

quence of the depravity of the age and the sensuality of the public mind. The motives of the "Mormons" are judged by their opponents from the knowledge of their own desires. Marriage with many people is but a licensed arrangement for the gratification of lust, and those who enter or contemplate it from such a standpoint, can see nothing in plural marriage but increased opportunities for indulgence of animal appetites. Argument with them is also thrown away. But to the thoughtful and spiritually minded we say, that the plural marriage of the "Mormon" Church is an extension of all the benefits of the marriage relation to the greatest number of persons, and is particularly designed for the permanent good of the female portion of humanity.

It is true that this part of our religion was not incorporated in our creed at the beginning of our Church organization. Neither was the doctrine and practice of baptism for the dead; neither was the gathering of the Saints from all parts of the earth. The same may be said of many other tenets. We have not yet received all the principles which are to become part of our religious system. For this Church is a living body. It assimilates truth as fast as its capacity for reception and growth permits. But that which it adopts becomes as much an integral part of its organism as its fundamental principles. The editor of the Times is probably much larger than when he was a child. Fresh material has become incorporated with his system. But the new matter is identified with his being and is an essential part of it. We often hear of polygamy being an "after-thought;" an addition to "original Mormonism;" and shallow reasoners argue that therefore it is not an integral part of the system. They do not understand that this Church lives, grows, progresses, advances and that it will continue to advance, receiving line upon line, here a little and there a little, as its Divine Author sees fit, and its members are ready to receive, and that every newly revealed truth when adopted will become identified with the system as part of its being. In this it differs from all other religious systems in the world. Men form a creed whose articles may be counted, and its beginning and end may be defined. A God-inspired creed is not thus limited. It begins with simple, first principles and lays a foundation which may be built upon eternally, each newly accepted truth only opening the view to further principles and inciting the enlightened mind to further progress.

Thus, no doctrine or custom may be rightfully rejected because it is old, neither should it be derided because it seems to be new; the practice of polygamy may yet become possible of adoption by the best of mankind; and principles not entering into the primitive organization of a society may afterwards be accepted and become as essential to its existence as the first. We commend these reflections to the consideration of the London Times and of all who are not bound by the fetters of custom and prejudice.

#### A NEW WAY WITH THE "MORMONS."

We notice that many of the public journals are congratulating themselves and "Mormon" haters generally, on a section of the Laws of Utah, by the operation of which convictions against the "Mormons" can be had, without let or hindrance, or any possibility of escape for the accused. And an additional source of joy is that this sure and certain engine for the punishment of the Saints is one of their own legislative construction.

These glad tidings to "Christian" souls were first announced in the columns of the New York Tribune, and have been repeated throughout the land with that parrot-like intelligence that distinguishes the press when touching on Utah affairs. The Christian Weekly, referring to the Tribune says:

"There has been moreover, a change in the Territorial law relating to jurors, which puts it into the power of the prosecuting attorney to exclude Mormons from a jury about to try a man for polygamy.

The main difficulty now in the way is to obtain proof of plural marriages, as the ceremony is conducted in the Endowment House with great secrecy."

Is not this a matter for true rejoicing among the pious and the enlightened of the land? A plan has been discovered by which jurors may be excluded on account of a certain form of religious faith! A scheme has been devised by which the right of an accused person to be tried by a jury of his peers may be entirely ignored! The way is open to convict "Mormons" by a jury composed of their bitterest enemies! There is no chance for them to escape! Hurray! Hallelujah! Thank God!

But stop a moment, there is still a difficulty in the way; that is, the little matter of evidence, which is generally considered an essential to a trial by jury. The Eureka Sentinel, after dilating upon the change in the law above named, says:

"One impediment remains, the removal of which is imperative, and that is the difficulty in proving the polygamous felony after the forms prescribed by law. Mormon marriages are celebrated with all possible secrecy, and consequently evidence of their contraction is extremely difficult to obtain. It seems as though the law might profitably be amended so as to admit notoriety of cohabitation as proof of the polygamy which has been made a penal offense."

