

## A PITIFUL STORY.

We have received from Brother Joshua Hawks, of Franklin, Idaho, some correspondence, telling a cruel and pitiful tale of persecution. To go to the beginning of the story, while Elder Hawks was laboring in Decatur County, Tenn., he was the means, in November, 1883, of bringing a man named J. R. Henson, wife and family into the Church. Shortly afterwards the new members and others were subjected to violent persecution, one man attempting to assassinate Brother Henson, firing three shots at him, each of which fortunately missing the intended mark. The man who attempted the murder was arrested and committed to jail to await trial, which was to take place last July. Knowing the fiery anti-"Mormon" feeling that existed, Elder Hawks advised Brother Henson and family to immigrate to Colorado before the commencement of the trial, but they failed to do this. The consequence was as anticipated by the Elder, as proved by later events detailed in correspondence received by him a few weeks ago, dated at Jonesboro, Arkansas.

On the 9th of August last a mob made an assault upon Brother Henson, his wife and children. They fired seventeen shots into the house, the inmates narrowly escaping being massacred. No one was hit, however, except one of the girls, Laura Henson, who was wounded in the temple. The ruffians then threatened to enter the house, take Brother Henson out and kill him, but this threat they failed to put into execution, as none of them seemed particularly anxious to be the first to go inside. They, however, ordered him to leave the country within five days from date on pain of death. Brother Henson remarks in his letter that he did not want to be degraded by falling into the hands of such a low-lived, blackguardly and bloodthirsty crowd, so on the 17th of August he left his home and family, from whom he was thus pitilessly driven, and went to Arkansas. He got a friend named Bethel to go and assist the family to wind up business so that they might move to where he had gone, but this person was hedged up in his operations on every side by the anti-"Mormon" fanatics.

Then the wife of the fugitive, Mrs. Jane Henson, on the 10th of last September, got a note from the mobocrats, commanding her to leave within ten days, with the alternative, if she did not comply with this decree, of having her house burned down with herself in the flames. In consequence of these inhuman threats, which she had every reason to believe would be put into execution if she remained, she managed to get together barely enough money to take herself and little ones to Jonesboro, Arkansas, so she locked up her home and set out for that place, where she joined her husband.

In writing to Brother Hawks the particulars of the bitter experiences of himself and family, Brother Henson evinces a spirit of remarkable cheerfulness under the circumstances, and indicates that his faith in the Gospel is still unshaken. Adversity has evidently had no influence in weakening it.

One would suppose that such scenes as those described in the foregoing would touch a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the most hardened, but there are people who appear to be utterly oblivious to any of the finer touches of human sentiment. If it were not so, one of the leading causes of such murderous brutality as the hapless Henson family have been subjected to would cease its infamous output of falsehood against an innocent and unoffending people. The lies that cause prejudice to be created against the "Mormon" people are manufactured in this city by a villainous local anti-"Mormon" press and its sympathizers, and although the shedding of the blood of innocence, fiendish deeds of incendiarism, the rendering of helpless women and children homeless and destitute are some of the results of their hellish work, yet their diabolical knavery continues unabated.

When the day of reckoning arrives the position of these unprincipled individuals will not be enviable. There will be piled up a record of events for which they will be held answerable—as the indirect cause of their occurrence—that will make them wish they could shrink into eternal oblivion, in preference to meeting the consequences of their own infamy.

## THE BRITISH MILITARY FORCES.

The difficulties of the Nile campaign have again brought up for discussion the question of the strength of Great Britain as a military power. The facts show that she has given the burden of her warlike ideas to the construction of the most magnificent navy in the world, to the comparative neglect of extending her military facilities. A few years ago we visited one of the British ironclads, of the most improved pattern and including the most powerful weapons of naval warfare, among which was an eighty-ton gun, so adjusted as to require the application of but little physical strength to effectively handle it. The crew was composed of picked men, active, muscular, daring fellows, whose appearance de-

noted that they would prefer fighting to any other pursuit. Taking that vessel as a sample, there should be but little wonder that England has so long maintained her supremacy on the seas.

