

of woman's inferiority. It is founded in reason and nature, which show that in some things man is superior to woman, while in other things woman is superior to man. As a father, man has capabilities that a woman has not, and as a mother, she is his superior. The paternal powers of the husband are far greater than the maternal powers of the wife, and it is much better for the mother that those powers (unequally but not unjustly distributed), shall be exercised in accordance with reason and nature than wasted, yea prostituted, as they are when forced upon an unwilling and incapacitated recipient. Plurality of wives does not argue woman's inferiority to man on general principles. It admits the equality of the sexes as two parts of a whole humanity. But that man is in his sphere superior to woman and that woman in her sphere is superior to man, cannot be successfully controverted. And only in those things in which man is by nature and constitution superior to woman does plurality of wives convey the idea of woman's inferiority.

It does not "disregard her womanhood, her rights and her claims," as asserted without proof by Judge Zane. On the contrary, it recognizes the womanhood, the rights and the claims of the entire sex, by opening the way to wifehood and maternity of all who desire—and what woman does not—to enter into their charmed circle, while the kind of monogamy that he champions bars out millions of earth's fair daughters from filling "the measure of their creation." Thus plural marriage provides for the greatest happiness of the greatest number and is, on Judge Zane's rule of reasoning, therefore both moral and right.

His honor jumps to the conclusion that a plural family must be unhappy, because it "includes all the elements of domestic discord." Even so the musical scale also contains all the elements of discord. But it does not follow that discord is always the result of the combination of sounds or the association of individuals. Harmony is produced by the same elements in either case. But this needs a guiding mind and a proper influence. The influence of religion is potent in promoting harmony and dispelling discord. And it must not be forgotten in discussing "Mormon" plural marriage, that religion is the dominant influence in the arrangements by which it is effected and carried on. This is not "superstition and fear," as the Judge intimates; it is regard for God's holy law and a desire to do His will. This subordinates "passion," subdues "rivalries," quells "animosities," and brings about the reverse of the conditions that Judge Zane paints from the images of a disordered imagination. It gives an opportunity, in the most eminent degree, for the exercise to the fullest extent of all the Christian virtues. As a matter of fact, the children in plural families, instead of disagreeing and contending in the way Judge Zane considers inevitable, as a rule, have less conflict than is common in monogamous households, and the children of different mothers are usually less disposed to quarrel with their half sisters and brothers than with their own full relatives. Facts are stronger than theories, and what is known more potent than that which is imagined, even on the judicial bench.

Instead of tending to "make marriage a means of gratification of passion and bestial lust," as rashly asserted by his honor, it demands and requires self-control, self-denial, the sanctification of the body till it triumphs over animal desire and is guided by principle instead of lust; and it cannot be successfully practiced in any other way. And we will inform Judge Zane for his own private benefit that whether he believes it or not, there is a thousand-fold more male continence among "Mormon" polygamists than among the same number of "Christian" monogamists taken from any part of the civilized world. We know what we are talking about, and the voice of confidential physicians and of the abused wives and mothers of Europe and the United States would bear us out in this statement, if they knew enough of "Mormon" private life to compare it with their own, and had the courage to speak of their experiences.

All the flourish of words about the redemption of women under monogamous civilization and her being crowned on the hilltops of progress, is so much froth and fustian. That same civilization which has borne on its tide many blessings to the whole race has at the same time relegated millions of women to the most horrible degradation and infamy. It has shut them out from wifehood and honorable maternity and made them subject to man's baser passions, the slaves of lust, the victims of lewd fire, sacrifices on the altars of bestiality and sin. It has elevated a few to theoretical queenhood, but, abounding with words and professions of worship and adoration, it has made millions the objects of man's actual victory and subjection, thrown them into the gutter when dispensed with, and given the lie to its own professions of chivalry and honor for the fair sex.

