

## DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - JULY, 20 1881.

## PROVIDENCE AND THE PRESIDENT.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD, who is suffering from the bullet of the assassin Guiteau, is a religiously inclined man and a member of the society commonly known as Campbellites. His faith with that of his wife in his recovery from the attack upon his life, will aid greatly the means used for his restoration. The news of his condition continues to be favorable, and the whole country rejoices in the prospect of his deliverance. As a proof that the President believes in Providence, in the "Mormon" doctrine that the "hand of the Lord" should be acknowledged in all things, we copy the following from the *Cleveland Herald*. It was related by Hon. James Monroe, in a speech at Oberlin on the 4th of July, and at the present juncture will be read with general interest:

"It was on that eventful day at Chicago, when the weary suspense was ended and the nomination so satisfactory to all finally made.

One of Mr. Moody's young men was stationed at the door of the convention distributing leaves of the New Testament. Many passed him with a sneer or with the remark that Bibles were plenty at home; but the General, hurriedly passing out on business, politely took the leaf and thrust it in his breast pocket. The excitement increased and Garfield was nominated. And now telegrams of congratulation began to pour in so rapidly that to read them was impossible. In the hurry these, too, were thrust into the breast pocket till it was crowded with papers. Not till the rush was over, alone and in his room with his private secretary, could the mass be taken out for examination. And last of all, from the depths of the pocket the General took out a little crumpled wad. It was worn beyond the possibility of being deciphered and pressed into the shape of a small oval. It was a leaf from the New Testament, but on the outside, in a little hollow, these words from Matthew xxi. 42 could just be discerned: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes."

Said Mr. Monroe: "When I visited President Garfield at Washington, he showed me a little wad of paper pasted in his hat, and telling me its history, asked me what I thought of it. Visitors were passing, and I had no time to tell him what I thought of it or to learn what he thought of it, but I can easily imagine that he felt deeply the reverence due to Him who ruleth all things, and a deep sense of gratefulness that His hand is over all. That all, even to a political election, is 'The Lord's doing.'"

In mentioning the incident, Mr. Monroe said: "The President told this to me as a friend, and I have never been authorized to tell it, nor did I venture to do so, though sometimes very much inclined during the campaign, for I knew that the President's modesty would never sanction it; but in a case like the present, it seems to me that it cannot be out of place, when all affection is centered on him whose death would be a national calamity."

## THE GREAT CRIME AND ITS PENALTY.

The news from Washington is so encouraging that those who felt sure that the President's wound would prove fatal are now of the opinion that he will recover. The report that the weapon used by the assassin Guiteau was of the kind known as the California "bulldog," gave much strength to the opinion first entertained that the wound was necessarily mortal. But it appears that the pistol used was a cheap affair,

with a big ball, but little force. The shot in the arm did not penetrate the flesh at all, and the ball which entered the body, being deflected by one of the ribs may be lodging in solid flesh, escaping all the vital organs even if entering the walls of the abdomen. In this case the President, though weakened by the loss of blood and the regimen considered necessary in his case, and very sore from the painful wound, may have a rapid convalescence and soon be entirely restored. He is not yet out of danger, but the chances for recovery are daily becoming more assured. This is joyful news to the whole country, and the popularity of General Garfield will be immensely increased by his narrow escape from a violent death.

The question which will soon take the place of the absorbing topic of the President's condition is, what will be done with the would-be murderer? The fiendish deed was perpetrated in the District of Columbia; proceedings will therefore have to be conducted under the laws of the District. "The divinity which doth hedge a king" is not part of the dignity surrounding a President. There is no law of Congress for his personal protection, or placing him in a different position in such contingencies from that of a common citizen. The capital charge cannot, of course, be preferred against Guiteau if the President survives the attack. What then is the crime with which he will stand accused by the law? It is assault with intent to commit murder. The penalty for this offence varies in different parts of the Union. The code of the District of Columbia provides:

"Sec. 1,150. Every person convicted of manslaughter, or of any assault with intent to kill, shall be sentenced to suffer imprisonment and labor, for the first offense for a period not less than two nor more than eight years, and for the second offense for a period of not less than six nor more than fifteen years."

