

EDITORIALS.

CHARACTER OF THE CRUSADE

THE present onslaught upon the "Mormons" is a religio-political crusade. All attempts to hide it are transparent and vain. The situation is almost self-evident.

Here is the position in a nutshell. Two classes are directly interested in placing the "Mormons" under disabilities—local political place-hunters and hireling priests. The first are unable to reach the spoils of office while the "Mormons" hold the majority of votes in Utah and administer the local government in conspicuous honesty and frugality. The second are placed in the cold shade by comparison with the success of the "Mormon" religion. With distinct objects in the same connection the place-hunters and priests have coalesced in a crusade. Occasionally they have operated jointly and at other times separately.

The head-centre of the mischief-makers is in this city. For a number of years past the two classes have hob-nobbed, the one attending the anti-"Mormon" meetings of the other. Governor Murray and the clique to which he belongs have made themselves conspicuous in this connection by appearing in Methodist anti-"Mormon" assemblages and making rabid speeches, while the clerical Pharisees rubbed their hands and gleated over every foul slander that was uttered. Even Mr. J. R. McBride, a leading anti-"Mormon" political crusader, who is not known to entertain the slightest symptom of religious sentiment, has joined in this clamorous combination, by which the most detestable falsehoods have been spread over the country against the "Mormons," who have been traduced more than any other existing community.

The facts we are now stating are well known to the public of this city and Territory. And the great bulk of the popular fury which appears to have seized the public mind, has been worked up from the source we have defined. It is in this interest that Mr. Murray has deserted his post as Governor of Utah, and been floating about the country in behalf of the place-hunting fraternity.

The Edmunds law is pronounced by the religio-political crusaders as a failure. The only standpoint from which it can be so considered is their's. It did not attain their object. The legislation they desired was such as would turn the Territorial Government over to those who would trample the "Mormons" under their feet had they the power, and rob them right and left. It failed in accomplishing that and for that reason alone was a failure. Had it put the place-hunters in office and enabled jealous sectarian religionists to gloat over the spectacle of the adherents of a successful religion placed at a serious disadvantage, it would have been proclaimed a grand success.

We deny that the Edmunds law is a failure. It placed all that class of citizens against which it is pretended the crusade is aimed—polygamists—under political disability. Still the majority of votes is held by people who profess the "Mormon" religion and have broken no law, the place-seeker is still unable to reach the spoils of office and the jealous religious bigot cannot gloat over the discomfiture of a God-fearing people.

To re-ignite popular ill-will, the cry goes out over the land that polygamous marriages are as frequent as ever, and even more so, yet the schemers have not the slightest foundation for the assertion. The statutes for the punishment of that offence are still in force. If the statements are true, why do not those who claim to be informed report the cases to the proper officers that the law may take its due course. The reason is that the hue and cry is raised for a purpose and the shouters probably do not know of a single infringement of the statutes in the entire community.

In this connection the Sacramento *Record Union*, a journal of marked ability, and certainly with no leanings whatever toward the "Mormon" religion, remarks:

"There is a disposition in some quarters to assail Mormonism as a religion, and against that to aim machinery of law to be made for the occasion. This cannot be tolerated. The Mormon religion must not enter into the question of the suppression of polygamy in Utah. If a governmental assault is permitted

upon any one religion the first blow is struck at the perpetuity of free government. Let us enforce the laws against polygamy, and we shall have nothing to fear from the Mormon Church."

MR. BEECHER CORRECTED.

THE full text of that part of Henry Ward Beecher's Thanksgiving discourse which referred to the "Mormon" question, will be found in another part of this paper. The sentiments expressed by the great pulpit orator do credit to his humanity, and speak well for his common sense.

We cannot endorse his advice "to 'set the New Testament against the Old,' for we believe in the harmony of both divisions of the sacred record. Christ came not to 'whip out' or destroy Moses and the prophets, but to fulfill their sayings, and 'Mormonism' cannot be assailed by the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles. Mr. Beecher is also in error in regard to the proprietorship and exercise of power of the 'Mormon' Church over the irrigating water of this Territory.

