

QUIET IN THE TABERNACLE.

The Patti concert in the Tabernacle has established the reputation of that large and unique building for acoustic properties rarely found in any large structure for public gatherings. The softest, sweetest strains of "Home, Sweet Home" were distinctly heard in every part of the Tabernacle, and the manager stated that the singers found it so easy to pour out their liquid melody, that they were afraid to give voice to their strongest notes lest the echoes should be found too powerful. This speaks well for the sagacity and architectural ability of the late President Young, under whose supervision that fine house of worship was constructed.

But the general plaudits of the musicians whose performance charmed the multitude that attended the concert, will surprise many of our people who have been often mortified at General Conferences, if sitting in or near the centre of the lower part of the building, by losing a great deal of the instruction imparted through failure to hear the speaker. And the question will arise, why is it that soft sounds of music could be heard, when words uttered with a loud voice often fail to reach the ear distinctly?

There may be reasons for this apart from the cause to which we desire to draw attention. We do not design now to touch on the respective effects upon the auditory nerve of musical strains and verbal utterances. But we are satisfied that the great cause of the failure of some people to hear discourses at Conferences, is the disturbance made in the body of the building, chiefly by children.

If the same quiet which prevailed at the Patti concert were preserved in a Conference congregation, we believe that most of the speakers would be distinctly heard in every part of the Tabernacle. But so many juveniles are brought there and permitted to move about, that the noise they make and the movements of persons in charge of them cause such a rustling and so many echoes, that only the sound, without the sense, of the public speaking reaches the ears of the people in the centre of the floor. The occasional crying of infants is but a temporary disturbance, sufficient of course to be disagreeable; but the movements we have referred to are the worst nuisance and make the greatest noise and confusion.

To remedy this, it appears to us that measures should be adopted to stop all shifting about during the services. Children should not be allowed to walk up and down the aisles; and when people take their seats they should be required to remain at least while the speaker is upon his feet. There ought to be ushers enough distributed throughout the building to secure order. People with infants should sit where they can easily retire if the little ones become implacable. Every effort should be made to keep profound silence during a discourse or the presentation of any business before the Conference, and those who cannot keep still had better stay away, or if compelled to retire, to do so without noise.

Special efforts in this direction we believe would produce astonishing results. Quiet in the congregation, and distinct enunciation rather than a strained voice and great volume of sound on the part of the speaker, will, we feel assured, make our large gatherings in the Tabernacle more generally enjoyable and far more profitable than they have been on some occasions. If people cannot hear they become restless, and by their movements make hearing still more difficult. Whereas, if the speaker is heard imperfectly there is the greater need for silence and close attention.

We make these remarks for the benefit of our friends who are flocking into the city from all parts of the Territory for the purpose of attending the General Conference. Keep quiet, brethren and sisters, and help to preserve perfect order, and you will hear and be edified.

AN "INTER-OCEAN" MOBOCRAT.

The Chicago *Inter-Ocean* has somebody on its staff who needs a straight-jacket. Every once-in-a-while he gets cranky on the "Mormon" question. Recently he has advocated personal violence as an argument against our missionary system. The Elders of this Church are the most disinterested and self-sacrificing ministers of the Gospel to be found in the missionary field, from any society in any part of the globe. They travel "without purse and scrip," without fee or reward, for the simple purpose of calling people to repentance and obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And yet the *Inter-Ocean* crank would have them opposed by the weapons of mobocracy, and prevented from fulfilling their duties by maltreatment and abuse. He says:

"When Mormon missionaries visit an honest, law-abiding people and try to coax young girls off to Utah to be 'sealed' to satisfy the lust of the El Mahdis of the Desert, it is a good time to unseal the tar cans and pick the geese. A large number of such missionaries have just been sent out to various States, especially favoring the South. Give them a coat that they will remember. It is about the only remedy left for dealing with such moral lepers."

Falsehood and ferocity are equally mingled in that small paragraph. It is also a confession of moral and intellectual impotence. There are no missionaries sent out to coax young girls or anyone else to Utah, and there are to-day more victims to lust in one precinct of Chicago than have ever been in Utah from the beginning of its history. A man who advocates tar and feathers as the only argument possible against any religion or system of proselytizing, is unfit for the light and freedom of the nineteenth century. He is an anachronism. He missed his turn, and instead of coming into the world in the dark ages and among the torture advocates of Rome or Spain, he has been permitted for some unknown reason to breathe the air and blink in the sunlight of the latter days.

