

## EDITORIALS.

## A WICKED AND CORRUPT GENERATION.

AN advertisement was inserted in a Chicago paper a couple of weeks ago by a prominent physician, who wanted an office girl. The doctor's office thereupon was literally besieged by applicants. Ladies of various ages, many of them well educated, were anxious to obtain the position, and a large number of them had been separated from their husbands. The physician remarked to a reporter:

"You don't know how many women there are in this town who are separated from their husbands; the number is very considerable, and it would astonish most people if they knew how many there are who either cannot live with their respective life-partners for divers reasons, or who find, from a little experience in wedlock, that they prefer single blessedness."

Now remember this is in the monogamous and "Christian" city of Chicago. If it had been in "Mormondom," so-called, the whole country would have been called upon to look at the natural fruits of plural marriage. The same unhappy condition exists in other cities, whose pious inhabitants hold public meetings to take forcible measures against marriage relations in Utah which the women chiefly interested have not the least desire to dissolve. Why in the world do not these purblind philanthropists cease straining their eyes to look at fancied evils in Utah, and, washing them in the waters of common sense, turn their gaze upon the social errors and corruptions which honeycomb their own communities?

Another story of Chicago life, which is attracting the attention of the press is, pertinent to this question. A wretched girl was recently convicted of shooting and killing a man with whom she had cohabited and was a brute deserving a worse fate than that which befel him. She was sentenced to a year's imprisonment. Ladies interested themselves in her case and devised means for her redemption from the life which she had lead, one wealthy lady offering her a home where she would be treated as a daughter on her release from jail. For a time the girl seemed inclined to accept these kind offers, and to be earnestly bent on leading a new life, but, after awhile her principal benefactor found out that her thoughts were wandering off in other directions; and this she attributed to the infamous solicitations which the unhappy girl was incessantly receiving during her imprisonment, from more or less prominent men. "Could the public," said this lady to a reporter, "know of the offers of evil which the girl has received, and of the visits of men to her in the county jail, who discouraged and jeered at every purpose of reform, the good people of this city would understand her conduct as I do." Mrs. Black, the lady referred, to say that "some of these men are considered worthy of the respect of the public, that they are fathers of families and profess to be Christians."

Bear in mind that this is in Chicago, and that these brutes who lust after the fallen and beautiful homicide are "Christians," very likely among the pious mob who in the anti-polygamy meetings during the progress of the Edmunds bill in Congress, clamored and howled for the destruction of the "Mormons," because the latter married wives and did not follow the Chicago method of treating susceptible women.

The Indianapolis Review has the subjoined paragraph which tells the tale in a few words:

"Why is it almost impossible for a depraved woman to reform? The army of profligate men give her no chance. At every step upwards she is met by impertunate temptation. Every avenue of escape is blocked by man's sinful selfishness. If the woman is poor and friendless these wolves hold out money and spurious tenderness toward her. They do not always come from the degraded ranks, either; but often from the bosom of the 'best society.' If they were the kind of people the world cuts their influence would not be so powerful; but they are well-dressed, fine-mannered wolves, with full pockets and cruel hearts. Whatever victims they can clutch in their mercurial claws never again escapes."

Another exchange, commenting on this recent exhibition of the vile character of reputedly respectable men, says:

"We wish we could believe the evil confined to Chicago, but, unfortunately, we cannot. There are libertines in every large city who would sacrifice the happiness of another, without a qualm, to their base desires. This is not an evil with which the law can cope. What is wanted is the force of a purified public opinion."

Yes and that is what will not very likely be obtained, just at present. This is an "evil and adulterous generation," and outphrases the sect of that name of old in cant and smug-faced hypocrisy. While extreme measures that are in themselves destructive of the very principles upon which our national institutions and personal liberties are founded, are urged by the clergy and the press against a system which, if left alone, would lay the ax at the root of the tree of social corruption, society all around the preacher, and writers, and legislators is saturated with licentiousness, and only covered over with a thin veneer of polished make-believe. A "purified public opinion" will not obtain until the Lord shall shake mightily the nations and sweep the earth as with the besom of destruction.

## STATES' RIGHTS JUDICIALLY SUSTAINED.

A DECISION rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States on the 22d of January, is a triumph for the champions of States rights, and a blow against the advocates of Federal Supremacy over local authority. The case was that of the United States against R. G. Harris, and turned on the question of the constitutionality of Section 5,519 of the Revised Statutes, which reads follows:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire, or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws, or for the purpose of preventing and hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws, each of such persons shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment, with or without hard labor, not less than six months nor more than six years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The facts in the case are these: In the year 1877 four citizens of Tennessee, supposed to be colored men, although not so described in the record, were arrested by one Tucker, a deputy sheriff, on warrants issued by a justice of the peace and held to answer certain criminal charges, the nature of which is not set forth. While in the custody of the sheriff these four prisoners were attacked by an armed body of men, of whom the defendant, Harris, was one, and so severely beaten, wounded and maltreated that P. M. Wells, of their number, died from the effects of his injuries. An indictment was found by the grand jury against Harris and his associates of the attacking party under the above section, charging them with conspiracy to deprive the four prisoners of the right to due and equal protection of the laws of Tennessee and of their right to be protected from violence while under arrest. The defendants demurred to the indictment on the grounds, first, that offenses created by that section, are not constitutionally within the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States but are cognizable by the State tribunals only; and, second, that said section, in so far as it creates offenses and imposes penalties, is in violation of the Federal Constitution and an infringement of the rights of the several States and of the people thereof. The judges of the Circuit Court, before whom the case was tried, found themselves unable to agree as to the constitutionality of the section of the revised statutes above referred to, and certified the question to the United States Supreme Court for a decision.

