

EDITORIALS.

Now a story of "A German in Luck" comes in the *Laclede, Mo., Republican*, in substance as follows. Soon after the close of the war, Herman Schubert, a German, located in Livingston county on a small farm, but from sickness and other causes he fell into arrears, his farm was mortgaged, and eventually it was offered for sale, but on the eventful day when the farm was to be sold, Herman went into the field to plough, as he had been doing for several days, and here is the result of his labor, as related by the *Republican*:

"The land which he was ploughing had at an early period been occupied by a Mormon family, judging from an object soon after exhumed by Herman's plough. The article in question was a pine box about two feet long by one foot deep, which had been buried about thirty years since, and when brought to the surface found almost decayed. But the contents of the box forms the subject of interest. Some articles of dress, papers, a Mormon bible and a small tin box containing \$1,700 in gold and \$7.65 in silver were found!

"The overjoyed man seized the box, rushed home, entered the house where his patient frow was engaged at her usual duties, and exclaimed: 'Mine Got in Himmil! if it pees mine I bays for te farm right away!' The frow and kindern soon took up the spirit of the occasion, and a scene of tumult ensued seldom witnessed.

"The neighbors were quickly apprised of the German's good fortune, and lost no time to visit him for the purpose of gratifying their curiosity or expressing their congratulations. One gentleman, however, we are informed, laid claim to the box, basing his right on the fact that his uncle once owned the farm whereon the valuable prize was found. The field in question had not been in cultivation for many years previous to Herman's taking possession of it. It was doubtless owned by a Mormon settler who skeddaddled from this vicinity at the time these heretics were cleaned out by the Missourians."

Of another letter by Mr. S. S. Packard, in the *New York Globe*, the editor says appropriately, "It is a fresh, honest, candid, liberal view of Mormon life, such as we do not often find." So it is.

Mr. P. spent an "intelligently busy" week in Salt Lake City, interviewing prominent officials and non-officials, visiting several "Mormon" families, attending the Tabernacle and day and Sunday schools and a funeral service, talking freely with men, women, teachers and scholars, indeed going everywhere where he could see or hear aught to aid him in coming to an understanding of the industrial, social, or political aspect of "Mormonism." It was a week of much interest, but less satisfactory in attained results than he could have wished, yet he thinks the problem of Mormonism and Polygamy is a most pleasant one to study, whether you arrive at any satisfactory results or not, and he says, "You will not arrive at any satisfactory results, however long you may remain, or however faithfully you may prosecute your inquiries." That depends entirely upon the kind and amount of satisfaction you want. But as the study of "Mormonism and Polygamy" is so exceedingly pleasant, whether you obtain satisfaction or not, it does not so much matter which way the results go. Satisfaction or no satisfaction, it is a charming business.

Mr. P. thinks "the completion of the Union Pacific Railroad, and the rapid inundation of barbarians from the east has presented a problem which the greatest human wisdom cannot solve." Then let human wisdom lay its hand upon its mouth and say nothing. When men can do no more, is the time to wait and let the Almighty work.

Says Mr. P., the class of Mormons with which you are most likely to come in contact during a short stay are of a full average of intelligence, and a little beyond a full average of shrewdness. They have at their tongue's end ready answers to all the objections you may raise to their system of religion or domestic polity.

The directness with which he meets Mr. Sammy Bowles is exceedingly refreshing, inasmuch that Mr. P. says, "There would seem to be but a small leg for Mr. Bowles to stand upon." We must quote liberally here. Mr. Bowles will be glad to read, no doubt—

Probably no gentile who has written on Mormonism has said harder or more

bitter things against the leading saints than Mr. Bowles in his "Our New West," and yet that book can be found in all the principal book stores, and its charges, which are very specific as well as very sweeping, are met with a confidence and contempt which is truly refreshing.

In his account of the effect of polygamy upon women, Mr. Bowles speaks of "one poor, sweet woman," who, in alluding to the institution, said, "Lord Jesus has laid a heavy trial upon me, but I mean to bear it for His sake, and for the glory He will grant me in His kingdom." I was assured by that same "poor, sweet woman," that she did make a remark of this kind to Mr. Bowles, but it was solely with reference to a recent bereavement—the loss of a loved child. Of course I don't know the truth of it. I have only the statement of a sweet woman against a man who, having a book to write and a theory to maintain, must have his little facts at hand when he needs them.

Only to think of Mr. B's gallantry in bellying a "poor, sweet woman," for book-making or political effect. Why, that is very small potatoe business, Mr. B., and it does not improve the flavor of your sensational "little facts."

