

arisen disputes and differences of opinions as to its intent. This being true, and the danger being that it could be applied to restrict the liberties of the people, I cannot sustain it. I thought then, as I think now, that such a course would be a stultification. I had never dreamed that a condition would arise in my life where I could not serve God fully and yet yield my complete allegiance to my country and to my State. The spirit of the manifesto, as it appealed to me, was in violent antagonism to all I had believed and publicly proclaimed for many years, and I could not, and, so far, have not been able to bring myself to a point where I believed I should yield my political judgment to any set of men, however praiseworthy their intentions.

When the manifesto was presented to me it appeared to my mind as a command on all to recognize the right of the Church authorities to control political concerns; it meant, so far as I was concerned, a recantation of the principles I had for years advocated—a receding from the ground I had occupied during the division movement, and, above all, it made me feel that I would be untrue to myself. I do not claim that I cannot be wrong; but with the light I have, the manifesto (applied as its construction will allow, or as it would be interpreted by men whose personal ambitions might control and subvert their sense of right,) could be operated to the injury of the State.

Eighth—While protesting against the mingling of religious and political issues, he repeatedly thrust his differences with the Church into political speeches; as for instance in the Legislature at the close of the senatorial contest, and at a reception given to him at Logan, Feb. 12th, 1897, and also a reception to the Idaho Legislature at his house February 21st, 1897.

There is room in this new State for all societies and all organizations, but they must confine themselves within proper limits. The men who enacted the supreme law of this State, made a covenant with the citizens thereof and with this nation that certain things should be done and performed, and we must keep those covenants. He who desires peace and prosperity for Utah, will draw the line sharp between the rights of the citizens and the powers of the State and those of the Church. He who votes for the union of the two, or the overriding of the Church by the State, is no friend of Utah. He who invites the intervention of the Church in State matters is an enemy to Utah. If we think we can bring peace and continual prosperity to this new State by temporizing with this question, we will be mistaken.

With the same honesty of purpose, but with a much more joyful heart, he had voted with his quorum to grant the Saints entire political freedom. He meant it then, he just as sincerely meant it now. He who thinks because we are surrounded by the walls of statehood that it is now safe to unsay that which has been said, to proclaim by word or act that there was any duplicity or double dealing in order to secure desired concessions, is mistaken. He had not laid aside his office in the Church to obtain political honors, but because he saw dire calamity confronting the people if this course were taken. His audience knew the position he had occupied for forty years on the question of liberty, and he could not now with one act expunge that record and stultify the avowed sentiments of a lifetime.

He spoke of the struggles of the Mormon people in the early days, and dwelt on the relations between the Church and the State under a Republican form of

government. He described the position he had taken on this subject and reviewed some of the circumstances connected with the recent manifesto and his refusal to sign it. He conceded that the Church had a right to discipline its members for the infraction of Church rules, but it had no right to carry Church matters into political affairs.

Ninth—In his own published explanation of the remarks he made in the Legislature about a higher allegiance, as follows:

No legislator can keep his oath of office inviolate, if he or she allows the officials of an ecclesiastical organization to control his actions within the province of the State.

The day must come in Utah when he who [being an officer in the State] holds a higher allegiance [to the chiefs of any alien or Church organization] than that which [under his solemn oath] belongs to the State, must not be a lawmaker in the halls of the State.

Tenth—In the same article he uses this language:

Doubtless a great struggle is now inaugurated in Utah, a struggle for freedom, for liberty, for the integrity of free government, for the principles incorporated in American institutions. If the State is to be controlled by the dictation of the Church its sovereignty is lost and its independence is a myth, an irresponsible dream. It is a cause of profound gratitude and thankfulness that so many noble and true women and men, chosen as the representatives of a great and earnest people, have stood unflinchingly in the face of intense and unscrupulous opposition, day after day, for more than half a hundred ballots, as exponents and advocates of the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

It is only in this spirit that Utah will continue redeemed from a thralldom as obnoxious as that of African slavery or Russian serfdom.

Also this:

The State demands of its citizens and lawmakers duty well and faithfully performed under oath. The Church demands of its members, the same individual, another and different thing. The "higher allegiance" to which I referred would require obedience to the Church. Here is a conflict. Who is responsible? Under our State Constitution the Church is responsible. That being so, the proper solution of the conflict and difficulty is simple. Let the Church vacate the forbidden ground and all will be well.

I repeat, those holding such "higher allegiance" should find no place in the halls of the legislature.

Eleventh—The same ideas were elaborated in his speech introducing Mr. Warren Foster at Logan, February 17th.

Twelfth—No matter what were his intentions, the effect of his utterances and course on the public mind was that he was fighting the Church on a vital question, namely, the political liberties of the members of the Church. That he was the champion of freedom as against the chains which the Church was forging to bind them. That the Church was endeavoring to dominate the State and interfere with its functions, and he was opposing that attempt. That the leaders of the Church had promised political liberty to the people in order to gain statehood, and then had changed their policy, and promulgated a new rule, to dominate them and restrict their political

liberties, and were thus guilty of double dealing and double faith.

This is shown by the letter introduced by Brother Thatcher from the Presbyterian preacher at St. George, the article by the Catholic priest at Denver, introduced by Brother Grant, the letter written by Brother E. G. Woolley at St. George, the rallying around Brother Thatcher of the enemies of the Church, the enforcement of the hostile press, and the cheers of the multitude who were antagonistic to the Church leaders.

Thirteenth—The letter written by Elder B. H. Roberts to Brother Thatcher shows that Brother Roberts perceived the effect which had been produced on the public mind by their united course; and in not hesitating to appeal thus made and not endeavoring to correct that wrong, there was an un-Christian spirit exhibited by Brother Thatcher.

We recognize the fact that Brother Thatcher's bodily afflictions have been great, and that they weakened him in mind to some extent, or rather that they tended to cloud his brain while in the time of his greatest trials. This should be considered when the degree of his wrong is determined.

Brother Thatcher evidently fostered the idea that his brethren of the Twelve, or some of them at least, were his enemies, and that they desired his injury, to crowd and crush him; and this affected his mind as much perhaps as his bodily infirmities. In this he was wrong, as he now appears to perceive.

He also evidently allowed the idea to be magnified in his mind that he was under great obligations to his party, and that these were such as to overshadow his previous obligations to the Priesthood and the Church. Yet there was nothing in them to prevent Brother Thatcher from consulting with his brethren in reference to matters so important, as affecting the welfare of the whole people.

Now as to the Argus matter: Brother Thatcher has cleared himself of the suspicion that he was financially interested in that paper, or was responsible for its utterances and cartoons. But he might have repudiated those lies and shameful pictures in some public way, and we think he ought to have done so. The fact that prominent men have refrained from replying to or noticing falsehoods in the public prints reflecting on the members, does not apply to nor does it touch the case of Brother Thatcher's neglecting to repudiate things that reflected upon his brethren and exalted him, and created the impression that he favored them. We think he erred in not condemning those things in some public manner.

As to his plea that he sustained the Church authorities so strongly that he would have gone to the middle of Africa, if they had whispered to him that this was their wish, the fact that he would not conform to the simple rule which they submitted to him for his signature, weighs very heavily in contrast.

But in all Brother Thatcher's departures from the true spirit of a servant of the Lord, he was laboring under a misapprehension of the purpose of the Church authorities and of the meaning of the rule in the Declaration