Although the British army is small compared with that of Germany, France, Austria or Russia, it is probably not excelled for effectiveness so far as it goes. But the comparative absence of numerical strength would be disastrous in the event of her becoming involved in warlike troubles in several remote parts of the world at the same time, of which there appears to be a fair prospect, when the aggressive movements of Russia, Germany and France are considered. The British regular army is placed at about 190,000 men, and nearly half of them are required for service in India and the colonies, while Ireland takes the greater part of the remainder, and when deductions for garrisons, schools of instruction and non-effectives have been made, not more than 20,000 men are available for service abroad, it is said. The reserves swell the fighting power of England to 550,000 men, or somewhat more, but the militia, yeomanry and volunteers cannot be called out except upon the declaration of a European war or to repel an invasion.

There are many reasons why Mr. Gladstone should prefer to accept assistance from Italy rather than call for soldiers from India or permit the Turks to enter the Soudan. There are now nearly 2,700 English soldiers massed on the Nile, and with their Martini-Henry rifles they can repel the Arabs as long as they have ample ammunition and food. So it is held by high military authorities. And, reinforced by a few thousand more they could probably prosecute the campaign to a speedy and successful issue. But while the British are in active service at the front, the aid of an ally to furnish men to hold, in the meantime, the garrisons in Egypt, is indispensable.

## THE MORMON RELIGION CANNOT AND SHOULD NOT BE DESTROYED.

We are indebted to a friend for forwarding to us the following New York correspondence, published in the Portland, Maine, *Argus*, over the initials "L. W. S." It is a clearly and forcibly written paper, and will doubtless be read with considerable interest:

"Some of our dear Republican friends are made unhappy by their fear that President Cleveland will not exterminate Mormonism, forsooth. These same good people have controlled the national government 24 years, within which time Mormonism has grown from a mere pip to a very large tree, the roots of which extend into every territory. That pip could easily have been destroyed. Even when grown to a sapling it could have been plucked from the earth with no very great difficulty. But the big tree of to-day is not easily removed. Why did not our complaining friends destroy that pip or sapling?"

Mormonism has grown more rapidly than any other new religion ever did, and it is now so strong that it demands and must receive a recognized position as one of the established religions of the world. Judaism, Catholicism, Protestantism and Mormonism are to be the four great religions of America, of which the youngest is the most vigorous and tariffy. Mormonism cannot now be destroyed! Any attempt to destroy it will end as disastrously as did the attempt to destroy Protestantism in the days of Queen Bess, and the sooner we bring our minds to that conclusion the better will it be for all. Nor has the national government a right to attempt its destruction. The government has no more right to attempt the destruction of Mormonism than to attempt the destruction of its next elder brother Protestantism—a fact which all men know, but which few seem to realize.

Polygamy was no part of the original Mormon tree, but it has been grafted thereon, and is now the most fruitful part thereof. The national government has a right to crush and destroy Polygamy in all its territories, but it has delayed the exercise of that right until it is now probably too late. Practically it is not now possible to convict and imprison all polygamists. Suppose the government does arrest and try a few of them, what will be the result? It will be difficult to convict them, for the reason that no one will testify against them. But even if convicted, what next? They will become martyrs in the eyes of the neighbors, and the sufferings of martyrs are the seeds of the church. The loud cry of "persecution" will be raised, and persecution is the most powerful fertilizer for religious plants.

Congress can make polygamous marriages illegal and the children thereof illegitimate, but what do the Mormons care for that? They believe such marriages right in the sight of God. The Mormons are "higher law" men. They have adopted in full the dangerous teachings of Mr. Seward and the early republicans that conscience is above law, hence so long as conscience tells them to practice polygamy they will do so regardless of the law. With all their might they believe that they are doing the will of God, and as they are willing to suffer persecution even unto death in God's cause, our government can do little in the matter. Doubtless the bright sun of civilization will ultimately wither and destroy polygamy as

the natural sun withers and destroys garlic in the grass fields, but it will take much time. Polygamy will die, but Mormonism will live and will become one of the great religions of the world.