Now here Mr. P. enters very sensibly upon a fertile source of entirely unjustifiable abuse, provided abuse is ever justifiable, and again comes down upon Mr. B. with unrelieved and richly deserved heaviness:

A common complaint made by sensational scribblers against Mormon Polygamists is that they—the scribblers—are not invited into private households and inducted at once into all the little matrimonial secrets. Even Mr. Bowles makes this complaint, and yet in every instance where such courtesy is shown him he abuses it grossly by divulging the details of family affairs such as no gentleman would think of alluding to, much less of writing down and printing in a book for circulation among American youths. The disgustingly appetizing way in which he alludes to family matters, may be in the interest of a sensational subscription book, but would scarcely find favor with a decent daily newspaper, and should not with a decent public. I doubt if Mr. Bowles himself would care to invite to his home in Springfield, for the second time, a person who should so abuse his confidence. The wonder with me is, not that Mormons do not more frequently invite to their homes strangers whom they know to be inimical to their religion, but that they invite them at all. I made no effort to gain access to polygamous families, and yet I was invited to such with all the cordiality and freedom as I ever was to any house where I had not a previous acquaintance. I know at least a dozen Gentiles in Salt Lake City, who have boarded for months and even years in polygamous families, and who have the *entree* to other similar households as freely as they ever did in their home neighborhoods.

Mr. P., like every other honorable and unprejudiced visitor, was favorably impressed with the sobriety and good order prevalent here, and he honestly records his views:

I don't intend that my theories, however pure and conventional, shall stand in the way of my facts. I propose simply to record what I see and hear and leave the moral and philosophical application to whom it may concern. I will say then that I never saw and never expect to see a more orderly, quiet, law-abiding, moral community than that of Salt Lake City. There is, among Mormons, no drunkenness, no profanity, no licentiousness that is outwardly discernible. There is little or no use for lawyers, or doctors, as private differences are settled without going to law, and each "priest according to the order of Melchisedec" is gifted with the power of the laying on of hands, which does away with a vast deal of nonsense in the way of herb tea and bread pills. The tithing system, against which so much is falsely said and written, is not made oppressive upon the people. It is a religious duty, which all acknowledge, to pay over one-tenth of the yearly earnings for the uses of the Church.

After detailing (though not with absolute correctness) the processes for the adjustment of personal difficulties in the church, he says—

And all the service is rendered without a dollar of cost to plaintiff or defendant, it being the Lord's work, for which no pay can ever be exacted. I am a good deal of a fool, but I think I have sufficient discernment to see that

the legal jurisprudence of our Gentile cities might be improved by a little leaven of Christianity according to Brigham. Even our Methodist pugilists might, with profit to themselves and honor to their profession, cut a leaf out of this Book of Mormonism.

Mr. P. thus deals with the influence of the President of the church—

A great deal is said about the absolutism of Brigham Young. No one can watch the workings of Mormonism without feeling that he is the central power of the system. That he rules wisely must also be apparent in the utter respect and love that is felt for him by his people. There is nothing in his appearance, utterance or acts that would mark him for a man of strong spirituality; but everything about him shows him to be a man of strong common sense.

Of this great influence Mr. P. further observes—

That it is possessed with modesty, and used with discretion by Brigham Young, I fully believe. The best evidence of this is the fact that no one has aught to say against his personal character. His people love and trust him with a reverence and fervor that is difficult to understand, except through the fact that he is, indeed, their friend; while all others speak of him with respect."

Mr. P. very shrewdly and aptly observes of the extravagant stories related of domestic matters here, for outside effect, "The more extravagant and unreasonable they are, the more certain to be repeated and believed."

Now Mr. P. is no convert to the peculiar institutions of "Mormonism," not at all. Indeed he expressly disclaims any such assumption, and he says, "I don't know enough of polygamy to speak for or against it," but, in connection with many others who would like to see the end of it, he believes that feminine extravagance and a "new revelation" will bring an early return to the unsatisfactory one-wife system prevalent among the corrupt nations of the Gentile world. We can afford to wait and see. But we will again express our high appreciation of the candor, frankness, and straightforward gentlemanliness of Mr. Packard in his correspondence respecting Salt Lake, so far as his letters have come under our notice.

THE "WRONGS" of the women of Utah are an unfailing subject for comment by newspaper correspondents and editors troubled with anti-Mormon tendencies, and for mendacious lecturers of the Anna Dickinson school. But if some of those who denounce Mormonism understood what they write about, the tone of their articles would be very different. To assert that the women of Utah are all, without exception, perfectly happy, or that not a wrong exists, is nonsensical; for it is contrary to the nature and constitution of most women, as well as most men, to be perfectly happy. But this continual talk about the "wrongs" of the women of Utah is sheer nonsense, for it is positively true that they enjoy more rights than the women of any other community in the world; and it is only necessary to cite one or two facts to prove to all interested in the welfare of the sex that this is true.

