

The Progress.

Volume 7 - No 31.

SHREVEPORT, LA., May 28, 1898.

Price 5 Cents

THE CAUCASIAN AND THE ABBOTT CASE.

Doubtless our friend, the Caucasian thinks it is occupying a very conservatively-dignified attitude in reference to the charge, conviction and sentence of Mr. S. T. Abbott. But as a matter of fact prejudice, deep, strong and unrelenting, breathes through every article it contains on the subject, and has thoroughly permeated them from the very beginning. The editor may be unconscious of it, but the fact is easily patent.

Perhaps Caucasian thinks this strong language; but if The Progress doesn't prove it before this article is closed, then we will admit the failure, and apologize for the assertion.

We shall argue from the same line of evidence that Caucasian has based its arraignment on from the very inception of the homicide—circumstantial evidence. On this kind alone, was Mr. Abbott convicted.

On the very day of the occurrence, before preliminary trial had, Caucasian pronounced the accused, by strong inference, in refuting declarations of his guilty. Having interrogated him, it took his answer, "I am sorry I had it to do, but the negro was advancing on me with a stand," and attempted to disprove it by declaring that the position of the furniture did not bear out the statement of the accused.

If Caucasian is not governed by prejudice, why did it ask Mr. Abbott any thing about the killing, only to take his answer and base on it an argument for conviction? When the article in that paper was written there had been no preliminary trial, and the public, nor the readers of it, had heard what the plea of the defense would be.

Again. At the same term of Court at which Mr. Abbott was convicted for manslaughter, there was also convicted for murder, a white man; for rape, a negro. Both of these received life sentences: why did not Caucasian devote even half as much comment on the justice of their fate, as in the case of Abbott?

Gothard was convicted of assassinating an old white man; of shooting him down in the dark (aided and abetted by others). Does Caucasian consider this a less crime than that committed by Mr. Abbott? Is it a less crime in the eyes of Caucasian to assassinate a white man, an inoffensive old white man, than a young and insolent negro? Basing the decision on circumstantial evidence, the kind that Caucasian uses in its arraignment of Abbott, it will have to plead guilty to the occupancy of this position; or admit that prejudice alone prompts its hostile attitude towards Abbott.

And the crime of rape. Does Caucasian consider that a lighter offense than killing Mose Starke,

that impudent and insulting young buck who was out to boast that he was as good as any d—nd white man? If not, why does it not keep up its running fire on the perpetrator of that terrible crime for a little while; and not expend all of its force on Mr. Abbott?

And again; there were fourteen other persons, besides Abbott, convicted at this same session of Court. Of all these, why does each and every one escape with but a local notice, except Abbott, who is hounded even after the penitentiary gates have shut him from the view of the world and freedom; if prejudice, a personal grudge does not dominate the spirit which is active in the course?

Circumstantial evidence, the power which convicted Abbott, the authority which Caucasian has so fully indorsed, supported and upheld, in this particularly case at least, says it is personal prejudice alone which has controlled the action and voice of the Caucasian.

And still again. Our friend Caucasian has attributed a maudlin sentiment indulged by every one who is opposed to Mr. Abbott's conviction and believes he ought to be pardoned. And it seems never to have occurred to its honest editor that white gentlemen as honest, patriotic, law abiding, progressive, fair and dignified as he, or any one else, think that he is the one who has embraced the maudlin sentiment. That only a maudlin sentiment of the most unsafe kind would prompt such a course as he has taken, however honest he may feel himself to be, in doing so.

Caucasian should not be too hasty in passing criticisms. Because we have heard it intimated that it seemed to be trying to curry favor with the negroes. That it looked like the Caucasian was making an effort to stand in with the colored race. While others have said that, to judge by appearances, one could believe that it would only be a little while when the name, Caucasian will be replaced by that of The African, The Ethiopian or, The Knight of Cush.

Now of course no one who knows the editor of the Caucasian would entertain such an idea, and no one really believes it. But our friend must admit, if he will weigh the matter dispassionately, that the circumstances are heavily against him. In fact, circumstantial evidence, equally as strong as that which convicted Mr. Abbott, would convict Caucasian in a much less time than it required the jury to find a verdict against him.

