

THE CHRISTIAN METHOD WITH THE "MORMONS."

THERE is a religious paper published in cultured Boston called *The Watchman*. It is an eminently pious journal, professedly "Christian" in all its departments. It is an old-established representative of New England sectarianism and has for its motto: "Watch ye; stand fast in the faith." The *Watchman*, in reviewing President Garfield's inaugural address, takes up the polygamy question for the purpose of offering its own method of dealing with "Mormonism." Here are the suggestions offered by that strictly "Christian" organ of orthodoxy:

"Let the franchise be taken away from all women in the Territory, and thus let the polygamous husband be compelled to support his wives without the compensation of political power. Moreover, let all men who are guilty of polygamy be declared ineligible to vote and to hold office. It may be difficult to discover who are guilty in all cases, since the Mormon man and woman deem it a duty to perjure themselves in behalf of their church whenever it may be necessary. But in many instances detection can be affected, for there are thirty or forty thousand 'Gentiles' in the Territory, every one of whom is eager to contribute his share of the work necessary to destroy the iniquitous institution by whose means he is placed at a great disadvantage. But there is a third measure, which would prove more effective than either of those we have mentioned. Let the children born of polygamous unions, or out of wedlock, be disfranchised for ever."

How sweetly the spirit of the Savior of souls is breathed in the foregoing paragraph! What divine charity for supposed sinners! What tender desire to reclaim the erring, to seek and to save that which is deemed to be lost. Not only are men who practice a form of religion different from that of the Boston branches of divided Christendom, to be punished politically for their defection, but the women supposed to be victims of male transgressions are to be included in the chastisement, and even the innocent children are to be visited for the alleged sins of the fathers with the heaviest political penalty!

Supposing that the "Mormons" are as black as painted by the "Christian" *Watchman*, is this the way with sinners pointed out by the Master, whom the *Watchman* professes to follow? Is it not a strange thing that these dear, good, solemn souls who claim to be the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, can find no method of dealing with the "wicked Mormons" but by the gospel of force, the ordinance of the civil law, or the evangel of the sword and the gun? Why is it so? What is the reason that the great persecutions of this Church, in which men, women and children have been butchered, property confiscated, houses burned, and thousands of people driven from their homes, have been incited and directed by professed ministers and disciples of the pitiful and tender-hearted Christ?

If the answer is given truly they would say, "Because we cannot overcome them with other means. Argument has no power with them, scripture does not meet their case. They beat us with such weapons as these, and if we let them alone they will convince the multitude, and thus our craft would be in danger. They must be crushed out either by the force of law or the power of popular fury."

Why are the learned, wealthy, influential champions of fortified and entrenched orthodoxy, so fearful of the encroachments of 150,000 "Mormons" upon a nation of 50,000,000 "Christians"? Those fearful "Soldiers of the Cross" rend the air with their cries of "danger to the nation," and they dare not trust to the influences which it is their province to wield to overcome alleged error and protect asserted truth, but appeal to the arm of the civil law, and the strength of the national government, against an unpopular creed and a people whose numbers are as nothing in comparison to their own following. If they were not conscious of the inherent weakness of their cause, they certainly would not be so timid about pitting it, on fair grounds, against the obnoxious and numerically insignificant foe, nor so anxious to invoke the secular power to stamp out a religious institution. Aside from the anti-Christian character of such a course it is a virtual confession of

conscious feebleness, an admission of the vigor and strength of their diminutive opponent. The "Christian" Goliath is afraid of the "Mormon" David.

Another thing. Our kind religious enemies invariably resort to absolute untruth as well as ingenious misrepresentation in placing our case before the public. As an instance the *Watchman* says: "The Mormon man and woman deem it a duty to perjure themselves in behalf of their Church whenever it may be necessary." Will the *Watchman* be kind enough to prove this broad and direct accusation? It is not new by any means and has been no doubt been adopted by the *Watchman* in that "Christian" charity which "thinketh no evil." It is a mere assertion against which we present a simple denial. It is not true. There is no excuse for it. It is a positive falsehood. Will the *Watchman* require us to prove a negative? That is what our "Christian" assailants generally demand of us. They make a groundless accusation, and when we deny its truth want us to prove our denial, instead of presenting evidence of their own assertions.

