

## OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

JUNIUS, WITH HIS TRENCHEANT PEN,  
PUNCTURES SOCIAL AND POLITICAL  
BUBBLES.

## THE DISPATCH FIEND.

CHICAGO, Nov. 17, 1886.

Editor Deseret News:

That "dispatch fiend" has turned up once more. He is now located at Pittsburg. He has just commenced his old tactics. This must be in anticipation of the President's message. This fiend says "Elder Gray, of the Mormon Church, whose headquarters are in Chicago, is now provoking the ire of Pennsylvania by his zealotry in proselyting." The dispatch is dated from Pittsburg, which is now known as "Fiddler's Green," on account of the United Presbyterian Conference which has just split up there about music, or fiddling in church. There is the United Fiddlers and anti-United Fiddlers, and they have made a green of grimy, smoky Pittsburg. It was commonly supposed that Fiddler's Green was somewhere beyond the Styx, and it would be a blessing if the "dispatch fiend" were there also.

Speaking of

## MUSIC IN CHURCH.

It may not be out of place to call the attention of these benighted Presbyterianians to the lines of John Milton:

"There let the pealing organ blow,  
To the full-voiced quire below,  
In service high, and anthems clear,  
As may with sweetness through mine ear,  
Dissolve me into ecstasies,  
And bring all heaven before mine eyes."

The Harvard celebration is developing quite a special kind of literature. Mr. Lowell, Dr. Holmes and President Cleveland are the

## HEROES OF THE HOUR.

They are all coming in for some harsh criticism. It appears the great press was severely sat upon. Dr. Holmes said of Cleveland:

"I see the statesman, firm, sagacious, bold,  
For life's long conflict east in amplest mold;  
Not his to clamor with the senseless throng  
That shouts, unshamed, 'Our party, right or wrong,'  
But in the patriot's never ending fight,  
To side with truth, who changes wrong to right."

You Tribunes and bloody shirt organs put that in your pipe and smoke it. It is gall and wormwood to be sure, but gall and wormwood sometimes answer a purpose. Your occupation is gone. The Puritan and Cavalier are coming to understand each other, and Lowell and Lamar, Holmes and Bayard can dine in peace once more. Mr. Lowell said: "I am saddened when I see our

## SUCCESS AS A NATION

measured by the number of acres under tillage, or of bushels of wheat or of corn exported, for the real value of a country must be weighed in scales more delicate than the balance of trade."

This is something for the advocates of mere material prosperity to ponder over. The critics say in answer to Mr. Lowell that wealth prepares the way to intellectual greatness; that Athens had millionaires when Socrates and Plato lived; that Italy was rich when Dante wrote; and that when wealth decayed in Sicily no more of the Theocritus school flourished. This is all correct. But when the standard of national success was made mere dollars rather than intellect, then Greece, Italy and Sicily too, lost both wealth and intellect. A Gould, a Vanderbilt, and an Astor may be good things in a country, but turn them into national idols and you have the story of the golden calf retold over again. A Holmes, a Lowell and a Beecher are idols to be set up for a nation to worship. Industry, economy and enterprise are good, but they are only secondary to religion, integrity and conscience. A nation may contain aristocracies of mere wealth, but as long as it maintains a Westminster Abbey, and cherishes the memory of a Goldsmith more fondly than that of a king, such a nation cannot decay.

But it is the speech of President Cleveland which has set the venaal scribe in a fury. The President said: "Certain newspapers violate every instinct of American manliness, and in unbridled glee desecrate every sacred relation of private life." He is censured by the prostitutes of the press for saying this at Harvard. What more appropriate tribunal could he arraign a criminal press before, than that of an educational one. The alumni and professors of Harvard are surely competent to judge. And the man who has the moral courage to stand up against the vile, villainous and barlot press of this country, is the very Martin Luther of American politics. Of course, there are very few graduates of Harvard at the head of the press. Men of intellect and taste could hardly make a newspaper a great financial success. These men could not give the five finish to a church scandal, a bank swindle, or a bagno broil which your Goodwins, Medfills, Nixons, and Allens could give. These are the men who can penetrate where medicated paper is used, and detail its virtues or its defects.

