

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - FEB. 9, 1881.

NOT A POLITICAL QUESTION.

DISCLAIMING that the question involved in the certificate business is one of politics, the Louisville *Courier-Journal* says:

"It is a question of public morality. It is a question of religion. It is a question of civilization. Either the Mormons are right and the rest of the Christian world is wrong, or else the Christian world is right and the Mormons are wrong."

It is singular that so astute and able a journalist as the editor of the paper from which the above paragraph is quoted, did not see in writing it that he placed the subject outside of the sphere of national legislation which he aims to invoke. What has Congress to do with questions of religion? What part can the Government take in a controversy between the "Christian world" and the "Mormons"? Neither branch of the Federal system has jurisdiction of a "question of religion." The legislature is not organized to enact laws touching religious affairs. The judiciary is not appointed to interpret or rule upon religious disputes or institutions. And the executive department is not authorized or empowered to do anything for the suppression or encouragement of religion in any form, orthodox or heterodox.

Neither are questions of morality made the special subjects of national statesmanship. If they are, why do not our law-makers devote a portion of their time and talents to the correction and suppression of those gigantic evils, whose existence and disastrous effects are so palpable and extended as to preclude all denial or dispute? If Congress is required or empowered to manage the morals of a distant section of the country having a legislative body of its own, how much more is it under obligations to purify the morals of the District of Columbia, over which it has exclusive jurisdiction.

The *Courier-Journal* admits that the subject is an open question. It is, whether the "Mormons" are right and the "Christian" world is wrong, or the "Christian" world is right and the "Mormons" are wrong. It is not then a congressional question. It belongs to the sphere of polemics. The "Mormons" and the "Christians" for it. Let the "Christian" world prove that we are wrong, and we will abandon our position. But we cannot be forced from it by popular clamor, nor will our faith be moved by legislative enactments or illegal and unjust acts of executive officers. On the contrary, when we see that valid argument and sound reasoning cannot be brought to bear against us, but that our adversaries are compelled to resort to palpable wrong in order to reach us, we are confirmed in our convictions and strengthened in our determination to struggle for what we believe to be right.

Some self-sufficient and supercilious "Christians" may consider that there is no question at issue; that if the "Mormons" are not in accord with the "Christian" world they must be wrong from the very fact. But if those self-satisfied persons reflect a little, they will find that on many very important subjects they are hopelessly divided among themselves; that the differing factions cannot all be right; that it is possible they may all be wrong; that if they are wrong on one point of controversy they may be on others; and that while a subject is a question, a very small minority may be in the right. The numbers opposed to our views count nothing with us in the argument. The prophets and seers of old were derided and rejected by the multitude; the learning, piety, wealth and authority of the age when the Nazarene stood forth with a strange creed, as well as the voice of the unthinking populace condemned him; and put to death as a heretic, the founder of the Christian religion

which our opponents profess to believe in, but from which we consider they have widely departed.

According to the Book on which they claim to found their faith, the whole world has gone wrong more than once when religious innovations have come forth. History frequently repeats itself, and it will not do to say the "Mormons" must be wrong because they are opposed by the whole "Christian" world. Why, the "Christian" world to-day dare not affirm some of the tenets which only half a century ago were generally considered essential to salvation. Where is the preacher in a populous city who now has the courage, not to say the conviction, to enunciate the doctrines of Jonathan Edwards, whose writings were once considered next in authority to Holy Writ?

Popularity is no criterion of truth. The dogmas of one age are often the heresies of the next. This obtains in other departments of thought and credence besides theology. It is so in medicine. It is so even in "science," which is often more positive in its assertions and more settled in its conclusions than even religious orthodoxy. Every reformer or introductor of anything different to that which has been held correct, has to meet with the opposition of the world, and generally to endure the same kind of misrepresentation as that dealt out so liberally to the Latter-day Saints. So, though we may have to meet the antagonism of the whole "Christian" world, it does not follow that we are in the wrong nor, mark it, that either we or our faith must go down before the might of apparently overwhelming numbers and influences. What has been, can be and may be again. And it would be quite as well for those who take it for granted that we are in the wrong, to examine into the system which has obtained so firm a hold upon our consciences and lives, and for which we intend to struggle if needs be unto the death. We notice that the *Courier-Journal*, in its volcanic and splenetic eruptions, hurls epithets against us entirely undeserved, and that the whole tenor of its fiery ebullitions exhibits either a vile desire to falsify or woful ignorance of our true belief and character. We prefer to think the latter, and therefore invite examination into our principles, that men who oppose us may not be always fighting phantoms under the fatuous impression that they are demolishing "Mormonism."