The Church has no ownership whatever and exercises no jurisdiction over the streams and ditches. They are in the control of the land owners, whose rights to the use thereof are determined and regulated by secular law. Every possessor of water rights is protected therein by that law, and the idea that he can be summarily deprived of them in the way described by Mr. Beecher is entirely incorrect. "No court no trial, no anything—simply shut the gate," he says. The water owner has court, trial, everything necessary to sustain him in the lawful use thereof, and the Church has nothing to do with it, except in the way of wholesome influence in case of dispute between brethren, when the Teachers or Bishops may decide what is right in the premises. But this does not prevent an appeal to the courts under the laws when such pacific measures are insufficient.

The attention given to the "Mormon" question, and, even by those who express a friendly interest in our people is always so brief and imperfect that it is very seldom understood by any but the "Mormons" themselves. Some day it will be considered of sufficient importance to demand the impartial scrutiny of the foremost thinkers of the world.

GOVERNOR MURRAY ON UTAH.

HERE is a caustic but sensible article from the Omaha *Herald*, in relation to the nonsense and wilful misrepresentations of our dude Executive, now working hard for re-appointment:

GOVERNOR ELL H. MURRAY, of Utah, calls upon Congress to deal with the Mormon question by force of arms. He calls for carpetbaggers and troops much in the manner of the reconstruction governors of the South. The suppression of polygamy, according to Governor Murray, is "by no manner of means" the chief object in view. He considers that institution a comparatively unimportant feature of the present exasperating situation. Polygamy is practiced by but 12,000 persons out of a total population of 150,000, of whom 110,000 are Mormons. Under recent acts of Congress the right to vote and hold office is restricted to monogamists, and the territorial legislature elected last summer is composed exclusively of monogamists. But it is also exclusively Mormon. It is, therefore, not in sympathy with Gov. Murray, who is nothing if not anti-Mormon, and if it follows the example of previous Utah legislatures, will block all the governor's schemes for silencing the offices of the territory with outsiders bitterly hostile to the community in which they live. It is not asserted that, aside from their polygamous institution, the Mormons are not a strictly moral, industrious, orderly and law-abiding people. The governor admits that they are prosperous, polite and "very solemn," while the women "are very much like other women." The leaders are "polite and shrewd." "They have one face for the government and the world" and another in private "while carrying on their schemes, which take hold of the very marrow of thousands of people." They pay

their taxes promptly and abstain wholly from litigation. "In fact, to pay tithes, to live regularly and obey the priesthood are the three cardinal principles inbred in the Mormon mind." But they are rebellious. They have more respect for the authority of their church than for the views of the occupant of the gubernatorial chair, and manage in a thousand provoking ways to elude the application of his schemes for their reform. Their practice of settling their disputes among themselves is alleged as evidence of their rebellious disposition. Governor Murray sees in it "a hierarchy within a republic—the establishment of another and different government intended to meet all the requirements of a territorial government; a combination to defy the laws of Congress." Strange to say, this rebellion is not evidenced by the existence of a military force in arms against the territorial government or the government of the United States. There is not even an organized militia.

The Mormon question is a serious and a difficult one, but it will be a long time before it is treated in the manner suggested by Governor Murray. If there is danger "besetting the government in this irrepressible conflict," it will be necessary to adduce some more substantial proof than the rhapsody of Mr. Murray.—*Omaha Herald*.

THE BULWARK IN THE WAY.

THE New York *Evening Post* has the following suggestive paragraph:

"The Mormons are polygamists by virtue of religious belief, and each man is enabled to have as many wives as he can maintain through the connivance of the whole community, male and female. How could a Legislative Council deal with such a state of things as this? What is wanted is a court with summary jurisdiction, empowered to punish polygamy upon such proofs as it chooses to consider adequate, and unfettered by the rules of evidence, commonly so called. It is to this we must come, if we mean to put down polygamy by force, but everyone as yet, is afraid to propose it.

