

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - OCT. 31, 1888.

STICKING TO HER FALSEHOODS.

We expressed the opinion, when it was decided that the \$80,000 which was asked of Congress for the so-called Industrial Home, should be cut down to \$32,000, and its expenditure put into the hands of an agent of the Treasury Department, that the falsehoods told for the purpose of getting the money would be repeated elsewhere for a similar purpose. The press dispatches bring word that shows our conjecture to have been correct. This is the dispatch, dated New York, October 23d, and containing some particulars of the convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, a very worthy organization:

"Among the speeches was an address by Mrs. Angie F. Newman, who has charge of the work among the Mormon women. Her graphic description of the shocking condition of the Mormon women elicited horrified exclamations from all parts of the house. She told of two sisters, Mormon girls, one sixteen years old and the other fourteen years old, whom she saw in a squalid condition, both with babies in their arms, and both the girls were wives of their own father. Another case mentioned was that of a man who had married, beside a wife outside his family, his own mother, his grandmother, his daughter and his granddaughter. All these wives were living at the same time."

The infamy of the foregoing can be appreciated by the people of Utah both "Mormon" and "Gentile," but not by the audience to whom these wicked falsehoods were told. Mrs. Newman never saw any such persons as she describes in Utah. Her statements are untrue in every particular. If she said she saw the parties she describes, she cannot have the slightest regard for the commandment and fear of the fate described in the apocalypse for those who "love and make a lie."

In her testimony before Congress, which was published in the *Congressional Record* of October 3d, the story was told about the two girls with babies. It was atrociously false and made up out of whole cloth, either by Mrs. Newman or some one who told her the untruth. The most positive testimony has been obtained by Delegate Caine of the groundlessness of her story, and it appears in the *Congressional Record* of October 20th.

In spite of this, Mrs. Newman persists in repeating these dirty scandals, and will no doubt continue to make sensations in congregations of Christian ladies, to effect her own purposes. She seems to roll these vile stories upon her tongue as sweet morsels, and rejoices over the effect they produce in prejudicing and deceiving the public as to the "Mormons." The evidence is complete that Mrs. Newman never saw any such persons as she claims to have seen, and the story about the daughter, mother and grandmother is an old invention used before Mrs. Newman visited Utah and known to be fabricated for use outside the Territory, but is amplified and distorted and colored with new hues, to suit the peculiar taste of this pious painter of anti-"Mormon" illusions.

And persons here who know these stories to be false as well as we do, will pat Mrs. Newman on the back, load her with eulogies as a "Christian worker," and ask for money for her to fee her for slandering the people of this Territory. Verily, they will all have their reward!

FURTHERED FRANCE.

Forebodings of troublous scenes lower around every horizon of the French Republic. True, no striking nor immediate menace of her peace exists at the present time, but conditions within and without her borders are adverse to her welfare, and presage misfortune to her. Politically she is divided into many factions, among the leaders of each of which are self-seeking demagogues, who plot, scheme and labor for their own aggrandizement, rather than their country's good. Each faction is jealous and distrustful of all the others, and neither has the confidence of a majority of the people, nor hardly of a respectable proportion of them. In consequence of this condition, the national government is weak, though the present is a time when France needs all her strength,

and to have her people united, and her government conducted by wise and strong men.

There appear to be no great Frenchmen now. Mediocrity seems to be the highest standard reached by any of the present statesmen of France, and she has scarcely a single general whose fame extends across the Atlantic sufficiently to make his name familiar to newspaper readers in this country, if Boulanger be excepted. As for him, he has done nothing to either justify or satisfy the expectancy which centered in him a year ago, in his own country, in Europe, and in America. He is in no sense a great man, and the fame which it was predicted he would achieve, has become mere notoriety, and that of a kind not wholly enviable. His highest conceptions seem to be devoted to methods for producing a dramatic effect, or a transitory sensation. His intellect is of too light a weight and too small a calibre to fully grasp the needs of his country and provide remedies for them.

The French nation is languishing for a great leader; a man who can unite her distracted factions, obtain and hold the confidence of his own country, and command the respect of others. Frenchmen treading upon German soil are subjected to humiliating restrictions; many leading French journals are prohibited from being circulated across the German frontier; the French foreign office is in a continual state of dread and suspense lest diplomatic coalitions may be effected, which would work disastrously to the interests of France; and looming above all other causes of anxiety is the ever present and plainly recognized danger that some ambitious but unscrupulous and incompetent man may make an attempt to establish a dictatorship. And yet France, under her present government, is powerless to protect her citizens abroad, to prevent or redress insult, or establish internal tranquility and confidence.

