

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - MAY 9, 1883.

## NOTICE.

Our correspondents will please oblige by addressing all communications to DESERET NEWS COMPANY. Letters containing matters of business should be marked BUSINESS, and those containing items for publication The Editor or "EDITORIAL."

## A NEEDLESS SUGGESTION.

THE *Cleveland Herald* says: "The Mormon leaders should send missionaries to Alabama. There are 17,246 more females than males in that State." For the comfort and consolation of the *Herald* we will say that missionaries have been laboring successfully in that State for a long time. Not, however, for the reason hinted at by our *Cleveland* contemporary. Sex makes no difference to "Mormon" efforts at proselyting. The gospel we preach is for all, and the only attraction to any special locality is a disposition to hear and investigate our doctrines. Wherever people are willing to hearken our Elders are ready to instruct, and it makes not the slightest difference whether the hearers are men or women. However, it would perhaps be a good thing for some of those seventeen thousand and odd extra females to emigrate westward, for even Utah, popularly supposed to have a large excess of ladies, contains a population, in which, according to our last census, the males exceed the females by about seven thousand.

## ENGLAND'S WAR EXPENSES.

ACCORDING to John Bright, the opening of the nineteenth century have been no less than £4,414,000,000, or nearly twenty-two billions of dollars. But the cost of the civil government of the nation for the same period has been but £1,012,000,000, not a fourth part of the sum spent in the work of destruction and carnage. And this is "civilization." Nations that have professed Christianity for centuries and that boast of their progress in all that elevates humanity, are weighed down with burdens of debt, incurred in slaying men, laying cities waste and fighting like beasts of prey over coveted territory or some other bone of contention. This British war expenditure has been wasted by one of the foremost nations during the greatest of all centuries, the supposed period of the greatest light, the highest wisdom and the most refined and exalted humanity that the world has ever seen. Is it not about time that some other method of settling difficulties than fighting like enraged brutes, were adopted? Individuals and nations will have to be brought under a different influence from that which now prevails, before the reign of universal peace and good will can be ushered in, and the way be made clear for the King of Righteousness to come.

A SHARP AND TRENCHANT  
"BLADE."

We have been favored by a friend with the perusal of several copies of the *Kansas Blade*, a paper claiming to be "Independent in all things, neutral in none." Judging from what we have read we conclude that it is true to its motto, which is more than can be said of a great many public journals. In the numbers furnished to us a discussion is maintained between the editor and

a lady, by the name of English, who claims to have lived in Utah for several years, and who simply repeats a lot of trash told to her by malignant enemies of the "Mormons." Polygamy seems to be the chief object of her attack, but in assailing it she drags into the discussion a great many incidents that are utterly untrue, but, if reliable, would have no more bearing upon the subject of controversy than the social evil has to do with astronomy.

The lady evinces total ignorance of the facts and is palpably influenced by silly and groundless stories told to her by the class of persons with whom she associated while in Utah, if she ever sojourned here at all. The *Blade* editor, it is easy to be seen, has taken pains to inform himself upon the condition of affairs in this Territory, and while taking no stock in "Mormonism," being a skeptic on religious matters, he has obtained data which enable him to shatter the arguments of his antagonist as fragile glass by a hammer wielded by a muscular hand.

For this the adroit manipulator of the trenchant *Blade* has been blamed by some of the good, pious souls who are as ignorant of the principles and practice of the "Mormon" faith as Mrs. English appears to be, and, as is common in such cases, they accuse him of being an "advocate of polygamy." This is the common argument(?) raised against Members of Congress who have the courage to resist the violation of constitutional principles involved in most of the proposed legislation against the Latter-day Saints. Let a senator or Representative oppose a measure framed by sectarian bigots, and fathered by some priest-ridden Member or ambitious demagogue anxious to make a mark as the reputed squelcher of an unpopular creed and community, and an attempt is at once made to intimidate him by the insinuation or open charge that he is "a friend of polygamy." This has had quite an effect upon timid minds. But men of stamina who care not for such untruthful and cowardly attacks, pay no attention to them, and take their stand as defenders of constitutional rights and guarantees, indifferent as to the construction put upon their motives. Such men always win in the long run. There is yet to be recorded an instance in which a Member of Congress has been defeated in running for re-election, by the attempts of his enemies to make it appear that he winked at polygamy because he would not endorse unconstitutional measures though from what we read we judge that he needs no encouragement of this kind to support him in his fearless rebuttal of groundless charges against an unpopular people.

We do not endorse his views of the Bible or the Christian religion any more than he does our views of marriage and morals. But we credit him with sincerity and manliness, and assure him that he is in the right on many points relative to the system that is popularly called "Mormonism." He is incorrect, however, in the idea that the "Mormons" are intolerant—a failing which he attributes to all so-called "Christian" denominations, and in the common notion that we would injure in person or property those who differ from us in religious faith and practice. For "Mormonism" is the most tolerant of religions, not only conceding the right of all people to worship what or how they choose and to let worship altogether alone if they see proper, but teaching the duty of Latter-day Saints to struggle for and maintain the religious liberty of all persons of every race and creed. That freedom which we claim for ourselves we demand equally for every other people upon the face of the earth, the numerous statements of our traducers to the contrary notwithstanding.

