

tal affairs does not come within the

purview of the general government.

If Utah has the requisite population,

all that Congress can constitutionally

consider in the matter of her admis-

sion as a State is, whether her

Constitution is such as to guarantee

within the new State a "republican

form of government."

We do not wish it to be under-

stood by this that Utah is anxious

for the responsibilities and expenses

of State government. There was a

time when we were very desirous to

escape from the thralldom of the

anomalous and unrepresentative ter-

ritorial system. But since that

liberty which we have the right

to demand has been denied us, we

can stand this injustice just as long

as the nation can afford to exercise it.

And we understand perfectly well

that polygamy is merely the excuse

of partisans for excluding Utah, the

real cause being the fear lest the new

State would furnish two Senators

and a Representative on the oppos-

ing side in politics, and the certainty

that one more dumping ground

for officials, useless elsewhere, would

be lost to the patronage of those who

are influential with the Administration.

The American, in its allusion to

strange stories from Utah about

"women being left to toil for them-

selves and their children," of "wo-

men beaten over the head with

cooking utensils," and other titilla-

ting tales of vulgar tongues, descends to

a level unworthy of itself and the

high tone in which it commenced

the article under consideration.

Even if these stories were true they

would have no bearing on the sub-

ject. For it could be clearly shown

that such things are no part of the

system, but only the wrong acts of

individuals and in complete opposi-

tion to the theory and teach-

ings of the system. If such wrong-do-

ings on the part of brutal men

prove anything in the direction

sought, they prove too much for the

opponents of plural marriage. There

is not a daily paper published in the

large cities of monogamic Christen-

dom which does not chronicle ac-

counts of desertion, assault, cruelty

and violence of the most horrible

character, perpetrated by husbands

who have but one wife, and have no

intentions of forsaking monogamy.

We have just as much logical reason

to cite these as arguments against

polygamy, as the American has to

repeat the idle gossip of prejudiced

persons as evidence against poly-

gamy.

The American objects to the doc-

trine of continued revelation in the

"Mormon" Church, and says:

"To-day they enjoin polygamy; to-

morrow it may be murder. Shall we

say to-morrow even, in view of the

Mountain Meadow massacre and the

recent murder of the Mormon who

exposed that atrocity?"

Again that respectable paper has

demeaned itself in condescending to

take rumor for fact and unproven

accusation for a settled judgment.

The awful crime alluded to was no

more the work of the "Mormon"

Church than the murder of Garfield

was the work of the Quakia Com-

munity or of the "Salwar"

Republicans. As to the murder

of the "Mormon" who exposed it,

we are at a loss to understand what

the American is driving at, but it is

probably another rumor as ground-

less as the more general slander.

If the writer of the article had

read up on the "Mormon" question

as diligently as he claims, he would

have discovered that the shedding

of human blood is forbidden in the

"Mormon" creed under the severest

with it, as though all creation

was injured because a handful

of men in a remote Territory

marry more wives than one, while