And then, after all, will the *Courier-Journal* please inform us how a religious question, even if decided against the "Mormons," exonerates a Federal official in breaking the law and violating well known rules affecting vital political issues? And by what system of logic or what code of ethics do the religious or moral errors of a community justify a Governor in declaring "duly elected" a candidate receiving a ridiculous minority of votes?

HAULING MURRAY OVER THE COALS.

THE Louisville *Courier-Journal* is shouting itself hoarse over polygamy and several imaginary evils in Utah in the vain hope of distracting attention from the crime of Governor Murray, of whose cause it is the solitary influential champion. It is forced to confess that it is left alone in the conflict, and says itself:

"The press of the country generally dissents from the *Courier-Journal's* view of the Mormon question."

The Pittsburgh *Post* quotes from Watterson's paper in its attempted defense of Murray and remarks:

"It is proper to drive out polygamy, but not by nagging it—not by such petty and unwarranted persecution as Governor Murray's action comprehends, but by direct, steady blows. Usurping powers to exclude a congressman fairly elected is no way to treat a great question."

The Denver *Figaro* expresses itself on this question as follows:

"It has been suggested that Governor Murray, in refusing to Mr. Cannon, Delegate-elect to Congress from Utah, a certificate, on the ground that he is a polygamist, was a trifle 'previous.' That, inasmuch as four-fifths of the Gentile members of the body are polygamists also—or what in ethics amounts to the same thing,

prostitutionists—there can be no specially good reason on which to base the arbitrary action of Governor Murray in making an invidious discrimination against Cannon, even if the letter or spirit of the law justified him in so doing, which it certainly does not."

The course of the *Courier-Journal* in taking such an anti-Democratic position as it has assumed, is exciting the ridicule of its contemporaries of either party, and many of them wonder what is the matter with Watterson. On this query, the following dispatch appeared in the New York *Times* January 25th:

The Washington correspondent of the *Courier-Journal* telegraphs the views of Kentucky Congressmen on the Cannon-Campbell controversy, in which they assert that Governor Murray's conduct was without precedent, entirely unnecessary, and outrageous. Messrs. Chalmers and Young and some other southern members are of the same opinion. Governor Murray is now here, having returned from the Chicago press banquet with Mr. Watterson. He is dining with old friends, and rarely misses a chance to put in a sharp criticism of the Mormons. Agent Leman, who affects to know inside facts, declares that the impression is gaining ground that the new hostility against the Mormons is stimulated by number of gentlemen in Utah who are aware of the valuable mineral deposits in districts owned by the Mormons and who are seeking to drive them off, thus forcing their property into the market that it may be bought at a sacrifice. The zeal of the *Courier-Journal* in defending Governor Murray has strengthened the impression, which even the popularity and character of the Governor has been unable to overcome. The Louisville *Post* exposed the absurdity of Governor Murray's action in the Cannon case, taking the ground that the question was purely a legal one, that under the Constitution Congress alone had the right to judge of the qualifications of its members, and that even the law limits the power of the Governor by providing that he shall give the certificate to the person having the highest number of votes, etc. The *Post* charges that the *Courier-Journal* is either corrupt or crazy, and owing to Murray's presence a large degree of discussion is provoked by the controversy."

