

EDITORIALS.

THE ideas expressed concerning, and the course of conduct adopted by different parties towards, the "Mormons" open a wide field for observation and reflection. Some of those ideas and some of the conduct but too often evince an amount of bigotry and fanaticism that is really deplorable. One of the worst features connected with many of the traducers and accusers of the "Mormons" is that they appear to be utterly oblivious to the fact of their continually manifesting the bigotry and fanaticism which they so readily ascribe to the "Mormons." While on this subject it may not be necessary for us to point out any particular or notable instances for the verification of the truth of what we now advance; still it may not be out of place to ask whether recent occurrences would or would not justify an individual in taking the position that the course of certain officials has proved them to be imbued with as much fanaticism, bigotry and jesuitism as could well be crammed into any other specimens of the *genus homo*.

We add jesuitism because when an individual has pre-determined the attainment of any particular object, and in his efforts for the accomplishment of that object manifests unscrupulousness of conduct, it may be justly concluded that that individual works upon the hypothesis that "the means justifies the end," which is understood to be the doctrine of the Jesuits. Taking the downfall of "Mormonism" as the object desired, could certain officials have manifested any greater amount of bigotry than they have, or could they possibly have shown themselves any more jesuitical than they have done in their efforts to destroy the religious and civil liberties of the Latter-day Saints? An analysis of their conduct would almost lead one to the belief that they had been endeavoring to demonstrate on what a small amount of principle they could manage to subsist.

It is a correct principle, one that should always be acted upon, that men should not attempt to abolish or destroy a system of things until they have devised or discovered a superior system with which to supply the place of that they desire to become extinct. Now "Mormonism" has proved to be beneficial to its adherents, and as it has proved beneficial so far as the influence of its principles have already extended, were the application thereof extended an hundred or a thousand fold the benefits derived would be the same, and in a proportionately wider and more happy-fying degree.

"Mormonism" has gathered together its thousands of votaries, and built up a happy, virtuous and orderly community. Heretofore the people of Utah have had the reputation, and deservedly, of being the best ordered body of people extant; but already the scene begins to change, so far as this City is concerned, at least, and the change, it is needless to say, is for the worse. Those who are so anxious that "Mormonism" should be extinguished are not animated, therefore, with that anxiety because they have a better system of religion to offer, for that would be impossible. Most of those who are working against the interests of the "Mormons" either directly or indirectly, encourage the unhappy change in the aspect of matters generally here.

Some try to justify themselves in their efforts to stifle the exercise of religious liberty by the "Mormons" on the ground that the principle of patriarchal marriage is opposed to the laws of the country. This is a flimsy excuse and a false position. It is true that a law, if such it may be called, was passed by Congress in 1862 for the suppression of polygamy in the Territories, but this brings in the question as to the right of Congress to pass such a law, for as the Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law that will interfere with the religious liberties of the people, the law is unconstitutional, and consequently, in reality no law at all.

Some parties have gone so far as to say that plural marriage is not a religious principle. This of course is the extremity of foolishness. If a man is to be told what he shall or shall not embody in his religious faith and practice, how much liberty does he enjoy? None whatever. If the Latter-day Saints say that plural marriage is a part of their religion, who has a right to say that this is not a part of their religion? Making swelling pretensions of allowing religious freedom to all and then practically prescribing religious limits is, to say the least, hypocritical

in the extreme, and excessively tyrannical.

Were this matter tested in a fair, open and above-board manner, there would be no reason for "Mormons" to fear the result, as such a test would, of course, result in their favor, they being on the side of right and the Constitution. Certain officials seem to be as conscious of this as ourselves, and so, instead of acting in a straightforward, honest and conscientious manner, must needs, in order to carry out their nefarious designs, twist and manipulate Territorial statutes to bring them to bear on certain cases foreign to the intent of such laws. This is a sneaking course, and altogether unworthy of men who make any pretensions to fairness of conduct. It smacks too much of the tricks, comparatively speaking, of the cowardly skulking Indian, who instead of choosing to meet a person, whom he had singled out as his enemy, openly and on fair ground, lies in ambush and endeavors to pick off his unconscious mark from behind a tree, a bush, or a hillock.

Those who by any means whatever seek to take away a people's liberties are the next of kin to murderers. The difference is that the latter destroy human life, while the former, had they the power, would destroy that which makes human existence desirable, for what is life without liberty, glorious, untrammelled liberty?

