

THE "ENTERPRISE" AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE Virginia *Enterprise* is a smart paper, and frequently utters some very smart sayings. But, like all papers that assume an anti-Mormon attitude, it loses its usual brightness when touching on Utah affairs, and in its bitterness becomes extremely stupid. The *Enterprise* has something to say on the new election law, which, of course, does not suit its high mightiness, because the assessors who are to be the registrars "will of course be all Mormons." But it finds no fault with the Governor in signing the bill, except for "not expunging the provision allowing women to vote, &c." The *Enterprise* ought to understand a little more of this subject before handling it. The act conferring on women the elective franchise was passed in 1870, long before the present Governor came to the Territory; so its single word of blame for him is without effect.

The *Enterprise* goes on to say: "There is a strange inconsistency in clothing a woman with the dignity of a citizen and an elector in her own right, and then according her the same privileges, in addition, by virtue of being or having been the wife of a naturalized citizen. But it is too much, perhaps, to look for complete consistency in Mormon laws."

If the sage of the *Enterprise* will examine the Revised Statutes of the United States he will find that this "strange inconsistency" is the product of Congressional statesmanship; that the laws of the nation make every woman a citizen who is married to a citizen, and that marriage has the same virtue in her case as naturalization. Every woman born in the United States is a citizen thereof, just as much as a man, and there is nothing in the Constitution or laws of the United States to prevent her from voting, if the laws of the State or Territory in which she resides confers the right upon her. An alien woman has no need, under the general law, to take out naturalization papers in order to become a citizen if she is the wife of a citizen.

The subject of woman suffrage is debatable, and women may yet obtain that right in any part of the Union to vote at elections, which is conferred upon her in Utah, a Territory popularly supposed to be a place of bondage for the weaker sex, but in which they enjoy more true freedom and stand on a fairer equality with man than in any other section of the country.

The *ipse dixit* of the *Enterprise* as to the "inconsistency of clothing woman with the dignity of a citizen and elector" is mere assumption, and a little argument would be in far better taste. But we notice that argument has a very small place in the opposition to woman suffrage, ridicule and assertion being its principle strongholds.

Now, if the *Enterprise* wishes to give any reasons in support of its charge of "strange inconsistency," let them be directed against the law-makers of the nation, who are responsible for the principle involved in "clothing a woman with the dignity of a citizen, &c." But to use its own language, "it is too much, perhaps, to look for complete consistency" in any anti-Mormon newspaper.

A "LOOSE-JOINTED" ATTACK.

THE latest objections we have seen to the new election law are from the Beaver *Square-Dealer*. Here they are, minus a lot of nonsense based upon them—

"It would be difficult to conceive of anything more loose-jointed and haphazard than the section providing for the appointment of a registration commission in the character of the county assessor, without an oath of office or bonds, and consequently without responsibility."

"But to make the county assessor a registration autocrat whose dic-

tum "killeth or maketh alive" the suffragist, shows lack of discretion that is appalling."

The whole tirade of the *Square-Dealer* is predicated on the statement that the assessor is without an oath of office or bonds, and that registration depends on his dictum. And the bottom falls out of it when it is perceived that the entire statement is destitute of truth. Everybody knows, or ought to know, that an assessor is required to take an oath and to give heavy bonds for the faithful performance of the duties of his office. The *Square-Dealer* endorses the new revenue bill. Section 11 of that law makes the very provisions that he claims do not exist.

Now let us see how much of an "autocrat" the assessor is. His duties as register are made obligatory. He is required to perform them. "He shall visit every dwelling house," &c. He "shall" place upon the list the name of the voter who makes the required affidavit. If any lawful voter whose name has been omitted, appears and takes the affidavit, it is made the assessor's duty to enter his name on the list.

But the *Square-Dealer* may ask, "suppose he does not perform these duties, what then?" Why, he is liable to be sued on his bonds, and in addition, the wilful failure or neglect to perform the duties of this office is, by section 26 of the election law, constituted a felony, punishable by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars and imprisonment in the penitentiary not exceeding two years. Not much "autocracy" about that, nor much room for an assessor's "dictum."

Before the *Square-Dealer* grumbler makes any more objections, he had better study the law which he is so anxious to find flaws in, and publish the whole of it instead of half a dozen disconnected sections. The terms "loose-jointed and haphazard" are far more applicable to his silly attack on our legislators, than to the bill of which he appears to be densely ignorant, and his "discretion" if not "apalling" is certainly conspicuous only by its absence.

"MORMON" AND "LIBERAL."

WE observe in one of our exchanges a communication objecting to the use by the *DESERET NEWS* of quotation marks with the terms "Mormon" and "Liberal." The writer claims that they are "out of place because Mormons are properly and distinctively those who believe in and endorse the Book of Mormon," and Liberal means "generous, ample, large, free, open, candid."