Justice Woods delivered the opinion, taking the ground that every

valid Act of Congress must find in the Constitution some warrant for its passage, then proceeding to cite four paragraphs of that instrument which are the only ones that can be supposed to have any reference whatever to the subject, namely, Section Two of Article Four, and the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. The last named, he clearly shows, has no application because it simply relates to the voting rights of citizens of the United States. And concerning the Fourteenth Amendment he argues that it has reference to State action exclusively, and not to any action of private individuals. The language of the Amendment does not leave this subject in doubt. When the State has been guilty of no violation of its provisions; when it has not made or forced any laws abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; when no one of its departments has deprived any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, or denied to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws; when, on the contrary, the laws of a State as enacted by its legislative, construed by its judicial and administered by its executive departments, recognize and protect the rights of all persons, the Amendment imposes no duty and confers no power on Congress.

The learned judge goes on to compare section 5,519 with the Fourteenth Amendment, and proves that while the latter only applies to States, the former applies to private persons, who, no matter how well the State may have performed its duty, are made liable to punishment for conspiring to deprive anyone of equal protection of the laws enacted by the State. He reasons, therefore, that as the section of the Revised Statutes under consideration is directed exclusively against the action of private persons, without reference to the laws of the State or their administration by officers of the State, it is clear it is not warranted by any clause in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The Thirteenth Amendment is next considered and disposed of as relating only to slavery and involuntary servitude, and not broad enough to cover the section of the Revised Statutes under consideration. The second article of Section Four of the Constitution the Justice maintains refers only to State action, and not to the doings of individuals. It was never supposed that it conferred on Congress power to enact a law which would punish private citizens for an invasion of rights of his fellow citizens, conferred by the State of which they were both residents.

The decision then is that section 5,519 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is unconstitutional, its enactment was beyond the powers of Congress, and that it is therefore void. Considering that the case on behalf of the United States was fully argued by the Solicitor General and that no one appeared for the defendant nor for the State of Tennessee, it is a great triumph for the States' rights doctrine and a mark of fairness and justice on the part of the Supreme Bench composed chiefly of republicans.

The object in passing the law now declared invalid was to enable the Federal authorities in the Southern States to take lawless white men, accused of crimes against the colored people, out of the hands of the local authorities and try them and punish them by the Federal courts.

The principle established by this important decision is that such constraint as the Federal power is authorized to exercise for the maintenance of the civil rights of citizens must be exerted upon the States rather than upon individuals. Unless a State, for example, infringes some of the prohibitions against State action contained in the Constitution, there is no occasion for the interference of the general Government to preserve the personal rights intended to be guaranteed by those prohibitions. This is straight Democratic doctrine, and accords with the predictions of its exponents that this "civil rights" legislation, enacted for the special benefit of the colored race, would be found on a fair test to be in violation of the supreme law of the land. Section 5,519 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is dead, and States' rights remain intact.

County Licenses, Applications and Bonds, for Sale at the Deseret News Office.

## "DOES DEATH END PROBATION."

THERE has been quite a discussion of late among prominent theologians on the subject of probation after death. Some of the professors at Andover College have adopted the views expressed by Canon Farrar and others that there are, or at least may be, means for the redemption of those who die unregenerate. They differ from the Romanists in their doctrine of purgatory, but admit the possibility of a state of preparation between death and the judgment. This is cause of alarm to the strictly orthodox and others, who think any opinion dangerous which does not make death the end of man's opportunities for salvation and the period of fixing his eternal status for the future.

Among the champions of the old theory slightly modified is the Rev. Joseph Cook, the notorious Boston lecturer. As a prelude to his 152d lecture in the Tremont Temple he discoursed on the question "Does Death end Probation," and took the ground that it does, endeavoring to support his position from reason and scripture. He argued that "whatsoever fixes character ends probation," that "character will attain a final permanence, good or bad;" that "all moral decisions during life tend to fix character, and some great moral decisions during life are crucial;" that "sinning against light hardens the soul and blinds it to the very illumination needed to rectify its condition;" that "death in average cases is a great spiritual experience, and involves a great decision for or against the light it brings, and it may be that, under the natural laws of the soul, this decision is crucial, and becomes the rudder of all eternity."