Probably few people in Maine know what Mormonism really is. Neither do I know. When our honest lawmakers make a new law they tack thereon the declaration that all former laws inconsistent therewith are thereby repealed. Christians believe in the Old Testament and the New, and they believe that the New in part supersedes and does away with the Old. In other words, they believe that all parts of the Old which are inconsistent with the New are repealed. The Mohammedans come down another step. They believe in the Old Testament and the New and the Koran, and that all parts of the two Testaments inconsistent with the Koran are repealed; and the repeal is quite radical. The Mormons believe in the Old Testament and the New and the Book of Mormon, and that all parts of the two Testaments which are inconsistent with the Book of Mormon are repealed. And this repeal is not as sweeping as some timid folks think it is.

Moreover, we have very good authority for judging a tree by its fruits. What kind of fruit does the Mormon tree bear? The Mormons are the most peaceable, temperate, industrious and thrifty people in the Territories, and polygamy aside, they are the most law abiding, moral and virtuous. In Utah but 17 per cent. of the people are Christians, and 83 per cent. are Mormons. In the Utah penitentiary there are 79 Christian criminals, and but 16 Mormons. Thus we see that 17 per cent. of Christian population produces 79 criminals while 83 per cent. of Mormon population produces but 16 criminals. If the Mormons produced as many criminals in proportion to population as the Christians do, they would have 385 instead of the present 16. Evidently the fruit of the Mormon tree is not so very bad after all. Indeed, Mormonism with its polygamy is not half so black as it is painted, nor is Christianity, with its endless divorces and unmentionable things, half as white, and were the two placed side by side the man in the moon, who is a trifle short sighted, could not select the whitest quite as readily as those cantankerous politicians, the Baptist preachers of New York, think he could.

Furthermore, however much we may dislike Mormonism we must perforce admire certain characteristics of the Mormons. In enterprise and courage in patient uncomplaining self-denial, in willingness to do to suffer or to die for what they believe to be right, the Mormons rank with the Pilgrims. As the Pilgrims crossed the wide waste waters of the ocean for the purpose of worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences, so the Mormons crossed the wide waste sand of the desert for a like purpose; and it is probable that greater self denials were practiced, greater sufferings were endured, and a greater number of lives were lost in the effort to establish freedom of worship in Utah than in Massachusetts. The Mormons with their many and gross faults and sins are the heroes and martyrs of the age, some of whom have been sent to jail, and some of whom have been put to death by Christian mobs for no other reason than obeying what they believed to be the direct command of God. And the Mormon "Book of Martyrs," when published, will be quite as cheerful reading as that written by Fox, where-withal our grandmothers enlivened the long winter evenings of their discontented foretime. In these slack twisted days, when men give hardly more attention to the commands of God than to the waisting of the winds, it is cheering to find a body of men and women who willingly follow what they believe to be the command of Jehovah even into jail and unto death, mistaken though they are in that belief.

A final word: The Mormon question is something like the famous old question of the broken kettle you see.

1st. Polygamy is a great evil which our republican officials could and should have destroyed in its infancy.

2d. It is now so strong that it cannot be destroyed, and to attempt its destruction is but to strengthen it.

3d. It is not so very bad after all, and if unmolested, will die from natural causes.

Now that you mention it, what great harm is there in polygamy anyway? Did not Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the other chosen of the Lord have a plurality of wives? We are told that Solomon was the wisest man, and that he had 700 regular and 300 brevet wives, or 1000 in all, and if the wisest man had 1000 wives is not the average man wise enough to have two or five? Judging your Granger Governor by his late message he seems to be about wise enough to have one very small dwarf wife. Blaine was not wise enough for two wives but he married one wife twice, which should count for something. What joy unspeakable polygamy would carry to Gov. Andrews' 60,000 anxious and aimless maidens in Massachusetts. If half a loaf is better than no bread, half a husband must be better than no husband. If a woman cannot have a whole John for herself alone, she should share with another woman and each have a demi-John. If every Jack had a Gill it is but fair that every Gill should have her Jack, and if there are not Jacks enough for all, then let each and every Gill have her just and honest share of such Jacks as there be. I once knew a lovely woman who became wealthy in

the course of years through her ownership of an undivided sixteenth of an estate, which shows that an undivided sixteenth of a husband is a good thing for a woman to have, especially if the man is dead.

