

EDITORIALS.

WHY NOT SETTLE THE QUESTION?

THE opposition in the House of Representatives to the admission of Dakota as a State in the Union, is one of the evils of partisan politics. No other reason for it can be truthfully advanced but the fact that it would be a Republican State. If Dakota were Democratic in politics, it is just as likely that her admission would be obstructed by the Senate as it is now that it will be prevented by the House. This is all wrong, but quite natural when the interests of party are placed before the interests of commonwealths and the welfare of the nation.

But it seems that Dakota does not intend to be kept in territorial tutelage and be deprived of the liberties of free government, simply because a political party dreads the effect of an addition to the working forces in Congress of a rival party. The South Dakota Legislature not long ago, at Huron, took definite action on this matter. After praying and beseeching Congress, presenting a bill of rights and making all the needful arrangements for entering the Union in vain, the Legislature determined that the State government already organized in form, and only waiting the breath of Congress to vitalize it, should not much longer remain a lifeless body. A definite date has been fixed upon when it shall be set in motion by local force, if the national power refuses to act.

That portion of the schedule and ordinances providing that the provisional government shall not go into effect prior to the consent of Congress has been repealed, and at an election to be held next fall, the people are to vote whether or not the State government shall be set in operation on the first day of the year 1888. We believe that South Dakota has done exactly right, and that the people of that region will be fully justified in taking the stand contemplated in the act of the Legislature. Whether the new State is then admitted or not, it will be a State. If not part of the Union because of the obstinacy of a political party, then a free and sovereign State, capable of managing its own affairs and ready to become one of the United States whenever the representatives of those States come to reason.

The assumed powers of Congress over the Territories are in violation of the spirit and letter of the Constitution and of the American system of government altogether. They are not warranted by any legitimate authority. They are subversive of the rights claimed for all people in the Declaration of Independence. They are only to be patiently tolerated while the citizens of the Territories are so numerically weak that they cannot successfully resist their tyranny and bondage. The whole territorial system ought to be swept away, as a relic of colonial vassalage and unworthy of the times in which we live.

We do not believe, however, that the Dakotans will be forced to the extremity contemplated in the action of their Legislature. The right of their position and the troubles likely to arise from national resistance to their course, even on the plea that they are in rebellion, will be recognized by wise men and Dakota will be admitted before the time comes for such a crisis. The movement advocated by Mr. Springer, or some other expedient, will no doubt be devised to offset the increased advantages to the Republican party which would accrue from the admission of Dakota, and other States will be organized which will either add to the Democratic representation in both Houses of Congress or at least preserve the present balance.

While the legislators of the country are about it, they should settle the vexed question for ever. All the Territories should be so grouped that they will be sufficiently populous and self-sustaining as to be fit for the responsibilities of Statehood. The Constitution provides only for free and independent States. Territories are not contemplated in that declaration of supreme law. They are after-thoughts, creations of emergency, mere temporary arrangements. The system was an expedient and has outlived its purpose and its necessity. It is a living contradiction to Democratic principles. It should be the work of the Democratic party to abolish it for good. Free States should cover the land from the Canadas to the Gulf and from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The only supposed difficulty in the way of this consummation is the "Mormon" question. Ignorance of the facts in the case make that an obstacle. There is no earthly reason that will stand the test of sound sense and statesmanship, why Utah should not come in with the rest of the Territories, that are ready for the duties of self-government and anxious to swell the power and strengthen the unity of the greatest government in the world. Statehood for Utah is the only true solution of the "Mormon" problem, even looking at it in the common light. It is really a local not a national question, and under Utah's statehood would speedily solve itself.

We do not say this because we anticipate any such wisdom on the part of our national lawmakers as the

movement we advocate. The power of prejudice and the ends of party politics stand too strongly in the way of such vigorous and sensible statesmanship. But it will be a stroke of policy superior to anything that has been achieved in this nation for many years, and the prosperity that would flow from it would soon demonstrate the prudence and vindicate the action of its promoters. There is no fair objection against the admission of Dakota, and the retention of territorial servitude in any part of this great republic is equally indefensible.