The fact is, the French race is deteriorating. Its social corruption has sapped its vitality. Physically, Frenchmen have become inferior, and were the warfare of the present age dependent for its results upon bodily prowess rather than the appliances of science, they would be the weakest race in Europe, numbers considered. Were the strong man to appear for which France yearns, it is doubtful if he could find material in the nation out of which to construct anew the superstructure of her former glory and power, which have probably passed away forever.

THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

As the time draws near for the November election the voters of Utah should be preparing for the event. They cannot cast a ballot for President of the United States or for any national officer, and if the so-called "Liberals" of Utah had their way, no one in this Territory would be allowed to vote for anything or anybody. The bogus Democrats and renegade Republicans, fused into the motley mass we call the "Liberal Party," want the President and the Governor to appoint all the local officials, and the laws to be framed by an appointed Commission. Thus the whole people, Jew and Gentile, "Mormon" and Infidel, would become political slaves, if these "Liberals" combiners had their sweet will.

It is amusing to see their straining towards unity among themselves, and their detestation of it among the People's Party. The union of the majority is denounced with all the venomous adjectives in the "Liberal" vocabulary; the union of the minority is held up as altogether lovely and the one thing needful. If the People's Party are united it is described as the effect of "priestly influence;" if the heterogeneous elements of the "Liberal" Party coalesce it is the result of prudent alliance! Votes are wanted awfully bad or the "Liberal" candidate, and some folks who cannot see an inch before their noses for anti-Mormon hate, will actually vote for a candidate for Delegate in Congress who, if he could only "get there," would work to deprive them of power to vote at all!

Of course they cannot succeed, united or divided. The People's candidate will no doubt be elected. But if the opposing party want every vote they can catch, the People's Party want the support of every voter who endorses his principles and candidate. It is important that he receive a good rousing majority. We believe he will have a larger vote than ever. He ought to have it. He has earned it. If a large number of non-"Mormons" in this Territory were wise and consistent, they would vote for John T. Caine for Delegate to Congress. Some of them undoubtedly will. He has done his best to meet the wishes of all his constituency, in everything but in such measures as are desired by a faction for the enslavement of the people.

Every true Democrat in Utah can vote for John T. Caine without going back on a single principle. He is known in Congress as a Democrat in principle and in practice. He is the nominee of the People's Party, but the platform of that party is Democratic in every plank. The organization is not a part of the great national Democratic party, but its principles are harmonious with those of Democracy in all essentials.

The nominee of the "Liberals" is

a pretended Democrat, but he and his party are pledged to measures which are diametrically opposed to Democratic principles and utterly subversive of Democratic government, in that they are devoted to the destruction of local liberty and the individual rights of citizens. They work for an extension and increase of centralized power as opposed to popular and local power. They would rob the people of Utah of the franchise, and give the Federal authority power to dominate in local affairs. They place in the field an advocate of absolutism in the guise of a Democrat; the People's Party put forward a recognized, registered and acting Democrat who works for the freedom of the citizen and for local community self-government. True Democrats will have no difficulty in choosing.

The People's Party cannot afford to divide, even if there was any reason for doing so. When the enemy combine we ought not to split. That must be plain to every rational person. All movements calculated to draw off a single vote from the People's Party are foolish and reprehensible. Everything that would tend to weaken the People's Party or lessen its vote must be inimical to its interests. This needs no argument.

But there is not the slightest reason for division. We hear of no objection to the candidate or the platform of the People's Party among those who have been their supporters. If anybody wants to vote for a Democratic candidate they have one in the nominee of the People's Party. There is no Republican candidate in the field, except such Republicanism as may exist in the composition of the bogus Democrat of the "Liberal" combination, who is neither one thing nor the other, and yet affects to represent both while his aim is to destroy both.

We bespeak for Hon. John T. Caine the suffrages of all the voters of Utah who want free government, who value a tried and true public servant, who are opposed to centralization and absolutism, who want to keep the liberties they have and gain all that they should enjoy under the institutions of this country, and who desire the progress and prosperity of Utah. Let there be no division in the People's ranks, let there be no weakening of effort, but let the vote on the 6th of November demonstrate that the People's Party of Utah is one and undivided and has gained in numbers through the attacks of its foes.

LAYING IT ON TOO THICK.

In this morning's issue of a virulent anti-"Mormon" paper of this city is a characteristic article. It is as thin as mosquito muslin. A keen observer can see through it to the other side with one eye shut. The article is devoted to a fulsome eulogy of one the District Judges recently appointed to Utah. The writer of it has so far overshot the mark that the emanation reads in some respects like an obituary eulogium instead of a respectful compliment to a living mortal. The subject is compared to "Cincinnatus." That is followed by such expressions as this: "Were his own son arraigned before him he would try him on the evidence alone, and if convicted he would without a change of face or quiver of voice send him to the penitentiary or scaffold, even if his own heart were to break with anguish." Then there is an expatiation about the gentleman's "Portian inflexibility," and "south-western straightforwardness."

