



GEORGE Q. CANNON,

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Wednesday, January 3, 1892.

UTAH affairs are subject to much news paper discussion in England as well as in America just now, the pros and cons apparently being presented as strongly as the discussers know how to present them. The Sheffield *Independent* (Nov. 27) is indignant because, "in a weekly paper of Liberal politics, which is always ably written, there appeared a few days ago an article on the persecution of the Mormons, long and elaborate, and evidently meant to be exhaustive, in which the American government is held up to odium for persecuting the Mormons; and we are told that because we not only permit, but support, polygamy in India, we are hypocrites, and the fools of inconsistency, when we venture to approve of the suppression of the society raised near Salt Lake, with a polygamous character."

The *Independent* thus states its views of the cases comparatively of Britain and India and of the United States and Utah—

What the United States Government object to is polygamy, and we maintain that they are perfectly justified in the course that they have taken, if they believe it to be for the public good. Nor is there any analogy between our case in India and the relation of the Washington Government to the settlement of Brigham Young. When we went to India we went first as traders, and afterwards assumed a warlike attitude and became conquerors. Nobody asked us to go to India. We had no right to interfere with Indian institutions. We found polygamy existing as one of the principal institutions of the Peninsula, and we should have been guilty of revolting tyranny had we tried to suppress it. The facts are altogether different in America. Mormonism sprang up after the American Constitution had been founded. It sprang up after and while the law of the land declared bigamy was a crime in the territories of the United States. This it has been attempted to deny. But it is nevertheless the fact; and having so sprung up it cannot blame the Executive if it takes the first opportunity of carrying out the law. It is, we admit, a question whether the government of the United States have acted with wisdom.

To which we may say that while some people proclaim that plurality of wives is the head and front and entire body of Utah's offence, other people as emphatically declare that the plural marriage system is nearer the least than the greatest of her offenses. True it is that President Grant, in his message, merely refers to the practice of plural marriage as obnoxious, but the Federal judiciary here condemn and proscribe the belief in that order of marriage, and further, in their various decisions and rulings, they lose no opportunity of manifesting that it is "Mormonism" and those who believe in it that they are opposed to, and not plural marriage alone. Nor are they so violently opposed to lewdness as they are to plural marriage, for, in the cities whence they came to Utah, lewdness prevails unchecked in its most repulsive forms, and here these same judicial gentlemen who snivel over plural marriage are found virtually defending persons charged with keeping or being connected with houses of licentious repute, acknowledgedly such the world over.

Besides, first, experience teaches that the same deadly enmity prevailed against the "Mormons" before its enemies knew that plural marriage was practiced or even believed in by the "Mormons;" second, if the "Mormons" were to give up one portion of their religious faith and practice, they would soon be called upon to give up another, and another, and another, until it would be reduced to the miserable level of the

divers sectarian religions around them. As to the statement that "the United States are perfectly justified in the course they have taken if they believe it to be for the public good," it is simply a restatement of the old propositions to do evil that good may come and that the end justifies the means, propositions which in the eyes of the tyrants and oppressors, may be stretched and twisted to cover all the tyranny, and oppression that ever existed. So we need say no more on that point.

The *Independent* thinks Britain right in permitting and even supporting polygamy in India, because nobody asked Britons to go there, polygamy was a principal institution existing in India when Britons went there, Britons went as traders and then turned conquerors, and therefore had no right to interfere with Indian institutions, in fact Britons would "have been guilty of revolting tyranny had they tried to suppress it."

But the *Independent* says, that the facts are altogether different in America, that "Mormonism" sprang up after the American constitution, and while the law of the land declared bigamy a crime in the Territories, yet the *Independent* admits that it is an open question whether the United States Government has acted with wisdom in this Utah persecution.

So far as the government has authorized or sanctioned the judicial crusade against "Mormonism," we are satisfied that it has acted with anything rather than with wisdom or statesmanship.

The facts in America are not so different to the facts in India as the *Independent* represents. True, in the providence of God, "Mormonism" sprang up after the American Constitution, but the *Independent* makes an egregious mistake if it supposes that there is one word in that instrument that condemns plurality of wives, or that is incompatible with the existence of that system of marriage in every State and Territory in the Union. There are no greater sticklers for the Federal Constitution than are the people of this Territory.

