

EDITORIALS.

A DISGRACE TO JOURNALISM.

In noticing the reports of some of the Colorado excursionists, we alluded to an alleged interview with President Taylor by "A Bohemian" published in the *Denver Tribune*. We pointed out some inaccuracies in the account and attributed them to unintentional mistakes on the part of the reporter. We have since read another letter, by the same writer, in which he expresses himself as a contemptible liar and intentional defamer, and we take the present opportunity of posting him as a low-lived ruffian and a disgrace to his profession. This may be thought strong language, but when we give some quotations from his letter to the *Denver Tribune*, we think that all classes of people in this city will agree that if there is any fault in our expressions concerning him they are too mild, and do not approach full justice.

We pass by a number of absurd remarks about the "Mormons," and clip the following:

"I had the pleasure of meeting a member of the Edmunds Commission at the Continental, and in speaking of this law the Commissioner said the law is defective, and some of the members are bought off. As soon as a number of them arrived a large delegation of Mormons waited upon them, and the interviews and cash propositions seemed to be generally satisfactory to both parties."

"You see," continued the Commissioner, "that the law is defective in one particular, and that is in regard to polygamous marriages. The law now reads that if a man has been married to one wife more than two years he cannot be brought to trial for the commitment of the crime, and I am free to state that polygamous marriages are taking place every day. The way they work it is this: They are married, enjoy their unlawful practices, and keep it quiet for two years, and then give it out cold that they are married; and the law cannot reach them."

"Suppose, again," continued the Commissioner, "that the law could be made to reach them, we would have about the same result. The courts, juries and officers are all Mormons, and of course Mormons will not convict one another of what they are all guilty of. Even if the law had a larger scope we could not convict them."

Everybody here knows that the statements in those three paragraphs are not only absolutely untrue, but such as no member of the Commission could possibly have made. It is extremely improbable that the "Bohemian" met one of the Commissioners at all. If we are not mistaken there were none of them in the city at the time of the Colorado excursion. But be that as it may, there is not one of those gentlemen so base as to intimate anything of the kind manufactured by the vagabond from Denver. The Edmunds law, it is well known, has nothing to say about the length of time at which prosecutions for polygamy shall be barred. The "Bohemian" has heard something about the United States statute or limitations but does not understand its provisions, and in making up the falsehoods which he has attributed to the Commissioner, he has simply displayed his ignorance as well as his mendacity. It is also well known that instead of "courts, juries and officers" in Utah being "all Mormons," they are all non-Mormons, the judges and officers being appointed by the President and Senate of the United States, and no "Mormon" being permitted to serve on a jury when a case of polygamy is tried.

No Commissioner is so densely ignorant of the law and the facts as the Denver "Bohemian" would make it appear, and the brute has not the ordinary intelligence of the tribe of "interviewers," of which he is unworthy, who manufacture reports of conversations with prominent individuals, and gain a precarious livelihood by their so-called "enterprises," for they have ingenuity and sharpness enough to make their statements plausible.

But what he has to say about a private "Mormon" party to which he claims to have been invited, is far worse than the palpable falsehoods that he has charged to the account of one of the Commissioners. He says:

"While staying with friends in

this beautiful city, who are surrounded by Mormons, they being the only Gentiles in several blocks, I became acquainted with several Mormon ladies, and as a matter of courtesy, they wanted me to attend a social gathering. I accepted the invitation and was promptly on hand at 9 o'clock in the evening. The guests were entertained royally, so to speak, but the mode of entertaining would not be acceptable to the people outside of Mormondom. Large reclining chairs were the seats, and soon I found myself surrounded by a bevy of ladies who squeezed my hands, and one sat down in the same chair with me. Wine and cake were served and each guest partook of a large amount and soon the married ladies and some were present with their husbands, became more free in speech and actions. I began to think I had probably made a mistake, but on inquiry found out that it was the *modus operandi* of all parties by the Mormons. I have no hesitancy whatever in saying that the actions of the men and women that evening would have disgraced a Holladay Street bagnio. But what was still worse in regard to it was the fact that the hostess had four small children, the oldest being about 13 years of age, and they were in the parlor watching the actions and absorbing the conversation, which in its character would tend even to corrupt men. Another peculiarity was that the man who takes a lady to a Mormon social is not expected to take her home, and several married ladies who were present all left at the close of the evening's entertainment with a different gentleman than the one they accompanied to the social gathering. Such practices as these tend not only to corrupt the children who are eye-witnesses to all of it, but to older men as well. This is one of the evils of polygamy, and to do away with one it is absolutely necessary to do away with all."