How he would have rejoiced over the flames of an *auto da fe*, chattered with delight at the cracking of bones upon the wheel, and grinned while calling for the piling on of the faggots and the turning of the thumb-screws. But now he can only screech for tar and cry out for feathers. The *Inter-Ocean* people had better look out for him. He has an object in posing against "Mormon" immorality. He wants to divert attention from himself. We warrant that if his own deeds were made manifest there is no "moral leper" in the sin-sick city by the lake in Illinois that is in worse condition of soul than the false and ferocious *Inter-Ocean* advocate of intolerance and mobocracy.

A HINT FOR OHIO.

LAST November Ohio was affected with an outburst of virtuous indignation. Its anger flashed across the country to Utah. It was stirred to the depths with wrath at the supposed lawless situation here. "Mormonism" must be extinguished and methods were adopted to attain this object so devoutly wished. At Cleveland the head-centre of a secret organization was formed with a slashing sum of money contributed for sines of war. This secret combination, intent on dark deeds, with an ostensibly virtuous object in view, sent out twigs and branches, there being doubtless an offshoot in Cincinnati. In fact every city, town and hamlet in Ohio, was to have its society subordinate to the Cleveland parent stem, and from there the puritanical maze was to spread throughout the entire country, so that the nation, with Ohio leading the van, might pounce or rather slide like an irresistible avalanche of morality upon distant and supposedly degraded Utah, and wipe the "Mormon" blot from the face of the earth.

The spectacle was a grand one. Probably it was not known before that there was so much theoretic morality in the hearts of Ohioans, but who can doubt it after their intrinsic virtue having taken such definite though secret shape? The nobility of the Ohio attitude is intensified by the fact of the movement manifesting so much self-abnegation. The object was to crush out an imaginary evil in Utah. The self-denying nature of the effort was exhibited in the contribution of so much money and the expending of so much virtuous indignation and energy and putting so much endeavor forward to extinguish a myth in Utah to the detriment of the home morals of Ohio.

We hope that the good people of that State have learned the force of the old truism, "charity begins at home," and that it is not always in order for a community to ignore its own welfare and place themselves on the sacrificial altar for the sake of strangers. Had this truth been more fully sensed, perhaps Ohio would have been saved her late affliction, and the streets of her chief city would not have been moistened by the blood of many of her most respectable citizens. Some millions of dollars worth of property would have been saved from the torch of an incendiary and murderous mob, and the people and military, which should be as a unit in the preservation of peace, would not be excited by the fires of passion the one against the other.

All this teaches the salutary lesson that men and communities should occupy their chief attention upon matters connected with their own immediate surroundings, leaving others to do the same. Should they have a little time to spare after that they may with some consistency undertake to shape the morals of the people of more distant parts. Reformation, like charity, should begin at home. It is proved to a demonstration, that Ohio has no time to use in that direction outside of her own confines and jurisdiction. Utah can take care of herself, and her morality, so far as the "Mormon" portion of it is concerned, occupies a higher plane than any other part of the world has reached.

AN UNFORTUNATE AFFAIR.

News has reached us of a serious difficulty which broke out at St. Johns, Apache County, Arizona, a week ago last Tuesday. The rupture was between some parties who reside in the old or Mexican part of the town and others in the new portion, occupied mainly or almost exclusively by Latter-day Saints.

The Saints have greatly improved

the country upon which they have settled, and in consequence aroused the jealousy and cupidity of some of the more unscrupulous among their neighbors. A couple of white desperadoes, evidently leagued with others, on the day named above, went upon a lot which had been settled and partially improved by Don. C. Babbit, and began putting in posts and fencing. Mr. Babbit approached them and protested against the proceeding, when one of them struck him a blow upon the face. He seized a shovel with the intention of retaliating, when the two ruffians drew and leveled their pistols on him. Seeing that further resistance would cost him his life on the spot he withdrew for the time being.

After this occurrence Bishop David K. Udell, A. M. Tenney and William Gibbons proceeded to the Mexican part of the town and appealed to the better class of residents to use their influence to put a stop to such disgraceful proceedings as land-jumping and violence. Their effort in behalf of law, peace and good order was treated with sneers and contempt and their mission was a failure.

Don. C. Babbit and several others moved a house upon the land over which the dispute had arisen and began fencing the lot. A large mob from the Mexican part of the town had, by this time, collected, there being between seventy and eighty armed with pistols and some with guns. Six or eight of them drew their weapons and told the brethren to desist. The only one of Mr. Babbit's party who made any retaliatory movement was a young man named Charles Mallory, who pulled out his pistol. The more cool-headed men who were present saw that one precipitate act would cause a terrible conflict, accompanied with bloodshed, and no apparent end to the trouble, so they seized and held him. While Mallory was in this position the Sheriff, a Mexican, disarmed him, but made no effort to treat the parties on the other side, who had drawn their weapons, after the same fashion. While Young Mallory was held by the brethren a cowardly ruffian of the other party struck him a blow on the face.

