

## DESERET NEWS

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

WEDNESDAY, - DEC. 18, 1878.

## FAITH AND COMMON SENSE COMBINED.

In another place will be found a communication entitled "An Unnecessary Scare." It contains some very excellent suggestions, which are none the less good because they have been so many times repeated from the pulpit and the press. But there are a few points in the article which we do not think are well taken, and as our friend undertakes to criticize, he must consider himself also open to criticism.

We are not of the number who think there is danger in friendly controversy. We have no objection to being objected to. Different persons often view the same subject from different standpoints, and by an exchange of opinions, if they are advanced in a proper spirit, the truth, as it is, may be arrived at by all. There is more danger in stagnation than in agitation. Running water is purified by encountering obstacles, while the still pool is pregnant with corruption. It is only a weak cause that dreads antagonism. Vigorous truth shines brighter and develops force through attrition, and while it does not defy others, it is ever ready to defend itself when the foe is worthy of attention.

The first point to which we object is the statement in the communication that our local item is "an unnecessary scare." This is incorrect. The scare, if any, was in existence some time before the item was written. A great number of little children have been stricken to death by prevalent diseases which are now generally conceded to be contagious. The sentiment expressed concerning the closing of schools is growing fast among the people, and is very freely expressed. And we really think our means of obtaining information on this point is at least as good as our objecting friend's. We scare nobody; we merely express an increasing opinion of a great many people who are already alarmed, not by anything we have said, but by the sight of so many houses of mourning and chambers of sorrow, and the fresh mould upon so many new-made little graves.

The next point is the idea which is very distinctly conveyed in the article, that when epidemics and other calamities which befall mankind appear in fulfillment of ancient and modern prophecy, nothing is to be done to avert them, and no precautionary measures are of any use. Indeed the notion is advanced that there is danger in adopting them, for the Scriptural saying is inserted in this connection, "he that seeketh to save his life shall lose it." But our friend, with singular inconsistency, recommends certain "precautionary" and also remedial "measures." They may differ from those which many adopt, but they none the less come properly under the head of those means which he denounces. We cannot allow such sentiments to pass without correction. Faith in behalf of the sick and to avert evil of all kinds, is enjoined by ancient and modern revelation. We believe in the doctrine, and this paper has frequently advanced and explained it. But according to our friend's logic it would be wrong even to exercise faith against epidemic diseases, for they are among the "great and terrible judgments of God, and he that seeketh to save his life shall lose it."

When sickness is stalking through the city, and suffering and death smite many a heart with grief, are we to stand by and smile, shake our heads in owlish wisdom, or sit down and do nothing? This is not faith, it is nothing but fanaticism. Faith is active, not supine. It gives energy and prompts to good works. There are causes for evils of all kinds. Generally, when the causes are removed the effects will soon cease. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." And we have no doubt whatever that if proper sanitary and other

precautionary measures prevail, many of the epidemics numbered among the "visitations of Providence" would be kept from our borders, and linger only around the localities where filth, decaying animal and vegetable matter, foul odors and impeded ventilation poison the air and spread desolation and death.

Then, all people have not faith. And those who have it cannot exercise it at will. It does not come at the call of man. The mainspring that touches that force called faith is secret from human eyes. We know it exists, we have felt its power, we have seen its effects. But it arises in the soul at one time with little effort, and at others it remains dormant in spite of hope, charity, desire or determination. Does our religion teach us to provide no remedies for the sick? Does it intimate anywhere that we "fly in the face of Providence" by administering remedies to them? Does it encourage inaction when contagious diseases prevail? No, indeed. Read the following:

"And whosoever among you are sick, and have not faith to be healed, but believe, shall be nourished with all tenderness, with herbs and milk food, and that not by the hand of an enemy."

"And the elders of the church, two or more, shall be called, and shall pray for and lay their hands upon them in my name; and if they die they shall die unto me, and if they live they shall live unto me." (Doc. and Cov. new ed., p. 160).