The best and most terse estimate of our civilization as it embraces religion, society and politics, is that given by

the poet Boyle O'Reilly, of Boston. He sees:

The moistureless froth of the social show;  
The vulgar sham of the pompous feast,  
Where the heaviest purse is the highest priest;  
The organized charity scrimped and iced,  
In the name of a cautious statistical Christ;  
The smile restrained, the respectable cant,  
When a friend in need is a friend in want;  
Where the only aim is to keep aloof,  
And a brother may drown with a cry in his throat.

Where purses are turned into priests and where Christianity has to be kept on ice, and where selfishness is the predominating characteristic, it is no wonder that strange developments are taking place. It is no wonder that Georgeism, Nihilism and Socialism are gaining strength and reversing the natural order of things. Religion is upside down, literature is mere cant, and politics are become chaos.

What are said to be Democratic gains in Minnesota are not in reality so much that, as kind of left-handed

## ENDORSEMENT OF HENRY GEORGE.

The wheat-growers of that State have long felt that "Millers' Associations" and "Boards of Trade" are playing a kind of Socialist game with general produce. The Republican candidates were supported by the millers and other wheat traders. The Democratic candidates were supported by the Labor party, and the farmers having tried the millers, now resolve to try something else. The press generally claim that farmers would prove the most bitter opponents of Georgeism. That is undoubtedly the case if farmers in their own dealings with merchants, traders, brokers and others were not as foully dealt with as Henry George could deal with them. It would be interesting to learn in how many ways the farmer finds himself robbed. His car of potatoes will pan out in Chicago 50 bushels short. His car of oats or wheat will run short 50 or 100 bushels, and it is sold not according to value but as gamblers dictate. The farmer of all others is the one least protected at present. The railroad man, the scale man, the elevator man, the inspector, the board of trade man, all look on the farmer as old "haysced" and fit for nothing else but plucking, and plucked he is.

As to the method of gambling practised by the

## CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

the Chicago Tribune of Nov. 11 gives a full account. Here is an extract from an editorial on this topic. It is lengthy, but it will explain why Henry George Socialism finds a soil for its pernicious seeds. The gamble is euphemistically called dealing in privileges, and it will be seen that the members of the great Chicago Board of Trade are lawbreakers as well as blacklegs.

There can be no question that the privilege business is a nuisance as well as a breach of State law. It is not a whit better than the methods of the bucket-shop in its character, being the sheerest kind of gambling, and its effect on the general business of the board is very far from salutary. It not infrequently controls the entire course of the markets for wheat and corn, and by this means places outsiders at a disadvantage, the existence of which they have not been slow to learn. The thing is simply a species of gigantic bookmaking, as it would be called on the English turf, in which a few men rake in a great number of dollars each evening in payment for the privilege of insisting that they shall buy or sell the next day at a stipulated price. If the market does not move in favor of the man who has bought the privilege he loses the money paid for it. If it goes in his favor he is then at the mercy of the bookmaker, who can repudiate or not, as he pleases, because the whole transaction is illegal in the eye of the board as well as under the State enactment against it, and it lacks even the code of honor which compels payment of losses incurred on the British turf. But the board in its corporate capacity has hitherto winked at the enormity, as the list of operators includes some of its biggest men. Of course while it does so the board cannot consistently take ground against the equally pernicious methods of the bucket-shop style of trading.

Yet these papers which publish the rottenness of our trade, our religion, and our politics, are those which ask why Georgeism is taking root. Some day it will be said the newspaper killed the American Goddess of Liberty.

## OGDEN DEPARTMENT.

## DISTRICT COURT.

FARR TRIAL CONTINUED.—On Tuesday evening, Mrs. William Farrell testified to being at the farm of defendant in 1884 and to seeing him there, but she did not see him go into the bedroom of the alleged plural wife who resides there.

Chris. Hausen, was sworn and said he saw the defendant near the house of his second wife in 1884. But did not see him in, enter or come out of the house.

On Wednesday morning the court was opened in the usual way. The witnesses in the case of the U. S. vs. John Bergen were excused until next Monday.

