

# DESERET NEWS: WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE  
DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, Nov. 2, 1887.

## AN ADDRESS FROM PRESIDENT WOODRUFF

IN RELATION TO THE MANTI TEMPLE.

SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 20th, 1887.

To the Presidents of Stakes, Bishop and the Saints generally:

It is with profound feelings of gratitude and thanksgiving to our heavenly Father that we announce to the Latter-day Saints that the Temple which is being erected at Manti has been so nearly completed as to be ready for the upholstering, furniture, carpets, etc., which are necessary to put it in a state of complete preparation for the sacred labors to be performed therein. This is the third building of this character which in the kind providence of God the Latter-day Saints have been permitted to erect and finish in these mountains. The Temple at Salt Lake City is also progressing in a satisfactory manner, which, when finished, will be the fourth Temple that has been constructed by the Saints under the direction of the Almighty since we came to these valleys.

How blessed are the people who have had these glorious privileges granted unto them! Our hearts swell with inexpressible feelings of thanksgiving a joy to our Father in heaven that he has permitted His Saints to build these houses. They now have opportunities to act as Saviors of their fellowmen, which but few generations of the children of men have ever enjoyed. The great work of the restoration of the dead which will occupy the time and thought of future generations has now begun, never more to end until the earth is sanctified and the plan of salvation devised in the eternal worlds for human redemption is fully consummated.

Our object in addressing you in this circular is to present to all the members of the Church the opportunity of contributing to the building of the Manti Temple. Herebefore the contributions for that building have been confined to the Stakes which are numbered in what is known as the "Manti Temple District." Before the Logan Temple was completed an opportunity was given to the Saints to contribute towards the purchasing of its furnishings, furniture, etc. They gladly responded to the call which was made upon them. We feel that they will, on the present occasion appreciate the privilege of contributing in like manner towards the purchasing of suitable upholstery, carpets, etc., for the Manti Temple. The funds of the Superintendent are exhausted, and contracts are already made for needed articles, which have to be met at an early date.

Contributions will be taken from twenty-five cents upwards, so that those who are the most limited in means need not be debarred, while those who are more wealthy can have the satisfaction and pleasure of making donations according to their ability for the completion of this noble edifice. We would like the Presidents and Bishops to give every one an opportunity of doing something in this direction, and the names of all, with the amounts contributed, should be carefully taken.

We would like to see the names of every man, woman and child in the Church recorded in the Archives of the Temple, as having contributed something towards its erection and completion.

These funds with the donors' names, can either be forwarded to the office of the Presiding Bishop or to the Chief Clerk—Brother James Jack, at the President's Office.

It is important that these collections should be made and remitted as promptly as possible, as the need for this means is pressing.

WILFORD WOODRUFF,  
In behalf of the Council of the Apostles.

### A CHAMPION WANTED.

WANTED, someone who will champion the cause of the government in the suits for the seizure of the property of the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Thus far we have not heard of any intelligent person willing to undertake the unthankful task. Even the average anti-"Mormon" politician either expresses himself privately against the movement, or is mum in relation to the matter.

The reason for his attitude is plain. He cannot be accused of being overburdened with sympathy for the victims, but he has some regard for what he esteems to be his own interests and the attainment of his political ends. He is too wily to advocate a movement that must be decidedly unpopular. On other subjects it may be feasible to hoodwink the great American public, but it would be an uphill task to make the people of this country lend their sympathy to a wholesale steal, especially when the forfeiture or confiscation scheme is so plain on the face of it that it cannot well be understood by the densest imbeciles. The very "inwardness" and "outwardness" of the measure are more or less likely to turn the tide of sympathy against the law which incorporates so dangerous and dishonest a measure, and it is natural that the proposed victims should share a portion of the favorable tendency of sentiment. It is seen at once that there is nothing conducive to the forwarding of anti-"Mormon" political objects in pushing the confiscation scheme to a consummation.

Among the newspapers which denounce the attack on Church property, and who see danger in various directions as a result of it, is the *Truth Seeker*, published in New York. A friend has sent us a copy which contains a vigorous editorial on the subject, from which we liberally extract. It opens as follows:

"The Mormon Church is organized under the Utah territorial laws, and its affairs are managed by thirteen trustees. The Church owns a large amount of property, real estate and personal, has a fund for importing its converts, and is a thrifty, concern generally. The Mormon theology is based upon the Jewish Bible; its members religiously believe in imitating the revered patriarchs of old in the number of their wives; it has revelations of later date, but equal authenticity, than the Christian church possesses, and is for these and other reasons cordially hated by its mother and rival, the Christian church.

