

EDITORIALS.

CANNOT BE SUCCESSFUL.

We have been informed that a lady of this city is acting as an agent, or in some such capacity, in behalf of the charitable institution for which Congress, during its late session, made a considerable appropriation. We refer to the institution that it is proposed to establish as a home for "Mormon" plural wives who desire to sever their marital associations. In connection with this project the lady referred to recently visited the residence of one of the brethren whose case is in Court and made certain overtures. As to the nature of the proposals we, of course, cannot be absolutely certain, but we can state them as they have come to us with considerable directness. Substantially they are—allowing for possible misunderstandings of the parties between whom the communication passed—as follows: That the plural wife is to be provided with a home for herself and children conditionally that she subscribe to an oath to the effect that she shall in future, for all time, live separate and apart from her husband. An understanding is also to exist to the effect that the woman shall go out to work, if able, and turn the proceeds into the institution. In the event of the husband subscribing an oath guaranteeing separation he is to enjoy immunity from punishment for past plural marital associations.

We suggested to our informant that perhaps the institution for which Congress appropriated and of which Mrs. Angie Newman claims to be the originator had been, in this instance, confounded with the "Orphans' Home and Day Nursery," but were assured that there could be no such mistake with regard to the purport of the lady's communications.

Such propositions are necessarily based upon an erroneous conception of the character of "Mormon" women. It will yet be discovered, "in the course of human events," that it is much more exalted than is supposed. Speaking of them as a class, their degradation is a myth. Every attempt to make inroads upon their domestic relationships will serve to demonstrate this fact. It will be found that they possess an independence of spirit that causes them to look upon the bare idea of accepting of anything in the shape of charity as utterly repugnant to their natures. The discovery will be made that they look upon the ties by which they are bound to their husbands for eternity as being of the most sacred character, and that they will contemplate with dismay the thought of making a counter covenant or annulment of the religious contract. In the consideration of this question, those who appear to be so solicitous for the "Mormon" women and ignore their sisters of the world who are held in the most appalling thralldom to vice in its most destructive forms, leave out the element of human nature. This is a point, however, that cannot be ignored in attempts to solve any human question. Those who suppose that "Mormon" women as a rule do not devotedly love their husbands, "reckon without their host." Scarcely a day passes but this species of affectionate devotion is dragged before the public gaze by the operations of the anti-"Mormon" crusade. To set aside this important factor in dealing with the subject referred to is not only unphilosophic; it is foolish and exhibits that species of incapacity that is the outgrowth of ignorance. Let us see the man on whom a woman has centered her affections, and there are few things she will not prefer to do rather than sever any existing tie that binds him to her. The difference between the legal and judicial raid and such purportedly benevolent institutions as the one referred to is that the former seeks to accomplish the object by force and the latter by inducement. But where the love-tie exists, no power, either coercive or persuasive will ever cause the woman to yield the point. This is a law of humanity, and no law or institution that does not recognize it is worthy of respect from an intellectual, moral or benevolent standpoint.

But it seems to be fashionable to presume that "Mormon" women are scarcely human. This is a mistake; they are intensely so. Woman, properly constituted is imbued with the genius of domesticity. She is essentially a home-bird. This being the case, even aside from the repugnance she feels at the idea of being the recipient of charity, the thought of being in a manner herded together in a public institution is almost equally repulsive. It is not essentially a home in a truly domestic sense, and not at all conjugal, and consequently does not embody the constituents of attractiveness for woman worthy the name.

These thoughts come as we contemplate the powerlessness of all attempts to turn human nature into channels for which it was not intended by the Creator. The failures of despots and benefactors alike are to be attributed to their having ignored this most important and invincible fact. For this reason and many others we believe that the Newman scheme will meet with but small success in the attainment of what is claimed to be its object. The barriers that confront it are more formidable than they appear to the superficial thinker.

THE DUTIES OF THE TEACHER IN THE CHURCH.

A FRIEND who has resided two years in Manti, Sanpete County, draws our attention to a subject which he deems of much importance. As to the vital character of the question we heartily agree with him. During the period named he has been visited but once by a person officiating as a Teacher, and says that the hands at the Temple boarding house are seldom or never visited by one acting in that capacity. This situation may possibly be superinduced by the local ecclesiastical officials being reticent with regard to assuming jurisdiction in their religious capacity over those whom they probably took upon in the light of visitors. There is no necessity for any feeling of that character, however, as they are under their supervision, so far as their offices admit, just as effectively as if they were actual residents. If it were otherwise those Saints who may be absent from their permanent homes would be minus the supervisory care of the Church.

