

EDITORIALS.

THE LATELY DISCOVERED SPAULDING MANUSCRIPT.

SOME time since we published a statement from *Bibliotheca Sacra* to the effect that a manuscript story by the Rev. Solomon Spaulding had been discovered at Honolulu, Hawaii, in possession of Mr. L. L. Rice. As the discovery completely upsets the anti-"Mormon" theory that the Book of Mormon owed its origin to the Spaulding story, the subject has awakened considerable interest. We learn from the *Saints' Herald* that the editor of that paper wrote to Mr. Rice in relation to the matter and received a reply, from which we make the following extract:

"The Spaulding Manuscript in my possession came into my hands in this wise. In 1839-40 my partner and myself bought of E. D. Howe, the Painesville *Telegraph*, published at Painesville, Ohio. The transfer of the printing department, types, press, etc., was accompanied with a large collection of books, manuscripts, etc., this manuscript of Spaulding among the rest. So, you see, it has been in my possession over forty years. But I never examined it, or knew the character of it, until some six or eight months since. The wrapper was marked, 'Manuscript Story—Conneaut Creek.' The wonder is, that in some of my movements I did not destroy or burn it with a large amount of rubbish that had accumulated from time to time.

It happened that President Fairchild was here on a visit, at the time I discovered the contents of it, and it was examined by him and others with much curiosity. Since President Fairchild published the fact of its existence in my possession, I have had applications for it from half a dozen sources, each applicant seeming to think that he or she was entitled to it. Mr. Howe says when he was getting up a book to expose Mormonism as a fraud at an early day, when the Mormons had their headquarters at Kirtland, he obtained it from some source, and it was inadvertently transferred with the other effects of his printing office. A. B. Deming, of Painesville, who is also getting up some kind of a book, I believe on Mormonism, wants me to send it to him. Mrs. Dickinson, of Boston, claiming to be a relative of Spaulding, and who is getting up a book to show that he was the real author of the Book of Mormon, wants it. She thinks, at least, it should be sent to Spaulding's daughter, a Mrs. Somebody—but she does not inform me where she lives. Deming says that Howe borrowed it when he was getting up his book, and did not return it, as he should have done, etc.

The Manuscript does not purport to be "a story of the Indians formerly occupying this continent;" but is a history of the wars between the Indians of Ohio and Kentucky, and their progress in civilization, etc. It is certain that this Manuscript is not the origin of the Mormon Bible, whatever some other manuscript may have been. The only similarity between them is, in the manner in which each purports to have been found—one in a cave on the bank of Conneaut Creek—the other in a hill in Ontario County, New York. There is no identity of names, of persons or places; and there is no similarity of style between them. As I told Mr. Deming, I should as soon think the Book of Revelations was written by the author of Don Quixote as that the writer of this Manuscript was the author of the Book of Mormon. Deming says Spaulding made three copies of "Manuscript Found," one of which Sidney Rigdon stole from a printing office in Pittsburgh. You can probably tell better than I can what ground there is for such an allegation.

I knew Joseph Smith, Jr., and Sidney Rigdon, when they were located at Kirtland; and I once visited Smith, in 1841, when he was at Nauvoo. I have heard Rigdon preach, both as a Campbellite and as a Mormon. I knew Eliza R. Snow well: she was a poetic correspondent of mine when I published a paper at Ravenna, Ohio.

"As to this Manuscript, I cannot see that it can be of any use to anybody, except to the Mormons, to show that it is not the original of the Mormon Bible. But that would not settle the claim that some other manuscript of Spaulding was the original of it. I propose to hold it in my own hands for a while, to see if it cannot be put to some good use. Deming and Howe inform me that its existence is exciting great interest in that region. I am under a tacit, but not a positive pledge to President Fairchild, to deposit it eventually in the Library of Oberlin College. I shall be free from that pledge, when I see an opportunity to put it to a better use.

"Upon reflection, since writing the foregoing, I am of the opinion that no one who reads this Manuscript will give credit to the story that Solomon Spaulding was in any wise the author of the Book of Mormon. It is unlikely that any one who wrote so elaborate a work as the Mormon Bible, would spend his time in getting up so shallow a story as this, which at best is but a feeble imitation of the other. Finally, I am more than half convinced that this is his only writing of the sort, and that any pretense that Spaulding was in any sense the author of the other, is a

sheer fabrication. It was easy for any body who may have seen this, or heard anything of its contents, to get up the story that they were identical."

NOT LOGICAL NOR CONSISTENT.

