

## EDITORIALS.

NOTWITHSTANDING the many good points in President Grant's message, there are one or two against which exception must be taken. Our respected Chief Magistrate may be a successful general, a passable president, a respectable farmer, and an enthusiastic judge of horse-flesh and Havanas, but when to all these accomplishments he attempts to add the role of dictatorial theologian, and begins to drive stakes and run lines to define the boundaries of the religious faith and practice of others, he ventures on dangerous ground, and it is time for him to proceed very cautiously, lest he go too far and attempt too much. We have heard of such a thing as having too many irons in the fire, and also that it is a good thing to let pretty well alone. Besides, we can't all be Admirable Crichtons, and personally we cannot resist the apprehension that if President Grant shall persist in essaying the profession of theology, and dogmatically declaring that this people or that people may believe thus and so, and must not practice thus and so, he will prove an unhappy failure, unhappy because of the chagrin attending failure, because of the loss of time and means in effecting a failure, and because the world will not tolerate failure. Therefore, our friendly advice to His Excellency, if he values it, is either to let theology entirely alone, or to handle it as modestly as possible—it is really a ticklish subject, the way he seems to have taken hold of it, and there is small chance of his making any capital out of it; indeed, in our opinion, it is far more likely that he will not be able to hold his own, even with the aid of the flowery and sophistical Newman as his mentor. We do not think he will ever be able to fight it out successfully on that line, if he operates thereon all winter and all summer and all the winters and summers he may see.

At present, according to his message, the President is liberal as to faith, but inclined to set his foot down restrictively as to practice. He seems to altogether forget the declaration of the Apostle James, a gentleman quite as much of a theological authority as Newman, that faith without works is dead. A dead faith is not a saving faith, it produces nothing but a soporific effect upon the lives of men. A living faith leads to action, and when it is a true faith, and is faithfully supplemented by works, the results are beneficial to all concerned.

We are not only of the opinion that it will be bad policy on the part of the President to interfere with the religious belief or practice of any portion of the people, but we are very sure that neither he nor Congress has the slightest shadow of right to do so, when that practice does not infringe upon the civil or religious rights of others. This right of every citizen to the unrestricted exercise of his religion is one of the most glorious boons guaranteed by the constitution of these United States, and any such flagrant violation thereof as President Grant favors in his message, will be sure to work ruinously to the country at large, being of the nature of that injudicious and hurtful policy which aims to govern too much, a policy particularly distasteful to the genius of American government. We cannot witness any such suggestion or action in high and influential quarters without offering our decided protest against it, which protest we now offer solely with a view to the best interests of the country in the perpetuation uncurtailed of those civil and religious liberties which have been the pride and the boast of Americans, and we trust that our protest, respectfully presented, will be received and adopted in the same friendly, liberal, and patriotic spirit in which it is made.

"WHAT is Mormonism?" The New York Herald asks, and in its way answers the above question. The Herald is anxious to correct "the erroneous opinion, that polygamy and Mormonism are identical, and that if the former is by law abolished, under the provisions now going on in Utah, the latter will also disappear." Now it is of the kind of the Herald to be so explicit in informing the public just what "Mormonism" is, and what it is not, what principles and practices "Mormonism" can and what it cannot dispense with. But there is only one little difficulty in this business, and that is, the Herald is no kind of an authority in the matter, it is simply a blind leader of the blind. The Herald does not understand

"Mormonism," and therefore is neither able to properly define what it is, nor teach it to others in a trustworthy manner. The Herald says, "Polygamy is not vital to the existence of Mormonism at all, and were it destroyed to-morrow, it would not materially affect the religious belief of the Saints." The Herald very likely thinks so, but it must strike every reader as absurd for a paper to state that it will not materially affect a man's religious belief if he drop a portion of his religion at the bidding of another unauthorized mortal. Does not Scripture say that he who offends in one point offends in all?

Nearer the truth is the Herald's statement, that "the Mormons, so far as we have been able to ascertain, do not deny a single tenet held by the Christian." So far as we are aware, they do not deny any true tenet held by anybody. The Herald thinks the "Mormons" "differ from us" (save the mark), "not in the rejection of essential truths, but in the addition of vulgar superstitions," and the following are enumerated as among these superstitions, some of them at least—special revelation, priesthood, patriarchy, sacrifice, prophecy, and plural marriage. This, says the Herald, "is the finely spun theory of Mormonism, and these are the doctrines and dogmas which they teach," and further, "The Saints wait patiently for any other revelations which the Almighty may have to make. As things look now, however, all future revelations to the Mormons will probably be made after consultation with Uncle Sam's officials in Congress or in Utah, and through them alone." This is about equal to that remarkable judicial attempt to prohibit the Almighty from succoring an imprisoned "Mormon." The Herald concludes—that "from the foregoing synopsis it will be seen that Mormonism, in all its essential aspects, may still exist after polygamy and its superstitious abominations have been destroyed."

