

Waitsburg, W. T., Tuesday morning.

Bro. Neal Cheetham has been preaching some at Hillsboro, and a brother writes us that he made a very favorable impression there. We hope his preaching will result in much good.

We have had the pleasure of meeting Bro. I. N. Mulkey since coming to Albany. He is a worthy man, and we are glad to know that he is trying to make arrangements to devote more time to the ministry.

WHERE IS THE DIFFERENCE?

Every now and then we notice a strong attack of the press, both religious and secular, on the growing evils of Mormon polygamy, with suggestions as to the proper measures that should be taken for its speedy and final suppression. It is thought, and doubtless correctly, too, that nothing short of the strong arm of constitutional law rigidly enforced will or can crush out the demoralizing practice from the land. The spirit of intolerance on the part of some of our journalists is wrought up to a degree almost equal to that of the Greeks of old, who were so thoroughly aroused under the thunder of Demosthenes that they cried out, "Let us go and fight Philip!" The holy indignation of the press is to be seen and felt all over the continent, and in the face of an evil assuming such broad proportions right in the heart of a civilized and progressive people, who could expect it to be otherwise? With them it is not a vexed or complicated question of theology, nor one of conscientious scruples, but polygamy is a practice wholly inconsistent with good morals and highly injurious to the community, and for this reason should be forbidden and punishable as a crime. That it is attached as a practice to a religious faith makes it no less a crime, and hence on this account is not to escape just and adequate punishment. And, though strange as it may seem, it is a noticeable fact that those remotest from the seat of this curse are loudest in their clamor for its overthrow. Yet, in all this we believe they are fully justified.

We greatly sympathize with that class of writers who almost incessantly pour out their eloquence over a crime of which they have

only heard, and whose moral courage and independence of expression become greatest when the unfortunate object of their journalistic lash is farthest from them. We are no apologist for Mormon polygamy, but we are as anxious to see its ultimate annihilation, if possible, as, perhaps, its greatest enemy or the most sanguine writer among us. Indeed we hope the war may be carried right into Africa. But we think it just possible that in our great zeal for the suppression of polygamy we will show our own inconsistency; and this is the point we wish to make. This feature of our opposition, we are sorry to say, has already been used with telling effect against our measures for suppressing polygamy.

Under our depraved nature the human mind is so constituted that it likes to view sin at a distance. The mote in our neighbor's eye can be seen to much better advantage than the beam in our own. We can readily see and sharply rebuke the errors of our fore-fathers; and the sins of the poor Pharisee or the Sodomites may be made the special objects of our theological batteries, while, perchance, many sins and overt practices at our own doors, with as far-reaching consequences, and whose remedy is equally in the strong arm of the law, are passed by unnoticed. We are decidedly of the opinion that justice as well as charity begins at home.

We propose to suppress polygamy—and how? By the strong arm of the law. And what is the ground of our complaint? Why, we hold it to be inconsistent with divine law as well as human, otherwise it could not become a crime and be punishable by civil law as such. The law of our land has no right to forbid or punish that which is sanctioned by the word of God. Neither has it a right to encourage in any way a practice not in harmony with the law of God, and injurious and demoralizing in its tendencies. If the law-making powers presume to deal with or regulate Scripture institutions it should be done in perfect harmony with such laws and principles as are therein set forth, since by giving license to that which the word of God clearly condemns, they would be guilty of building up crime and immorality, which it is their avowed object to prevent. Now, with these facts before us, let us turn our attention to the present state of our laws regulating marriage and divorce.

Marriage is honorable among all men, and encouraged by the law of God. But there is but one cause that will sever the marriage vow, and that is so clearly defined that no one needs to be in doubt as to what constitutes the offense. Now is it not perfectly safe to say that at least one-half of those who obtain divorces from our civil courts do so on other grounds than the one plainly marked out in the New Testament Scriptures? And in nine cases out of ten do not these parties understand this a final release from all further obligations as husband and wife, and hence act accordingly? And can they not go to these same courts and procure a license and contract a second marriage in direct violation of the command of God? And lastly, is there anything in the law of the country to prevent them from going on in this course *ad infinitum*?

Hence, while they may be legally divorced, yet, in the eye of God they are just as much polygamists as the Mormons of Salt Lake City.

Then, in all seriousness we ask, Where is the difference? If any difference, it really looks as though it were in favor of the latter. He takes to himself a plurality of wives and thus obligates himself to love and protect them, while the divorced parties, perhaps honored and respected by the higher circles of society and protected in person and property by the courts, neither care for nor look after the interests of any except their last and unlawful partner! Is not such respected (?) and legalized adultery an overt practice equally injurious to good morals, subversive of Christian principles, and hence a crime forbidden and punishable by the strong arm of law in common with Mormon polygamy. Where is the difference? Cannot our judicial and executive authorities lay hold of this matter and regulate it? It seems to us that a code of laws could be put into operation regulating this matter as well as the defective ones we now have. Till this is done, to say the very least, we as Christian people are acting very inconsistently in seeking to overturn avowed polygamy by force of law without even an effort to check a vice with such pernicious effects right in our midst.

When we come to contemplate the vast number of such unlawful marriages contracted in the United States during the short space of twelve months, accompanied with all their fearful consequences, the

matter becomes a serious one. Let us not only root up polygamy among the Mormons, but let us make clean work of it. We call upon every Christian, therefore, and the religious press specially, to raise a solemn protest against the crime in all its forms, and insist that our laws be so adjusted as to prevent it so far as in their power.

"Thou that sayest a man shall not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery?" Rom. 2:22.

IS MODERN DANCING MORALLY WRONG?

It is our present purpose, to pay some attention to the above question.

1. That most of the dancing mentioned in the Jewish Scripture was expressive of religious joy and praise, is nothing more than every tyro in the Bible knows; but instead of that fact proving the innocence of modern dancing, it proves the very opposite, from the fact that popular dancing is not now engaged in as a religious performance. No one claims that dancing is a part of his religion, or a part of that of those who engage with him in the midnight waltz. But if no one thus claims, then how does religious dancing justify dancing for amusement? We might just as well argue that because baptism is a religious performance the Bible authorizes our engaging in it for amusement; or because the Lord's Supper is a divinely authorized institution, that we can turn it into a feast of gluttony as did the Corinthians.

2. All who have investigated the question from a Bible point of view, know that in all religious dancing the two sexes were never intermingled. We apprehend that if those who take pleasure in lifting "the light fantastic toe" were thus cut off from the association of the fairer sex, that this particular feature of their enjoyment, although religiously esteemed, would soon be wholly abandoned. The Hebrew dancing, as the word indicates, was simply a kind of skipping, leaping or whirling of the body for religious joy. Hence, if we appeal to the Bible for argument at all, we must necessarily confine ourselves to just such dancing as is described by the use of the term. This would forever put an end to the demoralizing practice of modern times.

3. But we are told that "many of the most zealous waltzers in the community are members in good standing of some orthodox church,"