

EDITORIALS.

"MORMON AND OTHER POLYGAMISTS."

UNDER this heading the Omaha Herald publishes the following article, which, taken as a whole is soundly sensible, the only mistake being, in our view, the designating of the marital institutions of the Latter-day Saints as "a blotch upon our national escutcheon:"

A Congregational minister in Hebron, Connecticut, recently denounced from the pulpit a member of his flock, who had married four wives in rapid succession, being divorced from three and living with the fourth in connubial blessedness at present. Thereupon an ecclesiastical action was brought against the offending pastor for conduct unbecoming a minister, and the committee of investigation recommended him as deserving of reprimand, which was subsequently administered by the church.

This occurrence, and the scandalous tendency of our divorce laws in view, an article in the current number of the *North American Review*, by President Taylor, the successor to Brigham Young, in defense of Mormonism, must elicit special interest, particularly as the argument is temperate in tone and character. In the outset he shows that the enforcement of the Edmunds act has been retroactive in Utah, every voter and candidate for office being required to swear that he has "never simultaneously lived with more than one woman in the marriage relation." That is plainly an unconstitutional extension of the law. If the test were applied equally to others in the United States as well as to the Mormons, it is to be feared that there would be fewer to denounce the "twin relic" as savagely as is now done, always regarding the Mormon practice alike with what Gail Hamilton denotes as successive polygamy among us.

President Taylor further contends that the Mormons are a more moral people than their Gentile neighbors. Among the former, he says, can be found no female outcasts such as swarm in the streets of every Christian community. Drunkenness, gambling and prostitution have been imported into Utah by the Gentiles.

It needs but the perusal of the criminal history of the day, and of such incidents as the one noted above, to be convinced that polygamy is not unknown in the midst of our own civilization. The Mormon practice is a blotch upon our national escutcheon, yet possibly many of us rant against the system, who are not, if the truth were known, quite as good as those we condemn.

"THE WOES OF THE PATRIARCHS."

Dr. Crosby said last evening that although the Bible does not explicitly prohibit polygamy, the woes of the patriarchs are traceable directly to that institution, and the lesson of their lives is in accord with the inferential teachings of Scripture that like Adam a man should be the husband of one wife. A few hours before, heterodox Heber Newton had recommended our Mormon friends to "read and inwardly digest the Bible example of the woes of being too much married," saying that no intelligent person would be troubled by the fact that polygamy was practiced by the patriarchs. These interpretations of the bearings of Scripture upon the institution of polygamy will have general interest now that the nation appears to be preparing to seriously undertake the work of extirpating the monstrous system of Utah.

We clip the above from a New York exchange. It serves to show how hard up for an argument are the fanatics who have no word to say against the social vices that fester under their noses, and are continually howling about imagined evils in a distant region. "The woes of the patriarchs," eh? Those same patriarchs managed to travel along a great many years under their burden, and some of their names have been handed down to posterity in honor, while their lives are held up in holy writ as examples to be imitated by all succeeding generations. More than that. Their names are written in heaven, and the Savior of the world, whose servants Drs. Crosby and Newton pretend to be, not only exhorted the people in His day to pattern after the works of those polygamous patriarchs, but promised that the sanctified, as a reward, should sit down with them in the kingdom of heaven while many other persons would be thrust out.

Some of those same men of "woes" conversed with Deity, learned the Divine will, obtained the Divine approbation and flourished mightily on the earth, one of them, called Abraham, obtaining while he lived, the title of the "friend of God;" and after he departed hence, the abode of bliss and place of rest for the faithful was named after him and called "Abraham's bosom."

In looking over the history of those grand old worthies, as recorded in the Bible, we do not learn that they suffered much in the flesh, but rather that they were highly prosperous and blessed of the Lord. They sometimes had trouble in their families, of course, but this did not make them men of "woes," neither did it prove that plural marriage was evil. And we notice that men who had only one wife were often troubled with rebellion in their families and that their children took a wrong course as often, if not more frequently than the children of men who had more wives than one. If the evil course of some women and some children in polygamous households proves that plural marriage is wrong, then the evil course of a great many more members of monogamous households proves that monogamy is wrong, and thus marriage will be made evil altogether.