The Farr case was then proceeded with. T. F. Anderson was the first witness. Knew the defendant. He lived in the home, corner of First and Main Street. He knew him in 1883-4; he then lived east of Fry's brewery. In that year he came to the house of witness' home accompanied by a Mrs. Farr, but could not say which one. They were in a buggy. They came there to visit Mrs. Farr's daughter, who then lived at the house of witness. Several of the alleged wives of the defendant could not identify either of them as being the lady he saw with defendant. In fact, his information as to her being defendant's wife was received from another party—he did not know for himself. Witness said that it was the

## GENERAL UNDERSTANDING

in this community that in 1883-4 Mrs. Farr resided at the farm, but could not particularize any one person who knew it to be a fact. He himself did not know it to be a fact. Witness had resided there since 1870, yet he never heard of such a place in this city as the Farr homestead.

Mrs. Anderson, wife of the last witness testified she knew defendant and Mrs. Farr, had seen them together in a buggy in the street in 1884. In the same year the witness was in company with Mrs. Farrell at the farm. She was in the house, and the supposed wife, but defendant was not in the house—he was in the yard.

Mrs. Nicoline Farr was recalled and said she went to the theatre in this city with defendant about one and a half years since, that was the last time. In reply to counsel she said defendant and his reputed wives were members in good standing in the Church. Counsel for defense objected to this question and answer as being immaterial to the case. The prosecutor wished to show that defendant belonged to an organization which believed polygamy, and that in consequence he had a disposition to violate the law against unlawful cohabitation—and that he belongs to a Church which does not hold in fellowship a man who

## REFUTES HIS WIVES,

and therefore he must hold out to the world his alleged plural wives as such, and is therefore living in unlawful cohabitation.

After considerable discussion the Court ruled that the prosecution has a right to show by the testimony that the witness or defendant believes that having entered into polygamous marriage that they have a right to continue their marriage relations notwithstanding the law against it. Defense excepted to the ruling of the court. The Court then said it believed the question of the prosecution to show the defendant's belief on this subject was improper and should not be allowed.

The same question was again put several times in different forms but was objected to by defense. Finally the witness said that she believed according to the Bible that polygamy was right, but she did not think it was right to violate the law against it. In reply to counsel for defense she said the way she came to go to the theatre at the time above named was, defendant went to her home to ask her daughter to go, and witness asked permission to go with them. It was granted and she went. She did not think defendant would have been a gentleman to have refused her.

Ann Jones Farr was recalled, and said about two years since she lived at the old homestead. Nicoline lived opposite to her, and Sarah lived at the farm. Shortly after that time she (witness) went to live on the farm, and no one has lived there with her except her children. She said at the time Emmertson went to her house for washing Mr. Farr did not live there, neither did he have or keep any of his clothes or other effects of any kind there. Here the prosecution rested their case.

J. P. Emmertson was recalled by the defense, and asked whether he had stated he went to Ann J. Farr's for washing three times. He said he stated he was there several times, but only saw Mr. Farr go into the house once. He went from out doors and got a coat and put it on and went away, that was the only time he saw him there.

After fifteen minutes recess court resumed, and by agreement the court

## DISMISSED THE FIRST COUNT

in the indictment. The defense then called Nancy C. Farr, who stated she was the wife of defendant, and had resided at the old homestead for 33 years; at the time of the passage of the Edmunds' law Mr. Farr resided there, has done so ever since, and has had no other home during that time to the present. The reputation is that he has not lived with any other of his wives since then, nor held them out as his wives. Up to some two years ago, Ann Jones Farr lived in a part of the old homestead. Witness stated that her house and the one in which Ann Jones Farr formerly lived are separate and there is no mode of communication from one to the other. The effects, clothes, etc., of defendant have been kept at the home of witness, and she had done the repairing, etc., of them during the time above named, and except the times when he has been away on business he has eat and slept at her house. She was cross-examined by the prosecution but nothing new or material was elicited. In her re-direct examination she said she was on friendly relations with the other wives.