EX-SENATOR PADDOCK, of Nebraska, has distinguished himself since his appointment to the Utah Commission, as being by far the most gushing and voluble member of that august body. He is full to the brim on the "Mormon" question, and the moment he is jostled by a press reporter he slops over. Some time ago the dispatches said he had been interviewed. In an eastern paper a fuller account of his diagnosis of the Utah situation appears, and we herewith present it. It is chiefly interesting as a curious example of how a man of fair intelligence can throw his reason, like physic, to the dogs, and persist in looking steadfastly at one side of a question, practically refusing to acknowledge that another even exists. Mr. Paddock is reported to have said:

"My belief is that the main object sought to be accomplished by the address is a revival of religious enthusiasm among the Mormon people, so as to make apostasy or schism in the church on account of the proceedings against the practice of polygamy more difficult, if not altogether impossible. The Edmunds bill has been enforced with so much vigor and success, the sentiment of the country is so unanimous in support of the determined policy and recent decisions of the supreme court have been so pronounced in favor of the law and its methods for suppressing polygamy that many good and strong men had begun to think and say to each other that it would be better to discontinue the practice. Several persons under indictment pleaded guilty, threw themselves on the mercy of the court, promised not again to offend, and many were released with slight punishment. All such performances were bitterly denounced by the Mormon press and people. In my opinion the mass meetings, the address which is mainly a defense of the polygamic covenant and the whole demonstration against the enforcement of the Edmunds law, for that is all there is of it, were gotten up to counteract the influences at work inside and outside the church against polygamy. Being thus considered the movement has been a great deal of a success. The Mormon people certainly could not expect to satisfy the President of the country by an appeal based upon the divine reign and sanction of polygamy that the Edmunds law is a bad law, that the Congress which passed the act, the Supreme Court which affirmed it and the officers who have executed it have all been parties to a monstrous wrong, but by such argument and denunciation of all who have been connected with making or executing the law they have undoubtedly, temporarily at least, stiffened the weak knees among the brethren and increased the difficulties of the situation. I believe the action will have the contrary effect from that hoped for by the Mormons or by some of them, and will demonstrate the necessity for still more stringent legislation. Regarding the denunciation of the Commission and its acts the Senator said that no set of officers charged with the responsibility of enforcing a law in Utah affecting the institution of polygamy and determined to do their duty were ever more conservative in all their acts, or less influenced by prejudice than the Commission. Proofs of this are abundant. The Commission have decided important questions in accordance with the Mormon view, believing the same to be right, thereby drawing upon themselves criticisms from the Gentile press and people. They have stood between the two extremes, and have often been unable to satisfy either, but have always endeavored to secure the best results from the Edmunds law so far as they had to do with it, and their efforts have been successful throughout. The commission has possessed the respect and confidence of the liberal Mormons and the best sentiment among the gentile element in Utah. In the report the commission has recommended an amendment to the Edmunds law, and it is because these amendments are unpalatable, and if adopted by Congress would greatly strengthen the movement against polygamy, that the Mormon indictment against the commission is so strong." He thinks the amendments will be adopted and that President Cleveland and his administration will firmly uphold the laws for the suppression of polygamy in Utah.

One might be excused for exclaiming—"Incongruity, thy name is Paddock." The honorable gentleman starts out with an expression of his belief that the "Main object sought to be accomplished by the address is a revival of religious enthusiasm among the 'Mormon' people," etc. As to the result he says: "Being thus considered the movement has been a great deal of a success." Then he suddenly floors his own conclusion by asserting: "I believe the action will have the contrary effect to that hoped for by the 'Mormons.'"

The puff given the Commissioners is a piece of personal horn-blowing that smacks of the odor of egotism, while the statement that many of their decisions were favorable to the "Mormon" view, believing the same to be right, is

exceedingly racy. But richer still is the slap which he unwittingly administers to the "Gentile press," which, he holds, did its best to induce them to decide in a way they believed to be wrong. The credit taken for martyrdom in standing by what was believed to be right in the face of a scurrilous fusillade from a partisan press, will not overwhelm anybody with admiration for such an exhibition of self-sacrifice. The inflation of this bubble is somewhat reduced, endangering a collapse, by the well-known fact, that the bias of the Commission was anti-"Mormon" from the beginning. This journal frequently took occasion to point out the errors and wrongs that were being perpetrated on account of that condition. It is notorious that the News drew attention strongly to each of the mistakes, to call them by the mildest admissible name, perpetrated by the Commission, for the perpetration of which they were brought up standing by the Supreme Court of the United States. Surely that kind of conservatism which includes the usurpation of functions foreign to the jurisdiction of the official who wields them is not of a character to be boasted about.

