DESERET EVENING NEWS.

PUBLISHED DAILY, SUNDAYS EXCEPTED. AT 10:00 O'CLOCK.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, - EDITOR

Saturday, - November 26, 1887.

JUDGE ANDERSON'S DECISION.

The full text of the decision of Judge Thos. J. Anderson, in the cases of John Moore and other applicants for citizenship, will be found in this issue of the DESERET NEWS. The conclusions reached by His Honor will not greatly disappoint persons of either party who watched the proceedings in court, and noted the Judge's repeated rulings in favor of the objectors and the trend of his own interrogations and remarks during the course of the investigation.

The so-called "Liberals" will greatly rejoice at this obstruction to the naturalization of alien members of the People's Party. Their present exultation, however, is somewhat tempered by their very evident anticipation of the result from the beginning, the cause of which is not difficult to surmise. The people will see in this decision one more act of gross injustice toward them on account of their adherence to an unpopular religion, and another "Liberal" obstacle thrown in the path to a full and fair election.

At the risk of being considered "treasonable," in having the temerity to differ in opinion with a Federal official, we will briefly review some points in this peculiar judicial decision. Treason is clearly defined in the Constitution of the United States, and dissent from official views is not included in the definition. Yet men here who claim to represent the Government, or who have at any time represented it officially, seem to take the ground that anything uttered by a "Mormon" in criticism of the "servants of the people," is treasonable in its character and seditious in its spirit. All the "treason" that either Judge Anderson or the attorneys whose reasonings he appears to have adopted can charge against the "Mormon" Church, consists simply in the denunciation of the conduct of individuals charged with official duties under the Government. This is not in any sense "treasonable" unless the term has acquired a new signification.

Judge Anderson falls into several errors in his review of the testimony. He says that among the eleven witnesses for the objectors "several had held the position of Bishop in the Church." This was true of only one of these witnesses. In speaking of the garment worn by persons who have received the endowment, he wrongly describes it and also states that "near the throat, and over the heart, and in the region of the abdomen are certain marks or designs intended to remind the wearer of the penalties that will be inflicted, etc." No such evidence was given, and it is not true. The marks are not as the Judge states, nor are those signs which exist made for any such object. Everybody who knows anything about the matter will recognize the error and so will any Mason who has seen the marks.

The Judge says in regard to the testimony of the witnesses for the objectors that "covenants are taken or entered into in these ceremonies rendered the testimony of but little value, and tends to confirm rather than contradict the evidence on this point offered by the objectors. Is this fair and conformable to the rules relating to evidence? We think not. The Judge in the opening of the investigation declared emphatically that it should go no farther than to determine whether there was anything in the endowment in the nature of an oath against the Government of the United States. (How well he kept his promise the report of the proceedings shows). These witnesses swore there was not and that there was no mention of or allusion to the Government of the United States. In this they were corroborated by all the reputable witnesses for the objectors. There was positively no proof offered to the contrary. The evident fabricators of too willing supporters of the objecting attorneys, or inferences drawn from half forgotten reminiscences, were entirely swamped by the positive testimony on both sides that no such obligation was taken. As to an oath, it was shown that no oath of any kind is administered in these ceremonies.

Now, then, suppose a case. If a Mason were placed on the stand and asked, "Is there anything in the Masonic rites which is hostile to the Government of the United States?", He would answer in the negative. If then questioned in regard to obligations which he had agreed to keep secret, he would reply, "I decline to answer." And if he were true to his agreements he would suffer imprisonment, and even greater penalties, rather than reveal his secret covenants. The "Mormon" witnesses were on similar ground. Would it then be fair to infer, because a Mason would refuse to "state specifically what oaths, obligations or covenants are taken" in Masonic ceremonies, that his objection would tend to confirm any vicious accusation that might be made against him?