On conviction, then, the utmost punishment to which Guiteau can be sentenced will be eight years' imprisonment. This, in our opinion, is entirely inadequate to the offence. The essence of crime is in the intent. When a responsible person intends to kill a human being and carries out that intention as far as possible, why should not the crime be considered capital, or at least next to it in enormity? In Guiteau's case, after eight years from conviction, he would be free to go at large and repeat his crime. Men of his cast of mind should not be allowed such liberty. They are dangerous to society. And it is very illogical to make the extent of the crime depend, as it does in this case, upon the recuperative powers of the victim instead of the act and intent of the criminal.

If Guiteau is adjudged a lunatic, and therefore irresponsible in law for his fiendish assault, he may be taken care of in an asylum. But the probability is that after a time, especially if he has friends with money or influence, he may be officially examined, pronounced of sound mind, and set free to indulge in the pastime of shooting those whom he may consider in the way of progress or the accomplishment of his own plans and purposes.

There is some talk of a movement to petition Congress for a law constituting an attempt or conspiracy to kill the President, treason, and punishable with death. This, however, would not affect the present case, as it could not be made retroactive. If the President should yet succumb to the assault upon his life, nothing less than the death of the assassin would satisfy the public mind, and should he recover, we do not think that eight years imprisonment will be regarded, by anyone, as an adequate penalty for the awful crime committed upon the person of the Chief Magistrate of the nation.

## GIVE US A CHANGE.

The Cincinnati *Times-Star* ridicules the silly story that "the 'Mormons' contemplate assertion of their independence of the United States Government by a general uprising against the Federal authority," and shows the folly of such absurd reports. But after taking this sensible position, that paper, as if fearful of being accused of saying something favorable about the "Mormons," adds:

"There is plenty of evidence, however, that the Mormons would se-

cede, and set up civil institutions for themselves in the West, if they had the power. Every leader in the Church, for the last twenty years at least, has been the avowed and violent enemy of the Republic. The whole community is radically disloyal."

Will the *Times-Star* be kind enough to furnish the public with some proofs of these broad assertions? Reference to polygamy, let it be borne in mind, will not help in evidence. Our views and acts as to the law of 1862 do not affect the question of our alleged "disloyalty" and "enmity to the Republic." The questions are separate and dissimilar. We admit that we think the anti-polygamy law does violence to the Constitution, and that the decision of the Supreme Court on that question is illegal and absurd; but we deny that our leaders are enemies to the Republic and that the community is radically disloyal. And we defy the *Times-Star* to substantiate the accusations by anything that calm and rational minds could consistently regard as satisfactory. Rumors, sensational telegrams, pulpit denunciations, and all that kind of rubbish are worthless as evidence. Give us some facts to establish this repeated charge against the people of Utah. And if you cannot point out anything definite in this direction, please stop repeating one of the shallowest and most baseless falsehoods published abroad against the people vulgarly called "Mormons."

The very genius of our creed disproves the common calumny. The actions of our leaders and our people are against it. We believe that the Constitution was inspired by the Almighty; we believe that it is the destiny of our Elders to maintain it intact when demagogues have so injured the Republic that many seek its destruction. We have never failed the Republic yet when a call has been made upon us, and many services have been rendered by our leaders which have been thankfully recognized by the Government.

These stale charges are the fabrications of depraved and lying adventurers, official and otherwise, which papers that know nothing of the facts copy and repeat with sickening plagiarism, and thus help to fix upon the minds of the public as realities. Please give us a change. And if you are not brave enough to tell the truth about the "Mormons," at least desist from this "damnable iteration" of flabby libels which are so old and stale that they smell to heaven.