For the comfort of those whose ardor is dampened by this consideration, we will say that evidence is of small moment in the trial of a "Mormon" by a packed jury. Rumor, common fame, newspaper stories and popular gossip will do the business, as in the celebrated Miles case, in which a conviction for polygamy was had without any definite proof whatever of any marriage but one. Still there is another "impediment" in the way, that is, an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, not on the validity of the law against polygamy, but on the errors occurring in the trial; and prejudiced as that Court may be against the practice of plural marriage, it is hardly to be thought that the highest tribunal in the land will endorse proceedings utterly at variance with established rules of judicature, or sanction an entire departure from the principles of the jury system, made sacred by the practice of centuries.

The Sentinel wants the "impediment" of evidence removed entirely out of the way. Of course; many others are in the same mind. But we do not think its suggestion as to the means of removal will be widely commended. If the fact of cohabitation is to be taken as sufficient proof of marriage, there are certain blatant anti-polygamists right here in Salt Lake, and perhaps some in Eureka, who will tremble in their boots. The loudest-mouthed opposers of plural marriage are generally the loosest in their social habits. Ribald, lustful, bestial fellows who boast of a seduction as a triumph and are eager in pursuit of other men's wives, are usually rampant against "Mormon" polygamy. It will be a poor law that will not work both ways. Let such a change as the Sentinel proposes be made in the law, and more "Gentiles" than "Mormons" will find their way into the penitentiary; and should such a law be made general, the whole revenue of the United States would have to be used in prosecuting culprits and building prisons to hold them.

But before congratulating too much, would it not be as well for the kind souls who are so anxious to punish the "Mormons" by extra judicial means, to learn something of what they are boasting about? We think so, and will therefore explain the matter in another article, which we will write for their special enlightenment, and for which we have not room in to-day's NEWS.

#### MORMONISM IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

The State Department is the dignified end of our commonplace and rather vulgar National Government. We have expended millions of dollars on the Secretary, and at least a hundred thousand on each clerk, to encase them in marble, fine woods, plate glass and gorgeous upholstery. Were a keg of dynamite exploded under one

corner of it, so that the entire structure, with all the contents, dead and living, would disappear in a loud noise and bad smell, the government would go on without let, hindrance or embarrassment of any sort. But we would be deprived of our dignity, and the foreign diplomatic corps would speak of our Government pityingly, as "a poor devil of a concern" that had no State Department. This would be very unpleasant.

The Secretary of State, recognizing this fact, is a man of imposing deportment. The late Mr. Seward was wont to carry a gorgeous portfolio under his diplomatic arm, and when he hinged on his diplomatic centre he sat down with an air and an expression that said, "Now let us make history." The late Hamilton Fish—by the bye, there was a report out not long since that he had escaped from his tomb on the Hudson and had been seen at Saratoga, but the report needs confirmation—Hamilton, we say, had to struggle against his appearance, which was that of a retired butler. He had the advantage, however, of being dead, and this inspired considerable awe in the lookers-on.

A clerk in the State Department carries more dignity to the square inch than a senator. For this is he a clerk. In the very bosom of his family he has the air and manner of a man in the hidden recesses of whose gigantic intellect are pigeon-holed away vast State secrets. He cultivates a solemn, reserved manner, that impresses people with the opinion that he never unbends, so that the wife of his State Department bosom approaches him with awe, and never asks questions. His children, if he has any, are all the results of ultimatums, protocols and things. If the clerk be a single man, the boarding-house that nurtures him feels as if it fed the most sacred part of the Administration. He never commits himself on any subject, lest it complicate the Department and fetch on a war with Mexico. If a boarder says to him, "It is a fine day," he responds at the end of a half an hour with, "Do you think so?" and then relapses into a portentous state of meditation, that impresses the boarders with the belief that his stupendous diplomatic intellect is wrestling with the complicated question of the effect of a double standard on Bismarck and the Guano Islands.