To make this plain to the ordinary reader, we will say that Mr. Cook believes there is no opportunity for changing the eternal condition of souls after death, but that in the process of death, which he thinks usually takes considerable time though this is not apparent to observers, there is an opportunity for final choice, that divine light is shed forth, and the soul that then resists and rejects that light is doomed for ever, without hope of any subsequent redemption.

In reviewing the subject from a scriptural standpoint he refers to 1 Peter, iii, 18-21, and iv, 6, which speak of the preaching of the gospel to the dead by Jesus, after being put to death in the flesh; and he applies the whole force of his peculiar style of logic to establish a different impression from that which the texts naturally convey; and against the view that those verses teach the doctrine of possible repentance and regeneration after death, he cites many other texts, among them the following:

"The Lord knoweth how to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment." 2 Peter, ii, 6.

"Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." Luke, xvi, 26.

"Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Math. xvi, 19.

"It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this judgment." Hebrews ix, 27.

"Ye shall die in your sins. Whither I go ye cannot come. Ye are from beneath, I am from above. I said, therefore, unto you that ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." John viii, 21-24.

It is to be observed that the quotation from 2 Peter, is given as in the revised version, others from the standard version, Mr. Cook using either, as it may suit his purpose. The generally accepted version reads:

"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."

This shows quite a difference by comparison, one making the punishment occur before the judgment, and the other afterward.

Examination of all these texts with others which the lecturer quotes, will show that they do not in any way conflict with the doctrine of preaching in the spirit world, or of possible redemption after death. The normal condition of the two states described in the parable of Lazarus and Dives, is no doubt one of entire separation. The "great gulf fixed" is ordinarily impassable. But though "with men things are impossible with God all things are possible." Jesus passed over it, according to the Apostle Peter, having as said in the apocalypse,

obtained "the keys of hell and of death," and thus opened the way for His servants, called and ordained to the same authority as He received from the Father, that His words might be fulfilled:

"He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto the Father."—John xiv, 12.

And that this will be done is evident from Isaiah xlii, 21, 22:

"And it shall come to pass that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth."

"And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited."

Let us suppose that men who "die in their sins" appear at the day appointed, and are judged for the deeds done in the body, that they are found under condemnation, and are banished from the presence of the Father, to be punished according to their works. What then? Does this prove that they shall never have another opportunity to reform? Is Mercy to die when Justice claims its own, or, after stern Justice has exacted its proper dues, shall not sweet Mercy reach forth the hand of deliverance and bring release to the captives, the opening of the prison to them that are bound; that having learned obedience through suffering, they may bow the knee to Him who died as "a ransom for all?"

Shall not the Lord of the whole earth do right? And will he not suit the punishment of the guilty to their offences? Are not those who know their Master's will and do it not to be "beaten with many stripes," and they who know it not and yet commit things worthy of stripes to be "beaten with but few stripes?" Are there not some transgressors who are to be cast into the prison, whence they shall not come "until they have paid the uttermost farthing?" And does not this show that when the penalty is paid release will follow? The scriptures speak of sinners who shall "go into everlasting punishment." But is it not possible that while the place and the means of punishment continue, the culprit may only remain therein until justice is fully satisfied and repentance succeeds the rebellion which is subdued? Also would not this be more in consonance with divine love, mercy, compassion, fairness, and the plan of salvation, than the doctrine of implacable vengeance and endless suffering for offences that can be numbered, everlasting doom for sins committed in a few years of time?

But Mr. Cook claims that "whatsoever fixes character ends probation, and that character will obtain a final permanence good or bad." Suppose that to be correct, how does he or any other man know that that "final permanence" takes place during this mortal state or even at the change called death? In order to reach his conclusion that "there cannot be a second probation," he has to assume a period at or before death when the final permanence is reached. For anything he can tell, there may be other conditions through which the spirit of man may pass before this finality—if there be any such thing where will is free, and good and evil remain in existence—is permanently arrived at.

But he claims that the doctrine of probation after death is "hazardous to the souls of men;" that the promise is "seductive;" and he fears lest people will use it so as to avoid repentance now, the "accepted day of salvation." But how about his doctrine of divine illumination and chance for every soul to receive or reject it at the very time of death? If all people are to be favored with that chance, and the mere assent to the light is sufficient to fix the soul in a "final permanence" of saving grace, and thus secure complete redemption and eternal happiness, will not that promise be "seductive?" [Will men not prefer taking their own course to-day and leave the change of heart to come at the supreme moment which he imagines? And is not that extremely "hazardous to the souls of men?" We think so. And where, we would inquire, does he glean his scriptural reasons for such an hypothesis?] He exclaims, in reference to the doctrine he assails, "Give me no guess for a dying pillow." Just so. Then throw away your guesses, Mr. Cook, for they are nothing else, and do not be afraid of the truth as declared by the Savior and explained by His Apostles. For that is not hazardous to any one. It does no