

## EDITORIALS.

## A CHANGE OF PRACTICE.

THE *Examiner*, a religious paper, gives an answer to a question which has been frequently propounded of late, that is, "What must the Christian Church do to be saved." It is so divided, discordant, racked with doubts, disturbed by scandals, loosed from old moorings, shaken by science and threatened with dissolution, that the question becomes very pertinent. The *Examiner* declares that its salvation must come from within the Church itself. It says: "The only antidote for this widely spreading skepticism is higher Christian living. We do not mean that spurious sort that goes under the name of the 'higher life,' but practical, every-day conformity to the principles of the gospel in all the affairs of life."

Endorsing this view the New York *Sun* remarks:

"Right, religious contemporary! That is the only chance for modern Christianity. But did you measure the weight and scope of your words? Do you apprehend what a general and sincere attempt on the part of modern Christians to obey in all the affairs of daily life the plain precepts of Jesus of Nazareth would be? It would be such a revolution as the world never saw. It would shake and rend and shiver the whole fabric of modern society."

What the *Sun* says is true. The so-called "Christian" world, while lauding the godlike precepts of the incomparable Nazarene, has gone to the very antipodes of their practice. Religion seems to be viewed as something to exalt the feelings and stimulate the emotions, but not to descend into the minutiae of daily life. A line of demarcation is drawn between things temporal and things spiritual. Christ is to be worshipped in ceremonies and praised in conventicles, but barred out of secular concerns. God is thrust out of State affairs, and repudiated in politics. And religion and the realities of ordinary existence are viewed as having nothing whatever in common.

Every day conformity to the principles and doctrines of the Gospel, as taught by its great preceptor and exhibited in the life of its chief exemplar, would indeed make a revolution in mundane affairs. It is not reasonable to expect such a change at once. It must be the work of time, and must take place gradually. Principle by principle the doctrines of the Gospel may be incorporated in the daily practice of those who affect to believe in them, until the professors of Christianity become the living evidences of its worth, its superiority over all other creeds, and undeniable proof is given that believers are better off for their belief and that skeptics suffer loss by their skepticism.

There is one thing that the leaders of modern "Christian" churches might do in this direction that would be seen and noted by people who doubt their sincerity and take no stock in their pretensions. That is, practice the teachings of the Christian religion in their course concerning that which they call "Mormonism." It is an indisputable fact that the bitterest animosity against the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has emanated from the churches that claim the title of Christian. And the most murderous sentiments uttered in public concerning the members of this Church, calling for their destruction by physical force, have been the expressions of "Christian" ministers delivered from the "Christian" pulpit. More than that; the mobs which with rifle and ball, with torch and sword, with whip and scourge, have ravaged the settlements of the Saints, burned up property honestly and industriously acquired, hacked to pieces old men, brained inoffensive children, violated virtuous women, and sought to convert "Mormons" by pillage, arson and murder, have been incited to their deeds of darkness and personally led in their fiendish onslaughts, by professed teachers of the gospel of the gentle Jesus.

The laws that have been enacted or attempted, the essays at physical force from governmental authority, the hue and cry raised against this body of people claiming faith in and worship of God the Father through Jesus Christ his Son, have originated primarily in the animosity of priests who could not overcome by argument, doctrines against which

they had hurled all the logic and religion at their command. The same spirit is at work to-day. The voice of "Christian" preachers is: "Down with the Latter-day Saints! Use cannon and powder, musket and revolver!" Or, "Hail them to prison, bind them in chains, confiscate their property!" Or, "deprive them of the common rights of citizens, disfranchise, enslave and debase them!"

Where is the "Christian" spirit toward people, children of the universal Father—supposed to be in error. Where is the gospel method toward them alleged to be sitting in darkness? Where is the practice of that precept, "Overcome evil with good?" Has anything of this kind ever been exhibited in the course pursued by the "Christian" world towards the Latter-day Saints? Never. If a pretended attempt has been made at any time to use argument, reason and scripture—instead of the worst methods of barbarism—in dealing with us, our doctrines, aims and desires have been, in the first place, grossly misrepresented, and the pretended efforts to enlighten us have been little else than attacks upon ideas that we do not entertain.