Dr. Howard Crosby, not long since, furnished the country with some startling statistics on the social condition of New England, particularly in relation to marriage and divorce. Using his own present argument in reference

to his own statements of the shocking family evils in the New England States, the many woes of the monogamists there are "directly traceable" to monogamy. Enforced monogamy, that is the system of only one wife at a time, with penalties against plural marriage, is thus made responsible for the divorce corruptions which are increasing in the country.

We agree with Dr. Newton that "no intelligent person would be troubled by the fact that polygamy was practiced by the patriarchs." And by the same rule no intelligent person should be troubled by the fact that the same system is practiced by some of the Latter-day Saints. There is nothing in either case to trouble sensible mind-your-own-business folk. Jacob's four wives have just about as much to do with the pious people of New York City as the plural wives of a "Mormon" in Salt Lake City; no less and no more.

If these learned divines are hunting for family "woes" they need not search the ancient scriptures nor poke their noses into "Mormon" plural households. They need not stir a peg outside of New York; they need not go beyond the circle of their own congregations, they need not move across the limit of their own church membership and, whisper it softly, some of those anti-"Mormon" pulp-pounders can find all that is needful for the "woe"-crying business without stepping out of their own domiciles.

The "Mormons" have read and digested the Bible examples that Dr. Newton cites, and have become thoroughly familiar with their history. It is the Bible which has prepared the minds of the people who have become "Mormons" to receive the doctrine of plural marriage as part of their faith. The anti-polygamist preachers must not fall back on the Bible for their arguments. They had better stick to their old denunciations, and rest upon popular prejudice to sustain them. This is more in their line and will give them more show of consistency, the Bible will fail them, every time.

About as good as the "woes of the patriarchs" as a warning against polygamy, is the Newman argument that if a man is allowed to have more wives than one some other man is robbed of his right to a wife, because the births of the sexes are about equal in number. When learned ministers get down to such shallow fallacies to forage for something with which to attack the "Mormons," it is conclusive evidence that they have run very short of reasons. Has every man a right to a wife? Are there not many men who are not fit to have one? Are there not a great many others who will not marry? Does it follow if the sexes are equal in numbers at birth that the same numerical equality continues? Is it not a fact that the deaths of males largely exceed the deaths of females, not only because of the risks which males are exposed to by war, adventure, travel and exposure, but through less elasticity of constitution, even in infancy? Then, are women to have no choice in matrimony? And if they are allowed to freely choose, without absurd and bondage-bearing laws, will not some men be rejected while others are preferred.

If the one-woman-for-one-man theory is carried out to its legitimate end, no widower should be permitted to marry again, at any rate to a spinster, for fear of taking the woman that some other man has a right to. And if the doctrine is applied to women, what will the Massachusetts people do? There are not nearly men enough to go round, in that State and some others that might be named. What is sauce for the gander is sauce for the goose, and every woman has as much right to have a husband, as a man has to have a wife. Every widow there who marries again is depriving some other woman of a husband.

The theory will not hold good. Unless it be in mining camps and other newly-settled places, there are plenty of marriageable women for all men who want wives. Even in Utah the marriageable girls in all the settlements who have no immediate prospects of matrimony are numerous, and there is no lack for any eligible man to choose from. This is observable in every part of the country. It is just as reasonable on the same line of argument as Rev. J. P. Newman takes, to say no man must have more than one house, or one horse, or one carriage, because some other man would have none. We are not comparing wives to property—so certain disingenuous anti-polygamists need not jump at that apparent chance to misrepresent; we are merely pursuing Dr. Newman's method of argument, which is communistic, irrational and unworthy to be called reasoning.