The Judge says: "The evidence establishes beyond any reasonable doubt" that the endowment ceremonies "are incompatible with the obligations and duties of citizens of the United States. We say the evidence establishes nothing of the kind nor even any approach to it. The Judge has not cited any evidence which goes to establish that conclusion. The preponderance of evidence actually establishes the contrary. The witnesses for the objectors mainly corroborated the testimony for the applicants on this pivotal point. And as a matter of fact, we know and every man and woman who has received the endowment knows that there is nothing of that character in the ceremony, but on the contrary, every covenant taken therein and every instruction imparted, is calculated to make the recipients better citizens and better members of society in every sense of the terms.

In denying the application of the men seeking citizenship on the ground that they had gone through the endowment ceremonies, Judge Anderson, in our opinion, goes directly against the testimony, and in his written decision has not offered any solid ground to support his position. In the case of the applicants who have not received their endowments he is, if possible, on still more untenable soil.

Take all the picked and partial extracts he has presented from old sermons, and the paragraphs selected without giving the explanatory context, and what do they amount to? Simply that over half a century ago, under circumstances not related by the Judge, the Prophet Joseph Smith received revelations to individuals as to the disposition of their property, they having sought for this divine direction as men did in times of old as related in the Bible. That in Nauvoo over forty-five years ago a building was erected under church auspices for the comfort of visiting strangers and a revelation was received in relation to it. That in Bishop's courts Church members have been tried ecclesiastically for unchristianlike conduct in their business relations with their brethren. That Elders have preached the doctrine that this Church is the Kingdom of God, not fully established and with no King till Christ comes. From this the Judge draws the inference that the Church claims and exercises the right to control its members in temporal as well as spiritual things, but he fails to show where, in the least degree, this infringes on the liberty of the citizen.

He also announces the extraordinary decision that "one of the doctrines of the Church" is that "for certain offenses the offender shall suffer death, as the only means of atoning for his transgressions, and that any member of the Church has the right to shed his blood." The truth is, the evidence shows to the exact contrary. We unhesitatingly brand as a wicked falsehood the statement that the Church teaches, or holds, or has ever taught or held such an abominable doctrine. All the one-sided utterances of individual opinion which the Judge has selected, fail to bear out his assertion. In an unfair and clearly partial manner, he injects remarks as to the meaning of those speakers, into his comments, conveying ideas that they did not express or entertain.

For instance, speaking of Jedediah M. Grant's sayings in regard to covenant breakers, he says: "That is, those who leave the Mormon Church." Also: "Referring to the right of the Church to shed the blood of those who apostatized, Brigham Young used the following language."

These are the Judge's own fabrications and are not the sense of the quotations he makes, but are gratuitous misrepresentations of both the language and the intention of the speakers. Quoting from a discourse by the Editor of the DESERET NEWS, he gives three isolated paragraphs and carefully suppresses the explanatory context, and thus conveys a meaning contrary to that actually proclaimed and expounded by the lecturer. The plain declaration and proofs that "blood atonement" only relates to murderers and adulterers who have made special covenants not to commit such sins, and that no one except a legal, civil officer has the right to execute the death penalty Judge Anderson omits and thus leaves a false impression the very opposite of that which the discourse conveys. Comment on this is needless.

Judge Anderson says: "Brigham Young and others claimed the proper officers for carrying on the Territorial government." "He claimed the right to say who the officers of the Territory should be," etc. We denounce this as utterly and entirely false. History is against the Judge in this particular, as published matter is against his erroneous assertions on "Mormon" doctrine. The repetition of the stale falsehood that the United States flag was trailed in the dust when Brother Wells was released from prison, and of the stupid notion that half-masting the flag, which has ever been viewed as a token of grief, was intended as an insult to the Government, shows the bias of the Judge and his eagerness to father and sanction the vain imaginations and bald absurdities of anti-"Mormon" fanatics.

The editorial opinions of the DESERET NEWS, for which this paper alone is responsible, he distorts into "pressure brought to bear by the Mormon leaders to prevent members when convicted of violating the law from promising obedience." They had nothing to do with the utterances of this journal, and what we have said on this matter related not to obeying the law, but agreeing to be governed by the lawlers and conflicting constructions of the law by the courts, which involved promises dishonorable to any man placed in the position referred to.