Now, let the champions of hydra-headed and many-notioned, incongruous Christendom go back to first principles, and try to exhibit in their course towards those who see not as they see, something of the charity exemplified and taught by the founder of real, unadulterated Christianity, and try how far they can succeed by such a change of action. Then they may go on from step to step in the practice of the creed which they laud in phrase and worship in the abstract, and may in time come into the condition which the *Examiner* claims is the only way whereby their crumbling ecclesiastical system can be saved.

## THE WAY TO WIN.

THE labors of the ladies at Washington, with the object of securing woman suffrage by an amendment to the Constitution, are not likely to accomplish what they desire. They assert as a principle something that is denied by the ablest statesmen and jurists of the country; that is that the suffrage is a national right not a local privilege, and consequently is a subject for national legislation and congressional regulation. The doctrine that prevails, and which has been sustained by decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, is that while citizenship is regulated by congressional enactment, the right to vote is to be such as the different States and Territories may each determine for themselves, a privilege conferred by law, not a right inherent in the citizen.

For this reason we think that the Woman Suffrage Association makes a repeated mistake in attempting to capture the Congress on this question. Any movement to deprive the States of the powers reserved to them by the Constitution is obnoxious to conservative people and clear-minded and patriotic statesmen. The tendency in this direction of late years, is deplored by those who see that the strength of our institutions will be lessened in proportion to our departure from constitutional principles. And this effort to introduce an amendment which would take away one of the reserved rights of the respective States, will be opposed by many persons who are favorably disposed to women suffrage itself.

We think that those who lead the van in the battle for woman's rights will be successful if they conduct the campaign in detail. Concentrating their energies towards the capture of some State where the prospects for victory are favorable, when they succeed they can advance on another and another, and the force of example and the faculty of imitation being both immense, success will eventually crown their efforts over the entire country. The assault on the whole nation at once, we believe, will only result in failure, except the influence which is brought to bear through the championship of their cause by able men in either House. And this will have to be made available in the States to which they belong, before much actual good will be effected by them.

Gradually, people in the various States are conceding the point that women have individual political rights. Their influence in school af-

fairs is acknowledged to be good. The right to vote for and hold school offices is being given to women in many places. More extended political privileges are being granted in some instances, and where failure comes upon the attempts to obtain full political powers, the majority vote grows less and less at every repeated effort.

The movement in Illinois is an example. Women have obtained the right to vote there on "local option." And through their influence many of the worst whisky holes in the State have been closed. Last winter they only failed by one minority, in getting the word "male" stricken from the law in relation to the franchise and office-holding. They will try again.

In Rhode Island, "school suffrage for women" is growing in public favor as in other States, and is likely to prevail. The Providence (R. I.) *Star* says on this question:

"We believe that the most thoughtful among our citizens are rapidly coming to the conclusion that the direct and active influence of women in the management of public schools will be beneficial, and that the enactment of a law such as the petitioners ask for would be generally approved by the people of this State. We hope that our Legislature will give this subject careful and earnest consideration, and that in doing so Senators and Representatives will remember that the probability that a large proportion of the women of the State will not avail themselves of the privilege of voting on school questions, if it is given them, is no argument against granting the prayer of the petitioners. Thousands of our most substantial citizens never go to the polls, and yet no one would think of depriving them of the right of suffrage because they neglect to exercise it. The only question for our legislators to consider is whether, on the whole, our public schools will be improved by the active participation of women in the management of them. We believe they will be, and we are therefore unequivocally in favor of the measure."

This is a sufficient answer to the argument frequently advanced by opponents of woman's political rights that,

"The voting for school officers will have to be somewhat more general before an agitation for unlimited suffrage will acquire great force over the public mind. The average voter cannot be made to see the injustice of denying women, suffrage rights which they do not clamor for and will not even exercise when conferred upon them."