At this juncture the Sheriff ordered all parties to disperse and leave the ground, which they did.

Some time afterwards about forty armed men from the Mexican part of the town, accompanied by many others, appeared upon the lot in dispute, tore down and totally destroyed the house placed upon it by Mr. Babbit and demolished the other improvements. Bishop Udell again appealed to the more respectable portion of the people among the residents of the Mexican part of the town present to intercede to have such unlawful doings stopped, but his efforts were unavailing, being treated similarly to this first attempt in the same direction.

An attempt was made by some of the residents of the new part of the town to find the sheriff, that the disturbance might be officially put a stop to by an officer of the law. He was nowhere to be found, however, having evidently kept out of the way on purpose.

On the following morning, a week ago last Wednesday, Bishop David K. Udell and eight other brethren were arrested on a charge of "unlawfully assembling and refusing to disperse when ordered to do so by the sheriff." They gave bail for their appearance for examination on Monday last, when it was expected they would waive a preliminary investigation and be bound over to await the action of the Grand Jury. As a matter of course the charge is groundless, and cannot be made to hold by anything like fair means.

The rupture is a subject of deep regret, as it unsettles affairs generally, and makes matters very unpleasant. It is to be hoped that the better judgment of the respectable portion of the inhabitants of the old town of St. Johns will prevail, and that they will do their best to prevent land-jumping and violence. The instigators and supporters of the disreputable proceedings are probably a few unscrupulous persons, who should not be permitted to overawe citizens who are in favor of peace and good order, nor to incite the more ignorant to unlawful deeds.

WOLVES IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING.

A JOSEPHITE apostle named Blair has been holding forth in San Francisco on "Utah and the Mormons." A synopsis of his fulminations is given in the *Chronicle*. He told the people that "thousands of Utah Mormons had been won over to the Josephites;" that "violence had been used towards the Josephites in Utah;" that "it was dangerous even now to openly advocate the Josephite precepts in Mormondom;" and that "Joseph Smith's own son had been threatened with death if he preached his 'infamous doctrines' in Utah."

These wilful and abominable falsehoods are samples of the stuff that Blair dealt out to a small audience in Montgomery street last Sunday evening. Then he offered his remedy for the "Mormon evil." It was, "enforcement of the laws against polygamy, backed up if necessary with ten thousand soldiers." "The leading polygamists must be punished." "They must submit or be compelled to leave the country."

No stronger argument against

"Josephiteism" need be adduced than the spirit and disposition manifested by its leading advocates. They join with the most rabid in urging violence and endorse the policy of persecution. Unable to convince they would resort to force. And they are "hail fellows well met" with those who would use the same weapons against the present leaders of the Church as were pointed with effect against the martyred Prophet and Patriarch, whose doctrines they pretend to believe but upon whose real lives and teachings they endeavor to cast discredit. They come in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

A WORD IN TIME.

A GREAT many persons take advantage of the large influx of people from the country at Conference times to make money by various subterfuges. Numbers of the unwary and unsophisticated are entrapped by them. The pitfalls are frequently in the form of special sales, when goods put up are invariably disposed of at an "enormous sacrifice." The vendor is generally gifted with a glib tongue and frequently gives the truth a wide berth. He makes it a point to show that the sale has been established for the express purpose of benefitting the purchasers and that the person selling the goods might lose money on them. To suspecting people familiar with the ways of the world these wordy wiles are thin as air, but it is astonishing how many people are deceived by them.

We advise the people to view these sales specially established at times when large numbers of folks are congregated in one locality, as institutions to enable those who conduct them to make all the money possible at the very smallest practicable cost to themselves. This ought to be self-evident to almost everybody, but unfortunately it does not appear to be so. People in that line of business are not around throwing themselves away for the benefit of the public, and we hope our Conference visitors will keep that fact in their "mind's eye." The safest and generally most profitable way to trade is to deal with people conducting business on legitimate principles.

HAVE WE ANY INHERENT RIGHTS?

This republic is a Union of Free and independent States. In uniting upon the basis of certain fundamental principles, these several commonwealths retained their individuality, and surrendered no rights to the Federal Union but those which were essential to the welfare of the Confederation and were expressed in the ordinance, agreement and compact called the Constitution of the United States. The objects held in view by this union, were "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty."

