whether he does so or not, it is to be expected that he will make himself familiar with the requirements of his office and also with its limitations.

The tendency of the Utah Commission from the first has been, not to the neglect of any official duty, but rather to the assumption of functions entirely foreign to the office. In order to act lawfully and consistently, it is needful for an officer not only to know what ought to be done, but also the bounds and extent of his rightful powers. Excess of authority is often more injurious than tardiness or apathy.

The Commissioners have done a great many things for which they can find no authority in law. It is true that their powers, as defined in the Act that created their office, are very limited. And, perhaps, having so good a salary they are anxious to do something in the way of earning the money so liberally provided by a generous government. This would be quite laudable if it was only lawful. But all that they do officially outside of the duties specified in the Edmunds Act, is unlawful and in the nature of usurpation. The full and complete authority of the Utah Commissioners requires no great research or study to thoroughly comprehend. It is all comprised in one section of a single law—the ninth section of the Edmunds Act. It is simply to appoint registration and election officers, who are to perform their duties under the existing laws of the United States and of Utah Territory. This, with the canvassing of the returns of votes cast for members of the Legislative Assembly, and the issuing of certificates of election to those persons who appear to have been lawfully elected to that Assembly, constitute in their entirety the duties of the Utah Commission. Whatever they do in that capacity outside of these well defined and easily understood requirements is surplusage, is extra-official and utterly void in law. If any one disputes this, let him cite the authority for anything further.

The Utah Commissioners have thought proper to formulate rules and regulations for the government of the officers whom they are authorized to appoint, and for the conduct of elections. For this they can find no warrant whatever in law. Those rules and regulations are of no more legal value than if issued by as many lawyers, doctors, carpenters, bricklayers or other private citizens. If the appointed officials choose to consider them authoritative, so long as no one is injured, all right. It pleases them and doesn't hurt us. But they have no binding force whatever in law. The only lawful regulations to registration and election officers are included in the Edmunds act and the Utah law of elections, approved February 22, 1878.

Among other assumptions of the Utah Commission was the formulation of a test oath. This was conformed to by many of our citizens, in order that no obstruction might be placed in the way of elections. We pointed out its invalidity when it was first intruded upon the people. The Supreme Court of the United States sat down upon it when brought to the attention of that tribunal, and the utter lack of authority on the part of the Utah Commission to issue orders, and formulate oaths, and do anything outside of the powers we have enumerated, was emphatically declared.

But what the Commissioners had done without authority directly, previous to the decision of the highest court, they have since done indirectly. At first they formulated the test oath themselves; now they induce the registration and election officers, whom they appoint, to require it. Each method is equally illegal with the other. It requires legislation to add to the oath prescribed by law. No mere administrative officer has a right to add a line to any law, national or territorial. That part of the oath which is now required of citizens in order to register, that relates to bigamy, polygamy and unlawful cohabitation is utterly void, because it is added to the lawful oath by persons having no legislative powers, and who are not authorized by any law of the United States or of the Territory to frame any oath or to require any oath other than that prescribed in the statute aforesaid. A great many of our people have taken the unlawful oath because they wished to exercise the right of franchise to which they were entitled, and did not desire to jeopardize in any way the result of elections. But that the interpolated or added portions of the oath are without warrant in law, is beyond the power of any lawyer to refute. Nobody need subscribe to it unless he chooses to do so.

In the latest issue of unauthorized and illegal rules and regulations by the Commissioners, the following appears:

"The deputy registration officers shall, immediately after the June and September revisions of the registra-

tion list, transmit to the secretary of the Commission a statement showing the total number of registration voters in his precinct, placing the number of females in separate lists. They will also report the names of all persons whom they have good reason to believe have entered into polygamy since the June revision of 1885."

We wish to inform the deputy registration officers that all such orders from the Commission are without authority in law. Those officers are under no obligations to perform this extra and unofficial labor. If the Supreme Court of the United States is any authority on the powers and limitations of the Utah Commission, this dictatorial assumption is without legal force and effect. There is nothing in the law which authorizes the Commissioners to issue any orders or "shalls" or "wills," whatever. If there is, let them or their apologists cite the law.

We also wish to caution registrars and deputy registrars in regard to erasing the names of lawful voters from the registration lists, and also in trying to play the spotter as requested or required in the order from which we have made the above extract. The Commissioners have no right to demand the names of citizens in any such manner, the registration officers have no right to play the spy or informer. Further, we call the attention of citizens to the law in regard to the erasing of names from the list. The registration officer is required to "make careful inquiry if any person whose name is on the list, has died, or removed from the precinct, or is otherwise disqualified as a voter of such precinct, and if so to erase the same therefrom." Mere rumor or spite story is not sufficient. The voter must be actually disqualified or his name cannot be lawfully stricken from the list.

Any voter whose name is not on the list may appear before the registrar during the week commencing on the first Monday in June in each year, and have his name registered on taking the oath provided by law. That oath does not contain the clause illegally added by the instructions of the Utah Commission. And if anybody is unlawfully prevented from voting by improper erasure of his name from the list and the enforcement of an illegal oath to restore it, he has his remedy in an action at law against the registrar, and can recover damages. He cannot proceed against the Utah Commissioners for, according to the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, the registrars are the responsible parties, for they have no right to obey the unlawful instructions and illegal rulings and regulations of the Commissioners and if they do so they do it at their own peril. A criminal prosecution is another remedy for the citizens against the registrar.