If the "Mormons" cherish any superstitions, that is, errors, it will be good to give them up. But neither the Herald nor any other journal can prove that plural marriage is a superstition. It is a system of marriage that has existed from the earliest times, and has always been believed in and practiced by the majority of the human race. Why, in most if not all the foremost nations of the world, plural cohabitation, even virtual polyandry, is common and is sanctioned by law, not for the honor of either sex, not for the procreation of the race, but for the abominable purpose of gratifying the lustful desires of mankind, and this avowedly.

The "Mormons" disbelieve in, discountenance, oppose utterly this vile practice, legalized or unlegalized. But they do honor marriage, singular or plural, because it was ordained of God for the wisest and noblest purposes. It is honorable in all, and when faithfully contracted and developed, the results are most satisfactory, they are purifying, elevating, refining, ennobling, and in every way beneficial.

The question, "What is Mormonism?" is very easily answered. It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it is the will of God to man, it is, in short, truth, all the truth there is. Wherever there is a true principle, that is an integral part of "Mormonism," and can no more be given up than any other true principle can. Marriage, plural marriage, is a true and eternal principle, and can no more be denied by those who have received it, than can faith, or baptism or any other true principle. A real Saint of God to whom this principle of plural marriage has been revealed, would no more think of rejecting it than he would of rejecting any other principle which God had revealed to him.

The following extracts, which we find in the Laramie Sentinel, from the message of Governor J. A. Campbell, vetoing the bill for the repeal of the woman suffrage act, passed by the legislature of Wyoming Territory, will be read with interest everywhere:

But it is said that it will degrade woman to "mingle in the dirty pool of politics." By what course of reasoning a conclusion so opposed to all the experience of mankind is reached I cannot clearly perceive. Give to a man better opportunities for his development, clothe him with responsibility, and he will endeavour to rise equal to the demands of his position. With the higher duties will come higher aims, nobler aspirations, and increased self-respect. So it will be with woman.

When her voice is potential in moulding public policy—in making laws and choosing the officers to execute those laws, and in all the ennobling, elevating duties of American citizenship—then she will rise to the higher level of a nobler life, and the inanity and frivolity of the merely fashionable woman of to-day will be unknown. Concede and assert the individuality of woman, and she will have incentive to elevate not only herself, but all the pursuits and interests with which she may identify herself. And politics will be no longer a "dirty pool," corrupting those who mingle in it, but a clear pellucid fountain bestowing life and health on the whole body politic.

To the statement so often made that the law which this bill is intended to repeal was passed thoughtlessly and without proper consideration, I oppose the fact to which I have adverted, that the law perfectly conforms to all the other laws in relation to women upon our statute book. Studied in connection with the other laws it would seem to have grown naturally from them. It harmonizes entirely with them, and forms a fitting apex to the grand pyramid which is being built up as broadly and as surely throughout all the States of the Union, as it has been built up and capped in Wyoming.

I need only instance Section 9 of the School Act which declares that "In the employment of teachers no discrimination shall be made in the question of pay on account of sex, when the persons are equally qualified." What is more natural than that the men who thought that women were competent to instruct the future voters and legislators of our land, should take the one step in advance of the public sentiment of yesterday and give to her equal wages for equal work. And when this step had been taken, what more natural than that they should again move forward—this time perhaps a little in advance of the public sentiment of to-day—and give to those whom they consider competent to instruct voters, the right to vote.

In this Territory women have manifested for its highest interests a devotion, strong, ardent and intelligent. They have brought to public affairs a clearness of understanding and a soundness of judgment, which, considering their exclusion hitherto from practical participation in political agitations and movements, are worthy of the greatest admiration and above all praise. The consciences of women is in all things more discriminating and sensitive than that of men; their sense of justice not compromising or time serving, but pure and exacting; their love of order, not spasmodic or sentimental merely, but springing from the heart; all these—the better conscience, the exalted sense of justice, and the abiding love of order, have been made by the enfranchisement of women to contribute to the good government and well being of our Territory. To the plain teachings of these two years' experience I cannot close my eyes. I cannot forget the benefits that have already resulted to our Territory from woman suffrage, nor can I permit myself even to seem to do so by approving this bill.