Now Caucasian must take no offense at this article. It is written in the best or spirit and friendly regard. But we do believe that that paper has been unjustly and uncharitably severe on Abbott. We believe the testimony against him no more warranted his conviction and sentence, than the ev-

idence against the Caucasian justifies the friendly criticisms referred to.

Readers, have we not made out our case?

A MORMON'S SAY.

To The Progress.

During the past two years a much discussed subject, in this State has been Mormonism, so called. While the world at large call the doctrine of the Latter Day Saints, "Mormonism," they themselves always think of it as a fulness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and so call it. The fact that many people are not well informed regarding the faith, motives, desires, and ambitions of this peculiar people has prompted this article, that all, so far as they will, may get correct information from the "Mormon" standpoint. The writer is a Latter Day Saint and desires to speak without ambiguity, tersely and to the point.

The greatest objection urged against the "Mormons" as a people is founded upon the question of polygamy, hence it is deemed proper to mention and dispose of it first. Permit me reader, before entering upon the question, to quote you the words of Dr. John M. Reimer of New York, upon the subject, as he recently presented them to a body of learned gentlemen who had assembled for the purpose of investigating "more thoroughly" the claims of the "Mormon." The learned doctor says "The subject of polygamy should, in my judgment, be left out of your investigation". In a manifesto dated the 24th day of September 1890, President Woodruff solemnly declared that he stood ready to abide by the laws of the land, and prohibited the priesthood of the church of which he is head, to solemnize any more plural marriages after the date of that manifesto. That declaration, I think, should be sufficient to make us hold our peace even here in the East (and the South as well)." I give these words of the learned doctor, because I know great deference is due him for his erudition and judgment. Dr. Reimer is in a position to know whereof he speaks from the very fact, that he has recently paid an extensive visit to Salt Lake City, the headquarters of the church, and that while there he made a considerably more than a superficial investigation of the Mormon tenets.

Trusting that the readers of this article will be inclined to give credence to the Doctor's words, I quote him further, as bearing on the intrinsic value of the Mormon leaders. "I take this opportunity to declare," said he "that it is my honest conviction, based upon close observation, that the leaders of the people belonging to that communion are certainly sincere and God fearing men." There is no denying the fact that polygamy was slightly practiced and tol-

erated among the Latter Day Saints. Nor would they, the saints, attempt a denial, for they practiced it in sincerity and conscientiously. They are just as sincere in its abandonment as they were in its practice. The Constitution of the State of Utah provides that no polygamy shall be practiced within its (the State's) confines. This is of especial signification, when it is remembered that the convention which framed that Constitution was composed of a majority of Mormon members. Why prate longer on this matter? The Mormons desire to bury the hatchet and, 'as far as in them is, live peaceably with all men;' for they stand or fall on the pure principles of Christ.

While polygamy should be the very last principle considered in connection with the Latter Day Saints' it is morally the very first. We look for a reason for this abnormal condition and find it only in the extreme willingness of the people to make up their opinions on hearsay and popular rumor. Many people are loud in their denunciation of the Mormons, in view of the fact that Jo's Smith and Brigham Young were, in times past, the acknowledged leaders of the people. Along this line, let us ask, who do we look to as the father of Protestantism? None other than Martin Luther. Oh, what temerity it requires to divulge his his views upon polygamy and kindred subjects! We are going to risk our popularity tho and do it just once. In a letter written to Spelatin, whom he encourages to embark upon the matrimonial sea, he writes; "I do not wish that you should be surprised that I who am reputed to be such a lover, am as yet unmarried. However, if you look for an example, behold here is a good one for you. For three wives at one time did I have all of whom I loved intensely, and lost two of them. The third one which I now hold in my left arm may be snatched from me at any time."

Carlstadt' Luther's disciple' was a polygamist also. When Luther heard of this he wrote to Chancellor Brueek, "I indeed can not forbid when one takes many wives, for it does not contradict the scriptures."

It goes without saying that the Landgraf Philip Von Hessen received a dispensation from Luther permitting him to marry again during the life time of his first wife. Regarding this matter Martin's ideas were gleaned from the following which he writes. "It was to us painful enough at the time, but in as much as we could not prevent it we wished to spare the conscience as much." "I understood that he (the Landgraf) would secretly take some honest lass and secretly sustain marital relations with her in some quiet home." To Philip himself he