On the basis of this telegram, the New York *Times* has the following spicy leader under the caption of "Kentucky Against Utah:"

"Exactly why the population of Louisville, Ky., should be divided into two parties on the latest phase of the Mormon question has not yet been made clear. Nevertheless, this seems to be the case. In the absence of any exciting political topic, and while the spring races are too far distant to inflame the minds of men, the propriety and expediency of Gov. Murray's action in giving the certificate of election to Campbell, who was not elected Delegate, rather than to Cannon, who was elected, excites the people of the good city of Louisville. This is a more burning question in Kentucky than the composition of Garfield's cabinet is elsewhere. It serves to bridge over the dull space which intervenes between the presidential election and the incoming of a new administration. The *Courier-Journal* leads the van of what we may call the Campbellites, and the *Post* espouses the cause of the Cannonites. The first-named journal appeals to the public with a frightful and blood-curdling array of adjectives, and the *Post* responds with sarcasm, saying, among other hard things, that its competitor is 'either corrupt or crazy.'"

The heat of this conflict is inexplicable only by the fact that Gov. Murray is a Kentuckian. It must be assumed, then, that Kentucky should stand by Murray, right or wrong. Indeed, the *Courier-Journal*, in one of its tremendous, double-leaded, and highly volcanic editorial articles, says that when Governor Murray was escorted by his fellow citizens to the railway train which was to take him to Utah, "where they knew danger, perhaps death, was to be faced, they meant, as Kentuckians, to say to a Kentuckian, 'We are with you,' and they will be with him to the end of the war." And these gallant Kentuckians, we are further told, are proud that the traditions of the past will live again in the person of this young Kentuckian who can neither be bought nor bullied. This is the reason why the seat of war has been transferred

from Utah to Kentucky. It is the honor of Kentucky as personified in Gov. Murray, who is now visiting Louisville, which is at stake. Most simple minded people have supposed that the Campbell-Cannon contest would be settled on principles of equity and justice, not on the honor of the State from which Gov. Murray went as a 'Gentile stalwart,' to the scene of his perilous labors. So, while Utah is tranquil, even phlegmatic Kentucky is perturbed. Louisville is fighting 'the twin relic' at long range.

If epithets will destroy polygamy, that peculiar institution is doomed. Certainly, no ordinary, or even extraordinary, custom can long sustain itself without serious damage under so furious a cannonading as that which the Louisville *Courier-Journal* directs at the twin relic of barbarism. The editor has suddenly awakened to a lively sense of the exceeding sinfulness of the sin of the Mormons, and he demands that preachers in the pulpits, and women by their firesides, and the people in their daily walks, shall rise up and "decree that the lewd spectacle which makes a Jardin Mabille of an American territory, which shocks, even while it amuses, the passer-by, which blots the glory of our setting sun, shall be obliterated, even though it be through fire and sword!" And to all this fine writing the local organ of the Cannon party only responds with the remark that the author of so much rhetoric and fire is either corrupt or crazy. To the mild-mannered anti-Campbellite the glory of Kentucky and the implied pledge to the gallant young Kentuckian, who accepted office as men go to danger and death, are as nothing. It is no wonder that Louisville is excited.

There are dark hints of a political plot being concealed beneath this furious and wholly unexpected tumult in Kentucky. It is reported that Governor Murray would like to be a member of Garfield's cabinet, and that, inspired by a desire to distinguish himself, and possibly prompted by some Kentucky Machiavels, he gave to Campbell the certificate which he refused to Cannon. This done, he hastened home, was taken in charge by the editor of the *Courier-Journal*, and now calmly awaits the reward of his courage. Sooner or later, everything in this happy land gets into politics. But who would have thought that the evil practices of a community whose lewd spectacle, to quote the burning words of our Louisville contemporary, "blots the glory of our setting sun," could have been used to hoist a man into cabinet position? Commissioner Le Duc has fondly hoped that garden seeds and tea plants might do as much for him. But here is a man who is believed to build his airy fabric of political preferment upon a single action. Let us think better of him. Let us believe that only a holy rage against the institution of polygamy prompts the Louisville editor to launch the thunderbolts of his wrath into the distant city of the Mormons.