Mr. Paddock claims that the Commission "have always endeavored to secure the best results from the Edmunds law," but how can he deny that they went beyond the scope even of that infamous act, anti-"Mormon" results being the object aimed at? There is neither dignity nor consistency in the position of ex-Senator Paddock, and so far as his own credit is concerned on the question upon which he appears over-anxious to empty himself, his conversation might be greatly improved by the introduction of a few brilliant flashes of silence. His fellow Commissioners appear to be sufficiently sensible and politic to pursue a course of comparative reticence on the subject. We apprehend that they can scarcely feel flattered at the way in which their cause has been championed by the gentleman from Nebraska.

although in other respects his magnanimity was not so visible to the naked eye. He made this astonishing response: "You may live with either one, provided you live with her only as your wife. Unlawful cohabitation consists in living with more than one woman as your wives."

The Court had a short time previous defined unlawful cohabitation under the Edmunds Act to be the "holding out by one man of more than one woman to the world as his wives." So far as that point is concerned, if a man discarded his legal wife, in acting upon the Judge's liberal definition, and recognized and lived in the "habit and repute of marriage" with one plural wife, he would be solid so far as the ruling is concerned. He would be "holding out" but one woman as a wife. But while he was "holding out" but one, the law would be "holding out" another. Consequently, although only one was being "held out" by him, two would be held out in the relationship of wives to the holder out. The question is whether the man placing himself in that position would or would not be held responsible under the law as a double holder out. According to Judge Zane's ruling of Saturday, May 9th, he would not. But if a case of that character were brought before that functionary there is but little reason to doubt that the person who imagined he was sailing in smooth, legal and matrimonial water would find himself in the penitentiary at the earliest practicable date on which he could be landed there by the Court. It may be said furthermore that if the friend of "Bothered" contemplates throwing off his wife simply because of her willingness to sacrifice herself for him, should he land in prison in consequence the general grief at the event would not be sufficiently overwhelming to cause extensive popular prostration. And if that be his mind he should be advised to have himself appropriately labeled.

The second question is more striking than its predecessor. If "Bothered" wishes his friend to "fall from the frying-pan into the fire," he should tell him, by all means, to go through a marriage ceremony with the plural wife whom he might select as the single sharer of his love, and the object of his protection. By that step his legal wife being alive "and undivorced," the maximum term of his probable prospective imprisonment would be extended to five years and a half, in place of six months, with a proportionate increase of the monetary penalty. In addition to this questionable comfort he would have the reflection that his children born subsequent to January 1st, 1883, would be no more legitimate than they were before the performance of the ceremony. The ceasing to "hold out" more than one woman as wives would in such a case not affect the question of polygamy, which is the act of marrying a woman while another who occupies the relationship of wife to him is living and undivorced, minus the exceptional conditions provided in the law.

PERTINENT INTERROGATORIES.

The following interesting communication reached us yesterday.

May 21st, 1885.

Editor Deseret News:

A friend of mine who seems bewildered because of the late rulings upon the "Mormon" cohabitation question, and who wishes to make no mistake in the future, propounds the following, which I submit to you knowing your ability in solving problems.

I will first state the case, which is as follows: My friend's first (and I suppose legal) wife has expressed her willingness that he should hereafter "hold out" exclusively his second (or plural) wife, and he wants to know:

First—If he can legally and lawfully do this without divorcing his first wife, for she says though she is perfectly willing to be left alone in the future, yet she is not willing to submit to a divorce.

Second—Should he hereafter "hold out" exclusively his plural wife, is not a marriage necessary to make the children legitimate? For according to the law those children only born of polygamous parentage up to January 1st, 1883, are legitimate, or will the ruling of Judge Zane stand good in law and legitimize their offspring?

Third—Though his first wife should consent freely to such an arrangement to-day, might she not change her mind to-morrow, and would he not be placed in jeopardy in more ways than one should she institute proceedings against him?

All of which is most respectfully submitted by,

BOTHERED.

Our correspondent is in perplexity; so is his friend. He evidently desires to place us in the same predicament. We confess to inability to solve the conundrums he propounds without coming in direct conflict with the rulings of the astute Judge of the Third District Court. What makes the situation all the more difficult and awe-inspiring is the fact that when people in this region have the temerity to differ from a Federal official, appointed without the consent of the populace, they are accused of treason. The very least charge ever hurled at those who exhibit such extravagant hardihood is that they are in revolt against the personified quintessence of 55,000,000 of people reduced to a fine focus by a not yet explained process of concentration. But we are cornered by "Bothered," and see no alternative but to give the best explanation at hand under the circumstances.