Has the *Watchman* ever reflected on the commandment which says: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." We commend that divine injunction to its Christian consideration, and also the penalty pronounced in the Apocalypse against those who love as well as those who make a lie. And with all respect for its orthodox position as a Bostonian religious organ, we would further suggest a little reflection on the benediction of the Redeemer, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy," and when breathing out threatening and destruction on the "Mormons," to think on His authoritative declaration, "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

WHERE TO COMMENSE THE CRUSADE.

A TALENTED and witty regular correspondent of the *Grand Rapids Times*, in a review of President Garfield's inaugural address, takes up the "Mormon" question. We do not endorse all his ideas but think with him that there are other things to do before our "Christian" friends in the east, or our national guardians at Washington, undertake to settle our marriage relations, however wrong they may appear. The correspondent says:

"Exclude Mormonism." Yes, exclude Zola and Camille and free love and harlotdom and divorce and all that sinks an ancient household order into sentimental animalism. How will you do it? Even King Arthur, according to the poet Laureate, found his "noble order" of the "table round," broken up by the woman question. Is American society fit to punish polygamy? Had it been pure there never would have been a Mormon. Judging from recent scandals, I advise, if there is to be a holy war against the favorite religion of the patriarchs, it ought to begin with a crusade against the licentiousness within our city limits."

A GROWING INDUSTRY.

THE silk industry of the United States is gradually gaining ground. There are 383 factories and 8,467 looms known to be engaged in silk manufacture, besides many others not reported. Pennsylvania is credited by the special census agent with 49 establishments, Connecticut 28, Massachusetts 22, New York 150, New Jersey 108. Nearly one-half of the operatives engaged at these factories are women. The wages paid during the year 1880 footed up \$9,107,853; the gross value of materials and supplies was \$22,371,300; and the manufactured articles reached the value of \$40,975,285. The capital invested in the industry was no less than \$18,899,500. The manufactured goods consisted of sewing silk, machine twist, floss, dress goods, satins, the silks and scarfs, millinery silks, handkerchiefs, ribbons, laces, braids, bindings, fringes, trimmings, cords, tassels, upholstery, and military trimmings, coach laces and trimmings, hatters' and fur trimmings, and mixed goods of almost every description now in use.

Worth, the Parisian fashion king, has declared the American made

silk superior to the European article, and this has very much increased the demand for the home production, and given an impetus to the trade. It is very gratifying to see the advance of this industry, furnishing employment as it does to over 34,000 work people. But it is a reproach to the country that it is almost entirely dependent upon foreign sources for its supply of the raw material when, there are so many places within its borders adapted to sericulture.

Utah is still in the back ground in regard to this industry. The late President Young was very earnest in his endeavors to urge the people in this direction. The climate here is admirably suited to the growth of the silkworm and the production of the *moris multicaulis*, the natural food of the valuable little creatures that supply the rich material. Old people and young children can be engaged in the care and feeding of the silk worms, and it is a light employment though requiring steady attention during the season. The industry can be made very profitable, if conducted economically, and can best be managed in large families, where little labor needs to be hired. The market for the cocoons or for spun silk is always lively, and though China supplies large quantities produced under Mongolian cheap labor, the freight cost forms a protective tariff in favor of our home product.

We hope the interest aroused during the past two or three years in this industry will not be allowed to die out in Utah. Mulberry trees can be had at a small cost, they make a pleasant shade and will beautify farms if planted to mark their boundaries; there are thousands of nimble fingers, not otherwise remuneratively employed, which might be used to turn an honest penny in feeding the growing worms; and cocooneries can be erected at small cost suitable for the purpose required.

The United States are advancing in the manufacture of silk; let Utah come to the front with her contribution of the raw material.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD AND THE "MORMON" QUESTION.