See also page 294.

"And again, verily I say unto you, all wholesome herbs God hath ordained for the constitution, nature, and use of man."

In the same revelation we are told of a certain herbal remedy which is "to be used with judgment and skill;" and all these "wholesome herbs" are "to be used with prudence and thanksgiving." This skill, judgment and prudence results from study of the best books and the knowledge that comes by experience and research, all of which is predicated by this word of counsel. Now if it is right to use remedial measures for the cure of sickness, does not common sense as well as divine revelation prompt us to use "precautionary measures" to prevent the spread of sickness?

The next point to which we object is the statement that diphtheria does not depend on its contagious character. We are sorry to differ with our friend, but a great many physicians who have made this disease their study, take the opposite ground, and among them are not a few who have become convinced that they were in error in supposing it non-contagious. We do not think our correspondent an authority on this subject.

The next is his assertion that "to be consistent, if schools are to be closed all public places of worship should also be closed, every store on Main Street, &c." We think this would be very inconsistent. There is a wide difference between visiting a store where fresh air is continually admitted, and being cooped up in a warm room with large numbers of others for two or three hours at a stretch. We can also see the necessity which may arise during the prevalence of diseases that chiefly attack children, for closing schools while places of public resort for adults may be kept open. But we fail to see any consistency or common sense in such regulations as he suggests as a necessary sequence to ours.

Perhaps he is not aware that in one large school in this city a physician discovered six cases of incipient diphtheria among the scholars. There are some districts in this city where it has been seriously contemplated to close the schools for a time, in consequence of the alarming spread of diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other diseases which we and man more believe are contagious, notwithstanding the learned opinion of our critic. And we repeat, that "as the disease spreads, this may not only be deemed advisable, but may become a necessity." The suggestion, of course, is only intended for localities where it is applicable. As measures that would be wise for one town would not perhaps be necessary in another, so it is with regard to different places in the same city.

We are no alarmists. We never assist in scares. But we believe in precaution, common sense and the use of preventives, all of which are quite compatible with faith and prayer. And we do not think it is of any great avail to ask the Al-

mighty to turn away a scourge, if we fail to search out and remove its causes and use the means within our reach to prevent their spread and prevalence.

With the exception of these several points, the communication, short of its head, makes pretty good reading.

## RUSSIAN CHAMPIONS OF THE CROSS.

QUITE a number of American journals took sides with the Russians, in the late unpleasantness between the Czar and the Sultan, and, in wishing success to the northern invaders, grounded their partizanship on their horror of the atrocious deeds said to have been performed by demoniac Turks in the Bulgarian provinces. But they appeared quite oblivious to the facts that Russian aggression aimed merely at the acquisition of territory, or, in other words, the stealing of a portion of the Sultan's domain, and that Muscovite barbarity was far in excess of Moslem cruelty.

Recent official investigations have established the latter point beyond contradiction. The Bulgarian outrages were committed by the Bashi-Bazouks. These are a set of marauders of the guerrilla kind, and cannot be correctly numbered among the troops of the Porte. The accounts of their depredations were greatly exaggerated, but in any case the Turkish Government was not responsible for them. The massacre and mutilation of Turkish refugees in the Rhodope mountains were the work of regular Russian soldiers, under the direct orders of the officers of the Czar, among whom was General Schouvaloff. At the close of last February there were 15,000 wagons full of fugitive men, women and children, between Kaekoi and Hermanii. They were at first harassed by Cossacks, and afterwards attacked by Russian infantry and artillery and at night driven through the snow into a corner formed by the junction of two rivers. Here the Russian artillery from the adjacent heights played

twelve hours. Helpless women sought refuge by plunging into the river, from which the bodies of two thousand dead children were taken. After the armistice the regular troops of the Russian army burned eighty Mahomedan villages between Staninko and Demouka.