It is a fact that the ladies of Utah, without exception, have the chance of obtaining husbands and, unless nature's interdict intervenes, of becoming heads of families. This cannot be said of the women in any other part of the world; and because of being denied this blessed privilege, hundreds of thousands of them are spending their days and wasting away their lives in what some blasphemers has styled "single-blessedness," but which the women know is single wretchedness.

Then again, the ladies of Utah possess that which many declare to be a panacea for every wrong woman has to endure—namely, the suffrage; and, wielding this power, it is natural to suppose, if they labored under wrongs, that they would speedily redress them. With such privileges as these, who can consistently talk about the "wrongs" of the women of Utah?

The above was suggested by reading an article in the *St. Louis Dispatch* of the 28th ult., the writer of which is a very sympathetic, but, so far as Utah is concerned, a very ignorant or mistaken individual—by the by, a common occurrence when newspaper folks talk about Utah. If our friend of the *Dispatch* carefully peruses the above

statements he will at once see that his oburgations on the men of Utah are uncalled for, and that his large expenditure of sympathetic talk on behalf of the women is a great mistake and an evidence equally of ignorance and prejudice.

But even supposing that all our contemporary has imagined about the "wrongs" and so forth of the women, and the vice and crime of the men, of Utah is founded in truth, could he not find scope for his sympathy and execration nearer home than Salt Lake City or Utah Territory? In asking this question we do not wish to reflect prejudicially upon the city or people of St. Louis: we believe that they are about as good as the average of cities and people in other portions of the United States or the world. But while admitting this, it is well known that what is termed the "social evil" had reached such a pitch in St. Louis, that the city authorities, a few months ago, in hopes of diminishing this hideous development of social life, were induced to adopt certain rules for its regulation, and that to carry out their designs they had to banish from the city large numbers of courtizans. Now to suppose that where such a system flourishes so well the men are all virtuous is preposterous: there must be some very licentious; and it would be equally nonsensical to imagine that in such a community there are no women suffering wrongs.

It is very pleasant to see manifestations of sympathy towards the distressed and unfortunate; and if our contemporary's expressions are genuine they are creditable to him as a man. But though his perceptions of the social ills existing in his own city may be blunted through being continually amongst them; we think that if he will be benevolent and sympathetic he can find worthy and needy objects at home; and that will be more sensible, than sentimentalizing and talking sympathy over imaginary objects two or three thousand miles distant. By way of conclusion, and to completely relieve the mind of the writer in the *Dispatch*, we will state that there are plenty here who are as anxious about the welfare of the women as he seems to be; they will talk sympathy all the day long and while so doing would delight, if opportunity offered, to debauch those for whom they express such concern. Our contemporary will see by this that his solicitude is entirely superfluous. "Charity begins at home," may seem to be a worldly and selfish maxim, but it is very sound, and it is just possible that St. Louis and its people may be a trifle the better if he will make it his principle of action in the expenditure of his gushing, overflowing charity and tenderness for poor unhappy woman.

MOST of the adult Latter-day Saints and many of the younger people in the Territory came here expressly on account of their religion. Had it not been for that, few of them would have come here, but most of them would have remained in the land where they heard the gospel—in some or other of the various States, in England, Scotland, Wales, France, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, or still more distant regions. They heard the gospel, believed it, obeyed its first principles, and gathered here in conformity with the commandment. What for? To build up the Kingdom of God, to constitute a community which would strive to keep his commandments and square their lives according to his laws, so that their children might have the privilege of being born and brought up without being compelled to witness the wickedness of various kinds which prevails among the corrupt nations, and so that there might be one place upon the earth where the name of Deity would not be profaned, where the drunkard would not be seen staggering through the streets, where the extremes of wealth and poverty would not be manifest side by side in painful contrast, where the laws of life and of the multiplication thereof would not be shamefully abused, in short where a man or a woman everywhere would meet a brother and a friend.

Has this intention been carried out? Pretty fairly with some, rather poorly with others. Have not some almost forgotten the purpose for which they came here or professed to come here? Possibly, and have permitted the cares of life, the pressure of business, or the deceitfulness of riches to take possession of their minds, almost if not entirely to the exclusion of other and more important matters. Is this an evidence of wisdom, of shrewdness, of intelligence? If so, it is