An equally egregious mistake does the *Independent* make when it says that "Mormonism" sprang up while the law of the land declared bigamy was a crime in the Territories of the United States. Bigamy might be considered and legislated against as a crime in some of the States and Territories, but those laws were local in their operation, and there was no law of the United States against either bigamy or polygamy in the Territories until the plural system of marriage had been years in existence here, and had been well and generally understood to be so. There is no law of this Territory against that form of marriage now, and the United States law against it was not made as against licentiousness, or in the interest of general morality, but solely and wholly and purposely with the idea of attacking and extinguishing "Mormonism."

Again as to the denied analogy of the two cases. When the "Mormons" settled this region, it was Mexican Territory, and they practiced the plural form of marriage from their first settlement in the Territory. The United States had nothing to do with the country when the "Mormons" settled it. To Americans it was a foreign country. The Americans came to Mexico first as traders, then as conquerors. Nobody asked them to come, and when they became conquerors plural marriage was existing as one of the principal institutions of the country, this part of it at least, and they had no right to interfere with the institutions of the country, indeed they did not interfere with it nor make any law against it until more than a dozen years after the country came into their possession by conquest, and according to the *Independent's* own admission, they would have been guilty of revolting tyranny had they tried to suppress it, and consequently they are none the less guilty of revolting tyranny now they are trying to suppress it, either by wresting and perverting local laws that have no legitimate application to it, or by executing a Federal law of an unconstitutional character. These are two horns of the dilemma in which the United States find themselves, with regard to their present attitude towards Utah. The Federal judiciary apparently prefer the first-named horn, while others prefer the latter. But neither the United States nor its representatives can attack readily "Mormonism" and escape both horns.

The *Independent* continues—

At present there is danger of giving a fictitious strength to Mormonism; what may be regarded as persecution by many, will, in not a few instances,

transform wavering religionists into zealous devotees. In prosecuting for lewd practices they are not so inconsistent as has been frequently insisted on, though we think the charge is too easily suggested and made, not to have deterred a wise man from taking this course. Nevertheless the fact remains that though immorality exists to a frightful extent in New York, though the same law is offended against, nobody proclaims this transgression, and proof would be difficult to get save under a system of social and domestic police whose influence would be worse than anything which now exists.

No unprejudiced man, who understands the subject, considers the present crusade against "Mormonism" in any other light than persecution, however great the exertion to disguise it and cause it to pass under a less objectionable name. Nothing could be more inconsistent than prosecution of plural marriage as lewdness, for every simpleton knows that a man who is inclined to lewdness can find abundance of opportunities of gratifying that vicious propensity in every city in Christendom, without taking upon himself the responsibilities of marriage, especially of plural marriage. This charge, therefore, of lewdness is one remarkably incapable of holding water, and the policy of preferring such a charge in the crusade against "Mormonism," is not only inconsistent, but is open to more serious objection, and it has been seriously questioned and unsparingly denounced by many intelligent writers.

The system of domestic inquisition that the *Independent* thinks would be necessary in New York to prove immorality, and that would be worse than any other evil, is adopted in the prosecutions of this persecuting crusade and made use of to convict "Mormons," not of what is everywhere acknowledged to be lewdness, but of honorable plural marriage, in which the majority of mankind have always believed. The *Independent* may well doubt the wisdom of the course adopted by the crusaders, and say, "We even regret the tone adopted by the New York press: it is indecent to gloat over the prosecution of any man, whatever may have been his crime," and consequently it is far more than indecent, it is brutal, it is barbarous, it is infamous to gloat over the prosecution of a man who has not committed any crime.

The *Independent* thus concludes—

What we wish to point is this: that Mormonism if allowed openly to exist would endanger liberty. For what is Mormonism? What did Brigham Young proclaim to be his mission? The restoration of the patriarchal state of things. What does this mean? We have seen that only very few could afford to have a large number of wives. The result, therefore, of the spread of Mormonism would be to create a class of rich men with enormous families, and therefore enormous powers, whose aspirations would be the same, and whose interests would be identical. In the course of a few years we should find amongst the American people a number of men with the wealth of our peers, and each with an army at his back bound to him by ties stronger than any of the means by which soldiers are induced to serve the state. When this class was opposed—or when it chose to be aggressive—a difficulty truly formidable would arise, and freedom would be seriously imperilled. Great families would rule the great Republic—and a race of quasi-slaves would exist—oppressed by a tyranny worse, as the history of Italy shows, than that of an isolated despot. To sneer at the American tenderness for slavery and its severity with Mormonism, is to mistake the real issue. Even with the slavery of a half-savage race the freedom of hundreds of thousands was compatible. But once let Mormonism spread, and in the course of a few years, the land and home and hope of the free would become a continent of slaves.

