

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - APRIL 25, 1883.

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN.

THERE are several societies in the Eastern States for the prevention of cruelty to children. They are, no doubt, doing a good work. The reports of their labors which appear frequently in the public journals, show the necessity of their organization and the benefit to society of their humane exertions. But their very existence is a standing reproach to the boasted civilization of the age, and a rebuke to those who laud it so highly. That in a so-called "Christian" land, in the very centre of "Christian" influences, little children have to be protected against the cruelty and inhumanity of their parents and natural guardians, argues a terrible condition of society.

If anything of the kind existed in Utah, it would be pointed out at once as an "outgrowth of Mormonism, a natural result of polygamic life." But these things are peculiar to the large cities of Christendom, and to people who dwell in near proximity to clergymen, philanthropists, and ladies and gentlemen who are fond of declaiming against the assumed depravity of the "Mormons."

The Philadelphia society for the protection of children has recently been working in the mills and factories of Pennsylvania, where it appears the laws in relation to the employment of children have been boldly disregarded. Forty children under thirteen years of age were discharged in one day, through the complaints of the society. It appears that one of these, a little girl, had been compelled to work from 6 o'clock in the evening to 6 the next morning. During the night the little toilers would become so tired and sleepy that they would drop the spools they were putting on the machinery. A watchman was employed whose duty it was to go among the looms and shake the little ones or prob them with a stick to keep them awake. It is said the parents of most of these children were compelled to have them work in order to make both ends meet in the struggle for life.

The labors of these societies are sometimes misapplied, and they are no doubt occasionally meddling and prompted by extreme notions of sectarian piety. But they are accomplishing much for the protection of children from brutal parents and taskmasters and deserve credit for it. And yet there is something radically wrong in the constitution of society in which children who ought to be at school or enjoying the recreation which is essential to their health and development, are compelled to toil in tasks unsuited to their years and strength, because of the inability of their parents to obtain employment—or gain sufficient return from labor to support their little ones.

Humanitarians and social reformers can find in the labor problem, affecting millions of their own people, a sufficiently important and perplexing subject of consideration without troubling themselves concerning Utah, where such sorrows as afflict the poor of "Christian" cities are unknown, and where there is no need for societies to protect little children from cruelty and oppression.

MORMONISM AND CHASTITY.

THE DESERET NEWS devotes a long article to the mistakes made by Mormon girls in marrying "outsiders." It declares that such unions too frequently end in unhappiness, because of the difference in faith, training and habits. We think the advice very sensible, for we are sure that a Gentile who is not an adventurer, would be loth to take a Mormon girl to wife, the risks being equally great on both sides. But what does the ancient

organ of the Saints mean by saying, "Many of them (the Saints) are under sacred covenants with the Almighty in reference to marital connections." It is stretching a point to make any deity responsible for Mormon lust.

We clip the foregoing from the San Francisco Chronicle. We shall be glad to see our advice followed, no matter for what reason. Experience has in almost every case proved the soundness of the counsel for "Israel to wed only with Israel." Yet we can assure the Chronicle that it is not at all uncommon for "outsiders," no matter what may be their hostility to "Mormonism" to desire marriage with "Mormon" girls. They are willing to run all the "risks," if there are any, in view of the prize they are almost certain to secure, and they generally gain great applause if successful, from generally considered respectable "Gentiles."

In answer to the question of our modern contemporary, we will explain our meaning. It is that all Latter-day Saints are under covenant with God to live lives of purity, and that many of them, male and female, are under special obligations, voluntarily entered into, to preserve themselves in chastity, having no connection with the opposite sex outside of the marriage relation. Is that plain enough? In other words, it is more sinful for persons who have learned the law of God in relation to sexual purity and have understandingly pledged themselves to a chaste life, to violate God's commandments and their own covenants, than it is for others who have not so learned and promised, to fall into transgression.

We endorse the remark that it would be "stretching a point to make any deity responsible for Mormon lust." We have never attempted anything of the kind. We regard "Mormon" lust, or rather, the lust of any person claiming to be a "Mormon"—for the reasons advanced above—as worse than "Gentile" lust, in fact and in the sight of heaven. Lust is forbidden and denounced in "Mormon" sacred books and in "Mormon" authoritative teachings. Plural marriage is not designed to gratify passion nor minister to lust; it is ordained for holy objects and far higher purposes than animal gratification. The reason that some persons and papers cannot think of plural marriage except as a vehicle for sensual indulgence, is because they are full of lust themselves and judge others by their low and debased standard.

The Deity we reverence "cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowance," has pronounced judgment against those of us who even lust in their hearts, and has declared that He delights in chastity. No, we do not make Deity responsible for any one's lust, be he "Mormon" or "Gentile;" the individual is responsible for his own degrading acts, and if he cannot master his own passions he is a slave and an object of pity if not contempt. There is no religion extant which teaches more rigid principles in regard to chaste conduct than that which people call "Mormonism." Any more questions?

"AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION" ETC.