It is the same with all the so-called arguments of the violent anti-polygamy fanatics. They do very well to catch the attention of people who have not looked into the subject. But when analyzed and put to the test, their inconsistency becomes so apparent that the thoughtful mind is led to the conviction that sound arguments cannot be found on that side of the question, or practised debaters and experienced public speakers would not resort to such subterfuges. Drs. Crosby and Newton had better study the Bible a little without their polygamy spectacles, and Dr. Newman had better retreat to his three Hebrew roots and Leviticus xviii, 18. The ancient patriarchs had a pretty good time, altogether, on the earth, and secured an exalted place in heaven; and the modern patriarchs will be very well satisfied if they fare equally as well in this world and in the world to come. We are of the opinion that if these

"woe"-cryers can manage to squeeze in by and by where those patriarchs are, they will think themselves very fortunate and in most excellent and joyful company.

A CHANGE OF OPINION.

A GREAT many journals are now praising the policy advocated by General Crook toward the Indians. But a few years ago they were condemning the same policy because it was pursued by the "Mormons" and recommended by President Brigham Young. General Crook's plan in substance is, to treat the Indians with justice. He says the red men must either be exterminated or civilized. He would have the government stop the annuities in money, and instead, furnish every head of a family among the Indians with a title to so much land, and with agricultural implements, farm animals, seeds, etc. He also suggests that the Indians be given the ballot. President Young used to say, "It is cheaper to feed the Indians than to fight them," and the "Mormon" policy inaugurated under his direction was, to treat the red men with justice and fairness, try to colonize them and teach them the arts of industry, preach the gospel to them, induce them to act honestly with each other and with the whites, and endeavor to make them peaceable and self-sustaining, tax-paying citizens.

The old policy recommended by many statesmen and so-called ministers of religion, was that of extermination. "There is no good Indian but a dead Indian" was a commonly accepted axiom. The natural savagery of the red man was imputed by the whites in their treatment of his kind. Indeed this has been continued pretty much up to the present time. Soldiers have scalped Indians just as the Indians have scalped soldiers. The Indian method of indiscriminate retaliation has been adopted by his civilized conqueror. And in the matter of agreement-breaking the "superior race" has gone far ahead of the barbarians, treaties have been ignored whenever lands ceded to the redskins have been coveted by the whites, and the promises and guarantees of the Government have not been worth the parchment on which they were inscribed.

That the very wildest and most worthless tribes are capable of reclamation has been demonstrated beyond controversy. That their children are susceptible to the influences of education and general culture is now beyond doubt. And both in Utah and elsewhere it has been proven that under good tuition and practical example from the higher race, the Indians can be turned from roving, thieving beggars, and treacherous, blood-thirsty savages, to tillers of the soil and fairly decent and provident members of society.

We are glad to see the change on this subject that is being wrought in public sentiment. That is a very uncertain thing but to a large extent it must in the very nature of things, under the American system of government, influence and direct legislation on all matters of public concern. What the populace denounce to-day they may applaud to-morrow. And the newspapers, which pandar a great deal more to the popular feeling of the moment than they ought to do, turn and turn about which ever way the general breeze blow. We hope Gen. Crook's wise suggestions will be heeded. And we are sure that if a different policy is pursued toward the remnants left of the primal owners of the soil, not many years will pass away before Indian raids and Indian troubles will be much rarer than broils among the denizens of civilized and "Christian" cities.

LONGITUDE AND TIME RECKONING.

AT the Geodetic Conference held in the Italian capital recently, a very sensible change was agreed to in the system of reckoning the degrees of longitude. All the great powers of Europe, also the United States and some other nations, were represented at the conference. It was decided to drop the terms east and west longitude, and starting, as now, from Greenwich, reckon from west to east around the globe to the place of beginning. The meridian of Greenwich will thus continue to be the standard and will mark both zero and 360 deg., and there will be neither east nor west longitude any more, but simply so many degrees. Thus, the meridian now marked 170 deg. west will be 190 deg. longitude; Salt Lake City, which is now about 112 deg. west, will be about 248 deg.; Washington, which is now 77 deg. west, will be 283 deg., and so on. This will simplify the reckoning greatly and the change will doubtless be approved all over the civilized world.