The great "point" here made is a specious one that can be used by every tyrant to justify the putting of his despotic foot upon the necks of a people, and that is, that he does it not for what the people are, but for what they may become. "Mormonism, if allowed openly to exist, would endanger liberty!" "Therefore, let us abuse and outrage liberty now in attempting to put Mormonism down, lest at some future time it should endanger liberty!" Such is the logic of the *Independent*, though not so explicitly stated by that paper.

As to the abuse to which plural marriage may give occasion, we may say that we do not think that system is intended for any but men who desire to live honestly, righteously, and godly all their days, nor indeed are any other men fit candidates for marriages of any kind, and if those who engage in plural marriage use the power which it gives them for the prosecution of vain, ambitious, or in any way unworthy purposes, God, by his mysterious providences, will not condemn marriage, or the honorable observance thereof, but will bring its abusers effectually to judgment in his own way and time. But no man, no government can be justified in punishing a people for what they may or even will surely do. Punishment can only legitimately be inflicted for actions committed, not for actions concealed in the womb of futurity.

SPEAKING of the supposed "approaching end of Mormonism," the Boston *Statesman* takes occasion to say—

But the railroad builders brought temporary colonies of gambling, drinking and cursing fellows, who let in a little of the wickedness and the light of the outside world; the completed road brought travelers; the mines attracted a population of stalwart, hardworking, unbelieved; and with the newcomers, good and bad, arrive Christian churches to establish the religion of the Bible against that of the Latter-Day prophet. It is in such influences as these, rather than in the efforts of United States judges, that the permanent cure for Mormonism is to be found.

The *Statesman* manifests a great deal more sense than do the judges who concentrate their judicial efforts in attacks upon the system, known as "Mormonism," and shape rulings and decisions, and twist and pervert laws, in order that by all means some "Mormons" may be incarcerated and their property confiscated, if nothing worse can be perpetrated against them. We do not complain of persons opposing "Mormonism." That which is considered wrong, should be opposed, but it should be done in an honest, legitimate, and constitutional way. That is all we ask. Justice is every one's due, it is every person's right. If he gets justice he has no right to complain. Mercy, generosity, or magnanimity, is a gift, a boon, that cannot be claimed, and that should therefore be gratefully received when needed and extended. Mercy is not what "Mormons" ask of their enemies, because it is not needed, it is not due, it can hardly be expected, and it is not expected. But the Mormons do claim justice as a right, which, if not rendered now, must be rendered with interest, and at the expense of those who withhold it, or their descendants, at some future time. A fair field and no favor are all that "Mormonism" requires or asks, and these are its just due. With them it fears neither priests nor judges nor presidents nor kings nor emperors nor any number of millions of people. But when justice is studiously withheld, we leave the results in the hands of the Lord, who, while fanatical and unjust judges rule to suit their narrow, east-iron prejudices, will overrule things for the accomplishment of his own mighty purposes.

In an article which we republished yesterday from the New York *Herald* is a sensible suggestion concerning the new apportionment of representatives of the people in the Federal Congress. The *Herald* suggests that there is no serious objection to a gradual increase in the number of members of the House, to correspond with the gradual increase of the population.

The Denver *Tribune* claims that the new apportionment bill, with the inclusive proposition to require a population of about 150,000 in a Territory ere it can become a State, is manifest evidence of eastern jealousy of western growth, and is a palpable injustice to the Territories.

How stands the question? The Territories represent an extraordinary proportion of the vigor, the enterprise, and the material wealth of the nation, and it is not only apparently but really an injustice for the inhabitants of a Territory to be deprived, as the inhabitants of all Territories are, of many of the privileges and rights of American citizens, such as the franchise so far as it relates to the choice of Governor, Secretary, Judges, etc., and of all voice in the choice of President, and in the making of Federal laws. These are real, substantial privations,