News of these and other similar atrocities found its way into papers all over the civilized world, and through the indignation it excited a Commission was organized, consisting of official representatives of England, France, Germany, Austria and Russia, to inquire fully into the matter. As the investigation proceeded the Russian commissioner withdrew, for the evidence was too conclusive and he had nothing to offer in rebuttal or defence.

The disclosures of this Commission, stamp Russia with the most atrocious crimes and bloody massacres, all committed in the name of religion. In the brutal and savage deeds investigated, it was not Muscovite against Turk but Greek Christian against Moslem. It was "religious" slaughter, "religious" barbarism, "religious" mutilation of women and children. Among the favorite exercises of the soldiers of the Czar was, cutting off the breasts of Mohammedan women; betting as to the sex of unborn children, and deciding it by mutilating the mother; rolling women in tar or petroleum and setting them alight; trapping Mussulmans in a barn and firing the building; violating young girls until they went mad or died from exhaustion; giving females from six to forty-nine years of age to the lust of "Christian" soldiers; beheading old men and granddames; nameless mutilations of men and women, etc.

These horrors are established facts. The Commission, after visiting the scenes of these atrocities, arrived at Constantinople with a thick volume of evidence, which will be published, and advanced extracts from which have been predated in English papers, firing the public heart with detestation of the beasts who invaded Turkey with the cant of "Christian" motives, and the pretext of delivering Christians from Mohammedan oppres-

sion, and reveled in blood and lust, putting to shame the deeds of the lowest heathen when victors over the foe.

The apologists for the Russians should now publish the authenticated statements of disinterested officials, who speak that which they know and testify to what they have seen; and then, if they can, exalt Russian "civilization" over Turkish "barbarism," and Greek Christianity over modern Mahometanism.

## A LADY WRITER ON UTAH.

Mrs. Matilda Joslin Gage, the talented editor of the *National Citizen and Ballot Box*, in the December number of her paper has a long and pointed article on the Utah question. The lady wants to know why the Governor of this Territory "in a spasm of virtuous indignation, proposed the disfranchisement of Utah women." She cannot see why he discriminated against her sex, and says, "If it is on account of polygamy, the women were not its institutors; if the laws of Utah are illegal, the women did not make them."

Perhaps we can enlighten the lady a little on this question. The Governor "didn't mean it." His recommendations were merely soap thrown to the hungry "Mormon-eaters," who had been clamoring against him because he had shown no decided hostility to the majority of the people for whose benefit he was appointed to office. But if it will be any satisfaction to the lady and her associates, we can assure them that he has made no capital by his "spasm," and it is not at all likely that his propositions will attract any further notice than that accorded to them by the portion of the press which has given them passing mention.

The lady then takes up the subject of the movement of "the Gentile women of Utah," and makes the following caustic comments:

"But, after all, what a sham morality is this cry against plurality of wives. In Utah, until the advent of the Gentile population, there were no liquor saloons, no gambling halls, no houses of prostitution, no paupers and few criminals. They were not compelled to lock their doors from thieves, and at any hour of the night a woman was safe to traverse any part of the city unattended. But now, through the husbands, fathers, brothers and friends of the male sex of these 'Gentile' women, institutions have been established which were previously unknown in Utah: 'Saloons,' gambling dens, houses of ill-fame." These "Gentile" ladies can endure, because they were accustomed to such vices in the States, but plural marriages they feel is more than their delicate natures can bear. Out upon such sham hypocrisy and nonsense. For our part, we think plural marriages stand white beside the common abominations of cities; cities, did I say? The country everywhere is rotten with lust, and woman is everywhere the victim of man's vices and crimes."

This is strong language. But it is not stronger than is warranted by the facts. It corroborates what we have maintained. It shows up the pious hypocrisy of those who pretend to be so greatly shocked with plural marriage. And it is a virtual endorsement of the advice of the "Mormon" women to their would-be censors to devote their spare energy and virtuous desire to shine as reformers, to the removal or diminishing of those vices which are so common in the places of their residence, before they came here to breathe the polygamous atmosphere of "Mormondom."