The obtuseness of the *Post* is as dense as its anti-polygamy desires are inordinate. Is it not obvious that the promoters of the scheme for a Legislative Commission expect to obtain from that body enactments for the establishment of just such tribunals with just such dangerous powers as those suggested by the *Post*.

The plain purpose of the villains who have started this scheme and are working it up in the public mind, is to harass and plunder the "Mormons" under cover of the forms of law. There are laws enough making the practice of polygamy criminal, the complaint is that they cannot be enforced. Proof of the offence must be had before conviction, and conviction must precede punishment. And such evidence as is necessary in any properly constituted court is not easy to obtain against leading "Mormons," who are the objects of radical aversion, and who it is thought could be financially phlebotomized. But if by some legislative hocus pocus this can all be changed, and courts can be so established and empowered that the ordinary rules of evidence may be set aside, and hearsay, rumor, and the alleged admissions of the accused can be taken in the place of proof, what will be easier than conviction and what more certain than punishment or blackmail?

But there is one thing that the *Post* has not taken into account and which stands in the way both of courts and commissions and even of Congress itself, when such unscrupulous propositions as those of the *Post* are seriously entertained. It is an instrument called the Constitution of the United States, and not only the law-making, but the judicial and executive departments of the government are restrained by its provisions and forbidden to do many things which demagogues, bigots and tyrants are anxious to effect.

The time may come, and we believe it will, when that sacred guardian of human liberty will be ignored and rejected by men in power. But the nation is not yet sufficiently "advanced" to submit to such desecration. And when it becomes possible for the Supreme Law to be stamped upon by the rulers without an uprising of the people, the "Mor-

mons" will be in such a condition that they will be able to endure the shock and, as predicted by their martyred Seer, will bear aloft the heaven-inspired instrument and save it from destruction. Meanwhile those who would punish "Mormons" without a fair trial by a jury of their peers impartially selected, and who, to destroy "Mormonism," would set aside all just and republican methods of government and of jurisprudence, will see confronting them at every twist and turn of their sinuous course, the bulwark set up by the founders of this republic, the palladium of human rights, the safeguard of every citizen, no matter what may be his creed or condition.

ROSECRANS' AMENDMENT.

LAST evening we published, under the heading Rosecrans' Folly, the full text of the bill he proposes to introduce in the House of Representatives for an amendment to the Constitution forbidding polygamy. On this subject the New York *Sun* has the following remarks:

"The Revised Statutes of the United States already prohibit polygamy in any Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction. The crime is called bigamy, although the definition is broad enough to embrace polygamy. The Supreme Court has declared the law to be constitutional, and has decided that those who make polygamy a part of their religion are not excepted from the operation of the statute.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the highest judicial tribunal in the land has already expressly determined that Congress now has power to prohibit plural marriages in all places under the exclusive dominion of the United States under the Constitution, as it is, we see no reason for amending the Constitution as proposed by Gen. Rosecrans.

There is law enough against polygamy already. The difficulty is in its enforcement."

These are similar reflections to those offered by the *NEWS* when the matter was first broached. But there is another view of it which should be considered. The promoters of the agitation against the "Mormons," and some of the old women in trousers and plous ladies in petticoats, claim to be in great fear lest polygamy should overwhelm the country. According to their pretences, the social customs of fifty millions of people are in danger of being overturned by the system advocated in a community of a hundred and fifty thousand. Monogamy is put in peril by polygamy. If something desperate is not done, and done at once, "Mormonism" will overspread the land, and the institutions of great "Christianity" will be placed in jeopardy! There is something about this system called "Mormonism" which renders orthodoxy powerless in its attack, and which is too mighty for either parsons or politicians to cope with. And if it is left alone it will overrun and revolutionize every thing.