There is not a sentiment of regard for virtue, the elevation of woman, the advancement of the gentler sex in all that is ennobling, pure and admirable, ever uttered by professed adorers of refined womanhood, that does not enter into the doctrine and practice of "Mormon" plural marriage as it has come to us from its divine author. That some do not live it as taught, argues nothing against its truth. No one goes to the cases of brutal violence and low-lived ruffianism with

which monogamous society abounds, to prove the beauties of "Christian civilization." But the candid (?) and honorable (?) assailants of "Mormonism" fly to the exceptional instances of improper conduct, which are in violation of the theory and the rules of plural marriage, to prove that it is bad and vicious.

Its real workings, its actual fruits, are ignored or misrepresented and the vices and evils attending or running parallel with Asiatic polygamy, are cited to condemn the doctrine and practice of "Mormon" plural marriage to which it cannot justly be compared and with which it has scarcely anything in common. This is the usual method of dismissing the question, and it is Judge Zane's way of proving the immorality of a system that has reached a loftier conception of pure morality than has ever entered into his soul, blinded as it is with the fury of an intense fanaticism.

There are other points in the Opinion in its moral aspects that we must refer to at another time, and its religious bearing will not be neglected.

JUDGE ZANE'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL DISQUISITION.

We have frequently had occasion to complain that those who oppose our principles and practices always resort to misrepresentation. The premises from which they argue invariably contain some awful misstatements of the facts. It is just so with Chief Justice Zane's sermon on the moral and religious bearings of polygamy. Take now his statements concerning "Utah divorces," and the laws of this Territory concerning the property rights of married women.

He refers to the divorces granted under a territorial statute, now repealed, and those given by the "Mormon Church" as evidence that "the institution of marriage is lightly esteemed where polygamy prevails." What are the facts? Why, that advantage was taken of a statute, loosely drawn, perhaps, in the early days of this Territory, but not intended to be thus manipulated, not by "Mormon" polygamists, but by "Gentile" monogamists who availed themselves of that now obsolete statute to show their light estimate of the marriage institution. And the very "Utah divorce" which Judge Zane cites as "a proverbial term of derision and contempt," was the resort of people reared and educated in and belonging to the monogamous society which he holds up as a model for "Mormons" to pattern after! The scandal which those "Utah divorces" occasioned arose from the perversion of the law by monogamists in various States of the Union, members of so-called "Christian" denominations, people who were just as much opposed to "Mormon" polygamy as Judge Zane can be. And it will be found on investigation that such divorces have been granted to professed "Mormons" in the Utah courts have been chiefly to practical monogamists.

As to Church divorces, Judge Zane knows little or nothing of them. If there was no opportunity afforded for a plural wife to be ecclesiastically separated from her husband whom she had ceased to respect, the cry would be raised that she was held in "priestly bondage." But the true theory of "Mormon" marriage is of an eternal union reaching beyond the grave. Sanctioned by divine ordinance and designed for a holy condition, it reaches within the veil and is sealed for time and eternity. And though provision is made—out of allowance for human weakness and sin—for separation when it becomes a necessity, yet the whole spirit of the institution breathes of veneration for the sacred bond and covenant, and the institution of marriage is surrounded with all the sanctity that an everlasting and solemn contract can carry. Nothing connected with it justifies the assertion that "marriage is lightly regarded" by the "Mormons."

And are there no easy divorces in the monogamous States? Are there no "terms of derision and contempt" for the divorce mills which grind out scores of divorces for confirmed monogamists in a day? What about the consecutive polygamy which is a concomitant of the kind of monogamy that Judge Zane champions, and the suppression of family increase that accompanies it? These show not only that the marriage institution is regarded lightly where that monogamy prevails, but that the natural affection which should attend marriage is, in millions of cases, frozen out of the monogamous heart of husband and wife, and that the spirit of murder has taken its place, finding vent in pre-natal crimes that are horrifying, disgusting and damnable in the eyes of heaven and of every "Mormon" polygamist.