The question of the duties of the Teacher, from a general standpoint, as regards the entire Church, is one of great interest. It would not be stretching the truth of the position to assume that, speaking as a whole, they are very imperfectly performed. Every man should stand in his own calling and not in that of another, and all its duties should be executed intelligently and thoroughly. He who accepts of the office of a Teacher should, by consulting the revelations on the subject, and by a prayerful spirit and reflection become familiar with its obligations. He will thus be in a position to act with intelligence. The next step, to insure thoroughness, is to allow no ordinary circumstances to constitute an obstacle to prevent him performing the duty he has undertaken.

It is the prerogative of the Teacher to be a peacemaker, and bring about a settlement of all disagreements and disputes between the Saints under his care, and where this is impracticable, to report to the Bishop, that such cases may be adjudicated in the Court which is composed of the last named official and his Counselors. It is always the better way, however to bring about reconciliation in the earlier stage. By this procedure the important element of unity in the Church is preserved and maintained.

It is incumbent upon the same officer to see that the Saints "meet often together, or, in other words, that they attend meetings that they may be instructed in matters pertaining to the duties of their religion, partake of the sacrament, etc., that the spirit of the Gospel may not languish amongst them. In this way life is infused throughout the body-religious.

One of the most important duties of the Teacher is to "see that no iniquity exists in the Church." If professed Latter-day Saints are guilty of any of the grosser offenses, it is his duty to seek diligently to discover the fact and report to the Bishop, that the offenders may be dealt with according to the covenants and commandments. It is always in order for the officer named to use an influence to bring sinners to repentance, and to take a course generally so as to prevent any of the sneer of the flock that can be saved from being lost. In this way abominations and every species of wickedness are eliminated and the purity of the Church maintained. This duty of the Teacher of itself exhibits the importance of the office. Its duties lie at the root of matters, and without their performance the more advanced processes of the organization cannot be fully operated.

The spirit of peace must accompany the Teacher, and he must be an exemplification of the principles he should enunciate. Otherwise his operations will be practically without weight. It will be absurd and inconsistent for him to advise the people to attend meetings if he personally absent himself from the gatherings of the Saints. If he be an unobedient neighbor, quarrelsome and a backbiter, with what degree of complacency can he reprove those who are in the same way disposed? If he is unchaste, his instructions on personal purity are but boomerangs that strike back upon himself, even if he is the only one near acquainted with his departures from the law of the Lord.

The objects for which the office of Teacher was placed in the Church cannot be attained by the person who holds it going around his district in a rush, as a matter of form, to enable him to subsequently report that he has gone through his field and "found all the Saints about as usual." Entering the houses of the Saints and talking about the weather, the crops, business and other people's affairs will not accomplish the desired end.

When the Teacher enters the house of a Latter-day Saint he should be given a cordial welcome. He may move in a humble sphere, so far as the things of the world are concerned, but he is a servant of God, and as such he should be treated. He should be given an opportunity to perform the duties of his calling. Household work and other occupations should be temporarily suspended and the head of the house should call the members of the family together and to order, and inform the Teacher that they are ready to receive whatever instructions he may be ready to impart.

Doubtless if the duties of the teacher were more intelligently, thoroughly

and effectively performed than they have been and are the Church would be more vigorous and healthful than it is to-day.

A CHANGE OF WARDENS.

We understand that Mr. G. N. Dow, late Warden of the Utah Penitentiary, retires to-day from that office to give place to Mr. O. L. Brown, recently appointed to the position by Marshal Dyer. The retiring officer gained a well-merited reputation for efficiency. While considerate and gentlemanly, he was a firm disciplinarian. It always pays a man entrusted with power over his fellow creatures, no matter what may be their character or situation, to treat them humanely. This ingredient has entered largely into Mr. Dow's official career as Warden and on that account he is entitled to our respect. We hope that Mr. Brown's course will be similar in that regard, and we believe that it will. The fact that Marshal Dyer is opposed to unnecessary severity leads us to that belief, besides it being the duty of all to expect that a man will act properly until his conduct impels a different conclusion. Such is the view we take of Mr. Brown, without having any acquaintance with that gentleman.

A PROMINENT BUSINESS EVENT.

The advertisement of The Home Fire Insurance Company appears in this issue. We hail with pleasure the birth of this business enterprise, among whose officers and stockholders are a number of the most solid and capable business men of the community. The step is highly proper, and the organization of the company is a prominent financial event in the history of Utah. It is decidedly in the direction of self-sustenance, shoulder to shoulder with the policy of home manufactures. The fact that distant companies can do a profitable fire insurance business in this Territory is a guaranty of success for the Home organization. The more of the business of a community that can be done within its own lines the better for it, and the broader and nearer will be the smile of temporal prosperity that is bound by the pursuit of that policy to ultimately beam upon it. The enterprise is not new, so far the idea of its establishment is concerned. It has been in the mind of its chief projector for the last ten years, but has only now taken tangible shape. We wish it the substantial success to which we believe it is destined to attain.