THE Sacramento *Record-Union* has still another sensible word to say about the "Mormon" question. The following editorial relates, no doubt, to the press dispatch professing to announce what the President said on this subject to a member of the Senate. We take these press reports *cum grano salis*, but all the same, the remarks of the *Record-Union* are pertinent, and show that the writer has given more thought to his theme than editors usually bestow upon this subject:

"We are sorry to see a disposition in Pres. Garfield to 'protest too much.' If what he is reported as saying about the question of polygamy be true, we shall not anticipate any practical measures from his administration in that regard. As a member of Congress for half a generation, Gen. Garfield has necessarily been kept informed as to the obstacles and difficulties of the Mormon question. He has seen Congress take it up half a dozen times, handle it awkwardly, and drop it again. He is aware that it has been impossible to get any anti-polygamy legislation executed in Utah, and that it must continue to be impossible to do this just as long as the people who believe in polygamy constitute three-fourths or four-fifths of the community. And therefore when President Garfield, knowing all these things, asserts that polygamy must and shall be suppressed, we can only conclude that he is talking to Buncombe, since we cannot believe that he has discovered a new way of doing that which he has often before failed to accomplish. Polygamy will never be suppressed by legislation. We make bold to hazard that prediction now. It will, on the contrary, derive strength and support from any hostile movement, and it will be clung to with increasing fanaticism the more vigorously it is assaulted. It needs no prophetic gift to tell this, for it has been the history of every such experiment from the dawn of history. President Garfield possesses no magic charm to overcome the laws of nature withal, and therefore it is a fair and just presumption that he will encounter the same insurmountable obstacles which have forced his predecessors to postpone the settlement of this question."

THE WASHINGTON METHOD.

THE Washington *Capital* generally takes a humorous view of the puritanical outcry against the "Mormons," but in its sarcasm usually strikes a heavy blow at the sham morality of the anti-polygamy fanatics. The annexed brief paragraphs, which we clip from that paper, are samples of the pungent style in which it touches up the pious and political hypocrites who profess to be so shocked over "Mormon" morality:

"Polygamy, as practiced in Utah, will doubtless have to go. But if the Saints are wise they will take time by the forelock and make a few alterations in the form of their pet institution, which will enable them to proceed in enjoyment of its substantial conveniences as if nothing had happened.

Let them send a delegation here to study and report upon the methods of polygamy as practiced in Washington, and then go and do likewise."

We are much obliged to the *Capital* for its sage advice. We understand full well that the outcry against us is simply because we marry wives, not because we live with them. But our real horror of the Washington style of spurious polygamy, is just as great as the pretended aversion of the Puritans to the Bible method. And we would far rather risk our social system, with a prison as a threatened penalty, than the system hinted at by the *Capital* with perfect immunity and the benefit of being in the fashion.

A WIDE DIFFERENCE.

THE Washington *Capital*, in discussing the Jewish question in Germany makes this remark: "The way for Jews to escape persecution is to cease being Jews," and adds: "This is a way out of oppression so easy and plain that we wonder much it is not more frequently followed." The same rule is applied to the "Mormons." But the change advised is not quite so easy as some people might imagine. In the case of the Jews, race as well as religion is in the way. If the Jews were to pretend to be Christians—we have very little faith in a full blooded Jew's professed conversion—blood would tell in spite of creed. A Jew might cease to be a Jew in religion, but he would still belong to Judah and among bigots and bogus "Christians" be an object of derision, aversion or persecution.

The "Mormons" would please a certain class of pious Puritans if they would cease to be "Mormons." But should this be asked of them in a land of religious and political liberty? Is there not room enough in this vast domain, over which the eagle of freedom is supposed to spread its protecting egis, for a people whose faith is antagonistic to the forms and professions of the majority? If not, the boasted toleration of this unsectarian government is a fraud and a delusion.

The *Capital*, pursuing the subject, says:

"We suggested once to a Mormon. We said to our polygamous friend, 'Why shock the Christian world by marrying your mistresses? The Constitution and Christian practices are as good to you as to a congressman. You can have as many mistresses as you please, provided you don't marry them.'"