Another change made at the Conference was in the reckoning of astronomical time. It was agreed that instead of commencing at noon from Greenwich, as at present, it shall be from midnight. Thus 11 a. m. will in future be the eleventh astronomical as well as civil hour instead of the twenty-third astronomical hour as heretofore. And 11 p. m. instead of being the eleventh astronomical hour, will be the twenty-third. These changes when once thoroughly understood will tend to simpli-

fy many calculations of importance to navigators and scientists, and they appear to be wise and economical.

THE TRADE WITH MEXICO.

A New line of steamers has been opened between New York and Mexico. This is a good sign. It indicates closer and more extensive commercial relations than heretofore between the two republics. The manufactures of the United States are wanted in Mexico, and the tropical products of that favored land are needed here. A greater infusion of American enterprise into Mexican trade will aid in developing the resources of the country and greatly increase its exports. It is strange, considering the close proximity of that rich region to this, that the trade between the two countries has remained so small. Cuba furnishes the United States with seven times the amount of the products which come from Mexico, and yet our trade with the latter should greatly exceed that of the former. Whether by land or sea, rapid communication between the two countries should be encouraged, and the railroad and steamboat line projects are signs of what is shortly to come. The land of the Montezumas is to be quickened into commercial life by Yankee spirit, and American enterprise is to transform the trade of the country, develop its magnificent resources and greatly benefit and enrich both nations.

THE LADIES AFTER MR. EDMUNDS.

THE attitude assumed by the executive committee of the New York State Woman Suffrage Association on Senator Edmunds's proposal to deprive the ladies of Utah of the franchise, is strikingly commendable. They take largely the same view of the subject as has been expressed in the News.

The fact is that the "Mormon" question is merely political, minus the remotest real reference to morality, which is made a cloak to cover up the actual motives which inspire the crusaders.

The stand taken by the executive committee of the New York Association stands out clearly to their credit, showing that on many important questions of the day women have better views than many men of broad pretences, and is another evidence of their ability to intelligently wield the franchise.

THE RAGE FOR DINGY GREEN.

THE public exhibit some striking freaks occasionally. One of these eccentricities is shown just now in the rage for painting outside woodwork in shades of dingy green. Pigment of this color is put upon all kinds of buildings, without reference to its harmony or contrast with surroundings. As a consequence some of the effects are so outrageous to a person with an eye to the beautiful and harmonious in tints, that he is almost led to wish that he could be seized with temporary color blindness. We presume that painters put on these pigments to order. If in some particular instances, the choice is left with them, it shows they should have selected some other business than painting. These incongruities in color are carried into interiors as well. We call to mind one room the walls of which are the usual dingy green and the ceiling a tolerably decided blue. The effect is so disagreeable that any person even if he be not a judge of color harmony can observe that there is an incongruity, although perhaps unable to tell what causes it. It at once offends the eye.

When the surroundings are in unison the prevalent green does very well, but when no regard is paid to adjacent conditions it is unsuitable. It always appears out of place upon a public building, the coloring on which should as a rule, be subdued, both on the exterior and interior. This is especially the case with houses of worship.

"OUTSIDERS."

THE term "outsiders" is sometimes used by our people in reference to persons living in Utah who are not of our faith. It simply signifies non-"Mormons," and is substituted for the word "Gentiles," which is occasionally resented and does not seem very applicable when applied to Jews. It is rarely uttered in an offensive sense, and should not be spoken in a denunciatory spirit without special cause, particularly in public discourses. The term "Gentile" is used in the Book of Mormon to designate the people of this country who are not of the native tribes, the latter being of Israel. All people who come into the covenant of the Gospel revealed in that Book are counted as Israel, and this is what has led to the appellation of "Gentile" as a distinctive term for those who are not Latter-day Saints.