Judge Anderson has suppressed from his opinion the documentary evidence of the patriotic sentiments entertained by the leaders of the "Mormon" Church which was introduced in profusion. He has done the same with the proofs of devotion to the institutions of this Republic on the part of the "Mormon" people, presented by counsel for the applicants. He has drawn conclusions utterly unwarranted by the premises. He has done all that the conspirators to capture this city desired he should do so. He has denied citizenship to men proven to be of good moral character, sober, industrious, honest, peaceable, and thoroughly desirous of the perpetuity of American republicanism, and this because they are "Mormons," while Liberals whose very faces and manners proclaim their vices and who have had to confess their unchastity, can be welcomed as citizens and viewed as of good moral character.

We do not know what further steps can or will be taken in this matter, but we do not propose to let it rest here. The opinion of Judge Anderson is not an exposition of "Mormon" doctrine but an echo of the misrepresentations of its unscrupulous adversaries. The truth may have a hard struggle against the errors official and unofficial, which are massed against it, but, thank God, it will ultimately prevail. And there is a day appointed when all things and all men shall be tried, and to the Supreme Judge on high we appeal for final arbitrament and eternal justice.

The Third People's marching club will meet this evening at 7:30, for drill; all members are expected to be present.

On Monday evening the People's Club of the Third Ward will hold its regular meeting. S. A. Kenner will be the principal speaker.

NATURALIZATION OF "MORMONS."

Judge Anderson Decides that No Member of the Church Need Apply.

A ONE-SIDED REVIEW OF THE TESTIMONY.

Evidence Produced by the Defense Practically Excluded from the Argument.

The Federal Court room was filled this morning by those assembled to hear the decision of Judge Anderson in the case involving the eligibility of "Mormons" for citizenship. The reading of the opinion occupied an hour, and at its conclusion the crowd, which was almost entirely anti-"Mormon," expressed their approval of the judge's decision by stamping their feet and clapping their hands. The opinion is as follows:

In the District Court for the Third Judicial District of the Territory of Utah.

In the matter of the application of John Moore, Fred W. Miller, Henry J. Owen, John Berg, Walter J. Edgar, Charles E. Clissold, Nils Anderson, Carl P. Larsen, Thomas M. Mumford, John Garbett and Arthur Townsend, to become citizens of the United States.

OPINION.

Anderson, J.

In these applications the usual evidence on behalf of the applicants as to residence, moral character, etc., was introduced at a former hearing, and was deemed sufficient. Objection was made, however, to the admission of John Moore and William J. Edgar upon the ground that they were members of the Mormon Church, and also because they had gone through the Endowment House of that Church, and there had taken an oath or obligation incompatible with the oath of citizenship they would be required to take if admitted. The admission of the other applicants was objected to solely on the ground that by their own statements they were members of the Mormon Church, although they had not gone through the Endowment House, and had not taken the oath usually administered there, nor in fact any oath incompatible with citizenship.

The claim is made by those who object to the admission to citizenship of these persons, that the Mormon Church is and always has been a treasonable organization in its teachings and in its practices, hostile to the government of the United States, disobedient to its laws, and seeking its overthrow, and that the oath administered to its members in the Endowment House binds them, under the penalty of death, to implicit obedience in all things, temporal as well as spiritual, to the Priesthood, and to avenge the death of the prophets Joseph and Hyrum Smith upon the government and people of the United States. The taking of further testimony at this time is for the purpose of determining whether or not these allegations are true.