A SHAMEFUL SLANDER.

FOR pure, unadulterated infernalism the chief organ of the anti-"Mormon" political conspirators published in this city breaks the record of any other perfidious sheet ever printed and circulated. Our usual policy is to let it severely alone, allowing it to revel unmolested in congenial filth and vituperation. Occasionally, however, it appears necessary to give it a scintillation of dignity by noticing some of its flagrant falsehoods. When this appears to be needful the task is approached with no small degree of disgust, and it seems as if it should be done in an apologetic spirit toward our readers.

The sheet now referred to, in its issue of this morning (Jan. 6th), makes elaborate mention of the burning of the Baptist school house, yesterday morning, asserting flatly that it was the result of incendiarism. Following upon this statement it says:

This fire brings forcibly to mind the fact that most of the robberies and fires of the last few weeks have been perpetrated and occurred on Gentile property. The Baptist school building has been repeatedly broken into and school paraphernalia stolen or injured; Independence Hall has similarly suffered; petty thieves attempted to burglarize Durst's store, while Husband's grocery was entered and goods stolen; one of Noble, Wood & Company's handsome glass windows was broken and a hat stolen. All these proprietors are Gentiles. The bottling property and the school house belonged to Gentiles, and there is no telling how long it will be before other Gentile buildings, especially educational ones, will disappear in the flames and smoke. It behooves owners and trustees to see that their insurances are sufficient to cover all possible losses. Very likely after two or three more conflagrations the insurance men will feel like putting on a patrol themselves, or making such representations to the City Council, as will compel them to properly protect local property. It is pretty well understood that these outrages are committed by Mormon Modocs or hoodlums."

Then follows assertions to the effect that it is in accordance with "Mormon" teaching and practice to prey upon the "Gentiles." And these aspersions are uttered against a people whose honesty is proverbial, and who have been repeatedly the victims of robbery and incendiarism, and the most inhuman indignities that could be heaped upon any community.

To come down to the facts, however, of the lawless acts of the last few weeks, we shall see how far they sustain such charges. On the same night on which Noble, Wood & Co's window was broken and a hat stolen, windows in the residences of Mr. Don Carlos Young and Mr. Harry Culmer, both "Mormons," were similarly treated.

On the night of the burglary of the stores of Mr. Husband and Mr. Durst and of Independence Hall, the houses of Mr. John Clark and Mrs. Perry, (both the latter are "Mormons") were broken into and robbed.

A short time since the house of Mrs. Wells, in the Twelfth Ward, was entered and robbed, and last night the store of Mrs. George Neal, near the Baptist church, was burglarized. Both these ladies are "Mormons."

Thus the baselessness of the assertion that the victims of recent lawless depredations are "Gentiles" is seen at a glance.

The next point is the identity of the depredators. The conscienceless scribe who charged the acts complained of to "Mormons" and the result of "Mormon" teachings must have known that his statements were false when he made them, the guilty parties in a number of instances having been arrested and punished, the facts having appeared in the local papers as well as being matters of record in the police court.

The parties who robbed the store of Mr. Husband were: John Leadford, an importation from Leadville, Col.; Wm. Davis, late from Denver; Willie Paddock, son of Mrs. Paddock of notorious anti-"Mormon" repute.

The same parties, in the police court, pleaded guilty to committing the robbery at Independence Hall.

The burglary of Mrs. Neal's store was committed by members of the same gang, among them being Dan Henry and Arthur Curtis, now under arrest, neither of them belonging to "Mormon" families.

It was the same set of young thieves who committed most, if not all, of the crimes mentioned. The gang is well known to the police. They are, so far as can be learned, as follows:

Wm. Davis, John Leadford, Norton Curtis, Arthur Curtis, Willie Paddock,

William Adams, Dan. Henry, Richard Babbles, and probably a few others. The first four named are the leaders of the gang, and the others cluster around them, as followers. The statement that they are "Mormons" is utterly false.