Polygamy—the old Jerseyman pronounces it Polly Gammy as though it was the name of a damsel in distress—will not travel far for the reason that one wife is quite as many as the average man cares to battle with through this sin stained world. Nor are there enough women to enable it to travel far. Even now our young men think there are not girls enough to go around and that they will fail to get one if they do not strike early. More male than female children are born, but as the good die young there is a small surplus of adult females. In our Eastern States this surplus is large but in the West the male surplus is about as large, and as a whole the females do not outnumber the males to any considerable extent.

"Polly Gammy is durned bad, but we have wass things in Jersey," said the veteran, sadly.

## MAXIMS FOR THE ANTI-"MORMON" CRUSADERS.

We are indebted to a friend for directing our attention to an article on the moral status of the legal profession which appeared in the *Century* for November, 1884. It is so generally applicable to local legal matters—notably the course taken by members of the profession engaged in the anti-"Mormon" crusade—that we are induced to present a somewhat copious extract:

"It is apparently the popular opinion that lawyers' morals are of a different type from those of ordinary human beings. There is evidently great difficulty in fixing the standards of legal morality and defining its rules. So much debate of this topic itself excites misgivings. Is a lawyer bound by the common laws of conduct recognized as binding by reputable men in other callings? Some of the disputants would seem to maintain that he is not, which is startling; and some to insist that he is, which insistence would itself seem to imply an abnormal condition of things. Nevertheless the discussion must be fruitful of good. Now and then we get a clear and uncompromising utterance like that of Mr. Theodore Bacon, read at the late meeting of the Social Science Association and printed in its journal. Mr. Bacon recognizes the fact that the typical lawyer is not a type of honesty. 'If,' he says, 'unswerving integrity, if ingenious simplicity are recognized by the community in the ranks of the legal profession, they are regarded—let us not blind ourselves to this fact—as an incongruous interpolation in the normal type.'

"Mr. Bacon's treatment of this theme is trenchant and uncompromising. His view is summed up in this saying: 'I can find no different—or rather I will say no lower—ethical basis of action for the advocate than for any other member of society.' This is a wholesome maxim. It blows away a whole firmament of fog. It brings the subject within the reach of common minds. If lawyers are amenable to the same ethical rules that govern other men, then it is not presumptuous for laymen to judge their conduct.

"Doubtless there is some confusion in the popular mind as to a lawyer's right and obligations. The common question, whether a lawyer can rightly defend a criminal known to be guilty—answered so generally in the negative—is often discussed under a fundamental misconception. The fallacy involved in the prevalent objection, as Mr. Bacon says, 'is in the notion that the interest of morality and of social order demands always the punishment of bad men.' The error is a grave one. The interest of morality and of social order demands, above all things, that a bad man shall not be punished unless he has violated some law; and even that a known violator of law shall not be punished except by the forms of law. And every lawyer who interposes against an eager prosecutor or a passionate jury the shield of a strictly legal defense, declaring, 'You shall not hang or imprison this man, be he guilty or not guilty, until by the established course of procedure, by competent legal evidence, you have proved that he has offended against a definite provision of law, and that the precise provision which you have charged him with violating, is defending not so much the trembling wretch at the bar as society itself, and the innocent man who may to-morrow be driven by clamor to crucifixion.' This view of the lawyer's duty in criminal cases is one that the layman does not always get hold of, but it is certainly just."

"Mr. Bacon knows that the honorable lawyer who knows beforehand that the case which he is asked to undertake is iniquitous, promptly declines it. Not only has a lawyer no right to undertake a clearly unjust cause, he has no right to continue in a cause which he undertook, believing in its justice, if, in the course of the trial he becomes convinced that it is unrighteous. His manifest duty to retire from the conduct of a bad case concerning the character of which his client has wantonily deceived him, is clearly maintained by the essayist.

"Out of all this discussion it is easy to draw two or three plain maxims, obvious enough to men in other callings, but far from being common place in legal ethics, as all who frequent the courts must know.