Now, first as to the term "Mormon." It is not, and never was, the name which the members of this church have assumed. They call themselves Latter-day Saints. If they have the right to organize in an ecclesiastical capacity, they have the right to affix a name to the organization and a title to its members. If other people choose to dub them with a nickname they are not compelled by any rule to adopt it. They never have accepted it, and therefore when we use it we quote it as a name which has been fastened upon us without our consent and which we do not endorse. Then it is inappropriate. If we should be called Mormons because we believe in a book arranged by Mormon, those who believe in the Koran should be called Korans or Mahomets; believers in the Bible should be called Bibles; the disciples of Tom Paine should be called Paines; Christians ought to be called Christs; and followers of the Pope should be called Popes. There is no precedent for such a fashion of making a title, and its advocate has entirely missed his point. We shall continue to use quotation marks with the nickname of "Mormons."

Next as to the term Liberal. His definitions of the word confirm us in our position. For if there is any body of men who have shown themselves to be the opposite of all he claims to be meant by that title, it is the so-called "Liberals" of this city. "Generous"? What generosity have they ever shown to the "Mormons"? "Ample"? They have been ample in nothing but abuse and attempts to deprive us of every right dear to American citizens. "Large"? In what does

their largeness consist? Not in numbers, not in any effort to do good to anybody but themselves. "Free"? They have talked loudly of freedom, but have been in dastardly bondage to a few unprincipled persons, who have lashed them into slavish submission with the whip of a licentious and foulmouthed press. "Open"? "Candid"? In what respect? Is wire-working and secret intrigue to oust those of their own party in office, that others may creep into their official shoes, open and candid? Are press dispatches, conveying positive untruths, framed for the purpose of prejudicing the Congress and the country against the "Mormons," open and candid? Is slinking around private dwellings and listening at street corners to pick up threads with which to weave prurient family scandal for public use, open and candid? Take the whole course of the "Liberals" in trying to disfranchise the "Mormons," to bar them from the jury box; to twist local laws so as to cover alleged infractions of a statute of the United States; in misrepresenting their doctrines and manufacturing falsehoods about their acts; in abusing women who have braved the world for their religion; in branding the offspring of those pure-minded women with foul names; in working upon the government to bring trouble and distress upon the people who have made it possible for many of those "Liberals" to come here at all; in banding together as a small minority to obtain control of the property, lives and destiny of the majority; has it not all been truly "Liberal."

There are and have been, doubtless, some really liberal minded men foolish enough to become identified with the unscrupulous persons who have taken upon themselves the title of "Liberal." But they have become smudged with the same brush which has blackened the others. We hope to see them separate themselves from the scamps who have assumed to dictate them, and who are the chief spirits in the so-called "Liberal" party. We admire a truly liberal mind, no matter how much its possessor may be opposed to us in faith or politics. We respect the views of a genuine antagonist who fairly combats what he believes to be our errors; but we have a supreme contempt for the low scurrilous defamer who, assuming the name of "Liberal," misrepresents and distorts that which we hold sacred, proclaims as our creed ideas and notions that form no part of it, plots for the injury of a people whom we know to be worthy, and has no regard for honor, truth or decency in fighting all that does not harmonize with his opinions. And such have been the foremost spirits among the class calling themselves by that title. Therefore we shall continue to quote the word "Liberals," feeling that at present it is a misnomer when attached to the plotters against the peace of Utah. But when we see a party growing up which is really entitled in any fair degree to the name, we shall be pleased to drop the quotation marks and to give an untrammelled and generous organization the undisfigured and unquoted title of Liberal.

A CANDIDATE FOR HEAVEN.

Henry Williams alias Lewis Hill, a colored monster, was hanged at Norfolk, Virginia, on the 22nd ult., for forcibly violating a young lady, the daughter of a respectable widow. The wretch confessed his crime on the scaffold, and went on to say that "his first trouble in life was about a woman, and his next waywardness was in committing an outrage on a white woman in Matthews County, Va., for which he was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment. He escaped after one year's confinement and went to Washington and New Jersey, where the worst associates were his most desirable friends, and he was forever fighting and stealing. In Elizabeth, N.J., he received a sentence of five years' imprisonment for committing an outrage on a negro woman named Hagar Smith. After serving his time out he went to New York City, and got five months for stealing. He then left for Virginia, and nearly killed a man in Richmond with a slung-shot about a woman, and then escaping to Surrey County, outrag-

ed a negro woman, and fled to Isle of Wight County. In this county he outraged a small school girl, and was undetected, and then committed the crowning assault on Miss Margaret Stephens, for which he was apprehended and condemned to die." Yet through the teachings of the preachers he declared his belief of a complete pardon of his sins, his acceptance by the Savior, and his assurance of a swift passage to the throne of God, and he had the assurance to give pious advice to parents and children. What a lovely place heaven would be with the society of such human fiends, strangled out of the world as unfit to live in it!

THE FINALITY DOCTRINE.

THE controversy which has agitated Christendom for some time past, in relation to the doctrine of eternal punishment, continues to attract public attention and to form subjects for pulpit discourses and press editorials. The less people know about it, the more they have to say on it and the greater the force and variety of the discussion.