We here append some extracts from a number of articles on the subject of "The Mormon Question" which have appeared in the columns of the *Kansas Blade*:

"I believe that religious jealousy is the main cause of the trade against the Mormons. I have doubted and still doubt, that from a physiological standpoint, there is anything detrimental in their system to the propagation of healthy, robust men and women, and cite my opponents to the children of polygamists and the puny, sickly, sentimental Christians to prove it.

It is asserted by the Christian that the system is detrimental to

sound morals, and I demand in vain of them to produce their proof. Viewing the Utah Mormons as they now are, mainly with comfortable homes, cultivated fields, schools and all the paraphernalia of modern civilization around them—all made in a desert which other "Christians" had avoided for three hundred years, as being absolutely unfit for civilization or settlement; then considering their condition before they went there, it gives a square and incontrovertible contradiction to the Christian charge.

I have stated a well-known fact—proved by the census—that when men and women reach the marriageable age there are about 30 per cent. more women than men, and ask you and all Christendom what you are going to do about it, and you make no reply. My opponents instead of attempting to solve this great problem, pass it by and charge me with "justifying polygamy" in simply mentioning it!

What you and other Mormon-haters refer me to evils you and they assert exist under Mormon rule to prove that Mormon polygamy is "the sum of all villainies," I refer you and them to the fact that every one of the evils you name exist where monogamy, and not polygamy, is the law—and this you and my other opponents twist into a "justification of polygamy."

I defend the Utah Mormons from what I believe to be unjust and unfounded accusations, but do not 'justify' their plural marriage system. When I look over the country and see seventeen marriageable young women without husbands because there are not enough men for husbands, I have frankness and courage enough to own that I see in this a very embarrassing question, and that I do not know what is the best thing to do under the circumstances. I say I have the 'courage' to make this acknowledgement, and that it requires some little courage to even allude to the matter will not be denied by those who have witnessed the war waged upon me from the west and the east on account of it.

The alleged facts against the Mormons comes entirely from their enemies, and I question them on this ground: How would you like to be judged exclusively by your enemies? How would you like to have your name go down to posterity written only by the persons who hated you while living?

These are facts that cannot be controverted and questions that will awaken thought in a channel different from what we read we judge that he needs no encouragement of this kind to support him in his fearless rebuttal of groundless charges against an unpopular people.

The Mormons also have the authority of the book upon which the "Christian system" is founded, for their system of plural wives. They give the book literal and truthful interpretation, and the Christian a false one.

As to the jumped-at conclusion that every departure from a strict line of propriety that occurs in Utah is chargeable to plural marriage, an illogical deduction frequently indulged in, the *Blade* says:

It is a very easy thing for you to say, and so it is for all Mormon haters, that everything that is bad in Mormonism results from their system of polygamy, but a little proof thrown in now and then would greatly relieve the monotony of your oft repeated assertions. Point me, if you can, to evils existing there greater than exist in the States; evils that grow out of this plural marriage system, but not the system itself. We all admit that to be bad, but cannot give the reasons for our belief.

The mainspring of the movement which has stirred up so much strife against the Saints is thus plainly pointed out:

The spirit of persecution that made the puritans notorious has never died out in this country. It was revived against the Mormons at Kirtland, pursued them to Missouri, Nauvoo and Salt Lake. It has been the incarnate devil that has caused more trouble than all other inherited evils. Following the example of the early settlers of New England, their descendants have opposed every new doctrine, and every reform that has been attempted in this country; from every "ism" in religion to the abolition of slavery and the propagation of temperance. It never tries to reason one out of a wrong belief, but invariably resorts

to force. It was this puritanical spirit that murdered Joe Smith and robbed the Mormons at Nauvoo, and has been trying to rob them at Salt Lake.

That contemptible egotistical idea of "I am right and you are wrong" has ever been uppermost in the New Englander and is the one thing more than all others, that has led to so much persecution in this country. The seeds of discord it has laid have been hatched in every part of the land. The spirit of hate of the Mormons that pervades Mrs. E's articles are the results of puritanical New England teachings—one may look in vain in them for the slightest spark of humanitarian feeling or sympathy. All is evidence of hate, hate. A crime committed by a Utah Mormon is, in your opinion, of far more magnitude, than the same crime would be if committed elsewhere. I suspect that your opinion of the Mormons has been formed more from what envious religionists and designing politicians have said of them than from indisputable facts. If the Mormons had been Methodists instead, and voted the straight republican ticket, Utah would long since have been a State in the Union, notwithstanding their polygamous practices. There is just two essentials to good citizenship, viz., first, one man must be an orthodox Christian, and second, vote the republican ticket. If he professes the former and practices the latter he is all right although he has committed adultery with forty women, like the well-known Brooklyn divine.

