DESERET EVENING NEWS: THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 1906.



PUBLISHED FVERY EVENING. (Sundays excepted).

Corner of South Temple and East Temple Streets, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Charles W. Penrose - - - Editor Horace G. Whitney - Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES. (In Advance):

Correspondence and other reading mat-ter for publication should be address d o the EDITOR,

Address all business communications and all remittances: THE DESERTER NEWS Sait Isake City, Utah.

Entered at the Postoffice of Salt Lake City as second class matter ac ording to the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879.

SALT LAKE CITY, . JAN. 25, 1906.

NEITHER LEGAL NOR MORAL.

A preacher in York, Pennsylvania, writes to the Daily Gazette of that city. complimenting the Mayor upon "the recent summary expulsion from the city of two Mormon missionaries." We do not know anything of the particulars under which this "expulsion" took place, but the preacher considers "the imperative duty of their removal a most delightful and enviable privilege." In what light he would have viewed this arbitrary act as "a delightful privilege" if he had been the victim instead of the exultant spectator, we can very easily imagine. And what sublimely Christian emotions well up in so intolerant a soul would be just as difficult to discern as the other is easy to perceive.

The preacher who publishes his approval of the action of the mayor admits that it will "naturally arouse a controversy in the minds of many people as to the legal and moral ground for such action." He appears also to fear that the missionaries themselves will "endeavor to excite the sympathy of all whom they can influence, and thereby secure a hearing for their message and an entertainment for themselves that would have otherwise been impossible." From these remarks it would appear that, though expelled from the city, there was a probability of better tre tment from people outside the municipal limits.

As to the "legal ground" for the action of the mayor we are not able to say very much, not knowing what regulations may be of force in that city, nor on what pretext the missionaries were excluded. If they were forbidden simply to preach on the streets, that might be according to civic restrictions which the mayor would have the right to enforce. But we do not believe that he had a legal right to expel any person from the city, and that therefore he exceeded his authority and could be brought into legal question for overriding the power entrusted to him. However, it is well enough for our Elders to yield to such arbitrary edic

can be raised against it? Has not a believer in baptism by immersion the right to convert a Methodist, a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian to the doctrine in which he believes? And if he regards that ordinance as essential to salvation, is it not his duty to try to impress it upon others, particularly if they profess faith in the Christian religion?

As a matter of fact, it is not true that our missionaries make a specialty proselvting members of other of churches. Their message is to all people in every land; believers and unbelievers, high and low, rich and poor, preachers and congregations. In doing this, however, they are not "disturbers of the peace," unless it may be the peace of those preachers who cannot meet their testimony and arguments from scriptural or logical grounds, and therefore desire to have them summarlly expelled from the cities and towns where they attempt to proclaim their

message. Another reason set forth by this preacher why those missionaries should be turned out of town is, that they "had been doing their work so cautiously and secretively that their presence was unknown to the pastors and to the churches of the city, until they were apprehended and excommunicated by the city officials." How does that harmonize with the assertion that they were "disturbers of the peace?" The minister who considered their removal "a most delightful and enviable privilege" on his part, ought never to rush into print until some kind friend, with at least a spoonful of brains, overlooks and revises his "copy."

He next attacks the "only pretense of authority for their mission," which he asserts is "the certificate of the head of a priestly hierarchy," whom he proceeds to accuse of all kinds of evils copying the libels uttered by vile apostates and repeated by other preachers. without knowing anything of the facts. But it is evident that he has not inquired into the authority of the Priesthood held by the missionaries, in whose expulsion he delights, and which he would find does not altogether depend upon the written certificate which he holds up to derision.

But let that pass. Suppose they have no other certificate of authority than that which he mentions, are they not at least on a level with himself and his confreres, whose authority is solely derived from a certificate issued by a conclave, or synod, or some other body which might just as well be called a "hierarchy" as that association of ecclesiasts whom he so violently condemns? But even, ff all he asserts were true, what excuse would that form for his conclusion that "the officials of church and state would be derellet to duty, who would tolerate it

within their jurisdiction or condone it

elsewhere?" His final reason for "legal and moral right" to cast those men out of the city, is "their impertinent advocacy and defense of polygamy on scriptural grounds, made by them to the mayor.' This he construes to be "indubitable evidence of the continued dissemination of the doctrine and practice of this moral leprosy." That is to say, that when the mayor assumed they were advocates of polygamy, without slightest reason for such assumption, the fact that they cited him to the scriptures, which relate to the practices of ancient worthies recorded therein, proves that they were "disseminating the doctrine in public and private." Yet he admits that the officials of the Church declare that they "prohibit the teaching of the doctrine as well as its practice." The poor fellow does not seem to be able to connect the threads of his own theory, nor to forbear from exposing his own folly in