The position of his honor Chief Justice Zane upon the first question propounded was defined by him when Mr. A. M. Musser was before him, on the 9th instant, to receive sentence under conviction for unlawful cohabitation. The prisoner, who has three wives, interrogated the learned Judge how, if he were disposed to live in accordance with the Edmunds law, he could place himself in harmony with it. He put the following question to the Court:

"I would like to ask you, am I allowed to choose which one of the three I am at liberty to live with?"

The Judge was, on that occasion, evidently in a mood to place a liberal construction upon the statute,

the most sacred concerns of life. It is time enough when such manifestations are made compulsory under the barbarous crusade upon men, women and children. Neither is it a noble part for people to play, to make it a business to inquire into the private concerns of their neighbors and take special pains to communicate their industrious gleanings as profound secrets to ever acquaintance they chance to meet.

Those who are involved in the present issue on the side of the party attacked must stand or fall upon principle. Honor and integrity cannot be relinquished as the price of safety.

ANOTHER VICTIM.
A SPECIAL to the News from Beaver informs us that another victim has been added to the swelling list of the anti-"Mormon" crusade. We learn of good authority that all classes of the community in which Brother Fotheringham is a resident, without respect to creed or condition, regretted his prosecution and conviction. We understand the feeling was akin to a sensation, owing to the respect in which the gentleman, well known for his straightforward qualities, is held. Judge Boreman has shown, in this instance, a considerable degree of humanity as compared with certain recent exhibitions of judicial fanatical spleen in the Court of the Third District. He did not seek to take advantage of the helpless position of the prisoner and endeavor to humiliate him by requesting a verbal guaranty regarding his future conduct. Assistant Justice Boreman was evidently satisfied with the injury inflicted upon the gentleman without adding to it the ingredient of insult.

His comparatively humane disposition toward the prisoner was further manifested by striking the middle count in relation to the imprisonment penalty in place of applying the maximum limit. Had the offer of liberty been made to Brother Fotheringham at the expense of manhood by the renunciation of principle, no one who knows him supposes for a moment that he would have accepted the condition. He is made of stuff that is too sterling for that. He goes to prison, but he takes with him the good feelings of his brethren and the esteem of all classes of people acquainted with him who can appreciate uprightness and integrity.

IT IS FALSE.

AS WILL be seen by a dispatch published elsewhere, the agent of the Associated Press in this city is, as usual, making desperate efforts to convey to the public outside of Utah an impression that the "Mormons" are resisting the officers of the law. Notwithstanding the repeated assertions to the contrary, we again declare that there was no resistance to the recent outrageous service of processes by a notorious horse thief and a murderer, who were employed as deputy marshals in Bear Lake Valley. On the contrary, a great deal of forbearance was manifested by the people assembled in Paris in allowing such scoundrels to enter a public meeting to serve a warrant upon one of the men who occupied the stand, and afterwards to parade in a swaggering manner about the streets without being molested in the least. In estimation of some people who are aware of the outrageous character of the persecutions to which people in this region are now being subjected, the "Mormons" are altogether too patient and long-suffering, but we are well aware that the hounds who are engaged in and are urging on the crusade against them would like to see some resistance on their part, as it would afford them a plea for calling for military force and appealing to the vengeance of the nation to aid them in the accomplishment of their vile objects.

The press dispatcher who fabricates the falsehoods about the "Mormons," which are continually being wired from this city east and west, would glory in seeing the "Mormons" resist, so long as his own carcass was free from danger, and when he sends a telegram like that we now allude to, "the wish is father to the thought."

The Saints have had ample provocation, but we are pleased to be able to say they have not offered anything more than lawful and peaceful resistance to the unjust laws, and the villainous execution of the same, of which they are now being made the victims.

WHAT A TRAVESTY!

JOHN L. ROBERTS and Wm. J. Pratt, the two brethren who were raided upon and arrested in the night time by deputy marshals in Bingham County, Idaho, recently, having plead guilty to the awful crime of cohabiting with their wives, are to be sentenced to-morrow.

And so the parody on justice continues—honorable, conscientious, pure-minded men, who respect the laws of God and never injured nor infringed in the least upon the rights of their fellows, who would rather suffer death than defile themselves, and would protect virtue at the peril of their lives, being prosecuted and im-