



GEORGE Q. CANNON.....EDITOR

Wednesday, ... Apr. 22, 1868.

BEECHER ON LONGEVITY—  
SHORT LIFE A BLESSING.

WE have met with some very ridiculous theories on one and another subject; but, we believe, for reaching the climax of absurdity we must award the palm to the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. He recently delivered a sermon on longevity, taking as his text the chapter of Genesis which contains the genealogies of the antediluvian patriarchs. In the fashion of modern divines, his reasoning had for its object the exaltation, in the minds of his hearers, of the present generation over every generation that has preceded it. If modern, popular preachers are to be believed, this generation is smarter, richer, better behaved, possesses more knowledge of God and of science and art, and has more and purer Christianity, and is every way more advanced than any generation that ever lived. If God does not reveal Himself to them as He did to the ancients, instead of being deplored and viewed as a cause of sorrow, it is claimed as an evidence of superiority—the ancients were ignorant, and had but few opportunities of obtaining knowledge, God, therefore, had to reveal himself to them; but the moderns are so advanced in knowledge, and possess so many facilities, that they can progress without His help! Miracles were needed anciently. Such was the condition of the world then, that the work of God could not progress without them. But now, when men have made such progress in science that the power to work miracles, which God formerly deemed necessary to give can be dispensed with—it is viewed as entirely superfluous! Thus they reason, doing all in their power to confirm the people in their vanity and self-conceit, until for these qualities the present generation is unequalled even by the Pharisees of old. Beecher aims to convince his hearers that short life is a blessing. He says:

"In the beginning the human race seems to have been created animals; not without the great elementary forces which constitute the mind, but these forces were undeveloped, and held in abeyance. It was the physical that was largely developed at first. They attained what would now be considered an extraordinary old age before they reached the period of puberty. The first children were begotten when they were one hundred, or one hundred and forty years old; we think that to be old age. Then came four or five hundred years, afterward, of life, indicating slow maturation. What coarse, slow growing, inefficient creatures they were! I do not think that Adam was any different from them. There is an impression that the human race began at the top and slid down to the bottom; I do not believe it. I think that Adam was a child; that he never had a thought, and, with the exception of eating the forbidden fruit, scarcely performed an act that was thought worthy of memory; and that that name which has filled all history and the world, is purely and merely a name. There seems to have been in his life, and in the whole of it, nothing worthy to have been remembered. My impression is very strong that the whole human family began at the bottom and worked its way up to the present time, and that it is destined to work its way up to an inconceivably higher level than humanity now stands upon. It is probable that in their eight or ten hundred years, these creatures did not live as much as we do in eighty. A life of eighty years, which does in that time the work, spread out in their case over eight hundred years, is a vast step in the progress of man. Considering the present nature of man, longevity, such as theirs, would be a great misfortune. While yet human life was inert; while capacity was undeveloped; while the accomplishing power was very small, it would seem to be in accordance with Divine wisdom to

lengthen out the scope of life, that man might have time to be and do something. But as they learned, there were many reasons why human life should be diminished in its scope."

The man who gives utterance to this inane folly professes to be a minister of the gospel! He would delude his hearers into the belief that his and their miserably short, ignorant and depraved lives are noble, compared with the lives of primitive men who lived upwards of nine hundred years! We presume that in his own estimation his knowledge is far superior to that of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, who walked with God three hundred and sixty-five years, and who, because of his faith, God translated! "What a coarse, slow-growing, inefficient creature" Enoch must have been compared with the refined, fast-growing and perfect creature so highly eulogized by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. Enoch's writings must have been in existence at least three thousand years, for Jude quotes from them, and says that Enoch prophesied respecting the coming of Jesus; how long are we to imagine that the writings and memories of the moderns are to live? Noah, the progenitor of a new world, the builder of the ark in which the human race and every species of animal that we now possess, were preserved, with all his knowledge and greatness is insignificant, compared with the pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn—that is, according to the logic he enunciates.