Isaac Farr was next sworn: Was son of defendant, was 18 years old. Lived with his mother, Nicoline; has lived there fourteen years. His father has not lived with his mother during the last three years. He has had charge of the store of Farr & Sons for six months past. He formerly worked on his father's farms, but lived where he now does. His father called on him a number of times on business during the last three years, but knew of no communication during that time passing between his mother and defendant; in fact, he was not there when he called. Other sons live on the same block as witness, and when defendant goes to visit them he has to pass the home of witness. Once in a great while defendant would call about meal time, when he was invited by witness and did eat at witness' house. On cross-examination he said his mother is the head of that household, and not the father; she exercises that authority there, and there is "no gentleman head of that household."

Court then adjourned till 2 p. m. At that hour the judge again took the judgment seat, and

## HYRUM TAYLOR,

of Slaterville, was arraigned on a charge of assault with deadly weapons. He pleaded not guilty. The trial is postponed indefinitely. L. R. Rogers, Esq., is engaged for the defense.

The Farr case was then resumed. Dr. Ulrich was sworn for the defense. He knows the defendant, has practiced as a regular physician in his family since 1880. He knew the reputed wives of defendant by sight but could not tell them by name. He has attended them in cases of sickness, purely, since 1882. Before that time defendant called upon him, since then some of the members of the family would call upon him to make them visits professionally. Mr. Farr settled the bills for his wives up to that date. On one occasion, when he was on his way to visit Mary B. Farr he met defendant who went with him to the house and after the visit was over defendant left the house with witness. Since 1882 on the passage of the Edmunds law the members of the family—that is the reputed wives of defendant, paid their own medical bills. Mr. Farr, the defendant, did not pay them. He sustained a critical cross-examination by Mr. Hiles, but his testimony was unshaken. He said if the ladies had not paid their medical bills he never would have requested defendant to do it.

Asael Farr was the next witness. He was the son of Ann Jones Farr; was 20 years old. In 1884-5 lived there. Remembered Emmertson's coming to the house in 1885 for clothes. It was in the kitchen. Mother went to the front room. His father, the defendant, came into the house with his overcoat on his arm and asked witness to help him put it on. He did so, and defendant at once left the house. This was in the latter part of 1884, or early part of 1885. Defendant did not live with witness' mother during any part of that time.

Mr. Hiles moved that the testimony of this witness be stricken out because he was in court and heard Emmertson's testimony yesterday. Objection overruled by the Court.

The prosecution then badgered this witness to a great extent, but made nothing of it. Witness admitted that his father visited the house some 12 times that year, but it was on business with witness.

Thomas Farr was the next witness. He is 23 years old. Was son of the defendant. Resided in the third house north of Nicoline's, on Main Street. Has lived there seven years. Several of his brothers live near him. All of them were in the employ of their father. Defendant has visited the house of witness a number of times during the last three or four years. Sometimes several times a week, on business. In doing this he necessarily had to pass the house of Nicoline. If the father happened in at meal times witness would invite him to sit down and eat with them, and he sometimes would do so. His mother's name is Sarah. The reputation in the family is that defendant lives with

## ONLY ONE WIFE—

that is the first or legal wife—Nancy C. Farr, and that he does not hold out any others as his wives.

Valasco Farr was examined. His testimony was similar to those who had previously testified.

Miles H. Jones lived about three-fourths of a mile from the defendant. Has known the family for 34 years. Ann Jones Farr is witness' sister. Defendant's reputation has been reputed to have lived with his first wife only, during the last four years. Neither has he been reputed to have held out any others as his wives during that time. Witness has heard his sister say she lives alone as though she had no husband, and has done so for a long time.

George H. Tribe lived about half a block from defendant, in Ogden. Has resided there for 16 years. Knew Mr. Farr had heard it said in that neighborhood that defendant has lived only with his first wife for the last three or four years.

Thomas L. Williams belonged to the "Mormon" Church 22 years ago, but has not since that time. The rest of his statements were in substance similar to Tribe's.