WHAT NEXT?

The case of Orson P. Arnold, convicted on Saturday, on a three-count indictment, for unlawful cohabitation, has created unusual interest in the community. It is the first instance of one of those who, when first placed in jeopardy, "promised to obey the law in the future, as construed by the courts being again prosecuted." The evidence for the prosecution showed that the defendant had, on a number of occasions, visited the house occupied by his plural wife for the purpose of looking after his children and caring for her and their wants. In one instance he stayed over night in order to nurse his baby, who was ill and under medical treatment. It was also shown that Mr. Arnold's plural wife had accompanied him to Ogden, where they occupied separate rooms, selected by the clerk of the hotel where they stopped, and that while there they did not even eat at the same table. This is the sum of the evidence produced at the trial, and upon which the verdict was based.

The position taken in this case by District Attorney Dickson was in line with his official career, being merely a step in advance in a tortuous path. Those who have been before the Court on conviction for unlawful cohabitation have been given to understand that if they promised to obey the law in the future "as construed by the Courts," the imprisonment part of the penalty, at least, would be omitted, and they would, on account of this public declaration, occupy a similar position in relation to their plural wives as a man stands in toward a wife from whom he has been divorced. Judge Powers flatly asserted that the course for a person to pursue who had made the "promise" was to treat his plural wife "as if there had been a decree of divorce." Now comes Mr. Dickson and throws a bombshell into the camp of those who have "promised," by the assertion that every one of them should have submitted a written statement to the Court to the effect that their marriages with their plural wives were null and void, being illegal. Further, that they should have obtained a decree from the Court to the same effect. According to his theory, enunciated on Saturday, if this course had been taken, conduct otherwise guilty before the law would have been innocent. The utter faithlessness of this position is self-evident, and will probably cause a new light to beam upon

those who have given the "promise," they having imagined that they were practically, in the eyes of the law, in the same position in reference to their plural wives as in the case of parties between whom there had been a legal annulment of the marriage tie. In one instance a gentleman, in connection with his agreement to obey the law as construed by the courts stated that he did not propose to renounce or repudiate his wives; he still held them in that relationship, but would regulate his conduct so as to conform to what appeared to be required of him. The District Attorney, who, in his official capacity, must have been in a sense a party to this transaction, declares that his acts are colored by the status which the defendant in that instance declared to be his position. Why was this ground against the polygamous status not taken by the Prosecuting Attorney then, instead of resorting to deception, causing the defendant to believe he had taken the only step that would insure immunity from imprisonment? Why was he not told that if he had the temerity to visit his plural wife the fact of his not having taken a step further would militate against him? How does it look now for the District Attorney to say to him and all others who made the required "promise" that they have not gone far enough, but that they must dissolve the status by another process? Why were they not then and there told by the District Attorney that they were not permitted to treat their plural wives as a person could a divorced wife and still be innocent, but that they must act towards them as if they were snakes, to be shunned lest he who approached them with the commonest civility be tainted and destroyed by judicial venom?

Why did not Mr. Dickson explain to the G. A. R. visitors in his rabid speech in the skating rink that those who promised did not clear themselves from the meshes of the law even after the cases for which they were first in jeopardy were disposed of? Here is what he did say:

"There has never been a man called for sentence in the Third District Court or in the First or Second District Courts, but who had the chance to go thence free, without punishment of any kind, if he would but simply say: 'From this time forward I will obey the laws of the United States.'"

The first case against Mr. Arnold, who was fined \$300, notwithstanding his "promise," was a flat contradiction of that assertion. Mr. Dickson's own position of Saturday is also its antipodes. It punishes the promiser out of court, because it prevents him treating one who ought to be dear to him with the commonest courtesy that he can accord to those for whom he has no special solicitude.

Mr. Dickson is overreaching himself. Because he can, by the perversion of judicial machinery, obtain victories over victims who are helpless he imagines himself essentially powerful. He is puffed up with the plenitude of his egotism, aided by a cruelty that appears to be without bounds. He not only overleaps the meaning and intent of the law, and by the aid of a willing court and machine jury, tramples upon every legal right of those he seeks to crush, but he treats with contempt the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. That highest tribunal of the land held that the polygamous status is not criminal. Mr. Dickson holds that it is. He says that it is the denotation of the status that is aimed at. The law does not aim to destroy that which is legally innocent. He is losing his cunning, which has heretofore been a conspicuous constituent of his official operations. He is running wild and becoming reckless, being evidently under the impression that he is invulnerable. This can readily be shown.