"1. A lawyer ought to be a gentleman. His function as an attorney gives him no dispensation to disregard the ordinary rules of good manners, and the ordinary principles of decency and honor. He has no right to slander his neighbor, even if his neighbor be the defendant in the cause in which he appears for the plaintiff. He has no right to bully or brow-beat a witness in cross-examination, or artfully to entrap that witness into giving false testimony. Whatever the privilege of the court may be, the lawyer who is guilty of such practices in court is no gentleman out of court.

"2. A lawyer ought not to lie. He may defend a criminal whom he knows to be guilty, but he may not say to the jury that he believes this criminal to be innocent. He may not in any way intentionally convey to the jury the impression that he believes the man to be innocent. He may not in his plea, pervert or distort the evidence so as to weaken the force or conceal the meaning of it. He is a sworn officer of the court, and his oath should bind him to the strictest veracity. It would be Quixotic to expect him to assist his adversary, but his obligation to speak the truth outranks every obligation that he owes to his client. It is notorious that some lawyers who would think it scandalous to tell a falsehood out of court, in any business transaction, lie shamefully in court in behalf of their clients and seem to think it part of their professional duty.

"3. A lawyer ought not to sell his services for the promotion of injustice and knavery. Swindlers of all types are aided by lawyers in their depredations upon society.

"There are many lawyers—and they are not exclusively confined to our large cities—who should be disbarred without delay for dishonest and corrupt practices; and until some serious and successful attempt is made in this direction the legal profession must expect, and will deserve, to decline in popular esteem."

It is only necessary to note a few facts connected with the legal crusade against the "Mormons" that has been prosecuted during the past few months by District Attorneys Dickson and Varian and the court of the Third District of Utah, to show that many of their acts have exhibited the antipodes of the professional integrity advocated in the *Century* article.

One of the most notorious, low-down characters in the West has been hired by the prosecution to superintend its dirty work, thus not only scandalizing legal affairs, but every decent officer of the Court.

Legal wives have, contrary to law, been summoned before the grand jury and pled with questions, the purpose of which was the obtaining of evidence for the prosecution of their husbands after they have declined on account of their privilege of refusal to answer.

Weak women have been entrapped into giving testimony contrary to the facts. Notably in the case of Phoebe Calder, who was asked the indecent question: "Do you know whether Maggie Naismith is a pregnant woman?" which, under pressure, she was induced to answer in the affirmative, and thus to state as knowledge what it was impossible she could know.

An accused person was intimidated by the District Attorney into the production of witnesses against himself by a threat that if they were not produced the door of defendant's house would be broken in.

A young lady witness—Miss Grant—was summarily fined for contempt by a U. S. Commissioner, after she had testified in court, for not answering a subpoena that never was served. And she was not allowed the privilege of an explanation, which the law distinctly allows in all such cases, and thus a legal theft was perpetrated.

It was given in evidence by a witness for the prosecution in a case before the U. S. Commissioner that a minion of the prosecution had offered the said witness fifty dollars to assist in putting up a case against a prominent "Mormon" gentleman. No attempt was ever made to deny the fact of this shameless transaction.

Not only have the forms of law been ignored by the anti-"Mormon" legal crusaders, but its express provisions have been overridden, accused persons having been refused bail, thrust into prison and punished pending appeal, or before it has been judicially decided that they have been tried and convicted according to the "forms of law."

Alleged grand jury minutes have been thrust at witnesses in open court, for the purpose of making it appear that they testified differently before the inquisitorial body to what they did at the trial of the case. These minutes, as we have heretofore proved, were manufactured, or at least "doctored" for that villainous purpose.

Witnesses—men, women and children—have been badgered, browbeaten and outrageously insulted by Messrs. Dickson and Varian and have not been protected from such unprofessional proceedings by the court.

But the conduct of the crusaders has been so intrinsically inexcusable, and occasionally even brutal, as to need no comparison with the views and sentiments expressed in the *Century* article to make it appear in all its hideousness to thinking and consistent people.

## NOTHERS.

If you are failing; broken, worn out and nervous, use "Wells' Health Renewer," \$1. Druggists. W