At 4 p. m. both sides rested their case. A recess was taken till half-past 4, when counsel for the prosecution, Mr. Hiles, commenced his plea to the jury. He referred to the organization of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Lat-

ter-day Saints," which he said was a religio-political organization—a hierarchy. They believed in polygamy, and scorned every human law that runs counter to the law which they claim has been given them from God authorizing the practice of plural marriage. He then dwelt for some time on the magnanimous beneficence and grandeur of the character of the government of the United States, under which, he said, all men, heathen or Christian, could worship according to the dictates of their own consciences, unchallenged and unhindered. But he said polygamy was no part of any religion, but it was a system of barbarity—it is a system that is now dead and buried in the minds of all civilized men, and no men have a right to import it into their religion, no more than they have to introduce incest into religion. Such a system cannot be tolerated. The speaker seemed to have got suddenly out into a wide sea without a chart to navigate by. After concluding a

## TIRADE OF ABUSE

and ridicule against the religion of the defendant, he told the jury they must let their minds rise higher than this system reaches as civilized men in making up their verdict. In fact, from the remarks of Hiles it would seem that the Bible and its system of theology were on trial and not Lorin Farr. He occupied about 25 minutes in this style, he said the defendant was an advocate of such a system as he had referred to and does or did practice polygamy. He has one wife and four so-called wives by whom he has raised a large number of children. He scarcely touched the legal phase of the matter at all. As a philosopher he is shallow, and as a lawyer he proved himself a partisan and a fanatic. He adduced no valid argument to show that the defendant had violated the law as charged in the indictment. And being conscious of his own leanness and lameness, he sat down asking the jury to convict the defendant.

Mr. Kimball followed. He said the jury were not called to try a system of religion, a church or its doctrines, but to try an individual charged with violating the law. The defendant does not claim exemption for violating what is called the Edmunds law—there is not one jot of testimony to show that he set himself up above that law, but that he had endeavored to live within its provisions from the time of its passage. He showed that the prosecution had failed to show, in any respect, that Mr. Farr had at any time since 1882, maintained

## A POLYGAMOUS HOUSEHOLD;

but it had been proved that he had confined himself to living with one, and that one his legal wife, and he had not visited the residences of the others except on purely business occasions, or in cases of sickness; and that on such occasions he had no social or other special communication with any of the alleged plural wives, but the business was solely with some one or more of his sons, to give them instructions relative to the conduct of the farm or store. The remarks of counsel were confined entirely to the legal aspect of the case, and were listened to by all present with intense interest. He spoke twenty minutes, and closed by assuring the jury they ought to acquit his client. He was entitled to it.

At 5:30 a recess was taken till 6 p. m. At this hour the court room was again crowded.

Judge Emerson addressed the jury. He did not intend to inflict on them a lecture. He simply wanted to talk to them upon some of the principal facts that underlie this case to help them to come to a just and impartial verdict. He was certain he was addressing twelve sensible men who knew they were sworn to weigh the evidence in this case fairly and to act justly upon it. Counsel said, we stand here on the broad ground that the sole object of his client has been to obey the law against plural marriage; and if it has overstepped the bounds in any respect it has not been intentional. The jury were aware that the intent of this law was to prevent people living in a certain social condition. But it was neither the intent of the framers nor of the law itself to convict or condemn a man

## WITHOUT EVIDENCE

of having violated it. His client comes in with the presumption of innocence in his favor. They must not try him on his faith—his religious belief; into that domain the law does not enter—because it has nothing to do with it. It is the acts of his client they have to try; not because he is a "Mormon," a Jew, or a Gentile, but to find out if he has violated the law, the statements of the counsel for the prosecution to the contrary notwithstanding. In his obedience to the law, it was not required of Mr. Farr to go to an "anxious seat" in a meeting house, or go through the streets ringing a bell and telling the people that he had ceased to be a polygamist. The quiet actions of his life and the testimonies on the witness stand have proved this fact. And having done this he has lived without violating the law, and no public proclamation is needed. The presumption under which you must try him is, that on the passage of this law he put his house in order and complied with its provisions. Those whom he had claimed as his wives he married in the bloom of their youth, when there was no law against it. There is a law against it now, but from the evidence which was adduced here no one can point to the time or place when or