## LAME LAW AND SOUND JUSTICE.

THERE is a defect in the legislation of most countries which we consider radical and unreasonable. Crimes against the person often rank lower than crimes against property. The penalties are higher for the latter than for the former. If a man steals his neighbor's wife, he is not likely to be punished with anything like the same severity as if he broke into a house and stole his neighbor's goods. An assault with intent to kill, which is equal in essence, or nearly so, to actual murder, incurs a penalty of from one to ten years imprisonment, while highway robbery in many places is punishable by terms ranging up to imprisonment for life. In this Territory the penalty for many crimes against the person and against property rank in the penal code about the same.

One of the most inconsistent things in the laws of modern nations is the small penalties imposed against adultery, fornication and kindred crimes. We use the terms here in their common signification—adultery as improper intercourse between persons, one or both of whom is married; fornication as improper intercourse between unmarried persons. "Mormonism" regards all sexual intercourse outside of the marriage relation as adulterous. It throws the gates of matrimony wide open, but closes the door against all intimate relations of the sexes not authorized by marriage. It permits men under certain conditions, to marry more wives than one, but allows no commerce with the opposite sex unless the parties are husband and wife under the ordinance divinely appointed, which unites them forever.

If a lustful man obtains influence over another's wife sufficient to lead her astray and to submit to defilement, in some nations the only re-

compense for the injured husband is a civil suit for damages. The seduction of an unmarried female is placed in the same category. That is as much as to say by the voice of the law, that money will cover up this kind of crime; that cash is a sufficient compensation. And yet the injury is irreparable. The enormity of the offence cannot be estimated. Where the criminal law takes cognizance of this class of offences, the penalties are never adequate to the crimes.

It is for this reason that fathers, husbands and brothers, the natural guardians of betrayed females, so frequently take the law in their own hands and inflict personal chastisement on the brutes who use their devilish arts to betray and ruin their trusting victims. It is rare that a jury will convict a man who kills the seducer of a woman whom the accused had the authority to defend. This is right in the light of justice, but wrong in the light of the law. But law and justice should go hand in hand. If it is intrinsically right for the nearest male relative of a betrayed woman to personally punish her seducer, the law ought not to pronounce it wrong, and put the inflicter of justice in legal jeopardy for a proper action. If it is actually wrong for private persons to assume the role of public executioner or flagellator, then the law should provide adequate, or at least approximate, penalties for crimes of this nature.

If the young man who assaulted and thrashed the person alleged to be the seducer of his sister in this city and was on Wednesday fined \$30 for the offense, had shot and killed the licentious scoundrel, in all probability a jury of his peers would on trial acquit him of the charge for which he would stand indicted. We confess that we regard the seducer as worthy of death. Virtue is estimated, in theory, as dearer than life. It should be so valued in practice. Much of the sentiment on this subject that is uttered in public and private, printed in newspapers and published in books, is mere sham and cheap talk. It is the cant of a wicked and adulterous generation, that exalts highflown adoration of purity in word and tramples upon it in deed; that professes admiration of it openly but laughs at it in secret. We would bring the sentiment into practical bearing; embody the theory in criminal law; protect female virtue by something more than pretty words, and punish the seducer with something more than money fines or brief imprisonment.

It is a burlesque on justice that the young man alluded to should have to pay a fine for rightly punishing the defiler of his young sister. We say rightly, but do not wish to be understood as considering that the thrashing administered was anything like full justice for the kind of offense charged. The magistrate was right in assessing the fine, because the young man had broken the law, and it was the magistrate's duty to enforce the law which it was admitted had been violated. But justice says that the young man should not be the sufferer, and also that the seducer should not go scot free. The law needs remodeling on these questions all over the so-called civilized world. Penalties should be adequate to crimes, and no private person should be under the necessity of performing a duty that belongs to a public officer.