But to quote from one of Secretary Evart's good stories, "affidavits are not lobsters." No amount of tirade against the evils of polygamy and the wickedness of the Mormons can elect a man after the votes are cast and counted. We are prepared to admit that Utah is the Jardin Mabille of the West, and that the monstrosities of that wretched territory blot the glory of our setting sun; and that "the Mormon Church is simply a brothel with a sham Bible and a tall steeple." Let us concede this and much more which the Louisville editor charges against the Mormons; but none of these things can elect Mr. Campbell, who had a very small minority of all the votes cast at the late election. The gallant young Kentuckian who happens to be Governor of Utah, gave the certificate of election to Campbell because Cannon is a polygamist and is said to be unnaturalized. It is the business of the House of Representatives to decide whether these are facts, and whether they are disqualifications for admission to the House. And there is no law which gives to a defeated candidate for office the place from which the successful candidate has been excluded by reason of his own personal disqualification. This is common sense, although it may not wipe out "the blot which dims the glory of our setting sun."

An exchange says: "Henry Watterson wants polygamy 'proclaimed out of existence.' This is the gallant gentleman who ruled in the St. Louis national convention that 'no point of order is in order when a lady has the floor.'"

THE BEGINNING OF THE CONTEST.

MR. ALLEN G. CAMPBELL returned on Friday from the East. He was met at Green River by Mr. S. H. Hill, of this city, who, in behalf of Hon. Geo. Q. Cannon, served upon him the necessary papers of notice of contest for the seat in Congress of Delegate from Utah. We understand that the service was quite unexpected, so much so that it interfered with Mr. Campbell's appetite for breakfast. He churlishly refused to sign an acknowledgment of service, a proceeding quite in accordance with his whole course in this matter, but the effect of which will not be any assistance to his cause, or difficulty in the way of the Delegate-elect.

A little explanation here is necessary, that the situation may be correctly understood. Notice of contest must be served within thirty days after the issuing of the certificate of election. By a congressional rule personal service is required. As the person to whom the fraudulent certificate was given by the Governor was East, and could not be found so as to serve the papers on him there, they were forwarded to Utah. But his house at Frisco was closed and his attorney had gone out of the way, so considerable ingenuity had to be exercised in order to make service in the prescribed manner, and within the proper time. Whether the minority man and his counsel were keeping out of the way to avoid service we do not pretend to say. If so their little plan has failed, as we believe the whole conspiracy will in good time, and the churlish miner from Frisco will find other causes for loss of appetite, before he gets through with his nefarious attempt to rob the people of Utah of their right to representation in Congress.

Mr. Campbell has been somewhat successful, if general report speaks truly, in the well-known but disreputable process vulgarly denominated "jumping." But he will find it much more difficult to "jump" a seat in Congress than a mining claim. His failure in the case of the iron claims in Iron County should act as a warning to him in his present attempt. His barefaced assumption of title to another man's property in the South, for which he has had such a set-back in the courts, is only exceeded by the shameless part he has taken in trying to cheat the People's Delegate-elect out of his title to a seat in the House of Representatives.

Of course it is well known that in the whole movement, Mr. Campbell is little else than a figure head. Other brains concocted the plot and carried out its details, but he figured as the responsible person. His name has been given to the conspiracy and his money will have to foot the bill, which he will find rather a long account before the end comes. The Governor stands as the crime-tainted official who perpetrated the fraud upon this Territory, but Mr. Campbell appears as the applicant for the position belonging to another, and as the willing and eager recipient of the stolen honors. The old saying about the receiver and the thief might here find fitting application.

If we had any idea that this person cared a jot for honor, the opinion of just men and women, or his own reputation, we would ask him to consider the position. He knows that he is not the choice of the people of Utah; he must, if possessed of ordinary sense, perceive that he is not the choice of the "Liberal" or anti-"Mormon" party, and that but for his possession of money enough to make a dishonorable fight, he is not even the choice of the insignificant minority whose votes were drummed up for him at the election. He also knows full well that the certificate business was a fraud. If he can reason from facts, the law in the case and the generally expressed opinion of leading minds throughout the country, he must foresee that failure will be the final result of the conspiracy to which he has lent himself. So that he will gain neither place, fame that any decent man would covet, nor pecuniary emolument. What can he possibly achieve? He can for a time play the distinguished role of the dog in the manger, with this sole difference that while he can eat no official hay himself and cannot long keep out the rightful claimant for the stall and the fodder, his canine obstruction will cost him many ducats, with nothing to show for the outlay.