It is well known that the Boca Brewery Co's bottling building has been, on account of its being vacant, a rendezvous for this nest of depraved young criminals and their associates, and there is good reason for believing, on that ground, that it was set on fire by them, either accidentally or intentionally.

As to how the Baptist schoolhouse took fire it is not known. It may have been incendiary or it may not. There is little room for doubt that the fire first broke out in the interior. Mr. Willard Burton, a thoroughly reliable gentleman, who was among the first to observe the flames, declares that when he observed them they were breaking through the window at the south end of the building—the point where, we are informed, the flue is located. But if it were incendiary and not the result of an ordinary origin, to charge it upon the "Mormons" is extremely villanous and without the shadow of evidence or excuse. As well might it be charged that the late fire—the largest in five years—by which Coalter & Saelgrove, Geo. W. Davis, Anderson Brothers, James Dwyer and others (all "Mormons"), were the losers, was the result of a "Gentile" conspiracy.

The intimation that the fire was the work of "Mormon" incendiaries, is only excelled in villainy by the assertion that destruction of "Gentile" property is considered legitimate and in accord with "Mormon" sentiment, and that "murder, robbery and pillage become a celestial virtue" under the cover of "thus saith the Lord."

If this vile system of libel and slander is designed to work up sympathy and dollars for the sect which has suffered a loss to which any person or society may be subject, it is a most vile and shameful method to resort to. The writer of the article must be a mean, contemptible and scurvy ruffian, and no epithet would be too strong to apply to him. Even the proprietors and editors of the *Tribune* ought to be ashamed of such a thoroughly inexcusable effusion and of the creature that wrote it.

If it had not been for "Mormon" effort the Baptist Church would have met the same fate as the schoolhouse, and in saving the property a "Mormon" fireman received painful injury. There is not a respectable "Gentile" in the city who is not satisfied that charges like those, in which the *Tribune* seems most to delight, are false to the very core and a shameful slander both upon the "Mormons" and their creed.

MORE PECULIAR PROCEEDINGS.

THE verdict in the Bassett case adds one more to the list of proofs that justice need not be expected from juries in Utah, when picked and packed to decide as required by the Prosecuting Attorney. The testimony in this case has been given with considerable detail to our readers. Condensed it amounts to this:

The divorced wife of the defendant, who has manifested a strong disposition to bring him into trouble, and who threatened to get him into the penitentiary for five years if he pushed his suit against her for divorce, testified at the trial that in August, 1884, her husband, who had been absent three days, on his return informed her that he had been to Logan and had married Kate Smith. That she then refused to live with him, but did not want a divorce. That he subsequently obtained a divorce from her on the ground of desertion, the summons from the divorce court being served on November 28, 1885. This was all the evidence for the prosecution.

For the defense, Mrs. Kate Smith Bassett, the present wife, testified that she was married to the defendant in the Tithing Office at Salt Lake City, January 26th, 1886. She had not been married to him previously. She had not been in the Temple with him. During the time stated as the period when he was in Logan she was a clerk at the Fourth Ward Co-operative Store, and the day-book of the establishment was produced with entries in her hand made on the dates referred to. Bishop Adam Speirs, who was at the time a Justice of the Peace, testified to marrying Mr. Bassett and Mrs. Smith on the 26th of January, 1886. Mrs. Harriet Robbins corroborated the evidence in regard to the entries in the day-book and the presence at the store of Kate Smith. Joseph E. Wilson, clerk at the Tithing office in Logan, testified that at the time of the defendant's visit there in August, 1884, he went to explain to witness, who had succeeded him, certain business matters pertaining to that office. Other witnesses proved that defendant had boarded regularly at restaurants in this city from August, 1884, to April, 1886, and the night-watchman at the Tithing office in this testified that the defendant had slept there with the exception of four nights, from April, 1884, to August, 1886. The evidence of others went to corroborate these facts.