He continues his argument in favor of short life as follows:

For many other reasons it would be unfortunate if men lived, in the full possession of their powers, to an exceeding great age. Suppose that some men in New York, whose names are familiar, who have the power of making and amassing money and property, and who wield the great administrative influence which accompanies great wealth, suppose that they, instead of passing away in a few years, and making room for others, should live five hundred years, already having scores of millions in their hands, and already wielding a mighty influence through their wealth and experience, nothing on earth could prevent their being despotic in the commercial world. What a disparity would there be! If, with the tone and temper of modern manhood, men lived five hundred years, what chance would there be for a man at fifty to cope with a man of four hundred years. How would one end of society, the upper end, by its position, by its experience, by its knowledge, by its wealth—if these were sold selfishly or despotically—weigh down on the other side! There was a divine mercy manifested in the measurement of the duration of human life in this respect; so that a man lives long enough to develop his forces and to accomplish a certain amount, but not long enough to use that accomplishment as a means of obstruction to others, or as means of despotism. When men, therefore, are wicked, and are holding high sway, we comfort ourselves by saying, "Well, they can't live forever!" And they cannot. The shortening of human life, and the dying of men in this economy of life, is very often the best event of their lives. Even of men that are quite useful, it is their duty to die; and when they die, they frequently, as Sampson did, accomplish a great work of deliverance. In life they have done, it may be, very much of good or evil; now let them take themselves out of the way, and they will do something more. When a great tree is cut down in the forest, you will see that around it are the twenty trees that before had been overshadowed and had no chance to get the sun; all now begin to lift their tops up, and to drink at the fountain of life, and start up. Now, that the old, umbrageous monarch is gone, there is a chance for many more. So there are many consolations in the death of men—if the right ones only would die.

Did any man, who had the credit of being sane, ever advance such ideas and have them listened to with any patience before? After reading them we feel thankful that such men are likely to accomplish "the best event of their lives"—die. Such an occurrence ought to be accepted as "a divine mercy." When they pass off, they certainly "accomplish a great work of deliverance." They are "the right ones" to die. We wonder how many ambitious preachers there are in Beecher's neighborhood who would find "many consolations" in the death of the pastor of Plymouth Church. We agree with him that men live long enough, if New York life is the kind of existence to be led. But is it? We should be sorry to think so. We think he may comfort himself by saying re-

specting men there: "Well, they can't live forever!" Give us, we say, if we can have our choice, the "coarse, slow-growing, inefficient lives" of the ancients with their longevity, in preference to the fast, short life so much vaunted by H. W. Beecher:

## IS IT "MORMON SOPHISTRY?"

OUR article of the 21st ult. on Gold Digging, etc., has, it appears, displeased our contemporary of the Helena Herald. He clips an extract from it which he calls a "piece of Mormon absurdity." The extract reads as follows:

"Gold and silver are useful, and sometimes very convenient; but there are other articles which are of more value to us. We did not come here to dig these metals. Our time can be better used than in digging them. Suppose the people of this Territory had spent their time since they came here in exploring the mountains, cañons and valleys in search of gold, what would have been our condition to-day? Our country, instead of being filled with a happy, prosperous and contented people, with beautiful homes, surrounded with all the comforts of life, would have had a scanty and vagrant population, if any, and the country itself, would have been a howling desert."

He heads his article "More Mormon Sophistry," and, while he admits our ability as a writer, he calls us a most bigoted fanatic. He is evidently in a bad humor. Respecting the above extract he says:

"We would refer this benighted prince of fanatics to the Territories of Montana, Idaho and Colorado.—Territories whose population are essentially composed of Miners, nearly all of whom are contented and prosperous. Nor have they any reason to complain of hard times or a 'scanty and vagrant population,' vacillating and wandering over unexplored and barren regions. It may be policy to preach such sophistry in Utah, in order to prevent emigration to civilized and enlightened countries; but candid and unprejudiced men will demand more reliable authority than the mere *ipse dixit* of this votary of polygamy, before they pronounce Montana and other mining Territories—"howling deserts."

A paragraph more irrelevant to the point at issue than the above could not very well be penned. In our article we did not allude to Montana, Idaho or Colorado; we were speaking of Utah. We described what would have been the results if the people of this Territory had spent their time in searching for gold. We did not pronounce Montana and other mining Territories howling deserts. We can scarcely think that the editor wished to misrepresent us. Is not his digestion bad? He writes as we imagine a man would who is troubled with chronic dyspepsia. But if the statement we have made in the above extract be deemed an evidence of fanaticism, then nine out of every ten men, whether "Mormons" or "Gentiles," who are familiar with the circumstances under which Utah was settled must be fanatics; for we feel assured they would agree with us in making it.