There is another blow in a vulnerable place. We know well enough that most of the outcry against our marriage system is not made on moral grounds, but proceeds in a majority of instances from notoriously corrupt and immoral sources. And the hypocrisy of the uproar about "Mormon" polygamy is shown up in the following paragraph with which we close our quotations:

Granting that the Mormon system of plural wives is bad, what have we in the States as the result of single wives? One hundred thousand and more of prostitution! And who patronize the prostitutes? I have taken some pains to find out, and from the best information obtainable, that of doctors and druggists, I find that where one single man is a patron of these institutions four married men are patrons. In some cities has the "social evil" become so seated and permanent that houses of ill fame have had to be licensed. This is the case in nearly every city of the country. Two hundred of "Gods" anointed, are charged annually with breaking the seventh commandment. Alms houses and lunatic asylums are made to contribute to the gratification of the lust of some canting religionists. There is no disputing the fact that the "social evil" is greatly on the increase in the States; that its growth keeps pace with the growth of the Protestant religion; that the head men of that church are less constant to the marriage vow than any other class who lay claim to respectability. What I want to see is these Christians who are so horrified at Mormon polygamy, "pull the beam out of their own eye" before they make such an ado about the "mote in their neighbor's eye."

This is not an apology for one alleged wrong by the citation of another. It is simply the denial of the right of those who uphold or wink at admitted evils of the grossest kind, to rail at something which prejudice condemns and which, if as bad as it is painted, does not begin to compare in enormity with the villainies which abound among the very people who act the censor. We hope the *Blade* will not become rusty, lose its keen edge or cease to be wielded in opposition to sham and cant, and in defence of plain truth, however unpalatable it may be to the bigots and latter-day Pharisees.

## OFFICIAL DUTY AND PERSONAL RIGHTS.

A CIRCUMSTANCE that has recently occurred in this city, gives rise to some queries concerning the rights of officers, and the rights of the people in relation to them. The permanent residents of this Territory, with few exceptions, are eminently a law-respecting and law observing community. They will not knowingly violate the regulations

which are necessary to peace and good order. They are quiet in their habits and not disposed to resist any proper exercise of official functions. Because of this disposition they are liable to be imposed upon by impudent persons under the guise of official authority. They should know their rights and be fearless in maintaining them.

Proper respect ought to be shown to all officers of the law in the exercise of lawful duty. This is absolutely necessary to the welfare of society. The law protects its officers in their official callings, and all good citizens should act in the same spirit. Neither the law nor public opinion countenances extra-official and pertinent proceedings on the part of any public officer, no matter how high and mighty he may consider himself to be or how important his title may sound.

It is an old English saying that "Every man's house is his castle." The principle holds good in the United States. The rights of citizens must be respected by officers as well as private individuals. Yet an officer armed with civil or criminal process should not be interfered with nor prevented from serving it in a lawful manner. A warrant of arrest as a subpoena for a witness, or other paper issued by a competent court should be respected by all citizens and the person serving it should be treated with respect if he behaves decently. But the authority to serve such paper gives him no right to go with any impropriety, to invade the property, or insult the person of a citizen, nor to intrude himself into private premises unless he is expressly authorized for a purpose specified in the warrant, such as case of a search warrant, when the officer may break open any part of a house if necessary in his search for property ordered to be seized, or in case of arrest for a public offence. But he must first show his authority and purpose and be refused admittance.

In serving a subpoena for the attendance of a witness, he has no right of forcible entry or intrusion upon the premises of a third party. The service of a subpoena, too, must be made by showing the original document and informing the witness of its contents. If a witness conceals himself for the purpose of evading the service upon him, or proof of this, by affidavit, he may be punished for contempt, but the officer cannot lawfully force himself upon people's premises under the plea that a desired witness is concealed there. If an officer does not make his authority and purpose known, he must expect to be treated as a private individual, and on making himself obnoxious may be ejected without ceremony if he objects to leaving peaceably.

The penal code provides for the protection of an officer in the legitimate discharge of his duty. Following is

Section 1862.—Every person who attempts by means of any threat or violence, to deter or prevent an executive officer from performing any duty imposed upon such officer by law, or who knowingly resists, by the use of force or violence, such officer in the performance of his duty, is punishable by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars and imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year.

This is perfectly right and just. But the offender in order to be liable to the penalty must be informed in regard to the officer's authority. If the officer does not announce it, and he acts in an intrusive and impudent manner he may be cast out unceremoniously, as he ought to be, that he may learn better manners. The people have rights, and officers have no legal protection in trampling upon them.

There is another thing which deputy marshals or other officers or pretended officers have no right to do; that is, subject people upon whom they intrude to a cross-fire of questions with the view of eliciting something of a damaging nature to the persons thus insulted or to their friends. Citizens are under no obligation to answer the queries of strangers or persons clothed with a little brief authority. There are instances that might be named where a little judicious application of foot would be the best reply to impertinent interrogations, and the surest cure for barefaced impertinence.

An officer who knows his duty and seeks to perform it within the limits of law and propriety, will meet with little or no obstruction among the vast majority of the people of this Territory. But sneaks