The third subdivision of section 2165 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides that in order to entitle an alien to be admitted as a citizen of the United States, it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting such alien that he has resided in the United States five years at least, and within the state or territory where such court is at the time held, one year at least, and that during that time he has behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same. These objecting to the right of these applicants to be admitted to citizenship, and joined issue upon witnesses, who had been members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called the Mormon Church. Several of these witnesses had held the position of Bishop in the Church, and all had gone through the Endowment House and participated in its ceremonies. The testimony of these witnesses is to the effect that every member of the Church is expected to go through the Endowment House, and that nearly all do so; that marriages are usually solemnized there, and that those who are married elsewhere go through the Endowment ceremonies at as early a date thereafter as practicable, in order that the marital relation shall continue throughout eternity. That these ceremonies occupy the greater part of a day, and include the taking of an oath, obligation or covenant, by all who receive their endowments, that they will avenge the blood of the Prophets, Joseph and Hyrum Smith, upon the Government of the United States, and will enjoin this obligation upon their children unto the third and fourth generations; that they will obey the Priesthood in all things, and will never reveal the secrets of the Endowment House under the penalty of having their throats cut from ear to ear, their bowels torn out, and their hearts cut out of their bodies. The right arm is ascertained that it may be strong to avenge the blood of the prophets. An inner garment, a sort of combination of shirt and drawers, called the endowment robe, is then put on, and is to be worn ever after. On this robe, near the throat, and over the heart, and in the region of the abdomen, are certain marks or designs intended to remind the wearer of the penalties that will be inflicted in case of a violation of the oath, obligation or covenant he or she has taken or made.

On behalf of the applicants, fourteen witnesses testified concerning the endowment ceremonies, but all of them declined to state what oaths are there taken, or what obligations or covenants are there entered into, or what penalties are attached to their violation; and these witnesses when asked for their reason for declining to answer, stated that they did so "on a point of honor," while several stated they had forgotten what was said about avenging the blood of the prophets. John H. Smith, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church, testified that all that is said in the endowment ceremonies about avenging the blood of the prophets is said in a lecture, in which the 9th and 10th verses of the sixth chapter of Revelations is recited, as follows:

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?"

Other witnesses for the applicants testified that this is the only place in the ceremonies where avenging the blood of the prophets is mentioned.

John Clark, a witness for applicants, testified he took some obligations, made some promises, entered into some covenants in the Endowment House, and wore his endowment robes, but did not know the significance of the slit over the heart. E. L. T. Harrison, another of applicants' witnesses, testified he had a clear recollection that his right arm was washed, and something said about it being made strong to avenge the death of the Prophets, and that the names of Joseph and Hyrum Smith were not mentioned, but were understood to be among the number whose blood was to be avenged; and E. G. Woolley, a witness for the applicants, testified they were to pray to the Lord to avenge the blood of the Prophets. Every other witness for the applicants who was asked the question stated that Joseph and Hyrum Smith were understood to be included among the Prophets whose blood was to be avenged.

The witnesses for the applicants, while refusing to disclose the oath, promises and covenants of the endowment ceremonies, and the penalties attached thereto, testified generally that there was nothing in the ceremonies inconsistent with loyalty to the government of the United States, and that the government was not mentioned. One of the objects of this investigation is to ascertain whether the oaths and obligations of the Endowment House are incompatible with good citizenship, and it is not for applicants' witnesses to determine this question. The refusal of applicants' witnesses to state specifically what oaths, obligations or covenants are taken or entered into in these ceremonies, renders their testimony of but little value, and tends to confirm rather than contradict the evidence on this point offered by the objectors. The evidence establishes beyond any reasonable doubt that the endowment ceremonies are inconsistent with the oath an applicant for citizenship is required to take, and that the oaths, obligations or covenants there made or entered into are incompatible with the obligations and duties of citizens of the United States. The applications of John Moore and Walter J. Edgar, both of whom were shown on the former examination to be members of the Mormon church, and to have gone through the endowment house, are therefore denied.

As to the objection made to the admission of the other applicants upon the ground solely of their being members of the Mormon church, a large amount of evidence, mostly documentary, has been introduced, only a small portion of which can be indexed in this opinion without extending it to too great a length. The evidence consists mostly of the sermons and writings of the Mormon rulers and leaders, published under the direction of the church. On the subject of the right of the priesthood and rulers to dictate to the members in temporal matters, portions of section 124, page 476, of the Doctrine and Covenants is offered by the objectors, containing the prophecies of Joseph Smith as follows:

"And now I say unto you, as pertaining to my boarding house which I have commanded you to build for the boarding of strangers, let it be built unto my name, and let my name be named upon it, and let my servant Joseph and his seed after him have the keys of the kingdom of which I have spoken, in this place, from generation to generation. For this anointing have I put upon his head, that his blessing shall also be put upon the head of his posterity after him. And as I said unto Abraham concerning the kindreds of the earth, even so I say unto my servant Joseph, in this and in thy seed shall the kindred of the earth be blessed. Therefore, let my servant Joseph and his seed after him have place in that house, from generation to generation, for ever and ever, saith the Lord. And let the name of that house be called Nauvoo House, and let it be a delightful habitation for man, and a resting place for the weary traveler, that he may contemplate the glory of Zion, and the glory of her king, upon Mount Zion above, even the glory of God, as the soul of man. Then he may receive also the counsel from those whom I have set to be as plants of renown, and as watchmen upon her walls. Behold, verily I say unto you, let my servant George Miller, and my servant Lyman Wight, and my servant John Snider, and my servant Peter Haws, organize themselves, and appoint one of them to be a president over their quorum for the purpose of building that house. And they shall form a constitution whereby they may receive money for the building of that house. And they shall not receive less than fifty dollars for a share of stock in that house, and they shall be permitted to receive fifteen thousand dollars from any one man for stock in that house; but they shall not be permitted to receive over fifteen thousand dollars stock from any one man; and they shall not be permitted to receive any man as a stockholder in this house, except the same shall pay his stock into their hands as the time he receives stock."

Also from page 241 of the same book, as follows:

And now verily I say that it is expedient in me that my servant Sidney Gilbert, after a few weeks, should return upon his business and to his agency in the land of Zion; and I will bless him, and his name shall be blessed in my house, and his family shall be blessed, and I will bless my servant Isaac Morley in his place, and I will bless my servant Vinson Knight in his place, and I will bless my servant Peter Haws in his place, and I will bless my servant John Corrill in his place, and I will bless my servant John Lake in his place, and I will bless my servant Jesse Hitchcock in his place, and I will bless my servant Lyman Wight in his place, and I will bless my servant John Snider in his place, and I will bless my servant Joseph Coe in his place, and I will bless my servant John Gould in his place, and I will bless my servant Ezekiel Roundy in his place, and I will bless my servant Calvin Bebee in his place, and I will bless my servant Newel K. Whitney in his place, and I will bless my servant Isaac Morley in his place, and I will bless my servant Ezra Thayre in his place, and I will bless my servant Thomas B. Marsh in his place, and I will bless my servant David W. Patten in his place, and I will bless my servant John Byrom in his place, and I will bless my servant Martin Harris in his place, and I will bless my servant William Law in his place, even as many as I will, unto whom I give the keys of my kingdom, and all those who are faithful in my house, that they may receive a crown and an inheritance with those who are faithful in all things, even as many as I will bless, and make them rulers and kings, priests and priestesses unto me, saith the Lord your God, even as many as I will make rulers in Israel, unto my servant Joseph, and unto his seed, even unto the last generation, from generation to generation, for ever and ever, saith the Lord your God, even as I will, amen."—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 2, p. 256.

On the 22nd day of October, 1866, President Woodruff delivered an address in the Tabernacle in this city, in which he used the following language:

"The Lord has said that in the last days the kingdom should not be taken from the earth nor given to another people, but that the kingdoms of this world should become the kingdom of our God and His Christ. We have the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants and other revelations. He never intended any man, thing, or place, to be the Kingdom of God or it is not the kingdom of God. If it is not the kingdom of God, there is no use for it, and it should not be established. Our faith is vain, our works are vain, and we are in the same condition of ignorance with regard to the Gospel and the kingdom of God as the rest of the world. There are tens of thousands throughout these valleys who know that this is the kingdom of God. They know this by the revelations of Jesus Christ. It is not the testimony of another man that gives me the knowledge for myself. If I receive the testimony of another man, I should not be qualified to build up the kingdom. There is no man or woman living who can build up the kingdom of God if they have not the testimony of truth for themselves. I will say to this congregation, Jew and gentile, believer and unbeliever, that the time for the kingdom spoken of by Daniel, the commencement of the Times of our God, which we have spoken of, is at hand. We are referred to the Zion in the last days. The Lord has sworn by Himself, because he could swear by none greater, that He will establish it as the latter days."—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 11, p. 245.