We notice that Governor Long, of Massachusetts, is in favor of woman suffrage, where it certainly ought to prevail if anywhere, considering the great proportion of women above men in the population, and the fact that many thousands of the women there support themselves and pay taxes also. Gov. Long, in his message, makes the following excellent points:

"I believe that the State is made more secure in proportion as every member of it of mature age and sound mind has a voice in its administration, and that no one else anywhere can be safely entrusted with the irresponsible keeping of the rights of any other. The restrictions on suffrage, and upon the right of each citizen to cast one vote and have it counted should, therefore, be as light, and the safeguards of that right as strong, as possible. It is for this reason, as well as because suffrage is a right and not a

grace, that in my judgment, women, paying taxes as they do, and with their personal interests and property subject to legislation, should secure by an amendment to the Constitution the right to vote, and thereby have a voice in the imposition of taxes on their property, and in the making of laws that affect their lives, liberty and happiness."

The Constitution referred to by Gov. Long is that of the State, not of the nation. Now let the ladies work to secure a State like Massachusetts, and then follow up their advantage in other places, and we believe that they will be able every year to score some local victory, while now they have to record an annual national defeat.

## MONOGAMIC BARBARISM.

SOME of the New York papers have been discussing the propriety of flogging wife-beaters, a bill to estab-

lish that mode of punishment having been introduced in the State Legislature. Some take the ground that although the offence is dastardly, it does not warrant the adoption of "A mean form of punishment by the State." Others consider this "mere sentimentalism," and argue that it is the right kind of treatment for brutes in human form who "have no idea what a mean form of punishment is."

We do not wish to take any part in the discussion, but cannot help some reflections on the condition of society where such a measure is considered necessary. It appears that in the "Christian" City and State of New York there are so many brutal husbands and fathers and brothers, that for the protection of women extreme measures are required in the Legislature, in addition to the societies already established in the State for the special protection of women and children.

If anything approaching to the brutality exhibited in the great "Christian" centres of commerce, religion and civilization, was to be seen—even proportionate to the numbers—among the people called "Mormons," what a cry would go out through the land about "The brutalizing effects of polygamy!" But in New York and Chicago and St. Louis and other "Christian" cities, where husbands often persuade their wives with a club, or coax them with a clenched fist, and blackened eyes, bruised bosoms and gashed heads are no uncommon witnesses of monogamic affection, we do not hear anything against the monogamic system.

We do not say that the horrible and numerous evidences of human savagery that abound in monogamic communities are arguments against monogamy; we merely refer to them as sad realities that indicate the barbarism existing where people people lament about or cry out for vengeance against the "Mormons" on account of polygamy, and to show the propriety of a little "Christian" philanthropy and "Christian" indignation at home, instead of so much wasted on a people among whom such scenes as are common in the exalted social circles of monogamy, are as rare as punishments for murder in California, or expulsions of known libertines from the highest circles of refined "Christian" society.

## NOT TENDERED.

THE Washington correspondent of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* telegraphs:

"Washington, Jan. 24.—I am satisfied, after careful inquiry, that Mr. Blaine has not yet been tendered the Secretaryship of State. Neither has Mr. Watterson been offered a place in the new cabinet, notwithstanding the rumors to that effect."

Just so. "Neither has Mr. Watterson," is rich. We might add, neither has George Francis Train, nor Eli H. Murray, nor Mrs. Partington, nor Eli Perkins, nor Petroleum V. Nasby, nor Susan B. Anthony.

## JOURNALISTIC FAIRNESS.

THE New Zealand papers, although violently opposed to "Mormonism," seem to be acting very fairly towards our people in that country, giving space very frequently to letters vindicating our cause, and in reply to untruths published against the Saints and their doctrines. Elder George Batt, who is laboring zealously in that part of the world, has been favored by the press in this particular, and it seems ever ready to stand up for his principles and refute erroneous statements.