So far as we are concerned, we see no reason why the Latter-day Saints should cringe, or bend, or yield up their religious freedom, and so far as we know they have no intention of doing so.

Territorial statutes may be twisted to a misapplication of their true intent, and divers cases may be ingeniously hatched and numerous other means may be used to annoy, vex and irritate the Latter-day Saints into the commission of some overt act, but the people have had an experience which has taught them wisdom and forbearance, and to trust in God who will bring them triumphantly out of every difficulty.

There are persons, doubtless, who laugh at the idea of people rusting in God: such matters. They think it foolish to look confidently to the Almighty for succor. We think, however, that those who rely upon such a reliable source show their good sense, and that they will by no means be disappointed in their expectations.

HENRY SMITH, of Albany, was elected Speaker of the House in the New York State Legislature. Henry Smith took the chair and made a speech of a radically reformatory nature, of the following character—

More work and less play.
Continuous session.
No recess.
No going home to see your wives and split kindling wood.
Work every day.
That's the only way to produce short sessions.
Too many office seekers around the Capitol.
Better go West and eat potatoes on shares.
Hanging around the Capitol makes men idle.
Offices not created for any such purpose.

Now if Speaker Smith spoke thus just to unburthen and satisfy his conscience and please grumblers and other folks inclined to be or professing to be tolerably honest, he may get along. But if he spoke his real feelings and meant what he spoke, and means to stick to it, he is likely to have a rough time, for the same authority that tells us of his speech also tells us that at the caucus of the Republican members held in the Assembly chamber, "every office-seeker in the State was on hand, with four cousins and two uncles to assist." Does anybody think they are going West to eat potatoes on shares? Not unless they can impose themselves upon one or other of the Territories, in some sort of official capacity, which heaven forbid. Too many here of that sort already.

THE Sacramento Reporter catalogues the political conventions on the calendar like this—

Democratic State Convention, New Hampshire, Feb. 6, that's to-day: Governor Weston probably renominated.

National Labor Reformers' Convention, at Columbus, Ohio, Feb. 21. Julian probably nominated for President.

Radical State Convention, Indiana, Feb. 22.

Democratic State Convention, Oregon, April 10.

Radical State Convention, North Carolina, April 17.

Conservative State Convention, North Carolina, May 1.

National Mass Convention, of Liberal Republicans, at Cincinnati, May 1. Anti-Grant candidate, either Trumbull, Julian, Gratz Brown, or Governor Palmer of Illinois.

"Grant's National Convention of office-holders and brothers-in-law," more reverently speaking the Grant wing of the Republican party, at Philadelphia, June 5.

Republican Executive State Committee, Texas, at Houston, second Tuesday in June (11). To nominate State electors for Presidential election.

Last but not least we may mention the People's State Constitutional Convention, at Salt Lake City, Feb. 19.

COMMENTING upon Utah affairs, the San Francisco Examiner talks on this wise—

We think the easiest remedy is the admission of Utah as a State, with a clause in its Constitution declaring that the practice of polygamy thereafter shall be felony, preventing holding office, the transfer of property or the exercise of any civil right. As regards what occurred prior to the adoption of the Constitution, a clause could be found to settle the rights of children and the division of property. Congress could insure Utah the representative population in less than six months by now passing an enabling act setting forth that when Utah adopted a constitution containing certain provisions as now determined by Congress, she would be admitted. An act of this kind would seal the fate of polygamy and restore in a prompt manner one of the richest mineral regions of the world to morality, happiness and prosperity. It would also end the reign of licentiousness which has maintained an organized existence in a vast Territory, with the sanction of local law, for more than twenty years.

There are several things in the above paragraph in which we cannot agree with the Examiner, and we are quite as much interested in Utah affairs as the Examiner possibly can be.

True enough, the easiest remedy for many evils would be the admission of Utah as a State, such evils as an unjust judiciary, and the deprivation of the people of the Territory of many of the rights of American citizens.

It would be satisfactory enough to us if Congress would pass an enabling act for the admission of Utah. As to the kind of constitution required for such admission, the Federal constitution has these express directive provisions—

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

The United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

A constitution republican in form and clearly constitutional in letter and spirit it would be more than likely to meet with the approval of the people at large in this Territory and should meet with the approval of Congress.