These independent States had thrown off allegiance to the British Government, because that government had trespassed upon rights which the States deemed "unalienable." And to secure and perpetuate those rights for themselves and their posterity, the people of these several commonwealths agreed to vest certain general powers in a common government, established and sustained by the consent of the governed. The Constitution was framed and agreed to, not with the purpose of setting up a dominant power to curtail the rights and privileges which they were entitled to enjoy as separate sovereignties, but to ensure the maintenance of those rights and privileges effectually. That this might be thoroughly understood, the powers of the General Government were distinctly specified and limited. And lest inferences might be drawn encouraging the exercise of powers by the General Government not expressly granted by the States, Articles Nine and Ten of the Amendments were added as follows:

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

"The powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This places the respective rights of the General Government and of the several States in their different spheres, in a clear and distinctive light. No inferential powers may be lawfully claimed by the former, no other rights than those specified are relinquished by the latter. Also it is plainly declared that the States themselves have no rightful powers but those that come from the people. Each State is to be governed within its own sphere according to the will of its own citizens. The people or Legislature of one State cannot make laws for the citizens of another State. The State is not the author of power nor the bestower of rights to the citizens, but the people are the source of all authority, and the officers who exercise it are not the rulers but the servants of the people. In like manner the General Government does not confer rights and give

powers to the States or to the people, but derives all its own authority from the States and from the people; and its officers, from the highest to the lowest in all its departments, are the employees not the masters of the citizens.

The tendency of the times is towards the enlargement of the powers of the General Government and the consequent diminution of the powers reserved to the States and to the people. That "we are a Nation, with a big N," is affirmed by many, and that this Nation is the source of political power, is one of the heresies springing from that assumption. It should be observed that the United States when spoken of in their Federal capacity are always referred to in the plural, whether in the Constitution or in other authoritative documents. "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies"—Article iii, section 3 U. S. Constitution. "Neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction"—Article xiii, sec. 1 Amendments to the U. S. Constitution.

This Government, then, is a Union of several republics, each preserving its own identity and each deriving its powers from its own citizens. Whether individually as States or collectively as a Confederation, it is the PEOPLE who are sovereign, and they have no rulers. One of the basic principles of this governmental structure is the political equality of all citizens. The Declaration of Independence announces this as an indisputable axiom. And it also proclaims that the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are inherent. That document is not law, but the principles it enunciates are fundamental to our system of government. The grievances against which it protested, and for refusing to redress which the British Government was cast off and repudiated, cannot be repeated by the Government of the United States towards any of the citizens thereof without doing violence to those essentials and to the Constitution by which that Government was created.

One of the duties and obligation of the United States is to see that each State has a republican form of government. There is no authority given to the General Government to institute any other form within the limits of the public domain. New States may be admitted into the Union if they are republican in form, and "Congress may make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States." But, stretching the meaning of this grant of power from the States to the Congress to the full extent claimed for it by the advocates of centralization, it cannot be construed to give any department of the Government, or all departments combined, authority to set up or exercise any power that is not republican, or which is contrary to those vital principles that give life to the whole body politic.

It is evident that the Constitution contemplates a union of States only—free, independent sovereign States; no other kind of commonwealth is hinted at in that sacred instrument. But the public domain extends largely beyond the limits of these States, and citizens have taken up their abode thereon, thus departing from the supervision and authority of the respective States, but continuing to be citizens of the United States, owing allegiance thereto and being entitled to their protection. It has become necessary that some form of government should be locally established for their benefit. And the question arises, what kind of government shall it be and from whence shall its authority spring. The genius of our national and State institutions, the voice of the Declaration of Independence, the solemn tones of the Constitution, all unite in proclaiming that the local government among these citizens must be republican in form, and that it must come from the people themselves. But certain modern politicians have taken up with the heresy that Congress is supreme, and that it has exclusive jurisdiction in those portions of the public domain outside the limits of the States, and can establish just such local governments as it pleases, and that there is no inherent power in the people dwelling there and no inherent rights; that Congress is the source of all political power and these citizens derive what they gain from the gift of the General Government!

This is reversing things with a vengeance. It is an entire revolution of principle. It is putting the servant in the place of the master. It is making the creature the Creator. It is putting the stream higher than its source. The General Government, representing the States in the aggregate, has authority over the public domain. And when a body of citizens dwell upon it unorganized into a State, it has the right to exercise such supervision over them as is necessary for the general welfare compatible with republican institutions. They have no right to set up a monarchy within the limits of the United States, and the General Government has no right to establish anything subversive of the rights which inhere to the citizens or of those principles which are essential to republicanism. A government in which the people have no voice cannot be lawfully established in the United States by Congress or any other body or power. Every citizen, whether in or out of a State, has the inherent right to liberty.