At the last session of Congress Senator Edmunds prepared the passage of a bill authorizing trustees to be appointed to take possession and control of the property and affairs of the corporation of the Mormon Church, and wind up its affairs. The bill also authorizes the attorney-general to sue for an escheat to the government all property of the Mormon church corporation in excess of \$50,000 of value in real property, except buildings used exclusively for religious worship, and to devote the fund realized to common school purposes. The bill further provided measures to disincorporate the Mormon 'Perpetual Emigration Fund Society,' winding up its affairs and devoting its funds to common school purposes."

The writer then goes on to recite the proceedings instituted in behalf of the government by District Attorney Peters, with which our readers are familiar, and continues thus:

"The United States, therefore, may now be considered as fairly embarked in the business of confiscation of religious property, and a precedent is established for future crusades of the kind. But in the beginning of this affair, as one who opposes the church cannot be despoiled as well as the church which has started the crusade, we desire to enter a protest against the conduct of the United States authorities. These authorities are being made the tool of priestcraft—the cat-paw of a rival religion. The Christian church reads the progress of the Mormon Church, and has determined to stamp it out. The United States are the hosts the Christian church has put on to do it. The reason for these forcible measures is that Christian ministers cannot answer the arguments of the Mormon Elders. The Mormons carry out the precepts and follow the practice of the Christians' Saints, and quote chapter and verse from the Christians' Bible to justify their lives. No one who accepts the Bible as the word of God, divinely given, can live by and die by, can prove these Mormons wrong."

After making some comments upon what the writer erroneously presumes, from want of information, to be the genius of the Church, he proceeds to say, in conclusion:

"Its destruction should not be undertaken by force by the government, unless the government is prepared to undertake the destruction of all religions. Neither should it be undertaken at the instance of a rival sect, anxious for revenge because of its argumentative defeat. If the government is to destroy all detestable religions, where shall it stop? If it is to confiscate the property of every sect that becomes a menace to our institutions, where is the law against the Roman Catholics? If church members are to be placed under the direct supervision of the national government because they vote for men of their faith, why did not Congress pass laws robbing the Methodists who combined at the instance of their church leaders and voted for Grant and Hayes for presidents? If Congress can appoint trustees for a church because five or ten per cent. of its membership have relations with more than one woman, where are the trustees for the Protestant churches? Aye, where are the

trustees for the churches dishonored by the membership of the senators and representatives who spend their salaries on hired mistresses, and when their money is gone procure them places in government service?

The people of the United States owe such liberty as they possess to such freedom of speech and worship as the Christians cannot help permitting. The Constitution of the United States does not permit Congress to legislate regarding religion, and without violating the supreme authority of the land, Congress cannot take from peaceful citizens private property for public use without compensation. The fundamental law of our country was framed to protect all alike, to throw the arm of the law around all alike, and to allow everyone to exercise and support his own professed religion, be it Christianity or Confucianism, Mormonism, or Mohammedanism. Congress has precisely the same right to confiscate the Roman Catholic cathedral that it has to sell at auction the Mormon Temple. If the Supreme Court sustains this law, we shall expect the Protestants to urge Congress to knock down to the highest bidder the territorial property of that other enemy of theirs, the Roman Catholic church.

"The only reason that other governments than ours have urged when taking steps of this nature, has been that the church possessed so much property and had such a hold upon the people thereby, that the existence of the state was menaced. This was the plea of the old English kings, and of the Italian and Mexican governments in recent times. But in this case there is no such plea. If there were, the insignificant amount of property attached, compared to that held by other sects, would disprove it. Three millions of dollars is nothing for religious corporations to hold. The Mormons would not build the bare walls of the Catholic cathedral, and scarcely repair the rotten tenements held by Trinity corporation. The only reason, therefore, for this unconstitutional proceeding is that polygamy must be suppressed. But this, in itself, is a flimsy pretext as the other would be. Only a small percentage of the Mormons are polygamists, and the law for reaching them is ample and efficacious. Hundreds of them have suffered under it, and it is not pretended that this suit will reach more. But, for the fault of the few—a fault, as we have said, already expiated by many—a whole body of religiousists, thousands and thousands of men, women and children, are to be robbed of their property. It is no excuse that the proceeds of this robbery will be devoted to a purpose infinitely wiser and more beneficial than that chosen by the victims. The property is theirs, and they should be allowed to use it as they choose. The United States are rich enough to build all the schools Utah needs without this money. Instead, the robbery of the Mormons is deliberately planned and legally executed to satisfy the hatred of an opposing religious sects.