One of the most fruitful sources of error in relation to it is the ecclesiastical dogma of the fixed condition of the soul at its departure from the body. With the exception of a few liberal thinkers, the masses of "Christian" people believe that the eternal fate of all is fixed at death; that everlasting bliss or eternal misery is entered upon as soon as this mortal career is closed; that all opportunities for reformation and redemption are confined to the short period of the immortal spirit's earthly probation in the body; to use the words of a well known hymn:

"There's no repentance in the grave,  
Nor pardon offered to the dead."

And yet neither reason nor Scripture will support the popular view of this important matter. It is a relic of Roman superstition, a portion of the paganism with which what was left of pure Christianity was inoculated when the empire changed its national religion. Nearly all the sects—branches that have sprung out from the tree of Catholicism, are tainted with it, and the daughters have even gone farther than the Mother Church; for she admitted the possibility of the purification of sinful Church members in purgatory, while consigning all other sinners to everlasting torments, but they plunge into the quenchless flames all who are not prepared by faith for the happiness of heaven.

Yet why should not the impenitent soul in this life become penitent in the next? If it is possible for a sinner to become a saint in mortality why not in immortality? If the mind of the skeptic can be quickened by faith when in the body why not when out of the body? The real person is the spirit dwelling in the earthly tabernacle. Faith is not a physical but a spiritual quality or action. Repentance works in the soul. Is it not possible, nay probable, that under new conditions and better opportunities many, who in this state received not the plan of salvation, may be convinced and converted and redeemed? If all men are to be judged "according to their works," justice will mete out different degrees of punishment to the various grades of evil doers, and neither the duration of the penalty nor its severity can be made the same in every case. The judgment of all men at "the end of the world" is plainly taught and generally believed in by the various denominations. How then can death fix the fate of mankind? There is a period between death and the judgment. Who knows what possibilities exist for the departed spirit, while waiting behind the veil for the time when "death and hell shall deliver up the dead which are in them," and "all shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ?"

The Scriptures teach the contrary of the orthodox doctrine of finality. Jesus told his disciples that in his father's house there were "many mansions" and he was going "to prepare a place for them." But in speaking of the judgment day he said the righteous were to be welcomed to a kingdom "prepared for them from the foundation of the world." This makes

a change from their position after death and before the judgment. If there is any meaning in language, Christ preached to the spirits in prison whose bodies were drowned in the deluge, and the object of that preaching was their conversion, or that they might "live according to God in the spirit," and also that "they might be judged according to men in the flesh." (1 Peter iii 18 20; iv 6.)

And this opens up a wide field for thought on the condition of the dead; that is, departed spirits. According to the Apostle Paul, all men are to be judged by the gospel; also, there is no salvation except through Jesus Christ, "the only name given under heaven whereby man can be saved." This argues the necessity of the preaching of Jesus Christ and his gospel to many millions of souls who never had an opportunity of hearing concerning these things while in the body. Without this they cannot be justly "judged according to men in the flesh." If the gospel could be taken to the dead who were slain for their sins by the flood, if "deliverance" could be preached to those "captives," and the "opening of the prison to them that were bound," why cannot the same gospel be proclaimed to all others of the dead who did not hear it in the flesh, or who, hearing it did not receive it, but after being beaten with many stripes and suffering the just consequences of their sins, become willing to "bow the knee and confess that Jesus is the Lord to the glory of God the Father?" We have the warrant of scripture for believing that this will be the case. Isaiah (xxiv, 1-6) after describing the calamities to take place in the latter days when general destruction is to come to the wicked upon the earth says:

"And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth that are upon the earth:

"And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days they shall be visited (v. 21 22).

The finality doctrine is thus contrary to reason and Scripture. Justice, mercy, and divine love all pronounce it untrue. And modern revelation, bringing a greater outshining of the true light than can be reflected from the letter of the word, explains the eternal purposes of Jehovah for the destruction of sin, and the triumph of truth over error and the Savior over Satan in such a way that the clouds of human speculation are chased away, and the heart of the lover of his race is filled with joy and praise at the prospect of the ultimate redemption of his fellow-creatures, through their willingness to forsake evil and the opportunity afforded them of receiving and obeying the everlasting gospel.

It is impossible in one short article to pursue this subject to its full extent. Suffice it to say that death does not fix the fate of any. All eternity is before the immortal soul, pregnant with punishment for the evil and rewards for the righteous; that man is a progressive being and finality cannot be attached to his condition in any stage of his career; and that while the consequences of sin will be fully and in some respects eternally experienced, the time will come when all but the sons of perdition who must in the nature of things remain filthy still, will clearly perceive the beauties and excellence of righteousness, and in humble obedience to the Great Father, will gladly receive the benefits of his grand atonement who gave himself "a ransom for all."

GOVERNOR EMERY.

THE enemies of Governor Emery are moving heaven and earth and the other place to secure his removal. If the non-Mormons of Utah want to see him officially decapitated for signing a bill providing for what they have for a long time demanded we have nothing to say about it. But we do not believe this is the desire of any except a very few evil-disposed persons who have nothing in view but their own selfish and malignant purposes.

If Governor Emery's friends intend to do anything in his behalf, now is the time. A word to the wise, &c.