Society is much to blame for the impunity with which brutal men can introduce sorrow and shame and ruin into decent homes. Any one guilty of an act such as is said to have provoked the assault on Tuesday night, making the cowardly betrayer squeal in abject fright, ought to be shunned by respectable people. Society which admits of a known libertine within its circles and winks or smiles at his villainy, is rotten at heart, no matter how fair may be it on its face. Yet the same people who will shrink with pretended horror at the betrayed victim, will associate and mingle with the seducer, and while the poor girl is cast out to ruin, the author of her shame pays the awful penalty of being called "a naughty, naughty man."

There are devils in the shape of men in this city who boast of their attempts to lead astray the unsuspecting, and whose successful efforts are applauded by others claiming respectability, provided that the victim is a member of a "Mormon" family. Perhaps the slight example set in the case under consideration will be followed up to its proper extent. If two or three of the scoundrels were made to bite the dust, we

believe it would purify the social atmosphere considerably. You will find that the corruptest libertine is the most blatant opposer of plural marriage. And you will also find the consistent upholder of plural marriage the strongest protector of woman's virtue, and the most thorough despoiler of the adulterous and libidinous deceiver. There are men in this community, who have more wives than one, who would sooner lay their heads on the block and suffer decapitation, than lead astray another man's wife, or betray his daughter or sister. While there are others here who cannot find language low enough to utter in regard to plural marriage, that would creep into any man's domicile and seduce maid, wife or widow, who would give them the least shadow of an excuse for encouragement. Such scoundrels are known and ought to be watched, and if caught in their damnable treachery should not escape their just deserts. We do not believe in private redress when the law provides it, but there are instances when the most rigid advocate for the law's supremacy could not consistently stand in the way of a just recompense for outraged honor.

## ANTI-REPUBLICAN REPUBLICANS.

THE New York *Post* and some other Republican journals are in great pain for fear Vice-President Arthur should succeed to the Presidency, and the *Post* asks, in despair, "How can, in this dreadful contingency, that success be prevented?" Is not this alarm a little inconsistent, and are not such questions as these shameful as well as silly? The *Post* labored hard with other papers of its party to secure the election of Arthur on the Garfield ticket. That election involved the accession of Arthur to the Presidency in such a contingency as that which a few days ago was probable. Those Republican organs that now assail Arthur and talk of preventing that which the Constitution specially provides, are revolutionists in spirit and traitors at heart.

There is no legitimate way of preventing Arthur from being President, except to keep Garfield alive and in a condition to assume the functions of his office. And the question propounded by the *Post* is suggestive of something illegitimate. What is meant by it? Apropos to this question is the following speech, said by the *Cleveland Herald* to have been uttered on the 14th by General J. B. Steedman, of Ohio:

"By G—d, Arthur shall never be President of the United States. He is an unnaturalized foreigner. We looked it up once thoroughly, and we know, and we will unite to a man, Republicans and Democrats, to see that he is not President. There being no President, the Vice-President being ineligible, there being no President pro tem of the Senate and no Speaker of the House, we will carry out the constitutional provisions and make Chief Justice Waite acting President until a new election can be ordered. Under the provisions of 1803 no man can become President who directly or indirectly, in the remotest degree, is morally responsible for the assassination that places the Presidency in his power."

"General Sherwood, a prominent Greenbacker, who stood by, said 'We will join in that also!'"

"Moral responsibility" can be stretched almost without limit. To make Vice-President Arthur morally responsible for the act of the villain Guiteau, is as senseless as to make Grant responsible because he refused Guiteau a position, and thus sours him against the Government. And it is not at all likely that those who put Chester A. Arthur forward as a candidate for the Vice-Presidency, would have exposed themselves to the defeat which would be certain if he was not a native-born citizen, or that their opponents would have let slip so good a chance to assail the Republican ticket.

The only thing that can be done is to pay a little more attention in future to the tail of the presidential kite. The office of Vice President may not be, in itself, of very large importance, but in view of the possibilities that are attached to it comes of great moment. At this juncture the anti-Arthur expressions of many Republican papers are not only in very bad taste but are supremely anti-republican and absurd.