"While no one would rejoice more than we to see the Mormon superstition as well as the Christian superstition become a thing of the past—a phase of barbarism from which the race had become emancipated by natural progress—it yet becomes our duty in the name of freedom, of impartial justice, of religious liberty, to protest against the action of the United States. The Mormon has as good a right to advocate his religious compound of faith and foolishness as we have to disclose its true character. And if, overriding our Constitution, it becomes a settled thing that Congress can legislate out of existence all religious bodies which it hates, what is to prevent the national government from stamping out the irreligious people whom the church hates more?"

There is a sort of healthy, sledge hammer vigor about the sentiments of the writer in *Truth Seeker*, and there is such corresponding weight in the style of expressing them, that it does one good to read his production. Carlyle himself could scarcely be more clear, forceful, or deft in the use of language in insisting upon the justice of a correct proposition. He is to be congratulated for his capable and unflinching advocacy of the right and uncompromising denunciation of wrong. He does not condemn the assault upon the property of the "Mormon" people upon mere political grounds, but from the high standpoint of correct principle.

### THREATENED SET-BACK TO PROHIBITION.

EXPECTATION is on tip-toe that the Supreme Court of the United States will shortly render a decision which will strike a severe blow to the cause of prohibition. From Iowa, Wisconsin, Kansas and perhaps other states, appeals are pending before that court, based on the claim that the states which have adopted prohibition ought to pay liquor dealers for the property they had invested in the business before the prohibitory legislation took effect. The argument in favor of this position is that the state, by enacting prohibitory legislation, virtually deprived liquor dealers of their property, by rendering the same valueless, without compensation.

The assertion is made that the opinions in the cases from Kansas have been written, and that they are favorable to the appellants. If, as is usu-

ally the case, a reasonable length of time intervened between the passage of a prohibitory law and the date at which it went into effect, thus giving due warning to liquor dealers, and time in which to dispose of their stocks, the reasoning in favor of the appeal appears to us to be unsound. If, however, the state should suddenly and without warning, by forbidding its sale, render worthless a stock of any kind of merchandise which could lawfully have been dealt in and sold prior to such action, it is possible that ground might be found in law and equity on which to base a claim for damages.

In any case, however, it seems unreasonable and unjust to claim that real estate, erected for saloon purposes, should be paid for by the state. The value of such property is not likely to be materially affected by prohibitory legislation, as it is worth as much for other purposes as for saloons. Under what is called the police power, which is exercised by virtue of the general welfare clause contained in most state constitutions and municipal charters, legislative bodies may forbid an individual to use his property for certain purposes, or in a certain way. For example, it is common to forbid by law the use of real estate for purposes of gambling or prostitution.

Such a power of legislation is a rightful and just one, and the argument that would oppose the exercise of it would, if carried to a legitimate conclusion, block the wheels of government. We are scarcely prepared to believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will render a decision requiring states which adopt prohibitory legislation to purchase the real estate erected for saloons, distilleries, breweries, etc. It is well to remember, however, that the greatest obstacles prohibitionists have yet met with have been placed in their pathway by the courts; and though the decision of that tribunal may not grant all that the liquor men ask in regard to their realty, the latter seem confident that it will give them a substantial victory.

Experience has shown that it is often easier to convert the community to prohibitory views, and to have those views embodied into laws, than it is to vanquish the liquor interests in the courts.

### THE ANARCHISTS' CASE.

TODAY the final argument on behalf of the condemned anarchists was to be made in the Supreme Court of the United States. They are represented by J. Randolph Tucker and Benjamin F. Butler, who make the speeches, Roger A. Pryor, who files a brief, and their Chicago attorney, Captain Black. The grounds upon which these attorneys rely are that the manner in which the jury was drawn was such as to admit of the "packing" process and that this in fact was done, contrary to the provision of the National Constitution which aims at securing fair-minded, disinterested, unbiased and impartial men as triers of every case, great or small; and the additional objection that, contrary to another constitutional provision, the accused were compelled in effect to testify against themselves, their private papers and documents having been brought in against their will and woven into the fabric of evidence on which conviction was made.

It will scarcely be proper, when the lives of seven men are involved in the issue, to say that these grounds are shadowy and technical, the straw which so many drowning men clutch at in the desperation of imminent death. They are substantial and rest at the very foundation of just government and good society. Without the strict observance of both of those safeguards against judicial murder, the courts might soon become more dangerous than the class of men we ask them to protect us against. We cannot, in accordance with Christianity or the just laws of man, take that which we did not give in the first instance and having taken cannot restore, unless the necessities of the situation are such that no other safeguard to our well being exists and guilt has been determined in accordance with the methods and forms duly accepted and in force. It therefore only remains to be seen whether or not the attorneys' points are well taken and have been supported by the record; if so, the duty of the Supreme Court in the premises would seem to be plain indeed.