Thus the whole case against the defendant rested on the single statement of a jealous woman, who had threatened to "give him

away," that he had confessed the plural marriage to her previous to the divorce. This alleged admission was, it made, a confidential communication from a husband to his wife, and should have been excluded, as the law and the practice have regulated for centuries, the time-honored rule having never been set aside until the Dickinson theory was adopted by the courts of Utah. But even allowing the evidence admissible, the unsupported statement of the divorced wife was contradicted by a mass of unimpeached and unimpeachable evidence. In any court outside of Utah, and in any case but that of a "Mormon" on trial for supposed infraction of the Edmunds law, it is not at all likely that a sane jury would convict on such a thread of doubtful evidence cut asunder by the force of such overwhelming opposing testimony. But the District Attorney had set himself to the task of getting a verdict and, as usual, the jury was compliant.

The question naturally presents itself, why was this case not prosecuted before, if, as alleged, the plural marriage took place in August, 1884? The answer explains the animus with which this case has been conducted. The defendant was chosen and appointed as the Bishop of the Twentieth Ward of this city, and a howl was immediately raised against him, followed by this prosecution. It is not the first time that the ecclesiastical position of a "Mormon" official has been made the provoking cause of hostile official proceedings. Mr. Bassett as an ordinary "Mormon" was unassailed. Mr. Bassett as a Ward Bishop was at once a shining mark for official target-shooting. The ecclesiastical standing of the accused seems to be a greater offense in the eyes of some officials than any supposed violation of the secular law.

The sentence in this case is the extreme penalty—five years imprisonment and a fine of five hundred dollars. An appeal is taken, which will probably go up to the court of last resort, the temper and disposition of the Supreme Court of the Territory on the question involved being pretty well understood. Polygamy cases are appealable, under the Poland law, to the Supreme Court of the United States. The chief question to be determined will be, doubtless, the admissibility of the divorced wife's testimony. It is important that this should be determined by a competent tribunal.

This case, however, we think, does not furnish a cause that covers the whole ground of the controversy in regard to a legal wife's testimony against her husband when both parties object. We hope to see a test made on the full merits of this innovation upon the jurisprudence of centuries. It requires the resistance of a legal wife, with nerves and physical and moral stamina sufficient to endure the strain and the danger to which she would be temporarily exposed, by standing up for the rights of her sex against the merciless, heartless and unscrupulous official assault that would follow her refusal to testify. Meanwhile it will be interesting to watch the progress and outcome of the controversy in the Bassett case.

A DISGRACE TO JOURNALISM.

THE villainy of the *Tribune*, in its shameless falsehoods about the depredations of the young ruffians who have been found guilty of various offences, has provoked the anger of all classes of the community. Respectable "Gentiles" are the most outspoken in their denunciation of the libelous course of the paper which pretends to represent them. There is not a decent non-"Mormon" in the city who joins in the falsehood that "Gentile" property has been the object of "Mormon" attack and that "Mormon" teaching encourages such wrongs.

Proven guilty of wilful misrepresentation of the facts, the vile slanderers of the vilest sheet on earth make no attempt to retract or acknowledge an error. The very individuals whom they called "Mormon Modocs" and whom they charged with the depredations complained of, have been proven to be the children of "Gentile" parents, and some of them the offspring of pronounced and active anti-"Mormons," hail fellows well met with the malodorous *Tribune* gang. On the same page in which the villainous falsehoods of Thursday are repeated by insinuation to-day, appears a long account of the confession and conviction of the young thieves, vagabonds and hoodlums, all "Gentile" progeny, who were designated yesterday as "Mormon Modocs," and are still called "Modocs," but without the prefix of "Gentile."

Suppose the *DESERET NEWS* was to adopt the *Tribune* plan, and remind the public on every case of crime that comes before the lower or higher courts, that the culprit is a "Gentile," and proceed to charge the whole "Gentile" fraternity with responsibility for those offenses against honesty, morality and decency, and take pains to show that all this crime and corruption is chargeable to "Gentile" teaching, influence and desire; would not a howl be raised that would echo through the whole range of the Rocky Mountains and reverberate throughout the civilized world?