IN the minutes of the proceedings of the City Council, on Tuesday, April 17th, appears the following, as published in the EVENING NEWS of April 20th:

The special committee appointed to locate places where oil warehouses might be established within the city, recommended that block 134, plot A, be designated as one place, an oil warehouse being already established there by the Continental Oil Company. That by permission of Hon. Wm. Jennings, who owns the premises, the northeast corner lot of block 100, plot A, be designated as another place; both locations being on the line of Utah Central Railway, the latter the one accepted by the Standard Oil Company for the erection of its warehouse; also that, by permission of Mr. Henry Wood, superintendent of the Denver & Rio Grande Railway Company, two blocks lying on Fifth West Street, between Fourth and Sixth South, or the block lying on Sixth West Street, between Second and Third South Streets, on the Denver & Rio Grande grounds, be designated as the third place. The

committee further recommend that permission be granted to any and all persons establishing oil depots in any of the locations mentioned, to lay and operate side tracks in front of their respective premises on the streets as they may deem necessary. The report was adopted and the committee discharged."

At first sight this may appear all right; the special committee no doubt considered the places designated suitable spots for the erection of the buildings required, and the City Council accepted the committee's recommendations. But on second thoughts queries arise as to the propriety of storing inflammable fluid in large quantities within the limits of the city, or, at any rate, in close proximity to dwelling houses. The last named place for an oil depository is perhaps not liable to very grave objections. It is open ground. The nearest buildings of any great value are those belonging to the Denver and Rio Grande Company, and the Superintendent seems to have no objection to the erection of the warehouse. The freight secured for his road is probably inducement enough to more than counterbalance any drawback that such a storage building might be to the Company's premises.

But how about the other places? The spot recommended for the warehouse of the Continental Oil Company is in the Nineteenth Ward, a little distance north of the soap works. No houses exist, at present, on the east any nearer than about a block away. But on the west, just across the Utah Central track there are a great many dwelling houses, which are likely to increase in numbers and importance, but not in value perhaps, if the oil warehouse stares them in the face with its possibilities of danger and its standing cause for alarm.

The place for the Standard Oil Company's depository seems to be still more objectionable. It is, we understand, two blocks north of the depot and one block west of Union Square. That is a thickly populated neighborhood, in the sixteenth Ward. If there is any danger to property from the Continental warehouse, there is still more from the Standard warehouse, and the value of the property exposed is much greater than that to the north. Therefore the spot recommended is, years even more unsuitable than the other.

The question may be asked where is the danger. The answer may be soon obtained if any one will reflect a little upon the damage that would be incurred in case of fire. Think of the spread of the flames from the burning oil—coal oil—to the houses in close proximity. Suppose the building containing the highly inflammable fluid should be struck by lightning—a not unlikely event in this region. Imagine the danger from an explosion. But it may be urged, these are all contingencies that may never arise. True. And then again who can say with assurance that they will not?

It is precisely that very uncertainty that will render them a continual menace to the people living in their immediate vicinity. And it must have an effect upon the value of property in their neighborhood. It will depreciate that value considerably. Any person thinking of buying a house or a building lot, would take into consideration the existence near by of a warehouse in which inflammable material in large quantities was stored, and rate its value with a considerable rebate. Suppose the depreciation to be only ten per cent. the aggregate would be a very large amount.

It may be asked whether the people in the neighborhood make any objections of this kind, and if so, whether they have been considered. To the first question we can answer most positively, Yes. Hearing of such objections we have made inquiries and learn that the people in the vicinity of the Continental Company's warehouse have protested strongly against it, but their protest was of no avail. Also that the people in the neighborhood of the Standard Company's warehouse intend to enter protest if they have not done so already, but have expressed the opinion that as no notice was taken of the Nineteenth Ward citizens' protest it would be but little use for them to expostulate. We think they are mistaken about this, and also in some of the doubts expressed about the indisposition of the City Council to listen to the voice of the people. We believe that the Council desire to redress every grievance that comes within their jurisdiction, and to make their decisions conform to the

public welfare. They recognize the fact that they are public servants and that it is the general good that is to be sought.

We do not pretend to be able to judge in this matter. But we may and do call attention to it as of some importance. It appears to us that places might be chosen outside of populous limits if not outside of the city boundaries, which would not be open to the objections urged against the present selections. Farther north there is an abundance of open ground near the line of the railroad which would be free from the objections named. It may be said that this would be an inconvenience to the oil companies and might either lessen their profits or slightly raise the price of oil. Admitting this, which is of the more importance, the convenience or profits of one or two business corporations or the convenience, safety and property of a large body of our citizens?

The powder explosion, fresh in the memory of the people, was a lesson that we ought not to forget. Danger was not apprehended much until the catastrophe came. The magazines were safe under ordinary conditions. But the extraordinary and the unforeseen occurred, and we know the result. There are now no advocates of storing powder within speaking distance of any populous district. Illuminating oil is ordinarily safe, but the many accidents that have occurred prove that it contains elements of danger. Common prudence, it appears to us, with the warning of the past suggests that the danger be avoided before the unexpected transpire. An ounce of prevention is worth many pounds of cure. We commend this subject to the kindly consideration of the City Council, feeling sure that they will study the best interests of the people specially concerned, and the safety as well as convenience of all.