Evidence was also introduced showing that the Bishops' courts of the Church exercise judicial functions to the extent of rendering judgments and annulling or modifying judgments rendered by the civil courts. It is contended, however, that they have no power of enforcing their judgments except by excommunication or other like means. This is perhaps true, but with a people so completely under the control of their leaders as the members of this Church are, this method is in many, if not in most cases, as effectual as any executions or other writs of the civil courts. The following are samples of the proceedings in the Bishop's Court:

"SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 30, 1885.

"*To Bishop F. Kesler:*

"Dear Brother—I hereby prefer a charge against Otto Van Ostrom, of the 20th ward, Sixteenth Ward, for unchristianlike conduct, in entering a contract to exchange property therein mentioned with the United States commissioner's court, before my wife had agreed to the transaction, and before I fully understood the nature of the contract, thereby my family have been left in the English language. And also for my being about to sell a portion of my property for supposed value in order that my family be not never sustained, as neither him nor I were in the land legally at the failure of the exchange. The formal charge is having been ascertained for November 16th, I respectfully ask that a hearing may be had before you in this city as early as possible.

"Yours respectfully, G. L. ROMNEY.

"Do not fail to appear with your testimony prepared for investigation of the above charge.

"By order of Bishop F. Kesler and counsel.

"GEORGE R. EMERY, Ward Clerk.

"N. B.—If you do not appear or send a justifiable excuse for your absence, this case will be heard and acted upon whether you are present or not.

"G. R. E."

"SALT LAKE CITY, Jan. 24, 1887.

"We, the Bishop and Council of the Fourth Ward, after due deliberation on the following judgment in the case of Joseph Sowden vs. Charles Williams: The said Charles Williams owes the said Joseph Sowden the sum of $178, to be paid on the 15th day of April, 1887, $40 of the principal and $42.50 interest on the first six months of the principal, to be paid on the 25th day of July, 1887; the remaining $40 principal and $22.50 interest to be paid for six months at 8 per cent per annum; to be paid on the 25th day of January, 1888.

"Harrison Sperry, Bishop; Thos. Cutler and Thos. H. Knight, Counselors; W. F. Smith, Clerk."

I think there can be no question but that the Church claims and exercises the right to control its members in temporal as well as spiritual affairs.

The evidence also shows that blood atonement is one of the doctrines of the Church under which, for certain offenses, the offender shall suffer death as the only means of atoning for his transgressions, and that any member of the Church has the right to shed his blood.

In a discourse delivered September 21st, 1856, Brigham Young said:

"There are sins which men cannot for which they cannot receive forgiveness in this world or in that which is to come; and if they had their eyes open to their true condition they would be perfectly willing to have their blood spilt upon the ground, that the smoke thereof might ascend to heaven as an offering for their sins; whereas, if such is not the case, they will stick to them and remain upon them in the spirit world. I know when I look upon my brethren talking about cutting people off from the earth, that you consider it a strong doctrine; but it is to save them, not to destroy them. It is true the blood of the son of God was shed for sins through Adam, and those committed by men, yet man can commit sins which cannot be atoned for. As it was in ancient days, so it is in our day, and though the principles are taught publicly from the stand, yet the people do not understand them. Yet the law is precisely the same. There are sins that can be atoned for by an offering upon the altar, as in ancient days, and there are sins that the blood of a lamb or of a bullock or a turtle dove cannot remit; but they must be atoned for by the blood of the man. That is the reason why men call to you as they do from the stand. They understand the doctrine, and I bless you in a few words about it. You have been taught that doctrine, but you did not understand it."