We do not know what kind of company the "Bohemian" strayed into, but the foregoing does not describe any "Mormon" family or custom. If he was invited to share the hospitality of any lady or gentleman in this city, and has thus shamefully abused the courtesy extended to him, he is unfit to be recognized by any respectable person, "Mormon" or "Gentile." But we believe that he has invented the whole thing from first to last. It is the offspring of a prurient mind. It does not describe any custom or habit of the "Mormon" people. The statement that "the man who takes a lady to a Mormon social is not expected to take her home" and so forth, is a falsehood, and his insinuations proceed from a base and filthy soul. The fellow is a dirty dog, and we ask the *Denver Tribune* to make inquiries of other representatives of the press that visited this city at the same time, whether they saw or heard anything while in this city to justify the vile assertions of the "Bohemian" who has befouled the columns of the *Tribune*.

We expect attacks upon the creed and social system of the majority of the people of Utah. We find no fault with journalists who oppose us on the ground of principle. But we think that a respectable paper like the *Denver Tribune* is letting itself down to a very low level in publishing the falsehoods of a creature who must be steeped in degradation and lost to all sense of honor and decency. One more quotation and we have done with him:

"In company with several others I attended the Tabernacle Sunday and heard George Q. Cannon and President Taylor orate to the people. The substance of their sermons were to the abuse of the Gentiles, talking about crops, irrigation and such matters, and telling the people to do with less meat, furniture and other luxuries of life that they could give more to the church, in excess of the tenth that they now give."

We appeal to the gentleman of the Colorado press who were present on the occasion referred to, whether anything of the kind asserted by "Bohemian" was mentioned by either of the speakers. Pres. Cannon's discourse appeared verbatim in *Pomeroy's Democrat* of July 28th, and has been published in this paper, and there is not a line in it that refers to either of the subjects claimed to have been preached upon.

It is plain that "Bohemian" has attempted to write a letter that he imagined would suit the popular taste and the common notions about "Mormon" affairs. He has only shown that he is not fit to be called

a journalist, that he ought to be "sent to Coventry" by every member of the profession who has any regard for decency, and that the *Denver Tribune* made a great mistake in sending him as its representative an unprincipled and dissolute "Bohemian" instead of a man.

BE WARNED IN TIME.

We hear of bolsterous and grossly improper conduct at night parties and Sunday excursions to the Lake. In mixed company like that which congregates on such occasions it may be expected that there will be considerable gaiety and some noise, also more freedom of speech and action than are considered decorous in well-ordered society. For, intoxicating drinks are sold at the bathing places, and people out for a holiday and unrestrained by principle, will indulge and become more than merry, and sometimes foolish and disgusting. These irregularities are to be deprecated, but it is very difficult to prevent them.

But we are of the opinion that the worst evils, said to attend these excursions, might be measurably suppressed. The sale of intoxicants on Sunday may be stopped, or those who violate the law be punished, and the rowdiness and unchaste conduct complained of checked and the guilty parties arrested.

We are aware that morals cannot be established and maintained simply by legislation even if the law is enforced. There must be a moral sentiment and disposition among the people or vice will prevail. But barriers may be erected against it which will be at least of some service. And our object in touching on this matter is to draw the attention of parents and guardians to the evils attending these midnight parties and Sunday trips, that they may use their influence to keep the young people away. Midnight dances by the lake may seem very attractive, but they are unfit for the people who have come here to establish righteousness and build up a pure society. Sunday excursions are in opposition to the law of the Lord concerning the sabbath. And they are attended by people who cannot be classed among the most respectable.