It struck us that it was extremely absurd to make such a disturbance over so small a difference."

But this seemingly small difference is in fact very great. The *Capital* puts it in an amusing and perhaps ironical manner. But it touches the marrow of the difficulty. It is perfectly true that the "Mormons" might practice any kind of licentiousness after the fashion of the corrupt world, and if they did not entirely escape censure would at least be untouched by national law. They would not, however, cease to be the objects of "Christian" malignity. The chief persecutions which the "Mormons" have undergone were suffered before plural marriage became a part of their faith and practice. Since its incorporation into their creed, they have been comparatively safe from the enmity of the sects and the fury of religious mobs. To cease being "Mormons" they would have to drop a great deal more than "polygamy," and if they were to abandon the one obnoxious tenet, the cry for further concessions

would increase until they entirely forsook the Church established by divine revelation in the nineteenth century.

This "small difference" that the *Capital* talks about, forms as wide a gulf as that between Abraham's bosom and the abode of Devils. "Mormon" plural marriage and the keeping of a mistress are "diverse and alien." They are exactly in the same relation as marriage with one wife, and cohabitation with a woman for mere lust. We are aware that with some monogamic people there is very little difference between the two, and that consists in the fact that in the first case a ceremony is performed which gives it legal and social recognition. But if it is a mere attempt at the sanctification of the other, the sentiments of some men on these subjects are expressed in the remarks about plural marriage. They cannot conceive of anything in it as a motive but the gratification of animalism. Why? Because that is their conception of marriage in any form. They are bestial in their nature, and cannot rise to any higher thoughts and motives than those that govern themselves.

"Mormon" plural marriage is merely an extension in practice of the principles that underlie matrimony, as ordained of God for the happiness and exaltation of man and woman in time and eternity. If it is practised in the spirit of lust, that is a departure from its design and principles. The keeping of a mistress and the marriage of a plural wife under the "Mormon" system, have nothing whatever in common. They are opposite in essence, they are different in their results. We would despise a man who would place his plural wife over the great void on the domain of the kept mistress, and consider those who would turn them adrift under any circumstances or any kind of pressure, legal, social or religious, beneath the contempt of any honorable man or woman on earth.

BY TELEGRAPH.

PER WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

AMERICAN.

WASHINGTON, 2. — Commander Henry Glass, of the sloop *Jamestown* at Sitka, Alaska, on March 4th, has submitted to the navy department a lengthy report upon the condition of affairs in that territory. He says: I have received information from all the principal tribes from the Chilkat River to Fort Wrangle, and everywhere the Indians are at peace among themselves, and show every disposition to remain on good terms with the white inhabitants. He has arranged at Sitka a conference between delegations of Kozlznos and Stickeen Indians, and hopes to settle amicably a long standing dispute between them. Since his last report only two Indians had been punished for drunkenness. No doctonies is now made in Sitka by either the whites or Indians, the traders having kept good faith on their agreement not to sell molasses, or cheap sugar for purposes of distillation. Having deprived the Indians of their chief occupation in winter by breaking up their stills, Commander Glass sought to interest them in habits of industry. He gives a detailed account of his experiments in this direction. First taking an accurate census of the population, a native police was uniformed and each man placed in charge of a certain portion of the village. The village itself was next cleaned and thoroughly drained, and the houses whitewashed and put in order. The best results, he says, have followed this as shown in the improved appearance of the Indians, and their manifest industry in making baskets and wood carving. All children of proper age have been enrolled, and their attendance at school is compelled. One hundred and fifty children are in daily attendance, while a number of adults some as old as 40 or 50 years, are voluntarily attending. So far the changes and improvements in the Indian village have cost nothing to the department. Commander Glass, however, requests permission to expend \$200 for the purpose of fitting up an old building as a hospital for Indians. In view of the probable speedy increase in the mining population of Alaska, Commander Glass suggests that the *Jamestown* be allowed to remain at Sitka until June or July. He desires, also, to continue the Indian policy he has adopted.