We are led to these profound reflections by the announcement, semi-officially made, that the State Department was about to try conclusions with polygamy as practised by the many-wived followers of Utah. What in the Old Scratch polygamy has to do with the State Department rather bothers one at first; but the brilliant head of that part of our Administration explains that Mormonism is fed and strengthened by supplies of believers from Europe, and in his diplomatic position he intends to protest to foreign governments the further shipment of believers in that nefarious practice. We have treaties with these foreign powers, that stipulate that no criminals shall, with the knowledge of the governments where they originate, be sent to our shores.

The Hon. Wm. M. Evarts is, as we have said, a profound lawyer and a brilliant advocate. He threw over one of the best, if not the best, practices at the bar, to accept this position of Secretary of State. But if he is correctly reported, we rather think he will get the worst of the argument when he makes his appeal or protest to these governments. He will be told in the first place, that the provisions of the treaty refer to the shipment by governments of convicts or paupers to the United States, and not to evil disposed people, who may go of their own notion, without either the encouragement or discouragement of the government. In the second place, he will learn that polygamy is not a crime in any part of Europe. For political and certain tainting purposes we have confounded it with bigamy, and pronounced that a crime which received, according to the Bible, the sanction of God and the approbation of Christ. Because the circumstances have changed—circumstances that have substituted Hayes for Moses and sectarian bigotry for God—we are not authorized to pronounce that criminal which an ignorant conscience regards as sacred.

Bigamy means the cruel deception practiced by bad men, when the criminal, representing himself free, legally, to marry, takes to himself a second wife, with the first living. If this is done with

the consent of the two women it becomes adultery—an offense common to clergymen and congressmen—and is not punishable with the penitentiary.

Of course the practice is beastly, degrading to women and destructive of a home, and is not possible in an enlightened community. Polygamy disappears the world over before the approach of christian civilization. But any attempt at suppression through criminal law will be persecution, that strengthens religious delusion.

We have no patience with the motive. It is born of bigotry and greed. It is the old cry, "In the name of God, amen; let's rob somebody." These ignorant but earnest creatures have given us one Territory where life, limb and property are safe under law, rigidly enforced, while in all others the lynch court is sustained by the revolver and bowie-knife, and every man is his own police. These fanatics have turned a wilderness into a garden, planted their rude civilization along the waste reaches of desolation's nakedness; and for this very reason, with certain rich silver mines added thereto, have become temptations to thieves who hide their rascality under the cloak of religion.—Washington Capital, Aug. 17th.

#### The Swiss Pauper and the Mormon Circular.

The efforts of the administration toadies—who approve the Mormon circular, not for any merit of its own, but because it was issued by the administration—to find some support for their course in the case of the Swiss pauper sent back to her native land show a lamentable confusion of ideas. There is not the slightest similarity in the two cases. In the Swiss case the woman who was sent back was a pauper, and was sent to this country by the poor-house board of Hellstein, Switzerland, with the full knowledge of the fact that she was a pauper and for the express purpose of relieving the town of the burden of her support. Under the circumstances the government acts very properly in insisting upon the woman's return. It would act very properly, moreover, in sending a circular to the Swiss government warning it not to ship its paupers to America and holding it responsible for neglect of the warning. It could with propriety take the same course in respect to persons convicted of crime or known as habitual criminals in Switzerland or any other country. But the reason why it could do this with propriety is that pauperism or conviction of crime or the condition of being an habitual criminal can be easily ascertained by the government of any country, and in most cases cannot fail to be known when the pauper or criminal proposes emigration. With respect to the Mormon the case is different. That he is a Mormon as a matter of so-called faith or profession may be well known; but so long as he confines himself to faith, or the profession of it, the United States has no power to punish him, even if he lives in a Territory. Still less has it the right to ask foreign countries to punish. If he were to land at New York an avowed Mormon, but with no more than one wife, the United States government would be powerless to punish him, or to prevent his taking passage for Salt Lake City. Even after he arrives at Utah the Government is powerless until he reduces his faith to practice. How preposterous, then, to ask foreign governments to make assumption as to criminal intent which the government cannot make on its own behalf, even when the prospective criminal is within its jurisdiction. The state department is reported as declaring that the Mormon circular is by no means so idiotic as its critics have assumed, and that it merely intends that Mormons intending to emigrate to this country shall be notified that their religious belief does not excuse the perpetration of the crime of bigamy, and that offenses of that sort are to be vigorously prosecuted. This, as we have already stated, the government may very properly do. It is to be hoped that the circular, when published—as it is promised it soon will be—will bear out this declaration of the department.—Detroit Free Press.