By the last Australian mail we received a number of papers containing communications on "Mormon" affairs, and among them is one written by a person named John Lunnon, who, it appears, came to this city from Canterbury, New Zealand, and who says the "Mormon" priesthood, as a rule, consists of liars, debauchees and murderers, who are shaking with fear that the truth should come to light." He makes a number of general but no specific charges as "information for the deluded ones in New Zealand." To this Bro. Batt and the local president of the Auckland Branch severally respond in the Auckland *Herald*, refuting Lunnon's falsehoods, and mildly giving his true character, showing that he was

advised not to come here as "his conduct would not secure him peace in Utah," also that he has left his poor and aged mother unprovided for and in the Government Asylum.

Bro. W. W. Day testifies to the character of the missionaries in reply to Lunnon's aspersions, and we take the following extract from his letter:

"They have dwelt in my house, I have visited and held continual intercourse with them, and have much pleasure indeed in testifying as to the purity of their lives, and the nobleness and earnestness of their general conduct and character. Of the many that I have had the pleasure of knowing here, I can safely say that they have been what zealous ministers of the gospel ought to be, and they have been ready and willing at all times to sacrifice themselves and their comforts for that which they know to be religiously true, and have manifested a care for their converts commendable in every particular. I have never at any time observed any immodest action or heard the expression of an immodest thought on their part, and this testimony can be given by many in Auckland, both Latter-day Saints and those not belonging to the church."

A lady named Mrs. Isabella Lucey also comes out in the papers with an able defence of the doctrines of the Saints and of the course and teachings of the Elders. The *Herald* having published a silly article advising the imprisonment of "Mormon" Elders and the confiscation of the property of "Mormon" converts, a gentleman not connected with the Church responds with the following communication, which appears in the same paper, under the caption of "Let Every Man Speak."

"SIR—In your trenchant leader of Thursday on Mormonism, you suggest and approve of very strong measures. You regret that Mormon advocacy cannot be stopped by committing Mormon apostles 'to jail for a period,' and you suggest that 'New Zealand might say, when a man joined the Mormon fraternity, his possessions should straightway pass to another.' In fact, you approve of suppressing Mormonism by imprisonment and confiscation, and regret that such action cannot be taken. This, Sir, is surely a great falling away from liberal principles, and if we admit that it is legitimate to suppress by such means as you suggest, the dissemination of opinions or beliefs, what a violent and personal conflict will be re-introduced into society! The world has seen enough of imprisonments, confiscations, hangings and burnings for belief and opinion's sake, and is, I think, done with that method of convincing people, for a time at least. The worst men of conflicting opinions now can do is to fling hard words at each other, and that you did rattle hard and strong words about the heads of the Mormons in your leader, no one who reads it will doubt. Mormons accept the doctrines of Christianity and its ceremonies, therefore their offence is not unbelief. I infer from your remarks that their dire offence is polygamy; and how can that be stopped? Of course it can be stopped legally, but if the people are otherwise disposed, it cannot be stopped actually. So long as women are to be found who will take shares in a man, and are not ambitious of a whole one, so long will there be polygamy, and the law cannot stop it. It is common among the Maoris, and is frequently to be met with, though, unlegalised, in European society. It was common with the Bible patriarchs and kings. Abraham had two wives, Jacob four, David ('the divine Psalmist') four. Polygamy is not adultery, nor a breach of the Seventh Commandment, and is a subject on which there is great scope for argument for and against. However, it is contrary to English law, and there we may leave it. A criterion has lately been set up for testing the value of society isms, new and old. It is this, that the ism which contributes the smallest percentage to the criminal calendar is the best ism for the State; and, strange to say, several of our most popular and old-established isms, when tested by this criterion, showed the heaviest percentages of crime. I do not remember that the Mormons were conspicuous, but whether or not, this criterion is the most practical that public men and journalists can use in determining the public value of an ism. At any rate it will not do in this year of 1880 to stifle thought and load it with pains and penalties. There is only one