

handed. It was the child of prejudice and congressional ignorance.

Judge Carlton is the only one of its members who has the candor to admit that it was a piece of useless legislation, and he values both more than his salary of \$5000 a year. Those who have signed the majority reports valued their salaries more than the truth. That is the whole of it. Hence their labored efforts to prove that their semi-annual visits to Utah were necessary for the suppression of polygamy and disloyalty. They are upheld in this pretense by the newspaper already referred to, but there is not a Mormon or a Gentile in the common walks of life who does not look upon them as actors in a ridiculous farce. The effect of the anti Mormon crusade for all these years has been for evil, and that continually.

It has got the community of Salt Lake City by the ears. It has demoralized society by introducing obscenity into the press and into daily conversation even among ladies of culture. By giving the impression that life and capital were not safe in the Territory, it has retarded the influx of a good and varied population, and has prevented the investment of money there. All that was needed was to have made polygamy punishable like any other crime, according to its degree. Criminals of all sorts frequently escape conviction everywhere, but in Utah, where the whole power of the courts is in Federal courts, who construe the laws of evidence to suit themselves, conviction of polygamy is almost always sure, though other crimes may be unpunished.

The fear of the law may have had a restraining influence upon polygamy, but the contact with outside civilization which absurd prejudice and the malignant lies of those whose main object has been political control, could not repel, would alone have accomplished its overthrow.

That is fully proven in the admirable paper under review.

Now that all we have a right to ask of the Mormons has been yielded, it would be the part of a generous government to restore to them the property it has stolen, but if it is unwilling to do this, it might at least for the future abstain from the enactment of needless and unjust laws against a people whom no tyrannical legislation has driven or can drive from their allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

JOHN CODMAN.

SODA SPRINGS, Idaho, Sept. 9, 1890.

### CONCERNING REVELATION.

I have read what has been said pro and con of late touching this topic and ask permission to say something about it as a disinterested party.

The controversy has grown out of President Woodruff's recent "manifesto," and the assumption of his critics is that he should have issued instead a "revelation." That is, the anti-Mormon writers and talkers insist that the declaration should have come from God instead of

from Mr. Woodruff. Let us see where this leads.

If God can be dictated to and compelled to furnish revelations to suit the requirements of any persons who desire to back their schemes with divine authority, he ceases to be God and becomes the tool, so to speak, of designing men. If, now, these men who insist that President Woodruff should have demanded a revelation instead of issuing his own manifesto are honest in their position, they either have a most degrading conception of God, or they do not believe in God. That is, they are atheists in either case, a degrading conception of God being equivalent to a disbelief in God. Now, as the men who are fighting the "Mormons" are, as a rule, professing Christians, it follows that their professions are only a sham and that, as a matter of fact they do not believe in either God or the possibility of "revelation." Such being the case, their claim that President Woodruff should have obtained a revelation is only bombastic pretense. For, not believing in God, they believe it would be impossible to obtain a revelation, and consequently, they believe that the only communication possible from the head of the Church to the Church must emanate from the President. Thus their criticisms are seen to be only the harping of harpies. Believing that the President of the Church is the highest authority that can speak for and to the Church, they demand a communication from God, in whom they do not believe.

This is a sorry exhibition for Christians to make; and shows only to what extent the evil of hypocrisy has honeycombed the Christian church.

But should President Woodruff's critics insist that they do believe in God, in the only true God, as their claim has been so long, then they must concede that "revelation" can only come, not when man wills, but when and how God wills. Such being the case, they must admit, if they are honest in their claims, that in the absence of revelation, President Woodruff's manifesto is all that they have any right to ask. That gentleman's critics insist that he did not say what he meant, and did not mean what he said. It is certain they would say the same of anything that might come from "the only true God" in whom they profess to believe, if it did convey precisely what they want. That is to say, they assume that if God does not take the prevalent hatred and bigotry manifested towards the Mormon people as the basis of any revelation He might make to the leaders of the Mormon Church, they would undoubtedly denounce Him as "a hired Mormon liar," a "traitor" and a "snake." If God should speak I believe He would demand a cessation of the persecution and oppression that have been forced upon the Mormon people. If He should speak I believe He would say: "Your outcry against this people is lying and abomination; I cannot receive it."

If He should speak I believe He would say: "Cease your oppressions: My freedom is for all." Yet if such a revelation should be given; if only an angel brought it and proclaimed it in our midst, it would be denounced by the anti-"Mormons" just as President Woodruff's manifesto has been.

The anti-"Mormons" are governed, not by judgment, but by hate, and therefore their criticisms are not reliable. So far as they attempt to argue the issue, they do not seek to state the truth, but to create a semblance of truth in what is not true. Wilford Woodruff is an old man. His long life is known to men. He has never been charged with crime. He has been a good citizen. He has the confidence and respect of many thousands of people who are as good as his critics. It is, to say the least, most unjust to charge such a man with fraud, as is covertly done. The law of the world is supposed to consider a man innocent until he is proven guilty. The manly course would be to accept President Woodruff's manifesto as true and sincere until it is proven something else. For my own part, I see in it a "revelation." That is, I believe every truth, every act of justice, every good for humanity is the coming of God, the presence and activity of God among men. To my mind President Woodruff has done much in issuing this manifesto. If he has not done all, the way to get more is not to denounce him as a fraud for what he has done, but to hail the rising day and instead of shunting the clouds of bigotry and hate across it, welcome its coming and help to make its noontide one of gladness.

CHARLES ELLIS.

### OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

Once more matters in connection with the World's Fair are moving smoothly. The question of site seems to be satisfactorily settled. The mass of the people are heartily in favor of voting next November for the five millions to be raised by taxation. Unless some hitch comes on from an unexpected source, all will be smooth sailing. The free trade papers are making much clamor about the McKinley bill and the effect it will have in deterring European manufacturers and artists from bringing over exhibits. This bill, however, is the expression of the will of the majority of the American people, and as we are still civilized enough to be ruled by majorities, the bill will become law. If the bill is for the best interests of our country, we need not lose much sleep over what Europe thinks of us. Anyhow, this Republic was not established to evoke encomiums from the monarchies of Europe or the satraps of Asia. But in disregarding foreign opinion we should be careful not to disregard the safety and stability of our own political traditions. On the other hand, if this bill is the basis for the establishment of an aristocracy of wealth looking to Europe for political and social ideals, then in-