What do the facts prove? Not that the tendency of polygamy, but the tendency of enforced monogamy, with its easy divorces, its changing of partners both on the male and female side, "is to make marriage a means of gratification of passion and bestial lust." The "Mormon" doctrine that one of the primary objects of marriage is the procreation of children is hooted at by monogamous journals and judges, and the cry is raised that we would make of woman "a mere breeding animal." The charge is untrue, but it shows the spirit of our accusers and indicates the object of "Mormon" plural marriage when contrasted with the marriage

motives of their assailants. "Mormon" marriage encourages pure maternity and surrounds it with safeguards that monogamy does not pretend to accord to it, and Judge Zane uses a boomerang when he talks about "the gratification of passion and brutal lust."

And what about the laws of the Territory and the property rights of married women? Which of them "belongs to a by-gone age," pray? Which of them "disregards womanhood, her rights and her claims?" We can find some excuse for his false reasoning on moral and religious grounds, owing to his traditions and prejudices. But what excuse can be offered for his falsification in regard to our laws, with which he is supposed to be thoroughly familiar? Is the statute that secures to women the property acquired before marriage and also that acquired after marriage, in their own right, a relic of a by-gone age? Does it "disregard their womanhood, their rights and their claims?" How about the rights secured by our Territorial laws to women, married and single, to sue, plead and defend at law? And what of our statute conferring upon women the elective franchise? Judge Zane ought to be ashamed of himself to utter such untruths, known to be such by every member of the bar, in order to bolster up a sophistical argument to prove polygamy immoral, or, in other words, to make white appear black, and to void his spite against a gentleman whose only proven fault was the practice of his honest religious convictions.

The only thing that any one can find in our laws to carp at in their relation to married women, is the repeal of the right of dower. But does that repeal "belong to a by-gone age?" Nonsense. The dower itself belongs to a by-gone age, to the old common-law slavery of woman which made her a legal nonentity after marriage, and deprived her of those property rights which Utah laws secure to her. A married woman under Utah laws is the peer of her husband in legal, property and political rights, and has been lifted up out of the thralldom and bondage of that common law which really belongs to a by-gone age, and which gave the right of dower as a sop to a slave of which it made every woman at her marriage. If Judge Zane does not understand the laws of the Territory on this subject, he is almost as culpable for that ignorance as he is for falsifying the facts if he is familiar with them.

Coming now to the religious part of the Judge's disquisition, he asserts that "the Christian world believes that the New Testament condemns polygamy." This belief he virtually endorses by using it as an argument. If it is a fact that the New Testament condemns polygamy, how easy it would have been for Judge Zane to quote his authority. But he knew better than to attempt that. It has been tried and proven a failure too many times. There is not a passage in the New Testament nor in the Old that condemns polygamy. But in the latter there are unmistakable approvals of the practice under divine regulations, and in the former incontrovertible evidences that it was not disapproved under the Christian dispensation.

Abraham, the polygamous patriarch is held up as a pattern in the New Testament. Jesus of Nazareth exhorted the people in his time to "do the works of Abraham." The paradise of God, to which the faithful desired to go was called by him "Abraham's bosom." The polygamists of Christ's day, just coming under the influence of pagan Rome, from which the moderns have obtained their enforced monogamy, were forbidden by the Savior to put away their wives. The repeal of such Mosaic rules as he desired to abrogate was made in clear and unmistakable terms, but he never uttered a word disapproving or changing the law in relation to plural marriage. We challenge Judge Zane to show wherein "the New Testament condemns polygamy."

As to "the relative proportion of males to females," the question is not materially touched by any statistics that may be produced. There are millions of men who will not marry, no matter whether females be scarce or in excess. There are numbers of marriageable women in Utah that are not wedded. They may be found in every community. "Mormon" plurality of wives would make it possible for every woman who so desired, to enter the state of wedlock for which she was designed by nature and is usually adapted by honorable inclination. The laws which oppose that system condemn a very large number of the fair sex all over Christendom to the solitude of celibacy, and those who fight against plural wedlock wink at it if they do not assist in the degradation of this "surplusage" to the vilest condition that can be imagined.