There is no justification for "declaring that the practice of polygamy thereafter shall be felony," etc. Morally polygamy is no crime. Technically it can be made a crime only by violating the convictions of four-fifths of the human race now existing, and the convictions of the chief nations of antiquity. To punish and proscribe for plural marriage is contrary to morality, contrary to the Bible, and contrary to good statesmanship.

An act proscribing such marriage would not restore "morality, happiness and prosperity," nor "end the reign of licentiousness," as the Examiner well knows. On the contrary, such an act would encourage "a reign of licentiousness," and destroy "morality, happiness, and prosperity," in a Territory where the former never did reign, but where the latter have prevailed to a remarkable degree.

When the Examiner states that "the reign of licentiousness has maintained an organized existence" in Utah, "with the sanction of local law, for more than twenty years," the Examiner states a barefaced lie, and what it knows to be a barefaced lie. It is well known to every candid observer that there has been less licentiousness and more morality in Utah than in any other State or Territory in the Union. It is also getting to be well known that licentiousness has been pushing into organized existence here the last year or two

because it has been inaugurated and established and sanctioned and sustained by those very persons most rabidly opposed to the system of plural marriage.

AMERICA is a proud nation, and, doubtless, there are some things of which it may have reason to be proud, but there are numerous other things for which it should put on sackcloth.

In some matters the nation has been, for some time, taking a downward tendency. One reason for this declination is that America is essentially a nation of politicians. There could be no objection to this, provided that policy were always consonant with sound principles, for if this were so the tendency of the nation would be progressive and upward, instead of downward and retrogressive. But it is the general rule for politicians to work to the interests of party at the sacrifice of the principles of justice and equity.

There is scarcely a surer sign of a nation's tendency to decay than to see corruption in the administration of the laws. It is indeed a pity that judicial and other legal responsibilities should be placed on the shoulders of truckling politicians, who let party motives sway them when official duties call them to act in matters wherein party interests are at stake. And even aside from political considerations, numerous instances could be cited wherein vast legal questions have been directed into desired channels by the magic influence of mammon.

An upright judiciary is the bulwark of a nation, and when that becomes rotten it is a sure indication that the whole fabric will, sooner or later, fall to pieces.

The evidences of political and judicial corruption in the nation are far too numerous to mention. Affairs in South Carolina, New Orleans, Texas, the stupendous Tammany frauds, the custom house transactions, and numerous other little affairs in various parts of the Union indicate which way the wind blows.

With regard to the doings of official tricksters in this Territory, they are well known here, and every honest, sensible man can have but one opinion concerning them.

"ALL Europe is preparing for a revolution," says an exchange, and so it seems. Nor is the preparation confined to Europe. Just now there is a very pretty chance for a war between England and America, the bone of contention the Alabama claims, particularly that portion of the claims which is for "indirect" or "consequential" damages.

If the two great Anglo-Saxon nations have no more sense than to go to war, there is a very good opportunity brewing, but if they wish to avoid such a calamity, it can be easily done. Either England contravened the laws of nations, in regard to the Alabama, or she did not. If she did not, America should say no more about it. If she did, she should pay reasonable damages. Those damages it would be better, for several sufficient reasons, to be understated than overstated. If it is intended to push hard for indirect or consequential damages, it will be very easy to extend the quarrel until doomsday, and then have it further than ever from settlement.

SAN FRANCISCO and California have been for some time exercised upon the loathsome physical penalties of a certain evil, and a movement has been on foot to sanction the evil by licensing it, under the plea of reducing the prevalence of the physical effects. The S. F. Call says—

Mr. Wand, of the State Senate, has given notice that he will introduce a bill for licensing disreputable houses in this and other towns throughout California. This is one of those abominations which it is unpleasant even to discuss; yet strange as it may seem, there are men who advocate the passage of such a law. They would cause this and other cities in California to become sinks of iniquity. They would strive to make respectable that which is the disgrace of modern civilization.

The S. F. Post favors the idea of legislative sanction and thus takes the Call to task—

If this is not hypocritical cant of the worst and meanest sort, we have yet to see a specimen of the article. The Call knows that Mr. Wand and the gentlemen who advocate this measure, instead of wishing to make vice respect-