any suggestion our government may deem necessary to make in the interest of fair play, will come very near

being acted upon. The United States is one of the sig. natory powers of several treatles with Morecco, bearing upon the status of foreigners there. The convention of 1881 was the outcome of a conference held at Madrid, at which the United States, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, France Great Britain, Italy, Motocco, Holland, Portugal, Sweden, and Norway were represented. The convention regulated the property rights of foreigners in Morocco, and to all its stipulations the United States was a party. Consequently, in any further discussion of the relations of the Moorish government to the outside world we have a voice, and it is clearly our duty to make it heard.

Those who are so afraid of disastrous results from the participation of this ountry in congresses on questions in which the entire civilized world is interested, forget, apparently, that unless we take part in affairs that pertain to other countries, we will not be consulted when our own affairs are the subject of discussion. A country that is supposed to be too weak to exert an influence in the council of nations, will be treated as Turkey is, or as China. The United States is not in that category. Let us have more patriotism and more coafidence in an administration that merits confidence.

FRANCE AND CASTRO.

The French government has received the assurance that the United States does not consider a naval demonstration against Venezuela as a violation of the Monroe doctrine, and it now appears probable that something will happen. Two French cruisers have been dispatched to Venezuelan waters, and as soon as the report of the former French minister at Caracas is received, decided action will surely be taken.

France really can do to chastise President Castro for the indignities heaped upon the French minister. It is pointed out that the capital. Caracas, 18 So situated in the mountains, that it would require a very large force to take it. The principal ports can be bombarded, but Germany, Great Britain, and Italy have already acquired some rights there, and these powers would, perhaps, object to anything that would interfere with the commerce, and delay the payment of the debt due to them from Venezuela,

The French will find a way, though. The Monroe doctrine does not give any of the countries on this continent a license to do wrong with impunity. It declares that American soll is closed to land grabbers, and even to Shylocks with a demand for the'r pound of desh, but it is no bar to the due course of justice between nations,

The Monroe doctrine declares, briefly, first, that the American continents are not to be considered as subjects for further colonization by any European powers; secondly, that interposition for the purpose of oppressing American states, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power would be considered unfriendly to the United States; and, finally, that we consider any attempt on the part of any European power, to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. That is the Monroe doctrine. By the letter and the spirit of it, France may know how far to go before it enters upon forbidden ground.

will continue for years to come, to do business at the old rate.

New York's municipal-owned ferryboats do not pay, but the privatelyowned ones do. All of which does not make in favor of municipal ownership.

ALBERT S. REISER.

JEWELER.

Bell Tel. 2640-K.

12 E. 1st South.

The Carnegie hero fund commission has not found any heroes lately, but it has found a lot of rascals who sought to obtain medals through fraud and hicane.

stored.

prejudice.

of Emerson, Longfellow or Lowell,

the system into the schools. A school official in Germany says: "I should esteem it a piece of good fortune for the entire nation if your exercises were in-troduced into the schools and our young people brought to regard them as one of the necessaries of life."--G. C. Stechert & Co., 129 West Twentleth St., New York.



At Z. C. M. I. SHOPPING HEADQUARTERS FOR EVERYBODY We Will Sell all Broken Lines of Shoes **REGARDLESS OF COST** The following is a Mere Hint of the Many Bargains you may Men's High Grade Shoes, always sold for \$3.00 to \$7.00 a pair, will be sold at\$1.95 to \$4.65 Misses' and Children's Shoes, worth every dent of St. 25 to \$3.00, will be priced for sale at75c to \$1.65 WE WILL OFFER SOME EXCEPTIONALLY GOOD BARGAINS IN LINED SHOES, SLIPPERS, ETC. Besides these Broken Lines, we have determined on a General Cleanup Sale, and will offer our Entire Stock at Reduced Prices FOR CASH. All the Newest Shapes and Styles. POSITIVELY NO SALE GOODS ON APPROVAL OR OUR CARPET DEPT. HAS ALL THE NEW SPRING GOODS Z. C. M. I. is always the first on hand in showing new Goods. This time we are several weeks ahead of any other concern with our Exhibit of new floor coverings and drap-All the new Carpets are here-the handsomest line ever shown in Salt Lake. Every late design and pattern in Rugs Our line of English and Domestic Linoleums is the finest that will be offered this year; the patterns are prettier than ever. Have just received a full car of Printed Linoleum and Floor Oil Cloths. Should be seen to be appreci-



than to contest them, at present, either in the courts or in any other manner Submission to the law is required of them in the discharge of their duties, and they had better suffer wrong than do wrong.

