

good men for, all that; better by far than some who assail them. But you say that you do not find in this so-called history one place where any man who ever opposed the Saints in a private or official capacity was right. Let me cite a few passages from the history:

"That all who hated Brigham Young and Joseph Smith were rogues and hypocrites we do not believe; no more than we believe that Joseph and Brigham were perfect men, without fault, and not liable, like all men, to make mistakes. We believe that many who hated them were sincere in their hatred, and honestly supposed that they had ample cause for it."—Page 534.

"But the Gentiles did not love him (Brigham); at least not all, nor even most of them. There were many reasons for this, both from his standpoint and theirs."—Page 535.

"The Federal officials and non-Mormons generally, who have come to Utah since that time, have usually been of two classes, friends and enemies to the great majority of the people. Most of them have been prejudiced against the Saints even before coming among them. Some who at first were friendly have turned against them after their arrival, and others, once thoroughly embittered, have had their views much modified after surveying the local situation and sojourning for a short time in the Territory. Some of these have embraced the Mormon faith. Why there should be this diversity in conduct is left to the reader to surmise. It suffices us to know that sincerity and disinterestedness, as well as selfishness and hypocrisy, have at times been manifested by individuals of all classes.

"As a rule the Federal officials sent to Utah have not been a superior class of men. Many of them have been broken down politicians, unfit for honorable service, but rewarded for some half or wholly dishonorable deed in the interests of men of influence, by an appointment to office in this distant Territory. Others, not so bad, have owed their appointments to kinship or friendship with persons in power. Others still have been men of character and ability, in every way worthy of the honors placed upon them, and the positions given them to fill. This is true of men of both classes—those whom the Saints have looked upon as enemies, and those whom they have regarded as friends. Some, the most unrelenting in their opposition to the Mormons, have still been respected by them, and that very properly, as sincere and upright men, who having adopted the mistaken notion that Mormonism was a system of lust and treason, a menace to the Christian or monogamic home, and to American institutions in general, have deemed it a patriotic and even a religious duty to do all in their power to extirpate it. This class have been both official and unofficial. On the other hand, the Mormons, with equal propriety, have considered some who have fought them and their religion as men of no principle whatever—mere rogues and hypocrites, masking for personal ends as patriots and reformers. This class have also been official and unofficial. These sincere and pseudo patriots, these real and sham reformers have at times

united, with all the Gentiles, and made common cause against Mormonism. Hand in hand with them have been found many seceders from that faith, some moral and reputable men, others immoral and disreputable, and most of them bitter and unforgiving, as apostates generally are."—Pages 572 and 573.

"I think these extracts will serve to show that it is my purpose to be impartial, and to speak of men and things as they are. Of course my book is not an anti-Mormon work. Who expected that it would be? But neither is it a defense of Mormonism. It is what it claims to be—a history of Utah.

"One more word and I am done. You say: 'The writer seems to be unconscious that to make out his story he charges direct cruelty upon the men of Missouri, the men of Illinois and the Government of the United States before the Saints came here and up to the time of the closing of this volume.' Pardon me; but you certainly are mistaken. So far as the Government is concerned, I not only seem but I am unconscious of the truth of what you say. There is not a line in the whole book that I know of that would bear such a construction. But I am perfectly conscious, I assure you, that I do charge direct cruelty upon the men of Missouri and Illinois—that is, upon such of them as were concerned in the persecutions of the Saints in those States. The massacre at Haun's Mill, Missouri, was no less cruel and cowardly than the massacre at Mountain Meadows; and the murder of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, in Carthage Jail, Illinois, was, in every way, as treacherous and indefensible as the assassination of Dr. Robinson in the streets of Salt Lake City. All were foul and damnable deeds, by whomever perpetrated, and impartial history has a right to pass upon them as such. Very respectfully,

O. F. WHITNEY.

"May 31, 1892."

This appeared in the paper to which it was addressed, and three columns are occupied with an attempted rejoinder, which amounts to nothing but a repetition of a former charge that the "History" is not history because it leaves some things out. This is a little more of the critic's peculiar logic. On the same rule, a History of the United States would not be history, if it did not include a detailed statement of the critic's miserable failure in running for office in Utah, the exploded falsehoods which the *Tribune* has set forth for facts, and a full account of the rise and fall of the bogus Tuscaraoras. According to his notion, a History of Utah is not history, unless it contains the tables and libels about the "Mormons" that have been invented or adopted by the Salt Lake *Tribune*.

Here is another sample of the critic's logic (?). He disposes of the undeniable facts of Judge Cradlebaugh's infamous course in Utah, by the statement that he "happened to know him personally and helped to lower his body into the grave." This may all be true, but it would constitute a very poor refutation of the facts of history, and as a certificate of character would be judged from its source. But as an argument against the plain narration of Cradlebaugh's judicial vagaries, its childishness is too silly even for laughter.

So with his attempt at reply to Bishop Whitney's refutation of his criticism about the Mormon Battalion. The Bishop shows that the Mormons camped on the Missouri when the Battalion was called for by the Government, could not know that "California was practically conquered," as alleged by the critic, because "California was nearly two thousand miles away with no railroads and no telegraphs intervening;" and it took news six months to travel from the Missouri to the Pacific coast." Here is this critic's logical(?) rejoinder:

"How could the Battalion have expected not to meet an open foe in the field? Simply because Fremont was in California with a small command and had orders to practically capture the State, and so did commanders Sloat and Stockton, with their ships; and this was perfectly well known, because the news did not go overland, but went by sea."

The italics are ours. They are used to emphasize his brilliant argument. The "Mormons" on the Missouri river must have known all about this alleged capture of California, when camped on the Missouri river, because the news went round by the sea! Wonderfully conclusive, is it not? How did this news, that nobody in the interior heard of at that time, get round by "the sea" and "overland" to the Missouri river before the Battalion was called for? And why was the Battalion mustered, and why did Kearney march on to Santa Fe and capture it, if there was no enemy to conquer and no expectation of meeting a foe in the field?

Then the critic comes down to falsehood, as is his custom when cornered, and says: "The Bishop asks if it is real history that California was practically conquered before this expedition started." The Bishop did not ask anything of the kind as will be seen in his letter. He asked if the critic's conclusion that "the Mormon Battalion did not expect to meet an open foe in the field was real history," which is altogether another thing.

In the same way he treats the Bishop's history of Joseph Smith and says: "He makes Joseph to continually commune with angels," etc. Reference to the history, as explained in the author's letter, will prove that he does nothing of the kind, but relates what Joseph Smith and his associates claimed, and sets down nothing of their claims as historical facts but simply as their testimony.

The whole trouble with the critic is that he wants the History of Utah to be an anti-"Mormon" collection of malignant *Tribune* fabrications, idle hotel tales and salacious saloon gossip. This volume necessarily treats of the rise and progress of "Mormonism," as that was a prelude to the founding of Utah. There are many historical facts which will be brought out in succeeding volumes which could not and ought not to have been included in this. It must not be treated as the full History of Utah. It is but the first of four volumes. It is very complete so far as it goes. It is real history, not opinion, nor a repetition of stories started by socialists and skeptics and long ago refuted. It is a grand and splendid volume, and one proof of that is that it is assailed and misrepresented by the Salt Lake *Tribune*.