After reviewing the legal bearings of the act, and showing that rights once acquired and exercised cannot be taken away, His Excellency says—

"But even if we concede that these rights once acquired may be taken away, the passage of this bill would be, in my judgment, a most dangerous precedent. Once admit the right of a representative body to disfranchise its own constituents, and who can establish the limits to which that right may not be carried? If this legislature takes from women their franchises or privileges, what is to prevent a future legislature from depriving certain men, or classes of men, whom, from any consideration, they desire to disfranchise, of the same rights? We should be careful how we inaugurate precedents which may 'return to plague the inventors,' and be used as a pretext for taking away our liberties."

"For the first time in the history of our country we have a government to which the noble words of our Magna Charta of freedom may be applied—not as a mere figure of speech, but as expressing a simple grand truth—for it is a government which derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed. We should pause long and weigh carefully the probable results of our action before consenting to change this government. A regard for the genius of our institutions, for the fundamental principles of American autonomy, and

for the immutable principles of right and justice, will not permit me to sanction this change."

The Sacramento Record, as will be seen by an article in another column, is somewhat concerned as to "What Shall be Done with Utah?" Many papers and people are discussing Utah matters now-a-days, some of them rather stupidly, some maliciously, some bigotedly, and some with a fair degree of intelligence and candor.

The "Mormon problem," says the Record, "is ugly and repulsive" in appearance. All very difficult problems are, and especially so is the problem which some people, notwithstanding the salutary lesson of history, will set themselves to solve—how to put down truth. This is the pith of the "Mormon problem," the sole reason why it seems "ugly and repulsive," the reason why those who attempt to solve it find that Scripture true which says, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," and the result is, as expressed by the Record, "no practicable scheme" for the solution is found, and when a movement is made for the solution "the policy adopted is nearly as objectionable as the former indifference was." The fact is, the policy of opposition is far more objectionable and censurable than the former indifference.

The Record thinks statehood by compromise for Utah a seemingly fair and easy way of solving the problem, only that it would unduly exalt the "Mormon" people. That's the trouble—people are so dreadfully anxious to put down the "Mormons." Well, to persecute and proscribe is not the way to put them down. It is the way to put them up, far above par, as the Record seems to be aware. To those gentlemen who appear to be possessed with the "compromise" mania we may say, "Compromise, sir, why bless your souls, we have nothing to compromise. We propose to go into the Union free, untrammelled, in the full republican liberty of American citizens. Still, we should like to hear your propositions. We are American citizens and it is our duty to contend earnestly for the rights and privileges of American citizens. We do not expect more, and we should be recreant to our citizenship to ask less."

We have not space to notice all the things which the Record says, but we may say that we know nothing in "Mormonism" antagonistic to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. We do not recognize that there is any obligation resting upon the government to adopt any line of policy the main purpose of which is the disintegration of "Mormonism." The Government has no more right to adopt such an inconsistent and unwise policy than the "Mormons" would have to adopt a line of policy the main purpose of which was the disintegration of the Government. The proper policy of the Government and of the people to "Mormon" or non-Mormon, is integration, not disintegration; union, not disunion; accord, not discord; peace and order, and prosperity, not war and anarchy and ruin.

The Record, as will be seen, is one of the papers that do not consider plural marriage the whole offence of "Mormonism," hardly the head and front of it. The Record appears to be afraid of "Mormon" cohesion, although the secret of it be "the ignorance of the majority," which we are satisfied is a misstatement. Nor do we believe in "Mormonism" as a "sluggish mass of superstition and ignorance," for it cannot be denied that the "Mormon" people have manifested a remarkable degree of activity, energy and perseverance. The speculation about the Governor and Senator of Utah as a State "lost authority of Brigham Young," etc., may go for what it is worth.

The creation of a State of Utah would not create a foreign power, would not create a power hostile to the constitution or to constitutional law. It would be simply doing what is the duty, long deferred, of Congress. The "Gentle minority" in Utah would be in a similar position to the minority elsewhere. What more has a minority a right to expect? If they chose to emigrate to where their partisans were in the majority, they could do so, the railroad is open. If they chose to remain in Utah, they could do so, but they could hardly expect to be permitted "to overshadow the majority and ride rough shod over the laws and the rights of the people, as some of them delight to do now. If the 'Mormons' were to be the majority in Utah when a State would be fairly earned majority, an