Apart from any religious considerations, these amusements must be pronounced harmful to the young, for the reason that persons without principle take advantage of them to lead the youth astray. The influence attending them is the very opposite of purity. Dancing and drinking, recklessness and frivolity lead to things that are much worse, and there are creatures in the shape of men, who are always on the watch for a chance to lead innocent girls over the brink of honor and into the abyss of infamy. We do not endorse lawlessness, and very much deprecate violence. But if some father or brother should ride the bodies of some of these base betrayers with bullets or buckshot, we think it would be calculated to clear the moral atmosphere, and we could not complain.

Young ladies and gentlemen we conjure you to avoid these midnight carousings and Sunday excursions. If you value your good name you will not be seen in the society of those who patronize the same. They are a snare for the unwary. They are decoys to evil. Take all the recreation and innocent fun you want at proper times, but do not disgrace yourselves or your connections by mixing in these disreputable affairs. Do not follow a multitude to do evil. A good name is better than riches. Self-respect is of more value than a bonanza. And you will lose both reputation and self-respect if you mingle with the soiled and sordid, and are found in the company of the reckless and depraved.

WOMEN AND INSURANCE.

We have already noticed at some length Dr. Hammond's article in the *North American Review* on the subject of "Women in Politics." We did not dispute his facts, but objected to his conclusions, and refer to the matter again just to show that one of his assertions at least is incorrect. He cited as a proof of woman's unreliability, that, "On account of her inability to be exact in regard to her age, the disease she may have had, her mode of life, and other matters in which exactness is required, life insurance com-

panies decline to issue policies to her."

The officers of leading insurance companies in New York have indignantly denied Dr. Hammond's assertion. They are just as willing to insure women as men, and policies are not reserved for those alone who tell the truth of either sex. More men than women insure their lives, it is true. But the reason is not that advanced by the writer against woman's political enfranchisement. It is because men generally are the property owners and make provisions in case of their death, by means of insurance, for the women and children who are dependent upon them.

Dr. Hammond's statements are not all facts, and if they were, until a certain standard is set up for weight and quality of brain as a qualification for political liberty, his argument against woman's unfitness for politics amounts to a solemn nothing.

"INTERVIEWS."

THE inaccuracy of reported "Interviews" with prominent persons is becoming generally recognized. It is well known that in some cases the ambitious—or impecunious, reporter will manufacture out of the fabric of his own vivid imagination, long columns of fictitious conversation and yards of bogus opinions which he will credit to some well-known public man who, perhaps, he has never seen in his life. In other cases a few moments' colloquy will be dressed up into an extended "interview," and expressions put into an official's mouth on unimportant questions that are entirely foreign to his views. And even when the reporter aims at being correct, he frequently misses his mark and treats the public to a distorted account of what was said to him, misleading the reader and exasperating the victim of his errors.

The New York *Sun* proposes as a remedy for these evils, that no "interview" be published until the "interviewed" has had an opportunity of reading the proof of the report of his remarks. This would be an excellent thing wherever practicable. But in many instances it would be impracticable. Persons traveling through the country could not wait until their utterances were put into type; if they could, few would be able to return proof in proper time for publication, and while some papers might adopt the plan, others would pay no attention to it.

If editors and publishers were really desirous of giving their readers the truth and preferred that to "sensations," if they would decline the services of reporters who pander to public demands for "spicy" articles instead of striving after accuracy; if they would make it a point to be truthful and correct in preference to being what is falsely called "enterprising," there would be but little difficulty and rare cause for complaint. Of course the remarks of many individuals appear very different in cold type to what they sounded in warm speech, and disappointment will be felt by would-be great personages who are not accustomed to dictate for publication. But the present abuses of the "interview" business would be corrected, and there would not be so many angry public men who have been misrepresented, nor so many newspaper readers who have been shamefully deceived.