In this connection Mrs. Gage cites them to the exposures made by Talmage, from which she makes the annexed extracts:

"I have discovered in my midnight exploration that the haunts of iniquity are supported by what are called the better classes. The men who in our cities support luxurious vice come down from the fashionable avenues of New York and cross over from some of the finest mansions of Brooklyn, or are prominent citizens from Chicago, Cincinnati, Pittsburg, Philadelphia or Boston. I could call the names of many of the frequenters of these haunts of sin, and may call them

before I get through these sermons, though the fabric of New York and Brooklyn society should tumble into wreck—judges of courts, distinguished lawyers, officers in churches, political orators that talk on the Republican, Democratic and Green-back platforms about God and good morals till you might almost take them for evangelists expecting a thousand converts in one night. On the night of our exploration I saw their carriages leaving these dignitaries at the shambles of dissipation, and if the inmates will answer you will find stock brokers from Wall Street, large importers on Broadway, iron merchants, leather merchants, hardware merchants, cotton merchants, wholesalers and representatives of all the wealthy classes."

But I have something to tell you more astonishing than that the houses of iniquity are supported by wealthy people, when I tell you that they are supported by the heads of families—fathers and husbands, with the awful perjury upon them of broken marriage vows; and while many of them keep their families on niggardly portions, with hardly enough to sustain life, have their thousands for the diamonds and the wardrobe and equipage of iniquity. In the name of high heaven I cry out against this popular iniquity. Such men must be cast out from social life and from business relations. If they will not reform, overboard with them from all decent circles. I lift one-half the burden of malediction from the unpitied woman and hurl it upon the blasted pate of offending man. What society wants is a new division of its anathema. By what law of justice does the burning excommunication of society pursue offending woman down off the precipice, while offending man goes kid-gloved into respectable circles, invited up if he has money and means, forwarded into political recognition, and all the doors of high life opening to the rap of his gold-headed cane?"

Mrs. Gage adds, "Here is polygamy at our very doors." And that is where she is mistaken. But her error is shared by many persons otherwise well informed, so it is not surprising that she should be mistaken in this view of the matter. Polygamy, taken in its most sensual aspect, must not be confounded with the system exposed by Talmage and known to exist and flourish throughout Christendom, sustained and supported by the hypocrites who denounce plural marriage as immoral. It is the very antipodes of the modern "Christian" method. The former gives to each woman with whom a man associates a definite and acknowledged claim upon him. It provides for her and her children. It gives them a home and family associations. It fixes upon the man responsibility for his relations with them. In countries where it is part of the recognized social system it makes a lawful wife of each consort, with all that the name implies. In Utah, where an unrepented but inactive statute makes it unlawful, the strongest bonds known to the human conscience—religious faith and ecclesiastical ordinances, make all the beneficent regulations of legalized polygamy much stronger and far more binding to the husband and wives joined in celestial marriage. And it conduces to life, health, increase and industry.

But the system which anti-polygamist pietists wink at and apologize for, gives betrayed women no claim upon the author of their shame, inflicts no punishment upon the participator with them in their unhallowed practices; destroys the family influence; casts out the offspring of lustful cohabitation—if any, as nameless children of shame, puts a ban on the sinned against, but leaves the active, positive sinner unconcerned; spreads distrust, deception, disease, degradation and death; fosters crime, and strikes at the very foundations of domestic, social and national happiness and existence.

That which Mrs. Gage alludes to, and which Talmage in a small degree exposes, is the enemy of marriage, monogamous and plural. It springs from unregulated, untrained and unreasonable passion. Its origin is lust, its fruits are filthy, its atmosphere is from beneath, and its paths lead to hell. Marriage, plural as well as monogamic, is founded upon the affections; is governed by law, human or divine or both; makes a solid