Now, if there is any truth in these surmises and "awful warnings," is it not wise to make some provision against the threatened results? And what more proper than a constitutional provision against the practice which it is feared will become universal? If, as is claimed, polygamy is spreading through the Territories, what is to hinder it from running over the States? General Rosecrans, in this light, does not appear such a dotard after all. Of course if there is no dread of polygamy being adopted outside of Utah, his opposition is so much drivel; but if the danger is such as the sensational anti-"Mormons" would have the country believe, the sooner the Amendment is adopted the better for that pure society which now exists in the States, and in which there is no departure from the path of virtue and no violation of the marriage vow.

THE WAR-SPECK SPREADING.

THE speck of war in the East which suddenly burst into a flame when the army of Hicks Pasha was annihilated, bids fair to develop into a conflagration. The news from Egypt is of a threatening character, as the victory obtained by El Mahdi is, as might have been expect-

broadening his influence and swelling the bulk of his forces. It appears that the latest acquisitions to Mahdi's army are supplied with the most approved pattern. With the armaments obtained by utter extinguishment of the army under Hicks Pasha, will make hordes under the "False Prophet" no inconsiderable enemy to any army undertaking his subjugation.

The uprising in Egypt makes a thing connected with the success conspicuously apparent—that the Egyptian government is totally incompetent to manage its own internal affairs. No sooner the Arabi Bey difficulty is settled than another equally, and perhaps still more formidable opens. Probably the British will begin to consider that chronic interposition their part in the settlement of Egyptian internal disturbances, expensive and irritating enough. They will doubtless conclude that British occupation and permanent management of Egyptian affairs will be the most effectual remedy for the establishment of a pacific condition in the land of Nile. British rule with a new figurehead sovereign is the favored *modus operandi* of that government in the pursuit of the extension of empire and the acquirement of territorial dependencies.

The other great powers of Europe would doubtless object to John obtaining such an increased hold in the East, as a thorough occupation and management of Egypt would give to Great Britain. The overwhelming interests of the country would not admit of her admitting any other nation to have hand in the Egyptian pie, unless perhaps might permit France to assert the tip of her little finger.

The eyes of all Europe have been for centuries directed with longing gaze to East, and the question of the dominance of power in that part of the world has never reached a thing like a settlement. Encouragement in that direction is a policy with Russia, and to counter her attempts in that line is much a part of the policy of other powers. It is a most common bone of contention, and the centrifugalities of El Mahdi are likely to re-open the question and new and formidable complications. The ultimate result possibly be the opening of a general European conflict of arms.

A PRECIOUS TRIO.

PROCEEDINGS instituted in courts by some of the prominent creditors of the now notorious G. M. Pierce have brought queer developments to light. Evidence adduced showed that individuals had taken a hand in fraudulent business.

It appears from details elucidated in the District Court that Mr. Pierce did not, in the first assignment, turn over all of his property to assignee not subject to execution and numbers of names that have been upon the list of creditors were omitted. After the assignment was made M. M. Bane, a bill of sale given him by Mr. Pierce took possession of and carried away large quantity of books, amounting in value to several hundred dollars being permitted to do so by Mr. Griffiths, the assignee. After service on the property of attachment, issued at the instance of a creditor, and while it was in custody of U. S. marshal, Mr. Griffiths suddenly removed from the premises a quantity of valuable property, consisting of gold pens, articles of a similar description. Excuse subsequently offered by for such an apparently fraudulent proceeding was, that he said it would be safer in his personal session than under the official of the marshal. It was shown that Mr. Griffiths was responsible, not being the owner of any real property, and therefore a proper person to be selected as assignee having the custody of considerable amount of means behalf of a large number of creditors.

It was broadly asserted by counsel for Mr. Reedall, a prominent creditor, that Mr. Griffiths' appointment was entirely due to his being the attorney for M. M. Bane, the Rev. Pierce, and that triumvirate had conspired to fraud the creditors of the defaulting parson.