GLORIOUS UNCERTAINTY OF MODERN THEOLOGY.

IN answer to a number of questions on the subject of baptism, its object and proper mode of administration, the *Christian Union* gives replies which leave the anxious inquirer in the same condition of doubt as before the request for information. This is not unusual with theological journals and preachers, the supposed authorities on such matters having merely opinions to offer, which are quite unsatisfactory to a mind thirsting for knowledge.

The *Union* states that prior to the time of John the Baptist, baptism was administered by the Jewish rabbis; that Gentile converts were required to be immersed "as a sign that they washed away their old faiths and filthiness and emerged new creatures in the life of baptism;" that John took this symbol ready to hand, and that "Christ adopted it from John," and adds:

"So long as Christianity was a religion of the warm countries alone, baptism was ordinarily, and perhaps always, administered by immersion. Whether infants were baptized when the father was converted is a disputed question, on which, in our judgment, the New Testament throws no light. Ordinarily, however, repentance and faith in the individual baptized were conditions precedent of baptism. Whether we have a right to change the form of baptism from immersion to sprinkling, and whether we have a right to use it as the symbol in dedicating our children when we dedicate ourselves, are questions the answer to which depends upon the way in which the New Testament is regarded. Those who regard it as a book of rules prescribing a Christian ritual will say no; those who regard it simply as a divine revelation of love and helpfulness, and a call to spiritual life in which men may use such rituals as help, and cast of such as hinder, will give a different answer.

The chief characteristic of this reply is its glorious uncertainty. The matter is left to the candidate and his views of the New Testament; he forms his own notion, he "pays his money and he takes his choice." Upon such an important matter as an ordinance of divine appointment, established for a purpose vitally affecting mankind, it seems as though something definite should be promulgated by religious teachers whether from the pulpit or the press.

The chief editors of the *Christian Union* often administer that which they call baptism. They do it

in the name of the Holy Trinity. This is virtually a profession of authority to act in the stead of the Divine Three. And yet they do not know, apparently, how or for what purpose it should be rightly administered. They have some opinions about it but do not seem to think them any more reliable, or of any more value than the opinions of inquirers. They will suit the ordinance to the whims of the candidate. He may be sprinkled, or have water poured upon him, or be immersed. They are just as ready to administer it in one way as another, and to an infant as to an adult. But if they have divine authority they certainly should know the divine mind upon the ordinance they attempt to administer. If they have none, their administrations must be void. The acts of accredited agents of earthly Governments, if performed according to instructions, are acknowledged by the Powers that authorize them. Acts performed in the name of a Government without its authority would be null. Can it be expected that the Divine Government will recognize pretended official doings on earth without its authority? And will the Deity authorize agents who do not know anything about the Divine will in reference to the administrations? It appears to us that the answer to these queries can be readily given with confidence in the negative, by any one with ordinary capacity.

We are aware that the subject of baptism has been a matter of dispute among professed disciples of Christ for centuries. And the fact that it remains so is proof that most if not all of them are without Divine authority. "If any man do His (the Father's) will, he shall know of the doctrine," said Jesus. Those whom he sent out to preach were commissioned to baptize and were instructed to teach what He had commanded them. But these modern ministers have run without being sent. They have fished the commission given and intended only for the eleven Apostles. They have no more right to it than to the credentials of the ambassador to Berlin, or Paris, or London. That is why they know no more about this Divine ordinance than their deluded followers, and cannot give an authoritative answer to a simple question concerning its object and proper form.

John the Baptist knew what it was for and how to administer it; so did Jesus and his disciples. All of them declared that it was "for the remission of sins," and when they baptized, they immersed believing and repentant candidates in water. And they did not "adopt" or copy after any symbol or custom of the rabbis. What they did they performed by Divine commandment. John was sent by direct revelation to preach repentance and baptize with water. Christ and His Apostles were sent of God to preach, baptize with water and confer the Holy Ghost. They all knew what they were about, and did not leave their converts in doubt, or attempt to adapt a Divine command to suit human whims. Neither did they confine immersion to warm countries. They did not have one baptism for one nation and another for another, but they had "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism" for all.

It is so with the servants of God. Divinely commissioned in the present age, having the same authority in this respect with that exercised by the Apostles in the primitive Christian Church. They act under instructions given by direct revelation, which are as follows;

Baptism is to be administered in the following manner unto all those who repent—The person who is called of God, and has authority from Jesus Christ to baptize, shall go down into the water with the person who has presented him or herself for baptism, and shall say, calling him or her by name—Having been commissioned of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Then shall he immerse him or her in the water, and come forth again out of the water.

No one is to be baptized without previously believing in God the Father and Jesus Christ the Son, and repenting of all sin. That this mode and these requirements were part of the Christian religion as taught in the New Testament the *Union* does not dispute. Who, then, obtained authority to change them? No one can tell. Men have had the temerity to introduce things never commanded of God, according to their own notions. Hence the confusion of modern Christendom. If "faith and repentance are conditions precedent to baptism," as the *Union* admits, does not this settle the question of infant baptism, and prove it to be erroneous? It does most