

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, . . . April 23, 1892

"MORMONISM" AND INFIDELITY.

WE give place today to a reply to one point in Mr. Chas. Ellis' letter, published in a previous issue of the DESERET NEWS. The writer takes a correct view, in the main, of the relative positions of "Mormonism" and Infidelity. It is true that in their essence they have nothing in common. "Mormonism" means faith, in its fullest religious sense; Infidelity means unfaith, or disbelief in Divine things. But everybody who is called an infidel does not deserve that appellation as it is commonly used. We are all unbelievers to some extent. That is, things that are believed by some of us are disbelieved by others, and that which is divine in some persons' eyes is absurd to the vision of people who are just as rational and sincere as they.

It has become common to call any one an infidel who does not accept the orthodox ideas of Deity and the Christian religion. And yet there is more true faith and genuine Christianity among many who are unorthodox, than exists in the breasts of some professing religionists. Infidelity, then, as the term is frequently used, must not always be treated as opposition to true religion. If it is meant to express the idea of a denial or disbelief of God and revealed religion in general, of course there is nothing in it in common with "Mormonism."

But what we understand Mr. Ellis to mean is, that "Mormonism" will find that justice, fairness and aid in defence of its lawful liberties, among the people who are classed as infidels, which have been denied them by professing "Christians" in the orthodox religious sects. And there is some truth in what he advances. We have known so-called infidels to stand up for those equal rights which "Mormons" should enjoy in common with all other believers in Christ, while religious ministers and their very pious followers employed violence to prevent the exercise of these rights.

Another thing. We have met with men and women, denounced as infidels by orthodox church members, who fervently believed in the existence of a Supreme Being, in the eternal principles of truth, honor, justice, right and retribution, and in doing good to their fellows for the love of it, while they disbelieved in the organized forms of religion as the inventions of men. They vehemently opposed what they honestly considered cant, hypocrisy, pretence and soul-merchandise, but admired consistency, charity, devotion to a just cause and everything that is beautiful in cultured humanity.

From such "infidels" as these we believe "Mormonism," if they properly understood it, would receive the support which Mr. Ellis suggests. Not perhaps through their faith in it as a Divine system, but through their love of fairness and equal rights, and their sturdy hostility to injustice and intolerance.

Therefore, while it is true that "Mormonism and Infidelity are utterly incompatible, also that the triumph of the former will be achieved by the aid of influences higher than any human agency, it is nevertheless reasonable to believe that in the struggle for civil and religious liberty, the "Mormon" people are far more likely to receive help from so-called infidels, than from the orthodox sects, the hired clergy and the self-sufficient Pharisees of the nineteenth century, who would deny to the "Mormons" even the right to the common title of "Christians."

NORTH CAROLINA MOBING.

ON Monday, April 11th, we commented upon a report embodied in a special press dispatch to the effect that "Mormon" missionaries in North Carolina had been waited upon by a mob and taken from Stanley County over the border into Union County. Later reports were to the effect that the Elders had been whipped and finally killed. These latter rumors were, however, unfounded. From information gleaned from a letter, dated at Albermarle, Stanley County, N. C., April 5th, 1892, from Elder William C. Winder, who is laboring in that part of the county, to his wife, we are enabled to give the facts.

Brother Winder states that while he and his fellow missionary—the name of the latter is not given—were on their way on the 13th of March, to a place at which they had an appointment to hold meeting, they were met by a number of men, one of them handed them the following notice:

"To the Mormon Elders:

"This is to notify you that you must leave Stanley Co. within 48 hours or abide the consequence.

Yours in earnest,

CITIZENS."

Elder Winder then describes subsequent details as follows:

"We did not pay any attention to it but went on and held our meeting, which was very satisfactory and made us many friends. Everything went along quietly until March 31st, when we applied to a man by the name of Tucker for a night's lodging. He took us in. A Methodist preacher was just leaving the house. He called Mr. Tucker outside, conversed with him for a short time, and rode off. When Mr. Tucker returned to the house he acted very strangely. He, however, gave us our supper and we retired about 9:30. In a short time a man rode up to the house and called Mr. Tucker out. The two held a brief consultation and the visitor rode off. In a short time we heard a great noise. Six or seven men came onto the porch, called Mr. Tucker and demanded that he deliver us up, which he seemed willing to do. We asked them to allow us to stay until morning, which they refused and required us to go with them. They took us about three-fourths of a mile and put us across Rocky river into Union county and told us if we ever came back

to Stanley county our lives would not be safe.

"It was very cold. We walked around in the woods until morning unable to find a public road. At daylight we started for the house of our kind friend, Mr. Hudson. After walking forty-five miles we arrived there at 8 o'clock in the evening. Mr. Hudson and his son were incensed at the treatment we had received and were exceedingly kind to us. This circumstance has made us many new friends, and some say it came near making them 'Mormons.' Newly made friends are kindly inviting us to visit them, and we feel to acknowledge the hand of the Lord in what has occurred. The people generally are indignant at the outrage.

"We start for Guilford County tomorrow to see the President of the Conference. Do not be uneasy. The Lord will bring us through all right. I did not have the least feeling of fear the night they took us from the house, and I have never felt better than I do now. Our good friend Mr. Hudson has invited us to stay with him as long as we please. He tells his friends he has been blessed in keeping us, and he does not propose that we shall be driven away."

We say God bless Mr. Hudson and his household and all honorable, courageous people who befriend the servants of God in the hour of danger and trial! This will be the sentiment of many who peruse the foregoing account of an exhibition of staunch adherence to duty on the one hand and mobocratic bigotry and intolerance on the other.

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

THE situation in Utah directs the attention of several Eastern papers towards the proposed constitutional amendment now pending in Congress. The contention is that after the adoption of the amendment all valid objections to making Utah a sovereign State would be removed. The amendment referred to reads as follows:

"No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, society or undertaking which is in whole or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

An amendment of a similar kind was introduced in the House of Representatives in 1875. It is said that General Grant was the instigator of it. It passed the House by an almost unanimous vote, but was subsequently defeated in the Senate. In 1876 the St. Louis National Democratic convention and the Cincinnati National Republican convention both adopted blanks in their platforms, urging absolute separation of Church and State.

At the present time the public school question is becoming a rather vexed one in many of the Eastern States. The amendment, if adopted, would effectually settle the issue pertaining to the appropriation of part of the school taxes for parochial and private schools. It would also disqualify many religious institutions now receiving