Utah was settled under very different circumstances to Montana. We had no base of supplies convenient. We had no neighboring Territory to supply us with what we needed. No people to haul food to our doors and to glut our markets with their produce. We had to raise from the earth what we needed, by well directed and continuous toil—or starve. If agriculture had not been attended to in Utah, we repeat, it would have been a howling desert. It is very well for the Herald to talk at this time about Montana and Idaho and describe the condition of the mining population; but it must be recollected that twenty years have elapsed since Utah was settled, and civilization has not stood still during that period. Facilities have increased and a mining population can now subsist—and comfortably too, where a few years ago it would have been utterly impracticable. How much Utah has contributed towards this we need not say. Impartial, thinking men who understand this subject are not averse to giving the proper degree of credit to Utah, even though her population are "Mormons."

It is not likely that the editor of the Herald and ourself can come to any agreement upon which is the better pursuit, agriculture or mining. But his article has failed to show us, and we think any other person, that it is sophistry to urge the people of Utah to stick to agriculture and the manufacture of home products instead of pursuing an *ignis fatuus*, though it have the glitter of gold. As to it being our policy "to prevent emigration to civilized and enlightened countries," that is mere bal-

derdash, which we give him too much credit for sense to view in any other light himself. The Helena Herald is a good, well-edited paper—one of the best of our exchanges outside of the large cities, else we would not have noticed its articles. But is not its editor dyspeptic just now?

## THE BUSINESS OF STOCK-RAISING.

WE have several times urged upon the people's attention the necessity of their exercising vigilance in taking care of their stock. The subject will bear considerable agitation. Stock-raising is an important interest in our Territory, and there is every probability of it continuing to be such if proper measures be taken by those who are in the business. The beef that will be needed for the men who will be employed in the construction of the Railroad, will create considerable of a demand for cattle in this Territory, and when the Railroad shall be completed, there will be a market opened for the sale of stock in which that raised in Utah can doubtless find ready sale. If we do not suffer the business to fall into decay, and the advantages we possess to pass into the hands of others, there is nothing to prevent us from competing with any other stock-producing region in these latitudes. Our range is unsurpassed, and we have an excellent climate for the business, and if it receive a proper degree of attention it can be made profitable. To be successful, however, there must be more system than there has been. Very few have given that care to the pursuit which it deserves; but those who have done so have grown rich.

When we first settled here it was within the power of every person to raise stock. The people were comparatively few, and the range was unlimited. There was scarcely a person who did not own a few animals. Thousands of head were turned out and left to summer and winter themselves without the owners' care or attention. And though it was not unfrequently the case that people lost stock, the loss was not so great as it has been since, as the range was so extensive that cattle could find feed and shelter with but little difficulty. As the population has increased and the settlements have been extended, the range has been narrowed. Stock-raising upon the old system, though still persisted in by some individuals, has not been found to pay. Thousands of dollars' worth of stock have been lost each year by this careless habit, and the only persons who have found the pursuit satisfactory and remunerative have been those, who abandoning the old plan, have conformed to the changed circumstances and carried on the business in a systematic and careful manner. It becomes more and more apparent every year that cattle and other stock cannot safely be turned on to the range to take care of themselves. They must have the personal supervision of their owners, or of employed herdsmen, while feeding in summer; and in winter, calculations must be made to feed them and not trust to the range alone for food. The raising of stock as a business must of necessity be abandoned by those who cannot bestow upon it their personal attention. This is plain. And it is also plain that we must depend for our stock upon the farmers and those who follow the raising of it as a pursuit.

We may remark, in this connection, that we have often been struck with the carelessness of many of our farmers respecting the quality of their stock. There is evidently a lack of foresight and care on this point. It is as easy, and costs no more, to raise a fine-blooded, valuable horse or cow, or any other animal, as it is to raise a poor runt. This is almost self-evident. Yet if an examination were made of the teams that brought their owners to our recent Conference and of those which come to the city with produce, &c., one would be forced to the conclusion that many of our farmers do not think so. Scrubby horses and other animals are too common. If a wise policy were to prevail, inferior animals of every kind would be disposed of, and a judicious selection made of the best varieties from which to raise what we need. We ought to have the best kinds of animals, and of grains, fruits and vegetables, and with nothing short of these should we be satisfied.

The system of permitting stock to run at large on the range month after month, without caring for it, cannot be profitable for many reasons. One of the