In glance at the salient points in the evidence shows that there is and was something wrong somewhere, judging at a distance. In relation to the case against Spies, Schwab, Parsons and Fielden, particularly does there appear "some black and grained spots" so far as the record of the prosecution goes. An article in the *Chicago News* says of these men:

"There is no claim that any of them were at the Monday night meeting, nor at a meeting on the previous day when the conspiracy was first hatched. Spies wrote the 'Revenge' circular which was read at the Monday night meeting, but there is no claim that it was read with his knowledge. Spies wrote the word 'ruhe' for the printers of the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, but there is no evidence that he knew its special import, and when he learned it he told his advertising agent to go and tell the armed men that the word was put in by mistake. Spies was invited Tuesday morning by Fischer to speak at the Haymarket meet-

ing, but noticing that the hand-bill calling for the meeting contained the words "Workmen, arm yourselves and appear in full force," he said to Fischer that those words "must be struck out or he would not attend the meeting or speak." Spies spoke at the Haymarket, but Mayor Harrison and the reporters heard him and they made the testimonies that I have already given."

This looks as though there were still much room for reflection upon the question of guilt or innocence notwithstanding the verdict. The same authority says of Schwab, Spies' assistant on the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, that there is no evidence whatever of his connection with the plot, save that afforded by the doubtful testimony of Thompson. And of Parsons that he was in Cincinnati when the conspiracy was formed; he only returned to Chicago on Tuesday morning. He called a meeting, and attended it that evening, of what was known as the "American group," at the *Arbeiter Zeitung* office, and at the time of going to it, did not know that any meeting was to be held at the Haymarket at all. It is almost incredible that Parsons should have brought his wife and children to the meeting if he expected bombs would be thrown there.

We all understand that the most powerful outside pressure ever known in this country perhaps was brought to bear upon the jury to force a verdict of conviction. This was to some extent natural enough, since the crime was an awful one and stern justice was not to be thwarted through the imperfections of legal machinery; but if the men named had no further connection with the concoction or carrying out than being associates of and sympathizers with the actors in it, there should be a grave hesitancy about instituting as dangerous a form of anarchy as that advocated by the condemned men. It should not usurp the temples of justice and take possession of the processes and mechanism by which justice is satisfied.

Chicago is not noted for the purity of its administration in some of the branches of the public service, and on great occasions it might require close watching. This is justifiable now when three of the most eminent criminal lawyers of the United States, for no practical compensation, undertake to show that the state of which it is the metropolis proposes to commit murder under the name and in the form of law, through its peculiar system of jury drawing and disregard of accepted principles. However, it may turn out, the principles upon which they rely are sound and ought to be maintained at all hazards. Two or three of the condemned men seem to be guilty beyond doubt, and they ought to pay the penalty; but unless the facts and forms warrant it, the others should not be punished further, no matter how loud and long the clamors of the populace.

### SOMETHING FROM SENATOR McDONALD.

On Tuesday last Hon. Joseph E. McDonald stopped over at Denver on his way to his home, and was found at the Windsor Hotel by a representative of the *Denver News*. After describing the personal appearance of the distinguished lawyer and statesman and giving his impressions of him, all of which were highly eulogistic, he invited from him an expression of his views in relation to the "Mormons" and some of the questions potentially affecting them. The following, which does credit to the head and heart of Mr. McDonald, was the result:

"Yes, I have been to Salt Lake," said he, dropping into a settee at the Windsor, and looking at the *News* reporter with an air to determine his interviewer's intelligence. "I have been with Mr. Broadhead, of St. Louis, engaged in representing the Mormon corporation in the suit of the government to dissolve that body, and the emigration department of it. The hearing lasted some time, and I am now on my way home. No, the case isn't settled yet, but the arguments are all in. The suit was brought under the law enacted by the last Congress, and the Mormon corporation contested its legality as being diametrically opposed to the principles of the Constitution as it is."

"What are your impressions concerning the law and the Mormons, Senator?"

"Well, the law is clearly a violation of the constitutional rights, and I believe will not hold. The corporation of the church of Latter-day Saints is in no way that I can conjecture a violation of the laws of the country, and has as much right to stand as any other corporation in the country. We are basing our defense of the suits upon the construction placed by the Supreme Court upon analogous questions involving the constitution. The Mormons regard the passage of the law and its enforcement as a persecution, and it seems to me that it is such. The exaggerated stories of the monstrous acts of the Mormon people have no foundation in fact, as far as I have observed. They are a progressive, go-ahead people, and as a rule are of superior intelligence. Their practice of bigamy is recognized by them to be detrimental to a republican form of government, and while they