



ALBERT CARRINGTON.....EDITOR

Wednesday,Aug. 21, 1867.

LIBERALITY (!) OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.

The New York *Weekly Herald*, of July 13th, has a short article headed, "Is there a Schism among the Mormons," which demands some comment. The writer intimates that he has had information from this City, which we do not care anything about, emphatically denying that there is trouble here among the Saints. That rumor, which came to us in the dispatches, is as false and groundless as the thousand and one rumors circulated concerning us generally are, having not even a foundation for truth. But he makes remarks appendatory to that statement which we do not feel like passing without notice. He says, "But we are troubled with an uncomfortable recollection that in the thirty years during which we have closely watch Mormonism none of its leaders, from the days of Joe (!) Smith down to the present, have ever hesitated at denying the truth." To make such an allegation without evidence to sustain it would be the act of a base slanderer; to make such an allegation and not sustain it by evidence, is what no gentlemen could be brought to do; and we unhesitatingly say that the writer has made a statement the direct opposite of true, which he has not one particle of truthful evidence to sustain and which emanated from a wicked and malignant spirit. What causes has he for such "an uncomfortable recollection?" What truth has he ever known the leaders of "Mormonism" to deny? What proof has he to sustain the statement he has made? None; not a particle; and we characterize his allegation as a foul and unmitigated slander.

His prophecy that sooner or later a schism among the "Mormons" is bound to come, can go for what it is worth. But there is one statement in the article that shows the writer has paid some attention to the "Mormon question," though his knowledge of "Mormon" chronology is very much at fault. He admits that Joseph Smith taught plurality of wives; and in this he differs from those who, in the face of history and the mass of evidence at various times adduced, would contend that the revelation on plurality of wives was not given through the Prophet Joseph, but that the doctrine was grafted upon our faith at an after date.

The silliness of the first sentence, and the wickedness of the second, in the following quotation, cannot fail to strike the careful reader: "How little did the short-sighted Saints dream, when they fled from Nauvoo to the wilderness, that they would pitch their tents on the direct route of civilization from the Atlantic to the Pacific! Almost overtaken already by the westward march of progress, they must either abjure their errors or again—

Fold their tents, like the Arabs, and silently steal away."

How little does the writer in the *Herald* know of the purposes of God! And how much credit do men take to themselves, after an event has happened, for having

foreseen it before it was thought of by anybody! For nearly twenty years we have told the people of the United States that this was not only the direct route between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, but that it was marked out by nature as the highway of the world. The march of events has proved that we were correct; and now sapient scribblers will accuse us of having blundered in selecting our location, and arrogate to themselves wonderful wisdom in making discoveries after they have been known to all the world. Our location was selected for us. As a people we were led here by the same Power that has ever guided us since the organization of the Church, for the Lord we serve and worship was our Guide to this land and He pointed out the place where we should rear a house to His name. This the *Herald* will not believe; and we are not particularly troubled because he will not; but it is nevertheless true, and "the march of progress" will yet prove it so.

But the writer in question, like many others, assumes a censorship over our opinions, pronounces us in error, and demands that we abjure our errors, threatening us with condign punishment if we do not. This is liberty of conscience and freedom, with a vengeance! We "must either abjure" our "errors" or be again driven forth homeless wanderers, after creating a paradise out of a desert, and opening up this vast and incalculably rich western region to our country. But what power, less than Divine, can say we are in error? Will the *Herald* writer, or any other person, sect or community in the nation, be willing to allow to those who differ from them the privilege of saying whether or not their views are erroneous? Would not every man, every sect, and every party, by this means be condemned, for there are those who differ from them, who, if appointed judges, would say they are in error. Does this writer think for a moment that possibly he may be in error? And whether he think so or not, how would it come to him if another opposed to his views should censor-like declare him in error and say he must abjure it or suffer? The blow at freedom of conscience, at right and liberty, thus covertly given, would be much more serious and deadly than this sapient writer thinks of if it were acted upon and fairly extended; and if the opinion of many thousands is entitled to weight, one of the first who would feel its withering effects would be the *Herald*.

Better prove we are in error, show us by strong reasons and sound arguments wherein our views, doctrines and practices are incorrect, and help to remove the vices and evils that abound nearer home, than talk of our having to "fold our tents" and "steal silently away," or else abjure what you are pleased to call errors. Preserve at least a show of respect, in words if not in deeds, for the inalienable rights and liberties of your fellow citizens, [for the logic of events may yet prove to millions the truth of a scriptural aphorism, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."]

DOES IT CONDUCE TO HAPPINESS?

The world is full of division, strife and contention. Nation quarrels with nation; sect contends with sect; party opposes party; while families and individuals nourish bitter feelings against each other, and strive to do each other injury or obtain advantage over those opposed to them. This state of things is very wide spread. In the most enlightened and civilized nations, accord-

ing to the modern usage of the words, it is found to exist with rank growth, as well as among the most savage and barbarous tribes.