It is well understood who is the libeller responsible for the blackguard

embellishments with which reports of local occurrences are finished off, in order to conform to his alcoholic perversion of truth and decency. And such palpable falsehoods as have been indulged in concerning recent occurrences, serve to deepen the disgust with which he is viewed by all fair-minded "Gentiles" and the few "Mormons" who know of his existence. He is a disgrace even to *Tribune* Journalism.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

In sentencing the juvenile hoodlums to imprisonment for larceny and general depravity, Justice Pyper deplored the necessity of sending these youthful offenders to jail. A House of Correction would be the proper place for them, no doubt. Leniency has been tried, repeatedly, in vain. The young desperadoes are impervious to the appeals of those who express a merciful desire for their reform. Only adequate punishment will bring them to a sense of their iniquity. The law must be permitted to take its course.

The absence of any suitable establishment to which such offenders against law and order can be consigned is greatly to be regretted. The "Mormon" authorities will be again assailed because of this, as they have been before. But whose fault is it that no such institution exists in Utah? Is it not the fault of an obstructionist Executive? Did not Governor Murray, instigated and led by the nose by the *Tribune* conspirators and their ilk, veto the bill which appropriated money for this purpose?

The truth is that it is that villainous gang that hinders the prosperity of Utah in various ways. If the respectable "Gentiles" of this Territory had but courage enough to brave the abuse and laugh at the lash of the vagabonds who whip them into line or compel their silence when they cannot gain their support, they could make a revolution in affairs here that would cause a thrill of vitality to run through every business fibre of the community. The adventurers who are plotting for power have obstructed every good measure for the public benefit, have frightened away capital, have dampened enterprise and blundered business, in their bellicose schemes after place and plunder, and respectable people who dislike notoriety and want peace and the quiet pursuit of trade, have acquiesced by their silence in the ruinous policy that has been pursued, and are thus measurably responsible for the condition of local affairs.

We need a House of Correction, but we also need many other public improvements, which would be speedily inaugurated if the business men of this Territory would determine that this conspiracy against the peace and progress of Utah should be put down, or left entirely to the impetuous adventurers who have chiefly made all the mischief that bars the way to permanent prosperity.

ESCHATOLOGY.

RELIGIOUS circles in the East have been agitated for some time over the trial of five Professors engaged in the Andover Seminary, the leading Congregational training college for ministers. They are charged with heresy, the complaint having fifteen specifications. The chief accusation, however, is in regard to the views of those gentlemen in reference to the future of persons who have died without Christ in this world.

The doctrine of the final condition of souls is technically termed eschatology. The orthodox belief is that this is settled at death; all who die without faith in Christ perish everlastingly. Heaven for believers, hell for unbelievers, both eternal, unchangeable conditions. In the language of one of the Andover accusers, "all men are lost to-day, who are not Christians; they must be brought into contact with Christ to be saved," and this contact must be in this life, for "there's no salvation in the grave nor pardon offered to the dead," and the Andover Creed declares that "the wicked will awake to everlasting contempt and be burned with devils forever."

Progressive orthodoxy, by which the new ideas that are gaining ground are known, is not dogmatic on the question of eschatology, but considers it probable that there may be means provided by which those who do not actually reject Christ in this life, have an opportunity of learning of Him and accepting Him as their Savior in the life to come. Professor Egbert C. Smyth, who is the leading figure in this controversy before the "Visitors" who have to try the case, admits that "all men being sinners are lost without Christ," but holds the hypothesis of a future revelation of Christ to be reasonable and not unscriptural nor inconsistent with the Andover creed. Yet he does not claim that this view should be made central in systematic theology.

The case of these Professors turns practically on the significance to be attached to the obligations required of them when entering upon their positions in the Seminary. They subscribed to a profession of faith which