And again, on the 8th day of February 1857, in a discourse in the Tabernacle, President Young used the following language (see DESERET NEWS, vol. 8, p. 297):

"But now I say, in the name of the Lord, that if this people will sin no more, but faithfully live their religion, their sins will be forgiven them without taking of life. You are aware that when Brother Cummings came to the point of laying our neighbors, he could say yes or no, as the case might be. That is well; but I want to connect it with the doctrine you found in the Bible. When will we love our neighbors as ourselves? In the first place, we can safely that no man hates his own flesh. He is admitted by all, every person feels himself. Now, if we do purify our corporations, we want to be saved and continue to exist; we want to go into the kingdom where we can enjoy eternity and see no more sorrow or death. This is the desire of every person who believes in God. Now, take a person in this congregation who has committed sin, being saved in the kingdom of our God and our Father, and being an exalted one, who knows and understands the principles of eternal life, and sees the beauty and excellency of the eternities before him, compared with the vain, foolish things of the world, and suppose he is overtaken in a gross fault, that he has committed a sin which he knows will deprive him of that exaltation which he desires, and that he cannot attain to it without the shedding of his blood, and also knows that by having his blood shed he will atone for that sin and be saved and exalted with the Gods, is there a man or woman in this house that would say, 'Shed my blood, that I may be saved and exalted with the Gods?' My judgment gives themselves, and let them be slaughtered as a sacrifice, as I would be glad to have my blood shed, for I would be being themselves even unto eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers and sisters like as when they have committed a sin that cannot be atoned for without the shedding of their blood? Will you love that man or woman well enough to shed their blood? That is what Jesus Christ meant. He never told a man or woman to have their enemies in their whole fulness. He never intended any such thing. I could refer you to plenty of instances where men have been righteously slain in order to atone for their sins. I have seen before and hundreds of people for whom there would have been a chance in the next resurrection, if their lives had been taken, and the law of God put upon the ground as a smoking incense to the Almighty, but who are now sought for the blood of their fellows, that the law may take them up, requires death, hell and the grave. I have known a great many men who have had that chance for exaltation, but if their blood had been spilled it would have been better for them. The world is in ignorance of the nature of the eternals, the principle being in full force, but the time will come when the law of God will be administered in its purity, and our neighbors as ourselves. It be needful, help, to my kind, and it be needful for salvation, that it be necessary to spill the blood upon the ground in order that he may be saved, spill it. Any person who has committed sins of a character of eternality, if you have sinned a sin requiring the shedding of blood, except the sin unto death, would not be satisfied with your death, if you should be spilled, that you might gain that salvation you desire. That is the way to love mankind."

President Jedediah M. Grant delivered a discourse March 12th, 1854, on the subject of what he calls "covenant breakers," that is, those who have left the Mormon Church, in which he used the following language:

"Then what ought this stack people, who keep the commandments of God, to do with them? 'Nay,' says one, 'they ought to pray to the Lord to kill them. I wish to know if you wish the Lord to come and do all your dirty work. Many of the Latter-day Saints will pray and petition and associate the Lord to do a thousand things that themselves would be ashamed to do. When a man prays for a thing, he ought to be willing to perform it himself. If the Latter-day Saints should put to death the covenant breakers, it would try the faith of the very meek, but and many who are strong in faith would cause a great deal of whining in Israel. Then there was another old covenantbreaker. The Lord God commanded them not to pity, but to have them slain, killed, but to execute the law of God upon persons worthy of death. This should be done by the entire congregation, as a unanimous act. I have no doubt but there would have to be quite a revolution among the Mormons before such a commandment could be carried into effect. Many Mormons have a great deal of sympathy. It would cause them to weep in a situation of this kind. Suppose I should be killed, but to execute the law of God upon persons worthy of death. This should be done by the entire congregation, as a unanimous act. I have no doubt but there would have to be quite a revolution among the Mormons before such a commandment could be carried into effect. Many Mormons have a great deal of sympathy. It would cause them to weep in a situation of this kind. Suppose I should be killed, but to execute the law of God upon persons worthy of death. This should be done by the entire congregation, as a unanimous act. I have no doubt but there would have to be quite a revolution among the Mormons before such a commandment could be carried into effect. Many Mormons have a great deal of sympathy. It would cause. I wish we were in a situation to do the work of God. Some would cause a great deal of whining in Israel. Then there was another old covenant-breaker. The Lord God commanded them not to pity, but to have them slain,