Now, what does all this mean? Simply that the Judge who is made the objective point of this sickening bombardment of taffy has, in the opinion of the writer of the journalistic trifle, exhibited some symptoms of anti-"Mormon" bias. Hence the taffy stick is held enticingly out to induce his honor to step on in the same direction that he may be captured, and, being captured, controlled.

The journal that published this transparent bait could not see that the very expectation of its being snapped at by the gentleman for whose benefit the article was penned is in the nature of a gross reflection upon his good sense and perception. Such an anticipation was necessarily based upon the supposition that the gentleman had a soft spot on his head, that would cause him to be puffed up by this overdose of flattery laid on in thick layers with a lavish hand.

We think better of the Judge than that. So far as we have been able to perceive in relation to him, as yet brief, judicial course thus far, he appears to be an official of good capacity, backed by a determination to do his duty; one who is not liable to have his head turned by hyperbolic compliments from a source that is liable to change the regime to a torrent of abuse, or a stream of base insinuation, such as is tendered another Utah judge in the same article.

Fulsome flattery dealt out by wholesale, for a purpose, is the meanest kind of insult, being a gross reflection upon the good judgment and modesty of the subject of the application.

A DIPLOMATIC SENSATION.

DIPLOMATIC circles in this country are seldom stirred up as they have been over the letter written by the British ambassador at Washington, Lord Sackville West, giving advice to a voter respecting a choice for

President. Some time since Lord Sackville received a letter from California, which purported to have been written by a naturalized British subject named Murchison, who desired the advice of the British minister as to how he should vote in the coming presidential election. The British envoy was foolish enough to give the advice asked for. Not only did he do this, but he reviewed the policy of President Cleveland at some length, taking the view that his retaliatory message was intended for campaign purposes principally, and that, should he be elected, his course respecting Canada would be conciliatory and friendly. Lord Sackville advised his correspondent to vote for Cleveland.

The Los Angeles *Times* published the British minister's letter, vouching for its genuineness, and claiming to have the original in its possession. A sensation in official and newspaper circles, covering the entire country, followed the publication of the letter. There were widespread doubts as to whether the British minister had actually committed such a blunder as to write it, but these were set at rest yesterday by his confession to a press representative that it was genuine.

His defense at first was that he had a right to privately express his personal views; that the letter was a confidential and unofficial communication, and that he should not be censured in consequence of the treachery of the recipient in making it public. Later, however, it transpired that Lord Sackville had no personal knowledge of, nor acquaintance with, his California correspondent; and from statements made by him as given in our dispatches today, he appears to have reached the conclusion that he has been entrapped. Secretary Bayard took the same view, which is doubtless the correct one. Political wireworkers in order to secure their own ends, have by a stratagem, elicited from the British minister an endorsement of President Cleveland and a defense of his Canadian policy, with the result that the enemies of the President can now apparently with better reason than heretofore, denounce him as the "British candidate," and question the sincerity of his course and utterances respecting Canada.

For a foreign diplomatic officer to write such a letter to an American citizen is a gross breach of ambassadorial etiquette. Even under the strictest real of privacy his risk in so doing would be too great to be justifiable; and when Lord Sackville wrote as he did to the supposititious British-American in search of good advice, he, in the language of the New York *Tribune*, "invited his own dismissal." The New York papers are greatly exercised upon the subject. Republican and Democratic journals alike urge the removal of the indiscreet diplomatist. The *Sun* (Democratic) calls upon Secretary Bayard to "give him his passports," and "send him home." The *Mail and Express* (Republican) says: "It is the duty of the administration to send him home." The spirit of American independence voiced by these and other newspapers, vigorously resents the slightest foreign interference in elections.

That Lord Sackville has made a grave blunder cannot be denied; but whether it will result in his recall is doubtful. The trick by which he was caught is too transparent and contemptible to result in appreciable injury to President Cleveland.

JUDGE BERRY'S TEST OATH DECISION.

AFTER reading the evidence in the mandamus case before Judge Berry in Idaho, the merits and demerits of his decision can be passed upon intelligently. We have not published the arguments of the counsel of either side, as they would have taken up more space than we could reasonably spare; but those who heard them have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Hopkins completely demolished the sophistry of opposing counsel and made a magnificent and logical plea on the right of those "Mormons" in Idaho to vote who were not polygamists and had not taught, advised or practiced any of the offenses defined by the Edmunds law.