It is true that "infinite goodness and wisdom are manifest in nature;" and he who does not shut his eyes to nature can see without argument that man by nature is endowed with capacities and powers that fit him for plural marriage, while woman, to whom marriage is as natural as display, is by nature fitted to cling to one man as a wife and the mother of his children. The appeal of Judge Zane to nature is as unfortunate for his argument as his appeal to Scripture, and were it not for the delicacy of the subject we could bring forth from the book of nature such citations as would close the lips of any one with regard for consistency from uttering a syllable against plurality of wives on natural principles.

And if the Chief Justice will look a little beyond the surface of the subject, he will find that "the desire to be the only wife" to which he alludes, and the trials and unhappiness which sometimes are incident to plural marriages are not caused by any conflict with nature pure and undefiled, but are the result of tradition, custom, nature perverted by human laws and the conditions growing therefrom. We abstain from referring to the quarrels, violence, sorrows, and murders that grow out of disordered monogamy. They are well known in every part of Christendom.

The "injurious effects upon society" which he claims are the consequences of polygamy have not yet been made apparent. He simply assumes their existence. They certainly are not seen in Utah, and they cannot have that effect upon any other community. All the testimony that has been borne of "Mormon" society by disinterested persons who have had the fairness to state the facts as they have seen them, goes to prove that "Mormon" society is not "excelled anywhere for the qualities that tend to make up a well-ordered community."

He says that "the immorality of some misdemeanors is so slight that the offense does not in a legal sense involve moral turpitude." Such for instance as the case of a brute who has a wife, and after seducing her sister casts off his paramour with her babe and his, and whom the Judge himself turns loose upon society to repeat his crimes. Or that of a seducer and abortionist who is considered suitable by the Judge to sit on a jury and condemn an honorable citizen who would die rather than commit such sins, for the terrible offense of living with his wives bound to him by the most sacred ties and the purest affection. These are misdemeanors that society can pass by without a murmur and courts look upon as "slightly wrong," ruling that "the law does not notice trifles."

Into what a singular state of mind must that Judge have drifted, when he can see but "slight injury" to society in deeds of that kind, and becomes inflamed and angry and vindictive towards a man who, from conscientious motives and with religious convictions, marries and consorts with wives who love him and who with their children look upon him for support and regard him as their protector and guide forever!

We speak what we know when we say that all the blessings and good fruits which Judge Zane pictures as the growth of monogamous marriage, with others peculiar to itself, belong in an enlarged degree to "Mormon" plural marriage. This system extends all the benefits of the other to a greater number and in a wider circle. Neither are they necessarily antagonistic. One need not interfere in any way with the other. Society is not injured in the remotest degree by the marriage of one man to more than one woman. On the contrary, in many respects and places, it would be benefited thereby. Therefore, there is no immorality in plural marriage, taking the Judge's own mode of reasoning, and consequently his tirade against Mr. Miner, as an excuse for his disbarment, falls flat to the ground and can be looked upon by rational people only with contempt for its sophistry and pity for its author.

THE LOCAL SITUATION AS VIEWED BY A LONDON EDITOR.

The following from the London Standard of the 28th ult. evinces a degree of fairness on the part of that intelligent and influential journal, upon reviewing the late epistle of the First Presidency and the proscriptive and oppressive measures being enforced against the Latter-day Saints, that is seldom manifested by editors on this side of the Atlantic:

"The United States Judge in the Mormon Territory is daily passing sentence of imprisonment upon those who infringe what is known as the 'Edmunds Law,' specially passed to put an end to polygamy. The First Presidents—John Taylor and G. Q. Cannon—have addressed a long and, it must be owned, most able and eloquent epistle to the Mormon people, protesting against the persecution to which they are exposed. It is impossible to read this manifesto without feeling that, so far as argument goes, the Mormons have much the best of it. The law of the United States says, in fact, you may live with as many women as you choose, providing you do not call them wives; and no small number of citizens of the United States do so live. The Mormons, therefore, are summoned not to leave their wives, but simply to give up calling them such; to bring disgrace and dishonor upon the women who have lived—according to their religion—blamelessly as their wives; to repudiate that connection, and yet to continue in the same relation with them. And this is done in the name of decency and morality! Without having any leaning towards polygamy, we must own that the Mormon Presidents have made out a good case. The Mormons went out into the wilderness thousands of miles away from civilization, in order to practice their religion unmolested. The people of the United States have come to them; and, although the latter would be perfectly justified in saying that no

more polygamous marriages shall take place, they are not justified in asking the Mormons to set aside the women who have, for many years, been faithful wives, and the mothers of their children; or, what is still worse, to continue to live with them, while openly acknowledging them to be unmarried."