Suppose Mr. Dickson's new theory should be adopted, and every polygamist should make the supererogatory statement in writing to the Court, and obtain a decree from the latter to the same effect? He holds that a man who does this can then treat his plural wife as he would a legal wife who has been divorced. Any conduct between them would be innocent under the Edmunds law, which does not aim at meretricious conduct. How much would the polygamous status be affected by that? It is unnecessary to reply. The answer is self-evident. Indeed, the proposition may be laid down with unqualified breadth, that the polygamous status cannot be reached by any legal process in existence. Its annihilation by that means is an impossibility. A decree of court may be made, but it does not demolish that which never had a legal existence. The most ordinary common sense might have suggested that to any intelligent man not blinded by passion and prejudice. Blinded as the Court has shown itself to be, it saw this point and sat down upon the absurdity, by declaring that it was not necessary to obtain a decree of dissolution of the plural marriage tie.

If there is a person in the community who can intelligently defend the District Attorney's position, let him come out of his shell. He is making a record as one of the most unscrupulous and unmerciful official despots that ever disgraced the government of the United States.

WORDS OF TRUTH.

THE following extract from a letter from President Joseph F. Smith appeared in the latest issue of the *Millen-*

nial Star. We commend his words, which bear the force and sacred impress of truth, to the Latter-day Saints: "It is now thirty-nine years since President Brigham Young and the Pioneers entered the Valley of the Great Salt Lake, and for the first time in three years began to contemplate a season of rest and immunity from persecutions and drivings of mobs, and the many sad consequences incident thereto. Considering the many imperfections and failings of the people, and the great purpose of the Almighty to hasten His work and cut it short in righteousness, which must depend upon the advancement of the body of the Church, not independent of the active Priesthood, I think that we have passed through a long period of rest and quiet and immunity from the power of the enemy. But the time seems to have come that a new and healthier impetus must be given to the cause. This necessitates a sharper definition of lines and measures, and the uprooting and overthrow of that which is not firmly grounded in the truth, and solid or that has any unsoundness or rottenness in it. Things that are formed and that exist in impurity must be given asunder; hopes based upon mere human or worldly desires must perish; practices growing out of the multitude of human weaknesses must cease; the love of self and of pleasure supplanted by the love of God and the love of neighbor; greed and covetousness succumb to charity, and the will of man, as pertaining to the Church, swallowed up in the will of God, and a more perfect unity of faith and works be brought about. Among the many evils which must be corrected, that of the neglect of families—wives and children—by husbands and fathers, is not the least. I am convinced that many have brought themselves under the displeasure of the Lord because of their slackness and unworthiness respecting the sacred obligations they have assumed in regard to their families, while there has been great difference of thought and variety of opinion on these matters. Some may think that the weight of God's displeasure has fallen upon those who have been most prominent in carrying out the counsels of the Almighty, especially in regard to plural marriage; but if every man who deserves, and is worthy of chastisement, does not receive his full portion before the Lord gets through with us, then, have not read correctly the signs times; while they who are not worthy of such chastening shall be as a stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. It is good to be worthy of reproof, for 'whomsoever the Lord loveth he chasteneth'."

THE POSITION IN A NUTSHELL.

THE argument made by Hon. F. S. Richards, one of the attorneys for the defense in the Arnold case, consisted of a number of clearly defined propositions, that, in our view, are not susceptible of being overturned. It contained the following distinctly drawn enunciations, which we have extracted from it, and present separate from explanatory elaborations, so that they are *multum in parvo*:

Arnold's promise to obey the law, made in open Court and in pursuance of a mutual agreement between himself and his second wife, was equivalent to a divorce; there being no legal marriage existing between them there was nothing for a Court to dissolve. This being so, their status was substantially that of a divorced couple and their conduct toward each other should be in keeping with that condition. There is in fact no evidence which shows any intimacy between these parties which would be unlawful or even improper in divorced persons.

If the defendant's promise to obey the law did not have this effect, then the inducements held out to people to make such promises, even at the sacrifice of their consciences, are "a delusion and a snare." They are led to believe that such a declaration would relieve them from any unfavorable presumption which might arise from the fact of their previous marriage relation. If this belief is ill-founded and a spotter is to be set upon the track of every man who makes this promise, and his footsteps are to be dogged day and night, as Arnolds' were, with a view to placing him in an equivocal position, then the promise becomes a snare to him, for relying upon it he does what otherwise he would not have done and then his every act is torped against him.

The District Attorney does not deny that if the parties had been divorced the defendant's conduct would have been entirely proper and, to deny him the benefit of the presumption arising from his promise would give the law a most cruel and inhuman construction, making unlawful the performance of those duties which are most binding upon men according to the laws of nature and the instincts of humanity.

ECCLESIASTICAL, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL LAW.

A LETTER has been handed to us from a distant settlement, in which the writer desires some explanation