It is clear from the evidence before the court that the "Mormon" Church in Idaho has not, during the last two years, either counseled or advised the practice of anything condemned by the law. The testimony introduced for the purpose of proving to the contrary was an utter failure. What was done three or four years ago had nothing to do with the present question. The character of the witnesses for the defense, with perhaps one exception, was such as to damage their testimony even if there had been anything in it of weight or pertinency. And one of those witnesses stands branded today as a perjurer. He has been a frequent witness for the prosecution against men for associating with their wives, and has lately been a juror in such cases. Before acting he had to take an oath that he had never been convicted of a felony. And yet it appears he has not long been out of the penitentiary where he served a term for grand larceny. Will he be prosecuted as the law requires? Very doubtful; he has been an active spotter and accuser of the "Mormons."

The decision of Judge Berry has one weak spot in it which appears to vitiate the whole body of the opinion. It is this: He leaves out of consideration one very important clause in the language of the statute, and one upon which the weight of the argument hinges. The oath to be taken by the voter has this obligation:

"That you are not a member of any order, organization or association which teaches, advises, counsels or encourages its members, devotees or other persons to commit the crime of bigamy and polygamy, or any other crime defined by law as a duty arising or resulting from membership in said order, organization or association, or which practices bigamy, polygamy or plural or celestial marriage as a doctrinal rule of such organization."

The claim of the defense was that Mr. Woolley, the plaintiff, was a member of an organization which teaches and advises persons to commit the crimes of bigamy and polygamy as a duty arising or resulting from membership in said organization. This vital clause in the above which we have italicized, was wholly ignored by Judge Berry. He was perhaps justified in declining to pass on the question of the law's constitutionality, as that had been decided in the Supreme Court of the Territory. His argument as to the membership of the plaintiff in the Church as an entire organization, and not merely of the Ward or Stake where he resides, has some show of good ground, although the laws of Idaho cannot legally affect the Church in Utah, and the jurisdiction of Judge Berry does not reach beyond Idaho, and the laws relating to that Territory. We will not now dispute these two propositions. But the fact that polygamy was not such a duty arising or resulting from membership as contemplated in the statute, was clearly established by the evidence. The record shows that in Bear Lake County only 46 persons out of a population of 4,500 could be called polygamists. In Oneida only one out of every 150 persons, in Cassia there were but nine in a population of 1,500, and so on in what are called "the Mormon counties of Idaho." It has been demonstrated beyond refutation that the very large majority of the "Mormon" people have not violated the Edmunds law, or any law against bigamy and polygamy, therefore it follows that it has not been required of them "as a duty arising from Church membership," to practice bigamy or polygamy or plural marriage, whichever term may be used. If it were, how could the great body of the members remain in good standing and fellowship without practicing the so-called requirement as a duty arising from their membership?

The object of the law was of course to suppress a practice, not a creed. If not, it is unconstitutional, on the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Reynolds case, that legislation can only affect actions and not beliefs or opinions. If the "Mormon" Church required its members, as a duty arising from their membership, to enter into the practice of polygamy, there might be some show of validity in a law like the Idaho test oath statute, and the ruling of Judge Berry in the present case. But the contrary was proven and the known facts are against the theory of the decision.

It would be idle to say that the "Mormon" Church "practices plural marriage as a doctrinal rule." The "Mormon" Church, as an organization, cannot practice either polygamy or monogamy. Some of its members—a small minority—have in times past married more wives than one, but this was not the Church, nor did it inculcate the majority of its members who never engaged in the practice. That can only be charged against the individuals who broke the law. The Church cannot be indicted, the Church cannot be imprisoned, the Church cannot be called a bigamist or polygamist.

The Court decides that Mr. Woolley is a member of an organization which teaches, advises and encourages plural marriages, etc.; but the court does not state that the Church teaches it as "a duty arising from Church membership," and there is the point of the vulnerability of the decision. We might take up the court's argument that because the Church has taught and advised people to practice polygamy and has not, as an organization, publicly repudiated the doctrine, therefore it teaches and advises it today, and show how slender it is in logic and in law. But we do not care to enter into that matter. Suffice it to say that it does not follow, because a person broke the law or advised others to break it, two or three years ago, that he does the same today.

The evidence showed that the doctrine complained of had not been taught in Idaho for at least two years, and it was not proven before the court that the Church does now teach, advise and encourage its members to commit polygamy. No judge or other civil authority has the right to require a church to make a formal renunciation of any tenet, whether it leads to unlawful acts or otherwise. The simple cessation of teaching the tenet complained of must come within the meaning of the Idaho statute; the language is in the present tense. If it is shown that in Idaho the Church has not taught the doctrine, but that the teaching has been forbidden for two years at least, and if it is not shown that the Church to which the plaintiff belongs does anywhere now advise the practice of polygamy, where is the foundation, in the testimony, on which Judge Berry builds up his ruling?