

The Deseret Weekly,

PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY,
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, - - - \$2.50.
Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, - - 1.50.
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, - - - EDITOR.

Saturday, - - October 25, 1890.

PEOPLE'S TICKET.

Delegate to Congress:

JOHN T. CAINE.

NEITHER "ORDERED" NOR "COUNSELED."

On Saturday we replied to the statement of the "Liberal" candidate for the office of Delegate to Congress, that "the chiefs of the Church hold it a divine right to order the rank and file to vote as they decreed," and that this is the reason why he advocates the disfranchisement of every member of the "Mormon" Church. In our reply was the following paragraph:

There is not a member of the Church who can truthfully say he has been ordered to vote for any candidate for office. There is not a delegate to any of the conventions recently held for municipal, county or territorial politics who can truthfully say that he has been ordered to nominate or oppose any person, or to support or reject any ticket or policy. We repeat what we have stated again and again, that every member of the "Mormon" Church is free, in theory and in practice, to vote as he chooses without compulsion of any kind or nature. His creed accords him this liberty, his leaders do not interfere with it."

This paragraph is quoted in the "Liberal" organ, followed by a number of epithets and pet names such as that paper usually utters against an opponent in the place of argument; and the sweet-faced cherub and noted logician who penned them added these remarks:

"Of course it will be noticed how he plays on the word 'ordered.' Suppose the word 'counseled' were to be changed for 'ordered,' and then suppose that we all know that the one means to assist the same as the other, although they are two different words; and suppose we reflect on what the rule has been from the first, which has never been broken in forty years; which has caused every Mormon in good standing to vote whatever ticket was dictated to him by his chiefs; which has caused more than one of them to give as an excuse for voting for unworthy men, 'I had to do it,' etc.

Well, the word "ordered" was what we had to reply to. If we

had substituted some other word, that would have been after the mendacious fashion of the *Tribune* writer, who, when cornered in a dispute, invariably changes the language of his adversary, and proceeds to comment upon it and pour out the stream of billingsgate which be mistakes for reasoning.

"A divine right to order the rank and file to vote as they decreed."

That is what was charged that the chiefs of the Church hold, and which every "Mormon" has to obey. This we denied *in toto*, and we deny it now. Substitute the word "counseled," then for "ordered," if you please, and while we deny that the words mean the same to the "Mormons" or to anybody else who understands English, we deny that "every Mormon in good standing has to vote whatever ticket is dictated to him by his chief." We say that the chiefs of the "Mormon" Church do not formulate political tickets, or tell "the rank and file" or anybody else that they must vote for them. Such tickets are framed in regular conventions and nobody is under obligation or compulsion to vote for them.

It is not true that "Mormons" have had to give as an excuse for voting for unworthy men, "I had to do it." A short time ago the same charge was made by the same scribe, and we called for names. The reply came that the father of S. W. Sears said so, in excuse for voting for a certain candidate in the convention at which he was nominated. Mr. Sears, the father of S. W. Sears, when asked about this by the present writer, stated positively he had never said anything of the kind, he had never any occasion to say it, and he was not a member of the convention referred to.

The point in dispute is this: A demand is made that the chiefs of the Church shall give up a claim that they do not make, and that the members of the Church shall cease submitting to dictates that are not promulgated, and to a coercive influence that is not exercised. And the truth is, that those who make the demand either do not know anything about either the theory or practice of "Mormonism," or they are working in the usual "Liberal" way to deceive the public, and they know all the time they make these demands that they are uttering the very baldest kind of mendacious nonsense.

Dredge a little flour over the top of cake to keep the icing from running.

THE "LIBERAL" LOGICAN AT IT AGAIN.

THE bright logician (?) of the "Liberal" organ spread himself over three quarters of a column on Sunday to prove that the People's Party Convention knew nothing of politics. This he attempted to establish by quoting from the first paragraph of the platform. As he only quoted it in part, we will here repeat the whole:

"The Constitution of the United States is a divinely inspired instrument, ordained and established for the protection of life and property and to secure to every individual the most complete freedom compatible with the general welfare.

The first part of this paragraph he settles by saying:

"The Constitution was no more inspired than Hamlet," etc.

That is, it was not inspired because he says it was not inspired. Of course that is the end of controversy. But how does he know that "Hamlet" was not inspired? However, his opinion on this question is immaterial.

He goes on to belittle that splendid instrument, which has been eulogized as the "bulwark of freedom" and the "palladium of human rights," by the foremost writers and speakers of the age, and says:

"Neither was it designed to protect any one's life and liberty."

And how does he attempt to establish this? By the following language, which actually proves the very point he tries to disprove:

"What there is in it about rights to life and liberty was put in to bar the new power from trampling upon rights to life and liberty already existent."

What need is there of further argument? That is just what the paragraph in question states. The Constitution protects life, property and liberty. Or if he pleases to put it so, it is a "bar" to any "power from trampling upon rights to life and liberty."

But he says these rights were "not derived from the Constitution." Who said they were? The platform says the Constitution was established for their "protection," not for their "creation." But this is his everyday honesty and his peculiar logic. He substitutes other words and other thoughts for those of his opponents and then blazes away at them in reckless style, as though he had scarcely recovered from a fuddle, and commonly succeeds in refuting his own assertions. When he is not foul and abusive he is vastly amusing and, thoroughly absurd.