The trap that is being set does not require much sharpness of vision to perceive. Let all citizens of the People's Party keep a good look out for it. See that their names are kept on the registration list if they ought to be there. Watch the pliant tools of unlawful authority closely. See that the registrars do not exceed or neglect their duty. They are required by law to see whether any quailed voter resides in the precinct whose name is not on the registration list, "and if so to add the same thereto." If any such officer shall wilfully fail or neglect to perform any of the duties required of him, he is liable to a fine of one thousand dollars or imprisonment in the penitentiary for two years.

There are gentlemen on the Commission who ought to be ashamed of entering into any such scheme as that indicated by the unlawful order from which we have quoted. They know better. They are well aware that they are exceeding their authority, and that they are making requirements that registration officers have no obligation to notice. We have never obstructed them in the lawful discharge of their easy duties, but, on the contrary, have assisted to secure a ready and general acquiescence in their measures to secure elections regulated by the Edmunds law. But we consider their present course utterly unwarranted in law and not required by anything expected of them in the impartial and gentlemanly exercise of their very simple authority.

When high-toned officials discover what is required of them by the laws creating and regulating their offices, they will seek to perform faithfully every requirement, and remain within the limits prescribed. Assumption and usurpation are not compatible with republicanism, and the work of informers is below the dignity of gentlemen whether they be called by the name of Republicans or Democrats.

CLASS DISTINCTIONS.

Nor a few thoughtful people are more or less exercised over the existence and increase of a certain class of social distinctions among members of the Church. There always will be certain divisions in the ranks of society, more or less distinct. They are formed involuntarily by a variety of causes, in verification of the old truism that, "birds of a feather will flock together." When the causes that lead to the massing of classes are improper, so are the results. When the least degree of the genius of ostracism is infused, the condition must necessarily be detrimental to the welfare of the community, as it

is a bar to general consolidation. All distinctions in society, speaking from a Gospel standpoint, should be of a nature not to interfere with the unification of the whole.

When any one class of the community turns up its nose at any other portion of the social body, with an expression of, "I am better than thou," the attitude is simply abominable. This means that that particular class assumes to belong to the "best society." That such an assumption is made by some people professing to be Saints is beyond controversy. The claim has been made more or less broadly by actions, which speak with an uncertain sound, and in a few instances some people have set it up in words.

There need be no hesitation in declaring that no such position can be taken upon a gospel standpoint. It must be defined according to the ideas of the world at large. The standard from the latter quarter is defined without difficulty. The central and all-important qualification needed to entitle a person to belong to the "best society" is money. The manner in which he may have come into possession of the article cuts a comparatively small figure, so long as he has it. He may have obtained it dishonestly or otherwise, and may be by causing widespread misery among his fellows. His morality is not a matter of much moment either. Wealth covers any defect in that regard almost as easily as it is to write the word "libertine" on a slip of paper and cover it with a \$20 gold piece, so it is completely out of sight. Wealth occupies the same relative position in society as charity does in religion—it "covers a multitude of sins." It serves as a fair substitute, in the same connection, for brains. According to the "best society" standard, it would not be the correct thing for a person moving in it to have broad sympathies, because they would cause him to take an interest in people who are poor: he would mingle with those outside of the pale of his class, and that would be exceedingly vulgar. He should move only in his own limited circle.

People who move in "upper ten" circles generally expect to receive the adulation of other people because of their social standing—that is, because of their money. To expect it on that basis is consistent, because no person who has any inherent qualities worth admiring would anticipate obtaining conspicuous distinction in such a way. The society man has to go outside of his interior personal qualities to find something he deems worthy of attracting adoration. Both the receiver and giver of worship from such a cause are in a pitiable, not to say contemptible position.

The Gospel social standard is the antipodes of the one just described. Christ is its type. He had no fine mansion—nowhere to lay his head. He had that, however, which the accumulated riches of ages cannot purchase—the wealth of the soul. His mind was adorned with the glittering gems of truth, which never fade. He had the priceless jewel of unlimited love, his sympathies being broad as eternity. He had that sentiment which finds a lodging every in great, noble and magnanimous mind—ineffable contempt for sham, hypocrisy and deceit. He believed in class distinctions, however, but his theory and practice—always harmonious—were based on the wealth that adorns the intellect, the heart and conscience. All men belonged, in his estimate, to the "best society," who adhered—to the extent of their power—to the eternal principles of righteousness, upon which the throne of Jehovah is established. It had no relation to the amount of earthly goods they possessed.

Those who create, claim or maintain class distinctions in the community of Saints on the basis of worldly wealth are not in unison with Christ nor the spirit of His Gospel. They are taking a course that has been condemned in the covenants and commandments of the Church. The Saints have been warned by the Lord in the following words: "Beware of pride lest ye become like unto my people the Nephites of old." To foster the ordinary "best society" idea in the community is to drift away from the genius of the truth, which is easily choked and finally obliterated by the pride of the world. It is especially pitiful to see young men putting up a claim of belonging to the "best society," on the cash basis, as it argues for them a fruitless future, because of a meagre conception of the relative value of money when compared with the wealth of the intellect, the conscience and the heart. Such a disposition is diametrically opposed to the spirit of brotherhood which belongs to the Church of Christ, and is not in unison with the genius of ordinary philanthropy. It is not cherished by a magnanimous mind.

THE NEW EDMUNDS MON-
STROSITY.

THERE has been a great deal of comment by the press in regard to the alleged delay of the report of the committee to whom the Edmunds bill was referred, that passed the Senate more than three months ago. Mr. Reed of Maine made some sarcastic inquiries concerning it in the House of Representatives, which were replied to with quiet dignity by Mr. Tucker of Virginia,