JOSEPH SMITH AND CELESTIAL MARRIAGE.

We reproduce in our supplement to-day the second reply of Joseph Smith, of Lamoni, Iowa, to Lyman O. Littlefield, of Logan, Utah, and that gentleman's response, which we suppose will close the correspondence on the question at issue. The point established by Brother Littlefield, we think beyond reasonable doubt, is the fact that the Prophet Joseph Smith both taught and practised the system of plural marriage, which has become one of the permanent institutions of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It is doubtless a matter of surprise to some that so much time and space have been occupied by the discussion of a matter of fact about which there is no dispute among the people of Utah, and which, it may be thought, does not materially

affect the question of the rightfulness of the doctrine. The principal reason why Elder Littlefield has taken up the matter, and why we have copied his letters and the replies thereto, is because the sons of the Prophet Joseph have disputed the fact, well known to this Church, and, as we firmly believe, fully credited by themselves—and have deceived many individuals by their subterfuges, and it has become necessary that the truth should be plainly declared, and that the leaders of the "Josephite" movement should be placed unequivocally upon the record on this question.

It will be observed that the living Joseph has defined his position as "that we can all understand it. He 'prefers to believe' that his father did not receive the revelation on Celestial Marriage; but if it is proven that he did teach and practice plurality of wives, his son will not accept the doctrine, but conclude that his father was guilty of crime, a hypocrite, a deceiver and a coward. These are his own terms, and he goes still further, comparing the Almighty with duplicity and deceit, a changeable being and hence one that has 'ceased to be God' if it is proven that He gave the monogamic law to the Nephites in the early Church in this age, and afterwards gave commandment of permission to His servants to take plurality of wives.

This is an awful stand for a son to take against his father, and much worse for a creature to take against his Creator. It shows the great power of prejudice in warping the human mind, and should prove a warning to all not to permit time in any given direction to enter into the investigation of any subject or occurrence.

The position taken by Joseph Smith, of Lamoni, is evidence of lamentable lack of understanding in regard to the ways of God and His dealings with His children. On that ground Jehovah may be charged with all the evil things named by the son of the Prophet, without reference to His course in this dispensation. Some of the Lord's changes of policy are cited in Elder Littlefield's letter. It is clear to every student of the Bible that God as a Father has given laws suited to the circumstances of the people, and that when the conditions changed, the law in many respects was changed also. There are certain fixed and immutable principles, that are the same in all ages. But at the same time the Almighty has adapted other and special commandments to the wants, capacities and situation of the people to whom they were delivered. But this does not prove Him, as claimed by Mr. Smith, "a changeable being."

He does not change in His nature or essence because He changes His requirements. He was the same God when He gave the Mosaic law as when He repealed many of its provisions through His Son, who taught nothing but what He received of the Father. According to Mr. Smith's reasoning, those who believe and practice the Gospel revealed through Christ are sinners and charge God with changeableness, and all people in every age are bound to obey the older law of commandments. Thus Peter was wrong in accepting the heavenly vision in which he was told that God had cleansed that which His law pronounced as "common and unclean." Did God change when, after dealing through Isaiah that He would should die, and telling him to "sell his house in order," He added fifty years to the king's life in answer to his prayers? Did the Lord change when He hearkened to the prayer of the Ninevites and turned away the evil that He said He would do to them, and did it not? Mr. Smith is worse than Jonah at this point. Jonah was angry, but he did not charge God with changeableness nor denounce him as a "hypocrite" and a "deceiver." Christ to be called a changeable being because he at one time changed his disciples to take with them "neither purse nor scrip," and said, "he that taketh up the sword shall perish by the sword," and on another occasion said, "But now he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip, and he that hath no sword let him sell his garment and buy one?"

Neither is the Prophet Joseph to be designated by the vile epithets applied to him by his unworthy sons, because he did not make publicly known things that God revealed to him in secret. Was he not required to keep secret and sacred the manuscript of the Book of Mormon? Did he not incur the displeasure of the