That uncultivated, untaught savages should be governed by the grosser passions, and act under the influence of mean and ignoble feelings, is not to be wondered at; but when the civilization, labors, learning and religious efforts of the past centuries can show no better results than are witnessed to-day throughout Christendom, either the ameliorating causes have been defective, or those who have endeavored to apply them have been ignorant of the best means of doing so, or both. Individuals, families, communities and nations may advance in the arts and sciences, may live in better houses, wear better clothes, be in a position to minister more effectually to every whim, desire or wish, and yet, if they have not learned to govern themselves, to control their desires, to be actuated by high thoughts and noble feelings, to rise superior to the meaner, baser passions which, however hidden by refinement, continually impel those who are subject to them to acts that have a degrading and deathly tendency, what real progress have they made towards the great object of all human desires—happiness?

If mankind were to strive in emulation to do good to each other; if they were to contend in amity how each could make the other happier and better; then there would be something noble and Godlike in the struggle. If they were to strive with each other for the possession of property and riches, though the contest would be low, debasing and ignoble, there would a tangible object to be gained; but much of the strife, disunion and contention in the world, is a war for ideas, theories and the superiority of certain thoughts. One man thinks differently from another in religion, politics, social science, political economy, abstract science, and so on; and he must immediately go to war with his neighbor—morally and mentally—to prove that his neighbor is not so wise nor intelligent a man as he is. Where discussion is confined to a generous and kindly interchange of opinions, it can scarcely be other than beneficial, especially where the individuals have not revelation to guide them aright; but when acrimony and a strong desire for superiority enter into the contest, as is usually the case, the results are all that could be expected from yielding to a demoralizing and degenerating feeling.

Were the motives of contending parties purely to benefit their fellow beings, to increase peace, happiness and prosperity around them, their objects would give a sanctity to efforts which otherwise stand out bald, and bare of every holy or noble feeling or motive, evincing but a single yearning for triumph and superiority, without one thought, feeling or desire for the good of those against whom they are contending.

Rival sectaries bespatter each other throughout the world, and would move heaven and earth, if possible, to thin the opposing ranks, and increase their converts. Can they make their converts any happier, than are people whom they contend? No. Can they tell them any more of the future, and of the will of God concerning the present? No. What can they do for them, and what can they tell them? They can inoculate them with some of their own evil virus, and make them as unhappy as people always are who yield to passion; and they can tell them the

theories and speculations in which they have indulged, many of which in a short time explode like soap-bubbles; and for these men will contend with the bitterest animosity.

View the amount of malevolence, rancor, bitterness, billingsgate and slime which an election campaign calls forth! Rival political leaders aim at something tangible,—they are seeking emolument, place and power. But with the great mass of the contending parties, it is often only a strife for the dominance of views. Is the good of the country sought by the political parties of the day? or do they strive for the pre-eminence of party? We think the question can admit of but one answer. And when one party has gained the ascendancy over the others, what is its triumph? Are its members any better, happier, any nobler than they were? No; they are simply the possessors of a certain amount of power, and influence and certain offices of trust and emolument, which another struggle may wrest from them and place in the hands of their opponents.

What is all this but the wasting men's best powers, abilities and talents in struggles which do not conduce to the great object of human existence, happiness in time and in eternity? Why should men fret and fume and exercise their influence to make other more miserable than they are! An especially, why should men, professing Christianity, exert all their power in a course that is directly opposite to every teaching of the Christian religion? If they are convinced that their fellow-beings are in error, and that that error is inimical to peace, prosperity and happiness, let them in all kindness and with a desire to do good, present their reasons to bring those in error to the truth. But if the reasons advanced are not sufficiently convincing, then do not seek to cause men to change their views by abuse, bitter words and persecuting acts.

The gospel teaches men to be kind, charitable and forbearing with each other, and to labor in love with all who desire to do right, that they may come to understanding. We enjoy some of its fruits as a people, and they are internal peace, industry, great happiness, prosperity, and progress in things good and noble. Are we less happy than the people in other parts of this nation? No; we can justly claim to be happier. Does our happiness injure any other people? No; unless in a spirit of malignancy they should hate to see us enjoying our existence, and try to make us like themselves. Why then should people abuse, persecute and malign us for pursuing a course that brings us peace, happiness and good feeling which we now enjoy, when they can only offend us in their place strife, contention, and a misery from which we have fled?

All that we possess that makes existence desirable comes to us with and incorporated in the gospel which they profess to believe in but which we possess; and if they will embrace it and live according to its principles, they will receive and enjoy the blessings which now they vainly seek after, and know not how to obtain.

THE INDIANS.—On Tuesday and Wednesday telegrams were received from Generals Burton and Pace, in Sanpete, stating that the Indians had made a descent on Springtown herd ground and hay field. One man named James Meek was killed; another named Andrew Johnson was dangerously wounded, and is since reported dead; and another named William Blain was shot in the ear. Fifty men from Mount Pleasant, and a number from Fort Ephraim started immediately in pursuit of the Indians who had driven off some stock. After a close pursuit the savages were compelled to kill eleven horses, and leave some behind, getting off with a number of colts. Several Indians were believed to be killed.