

have to manufacture something to fill the demand out of the unreliable and prejudiced material sent forth to deceive the world!

This is how "Mormonism" as it isn't, and "Mormonism" as it never was, has been dealt out to the public. It is because of this that both the writers for the press and the people who read their effusions are so densely ignorant on the "Mormon" question. They do not appear to want to know the truth.

Literary men and women who come to Utah professedly to study "Mormonism" on the spot, usually consort with the bitterest anti-"Mormons;" persons steeped in the gall of bitterness and bound with the bonds of bigotry and intolerance, whose very breath is hate and whose spirit is the essence of spite and malignity. Of course the "Mormonism" they write up under such influences is the same old monstrous distortion which has been held up as a bugaboo for half a century, with a few new wrinkles and another daub or two of garish paint.

If they apply to the only source from which correct information is likely, in the very nature of things, to be obtained, it is not usually for the purpose of getting at and reproducing the facts, but of being able to say they have talked with persons advocating both sides of the question so that they may appear to be without bias.

"Mormonism" as it is" can never be presented to the public except by "Mormon" advocates. Its opponents do not fairly explain its doctrines nor truthfully state its position. Their blows are directed against a dummy of their own manufacture, their arguments against ideas of their own invention.

We think that even the money-grubbing publishers, as well as the "enterprising" editors of the country, make an egregious mistake in this continual pandering to public prejudice, and this perpetual repetition of anti-"Mormon" falsehood. They should give their readers something new. Why not deal out a little truth on the "Mormon" question? It would have the attraction of novelty. It might pay better than the stale trash in common use, for each sensation that is worked upon this subject is but an old rumor in a new garb, and the reading public are getting very familiar with it all.

Eastern publishers who prefer employing "some newspaper man on their own staff" in writing up "Mormonism as it is" to a person residing here who understands the subject and would give a "true and strong" presentation of the facts, merely travel in

the old time-worn ruts and deal in decayed and shriveled "chestnuts." They have no conception of the true purposes of journalism, they prostitute the power placed in their hands for good, and they occupy no higher moral plane than the dealer in "green goods" or other trader on the ignorance and folly of mankind.

DEATH OF KING KALAKAUA.

THE dispatches announce the death. January 16, at San Francisco, of Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands. He was on a visit to this country on account of his health, which had been failing for some time. He seemed to be recuperating after his arrival, but the improvement was merely temporary, the malady—Bright's disease—being necessarily fatal.

The deceased occupied the position of King of the Islands for seventeen years. A number of our Elders made his acquaintance while engaged in missionary work in his kingdom. They describe him as a genial, kind hearted and liberal minded man. He never at any time took any adverse position against the members of the Church. On the contrary he used his influence the other way and prevented the government from passing an enactment which had that tendency. He contended for the widest religious toleration, and in conformity with that view insisted that all should have the same privileges.

Kalakaua and the Queen paid several visits to the Church plantation, and invariably expressed, on those occasions, much gratification at the condition of affairs associated with it. They were specially struck with the superior morality that existed there, and pleased because of the large proportion of children compared with the number of adults. In that respect the plantation was not surpassed by any other part of the Islands.

The King had considerable trouble in his dominion, especially of late years. Much of it was occasioned by Mr. Gibson, one of the chief officials, who had the confidence of his majesty, but who was exceedingly unpopular. About two years ago the sentiment became so strong that it resulted in a revolutionary movement. The palace and barracks were attacked by an organized armed force, which, however, was too weak to accomplish its object. Gibson fled, came to this country, and, if we recollect aright, died in California. A result of the agitation was a change in the constitution of the Islands. This alteration resulted in a somewhat radical modification of the powers of the king.

Quite a number of residents of Utah will cherish a kindly remembrance of King Kalakaua, in whom there was nothing of the nature of the tyrant, he being kindly and sympathetic to an unusual degree.

CRANKY OR CORRUPT?

"THE most drastic law that can be invented is none too severe for the Mormons, and the enforcement of any measure, even to virtual disfranchisement, cannot be regarded as persecution by men who willfully and insolently defied the laws for twenty years."

The above is clipped from the editorial columns of the San Francisco *Chronicle*. It is a live newspaper and sometimes says some bright things. But it is cranky on the "Mormon" question. The *Chronicle* ought to know, if it does not, that those persons among the "Mormon" people who violated the laws of Congress restricting marriage, were disfranchised eight years ago. No argument is now raised as to the justice or injustice of their exclusion from political rights and privileges. They are out of the present issue. No drastic law is proposed as to them. Their case has long been disposed of.

The "Mormons" who are now threatened with "virtual disfranchisement" have not defied the laws for twenty or any number of years, and have not disobeyed the laws at all. Does the *Chronicle* mean to say that the enforcement of any measure, even to virtual disfranchisement of these "Mormons," against whom there is no charge of breaking or defying the law, "could not be regarded as persecution?" What would it be, then? Would it be right? Would it be just? Would it be Christian? Would it be American?

And what can be the object of such a drastic measure as the disfranchisement of thousands of citizens against whom the law makes no charge or claim? Is there any other object than the accession to political power of a minority of the people of Utah? If the *Chronicle* does not mean to advocate this villainous policy, what do its words signify? They amount to idiotic drivel.

The few in Utah want to rule the many. The only means to this end is to kill popular sovereignty, to reverse the law that majorities govern. Strike the ballot from the hands of men who will not vote for their enemies. Stifle the voice of the majority, so that the minority may have all the say, all the offices, all the emoluments thereof.

The *Chronicle* and every other paper that calls for the disfranchisement of those "Mormons" who now have the voting power, simply lend their aid to the most barefaced and brazen attempt at political robbery ever proposed in the United States.