CHEW JACKSON'S Best Sweet Navy Tobacco. d&w

#### DEATH OF BISHOP DANIEL DANIELS.

MALAD CITY, September 4th, 1879.

Editors Deseret News:

Brother Daniel Daniels, First Counselor to Bishop Dunford, and former Bishop of Malad Valley, died on Monday last, Sept. 1st, of inflammation of the lungs. He was in the 72nd year of his age. He died calm and contented, and had his reasoning faculties and spoke quite sensible to the last hour of his life. After informing R. G. Evans of a few items of tithing account, etc., that he wished him to attend to, his last words were, "Now I wish to depart." He laid down, and went calmly to sleep in death. The funeral took place on Tuesday, September 2nd. Addresses were delivered by Elders Henry Peck and R. G. Evans. The services were conducted by Counselor J. D. Rees, and the procession and all other arrangements for burial were conducted by his nephew-in-law, Wm. H. Jones, Esq., and to the credit of Mr. Jones I will say that in the arrangement of the procession from the house to the cemetery, a distance of two miles, it was solemn, impressive, and of the most profound respect. About seventy wagons and carriages composed the procession. His missions and labor for and in the Church are too numerous to mention at this time, not having dates, etc., on hand; but he died a member of the Church of Jesus Christ and in full fellowship; his friends are numerous.

R. G. E.  
Millennial Star, please copy.

#### Excommunication.

SPANISH FORK, August 29th, 1879.

Editors Deseret News:

Please publish the following notice.

Thomas Pickett was, on the 31st day of July, 1879, cut off from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, for an attempted rape. Pickett has left for parts unknown, and the Saints are cautioned against his imposing himself on them as a member of the Church.

GEORGE D. SNELL,  
Bishop.  
GEO. H. BRAMHALL,  
Clerk.

#### Correspondence.

NEPHI, Juab County, August 30th, 1879.

Editors Deseret News:

I often see in papers and almanacs many items under such headings as "Things worth remembering," "Box measures," etc., which, if they were correct, would be very useful; but of all the box measures that I ever saw in print, not one was mathematically correct.

I have before me an agricultural paper in which I read the following: "A box 16 by 16½ inches, 8 inches deep, contains one bushel." "A box 4 by 4 inches, 4½ inches deep, contains one-half peck." The first of the above measures lacks 33 2-5 cubic inches, and the other lacks 196 4-5 cubic inches. In another paper I read of a bushel measure which will actually hold over a bushel and a half. Now, as the farmers of Utah cannot afford to give a bushel and a half for a bushel this year, I give them the following which I have submitted to criticism:

#### A BOX

16 by 16 4-5 in., 8 in. deep, contains 2,150 2-5 cubic in., or one bushel; each inch in depth is half a peck.

12 by 11 1-5 in., 8 in. deep, contains 1,075 1-5 cu. inches, or half a bushel, each inch in depth is two quarts.

8 by 8 2-5 in., 8 in. deep, contains 537 3-5 inches, or one peck; each in. in depth is one quart.

4 by 4 1-5 in., 4 in. deep, contains 67 1-5 cu. inches, or one quart; each inch in depth is half a pint.

With the above measures any amount of grain, from half a pint upwards can be measured with the greatest accuracy.

Respectfully,  
JAMES BARDLEY.