The jubilant preacher who rejoices so much in the expulsion of the two missionaries, endeavors to give some "legal and moral" reasons for that act. The first is, that if they were preaching their doctrines "without purse and scrip" in accordance with the requirements of the Church," then they were "without visible means of support required by law." On the other hand, if they are not "thus preaching without purse and scrip, they are false to their own doctrines and official commission." That is a sample of the logic used by gentlemen of his class, when they step out of the usual line of their pious platitudes.

But does it follow that because the missionaries travel according to the plan laid down by the Savior, they would be always without visible means of support? Suppose that kind friends voluntarily supply them with the "visible means of support." so that they may have the wherewith to obtain food and lodging and clothing; would that be in opposition to the spirit of their commission and mode of carrying the Gospel? We think not. In the revelation to the Church concerning this matter, the Lord said to His servants going forth without purse or scrip, "By this ye shall know my disciples: They shall feed you and clothe you and give you money, and he that doeth this shall In no wise lose his reward."

But if the traveling missionaries happen to be really without money or food or shelter, is it possible that a minister professing Christianity would, instead of giving them "even a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple." applaud the mayor for turning them out of the city, on the ground that they had "no visible means of support?" We can readily understand how he would have acted if he had lived in Judea when the first apostles went out, "like sheep among wolves," under the instructions of the world's Redeemer.

Again, suppose these young men had money in their pockets and places where they could lodge, why would that be in violation of their own doctrines and official commissions?" And if it were, why should that form a reason for their expulsion from the city? The queer reasoning of some of those mectarian pulpiteers is wonderful and past finding out.

Another point put forth as "legal and moral ground" for the expulsion of the missionaries is, that they are "proselyters of the Christian members of other churches," and therefore "they are disturbers of the peace in the most flagrant and offensive and injurious manner, and deserve not only the restriction of the civil law but the censure and condemnation of the churches, as well as that of public officials." There is more logic for you! What law is there against proselyting among any of the so-called "Christian" sects and

every paragraph he writes. We need not go any further into this conglomeration of chop logic, "Christian" uncharity, lame law and limping morality, as enough has been said to show the weakness and nonsense of it all. We hope our Elders in the vicinity of York, Pennsylvania, will profit by the attempts of such adversaries to muzzle them and cast them out, by finding access to honest, rational and truly Christian people, who will at least listen to their testimony and treat them as human beings and American citizens, even if they do not believe in their teachings or accept their message. And we hope that the Mayor of York will learn that it is not his duty to expel from town anyone who does not violate the law.

WHERE IS PATRIOTISM ?

It is rather strange to hear American newspapers denounce our government for its participation in the conference on Morocco. The gathering, says the Sacramento Bee, is "for the sole purpose of throttling Morocco." It is "piracy." Consequently, "It is infamous that this nation should be concerned therein.'

It is, undoubtedly, true that the European powers have an eye upon Morocco, as they had upon China, before Japan spoiled the game there. The African sultanate is said to be rich in undeveloped resources. There are coal deposits, valuable forests, precious metals, etc. And the control of such resources means much to the countries that have found themselves under the necessity of adopting a colonial policy. But does this country, because it takes part in the international congress on Morocco, commit itself to piracy? Are the American delegates there to rob the Africans? Would not true American patriotism and confidence in the administration suggest the supposition that the presence of the American delegates at the congress is for the benefit of Morocco? Can we not trust to the impartiality and fairness of our representatives, to prevent, as far as possible, any injustice to be done to Morocco? If the European powers conspire against that country, the United States may possibly prevent such a conspiracy to mature. The policy of this country as to Manchurla virtually prevented Russia from annexing that province and gave Japan the opportunity of ridding the territory of Russian soldiers. Our country has no other interest at Algeciras than to watch denominations? What moral objection | that Morocco is not imposed upon, and

See America first-Theodore Roosevelt.

Vea America primera-Alfonso, Ia mua'i iloa Amerika-Mataafa,

Zie eerst Amerika-Wilhelmina. Schen sie erst Amerika-Wilhelm

Voyez l'Amerique d'abord-Fallieres.

Kia Kite Amerika 1 te tuatahi-

Rangitira, Gwelwch America un gyntaf-Prince

of Wales, Videte Americam primum-Julius

Se Amerika foerst-Oscar, Christian and Hakon.

Caesar.

The Mikado.

topics.

a scandal. take Castro's. a little farm.