NO, THANK YOU.

MAYBE our Mormon friends who are certain that that they are being badly persecuted in Utah would like to make a change and trust to the tender mercies of Bismarck or the Czar. They are going back behind this generation and driving out men, women and children from the homes in which they were born, because their parents or grandparents happened to belong to a nationality which the Muscovite and Teuton do not like.—Tribune.

No, thank you. We have no desire to leave Utah at present, and do not intend to be forced to change our location. But we question very much whether either under Bismarck the terrible or Alexander the autocrat, such dastardly measures as the Tribune endorses under cover of law would be attempted against a religious body, or such serfdom prevail under the pretense of liberty as that paper upholds and would like to see increased. And as to the "driving out of men, women and children from the homes in which they were born," that is just what the Tribune is aiming at; not against the Poles, because they are not Muscovites or Teutons, but against the "Mormons," because they hold to a faith which does not suit either Catholics or Protestants. But we are not going, thank you, and "Mormon" real estate is not going to be bought for a song nor be grabbed by adventurers. "Time tries all," and brings about many changes, and in time the tide will turn.

The following is taken from the Logan Valley Mirror, (Lyons, Nebraska), of Aug. 28, 1884:—

A TALL STORY.

But a true one, is the story of what has been done for our fellow townsman, John Armstrong. A little over a year ago, when we came to Lyons, Mr. Armstrong was not expected to live more than a few days. He was badly bloated, (dropsy), and racked with most excruciating pains, for the mitigation of which he had applied to numerous physicians in vain. His case was given up by one after another till the gloom of despair closed over him.

About this time Mr. Armstrong was induced to write to Drs. Starkey & Palen. After receiving a written statement of the case they decided that they could help him. He ordered a two month's treatment of Compound Oxygen and commenced its use about the last of March. In eleven days his pains had all departed, and he has been steadily gaining up to this time. He has thrown away his crutches, can walk down town, do the marketing and carry his purchases home. The results wrought, which he ascribes to this treatment, are simply wonderful, and more so when we take the age of the man into consideration, he being in his seventieth year. These facts are published in the hope of benefitting some suffering fellow mortal. Mr. Armstrong, and the facts as we have related them, are widely known in this vicinity, and can easily be verified to those who are disposed to doubt.

A "Treatise on Compound Oxygen," containing a history of the discovery and mode of action of this remarkable curative agent, and a large record of surprising cures in Consumption, Catarrh, Neuralgia, Bronchitis, Asthma, etc., and a wide range of disease, will be sent free. Address Drs. STARKEY & PALEN, 1529 Arch St., Philadelphia.

Orders for the Compound Oxygen Home Treatment will be filled by H. N. Matthews, 615 Powell St., between Bush and Pine Sts., San Francisco.

BEAR LAKE STAKE CONFERENCE.

The quarterly conference of this Stake convened on the 7th and 8th insts; President Wm. Budge, presiding. The regular business incident to these gatherings was attended to, consisting of ward reports, presenting the general authorities of the Church and of the Stake for vote, etc.

The meetings were very crowded, the house not being sufficiently large to hold half the people who attended conference.

The inspired counsels and instructions of God's servants, together with the sweet music of the choir, found echoes in the hearts and voices of the people.

T. MINSON,
Stake Clerk.

That list, which it is said the police have prepared of known frequenters of houses of ill fame in this city, acts like a new sword of Damocles over many a "respectable" head.

"Clean out the Mormons who live with and will not deny their wives, but save the male prostitutes and keep them from the hands of the police." That's the talk of the "moral reformers."

What a tremendous difference it makes whose ox is gored, doesn't it?