"Outsiders" are, then, people who are outside the pale of the Church. The word has no reference to the Territory,

nor to civil government, nor to citizenship, nor to anything of a political character. Yet there are some persons who affect to be in high dudgeon because they are numbered with "outsiders." Governor Murray, for instance, at a public gathering quite recently, strutted like an irate rooster, ruffled his feathers and crowed till he was red in the face, over worked-up wrath at the idea of being called an "outsider." We do not know that the word has ever been specially used to describe His Serene Mightiness; he has picked it up and applied it to himself. What for? Why just as a catchword on which he could fasten a bundle of epithets and cock-doodle-doo denunciations of the "Mormon" Church and its leading men, who pay no more attention to his ire or his railing than if he never existed. We notice his bluster just to show its absurdity, and to disabuse the minds of those who may have been deceived by it, coming from an official source.

If any one were to intimate that the gentleman was an insider, that is, a member of the "Mormon" Church, he would no doubt be madder than at being called an "outsider." He and a few other individuals that have obtained brief notoriety over the "Mormon" question are not only non-"Mormons," they are anti-"Mormons." They are outsiders so far as this Church is concerned, in the fullest sense. Ought they to get in a rage because they are denominated outsiders by the people with whom they have no interest in common? "Outsiders" means those who are outside the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, nothing less and nothing more. And when any anti-"Mormon" rears up and shrieks himself hoarse in trying to apply the term in a different sense, it shows that he is very hard up for something to make an anti-"Mormon" grievance out of.

"Outsiders" is a handy word, much easier to use than a phrase containing only the same signification, such as "those not of our faith," or "people opposed to our system," or "persons who differ with us," and there is nothing in it essentially offensive. "Our enemies" is a term that some of them object to, and it is not always applicable to individuals that see with other eyes than ours.

If we were as bitterly and vindictively opposed to anything "Mormon" as are those who bridle up at the word "outsider," we would take the term as a compliment. But there will no doubt come a time when it will be indeed a reproach; we refer to the period described in Rev. xlii, and particularly in the 15th verse.

SWEEP THEM AWAY.

LAST evening, while in a well-known book store in this city, we saw two rough lads hunting over the papers and magazines kept on hand for something which they could not find. "What do you want?" asked the proprietor. "The Police Gazette," was the reply. "We don't keep it," responded the bookseller, much to our surprise and gratification and the chagrin of the sinister-looking youths.

Some time ago flash publications of the kind mentioned could be seen at nearly all the news stands and book stores, and we noticed them in the establishment to which we now refer. We have talked very plainly on this matter, several times, and have commended the action of some of the States in suppressing the sale of publications which tend to corrupt the minds of the youth of both sexes and to demoralize society. In conversation with the bookseller, last evening, we learned that he had weeded out from his stock all the juvenile periodicals of a trashy nature, and had refused to receive subscriptions for the low class of literature which is scattered broadcast over the country.

We were much pleased to learn this. We hope all other newsdealers and booksellers will take the same course. Staring, suggestive and sensational pictures accompanied with vile descriptive letter press, strike the eye at nearly all the news stands of the country, and are doing an extensive work in sowing the seeds of sin and crime in the minds of young people. They pandar to a vicious taste in older folks, and are a public nuisance that ought to be abated. Respectable purchasers will do much towards the suppression of the filthy trash by declining to patronize the stores where it is kept on hand and doing business at other places.

While on this subject we will refer to another class of publications which has an evil tendency, though not in the same direction as the illustrated rubbish and sensational boys' and girls' papers touched upon above. Take "Peck's Bad Boy" as a sample. What good results except laughter at the odd situations and expressions it contains can result from reading it? The tendency of such books is to encourage practical joking, destroy parental authority, make fun out of human suffering and sport out of cruelty to animals. They are humorous, but they are vicious, and we are surprised to see them circulated by many firms that keep them for sale. Of all people in the world we should be the most careful over the influences brought to bear upon our youth, and while humor and pure entertainment should be encouraged, only such literature as will lead to right feelings and virtuous acts should be allowed to find its way into the homes or stores of the Latter-day Saints.