

## EDITORIALS.

## "UTAH AND ITS PEOPLE."

A PAMPHLET with the above title has been published in New York by a "Gentile," who was formerly an official of the United States, and who has been in Utah, where he gained solid information about the Territory, and studied its people and affairs from an unbiased standpoint. He has collected statistics which speak volumes against the popular views on the "Mormon" question, and presents them with pointed arguments and logical deductions in a forcible and pungent manner.

Unlike those recent romancers who in popular magazines have endeavored to misrepresent the people of this Territory, the writer of this pamphlet does not picture Utah before the advent of the "Mormons" as an earthly Paradise, only waiting occupants to enjoy its rich and fertile valleys ready to blossom into fruit and flower, he truthfully describes it as "a barren desert," peopled by "a few naked Indians, making a meal from a pint of roasted crickets or dried grasshoppers," on "dreary wastes of alkaline plains and sage brush." He paints the change to "blooming orchards" with "pleasant cottages and comfortable homes," and argues that the work performed could not have been done by individual effort, but the "signal conquest over rugged nature" was "effected through the unifying element of a religious faith."

He then takes up the character of Joseph Smith, questions "whether a man was altogether a knave whose prophetic pretensions were first acknowledged by his most immediate relatives," and confesses that the stories told of the origin of "Mormonism" by its opponents are "equally miraculous as those related by the Saints themselves." He goes on to relate briefly the persecutions in Missouri and Illinois, the building of Nauvoo and the exodus therefrom, and then describes "Mormon growth and its spread throughout the nations of both hemispheres. He came to Utah, he says, in 1879, and having seen in the East "the slow disintegration of the Christian faith," he here gazed upon

A society presenting features as strange as if it had been the outgrowth of a different civilization; one in which an effort had been made to unite feeling, reason and activity, and have them alike converge to constitute a religion which should present a complete synthesis of life; a religion proceeding from the Protestant Church, accepting its fundamental dogmas, admitting in the same sense the right of private judgment, yet resulting in a social system that rivalled in power, in the development of social feeling and the curbing of that vice of Protestantism—individualism,—the Catholic Church in its palmy days. In a word, bringing into harmonious accord those heretofore conflicting elements, the individualism of the Protestant and the social unity of the Catholic Church.

He next touches on "Mormon Theocracy," and exhibits the democratic side of "Mormonism," speaks of the semi-annual conferences with the re-election of Church officers, shows that the head does not make any pretensions to infallibility, explains what is regarded as inspiration among the Saints, and says:

The Christian "wrestling in prayer" over a doubtful policy to pursue and taking his matured convictions as an answer thereto, is doing just what the Mormon does, and the clergyman who indulges in sarcastic references to Mormon faith in special "revelations," or Brigham Young's "impressions," is but re-mouthing the infidel argument which bears equally hard upon himself. On no other ground can the unity of Mormon leaders be explained, and the wonderful success attending Brigham Young's "impressions" was certainly not calculated to weaken faith.

Alluding to the statement that the "Mormon" leaders have established a "land monopoly," and to the false statements about the disposition of public lands by the Legislature, he says:

We hear occasionally of the Mormon legislature passing certain land laws in the past in the interest of Church aggrandizement. Before the country was opened up roads were necessary through certain canyons in the mountainous country, and, in the absence of any United States survey, laws were passed providing for such surveys and roads, without force save as they were subsequently adopted and approved by settlers. We must remember that it is only within 10 years that the residents of Salt Lake City could possess a title deed to his homestead, and that in view of the uncertainty as to title, and the prevalence of "jumping claims," action by the Legislature became a social necessity.

In brief, land is procured in Utah just as it is in any other Territory, and 95 per cent. of the Mormon population live in their own houses, on their own land, to which they hold deeds in their own names.

In refutation of the charge of Mormon illiberality, he cites the following:

Every religion by Mormon law is guaranteed the fullest protection, and their church edifices exemption from taxation. Brigham Young gave over one thousand dollars to the erection of non-Mormon churches in Salt Lake City. He gave five hundred dollars for this purpose to the Catholics, liberally to the Episcopal chapel, and a piece of ground to the Jews for a cemetery. When divines of reputation visit Salt Lake City they are offered the pulpit of the Tabernacle. When Dr. Newman, sometimes known as the Royal Chaplain, visited Utah, as a writer has wittily remarked, with six Hebrew roots carefully committed to memory, immediately on his arrival he donned his intellectual coat, and trailing its skirts before the Church, challenged a discussion of Bible polygamy. The Mormons have since published this discussion without comment as a Church document, and now this belligerent parson, smarting under defeat, rears himself on end, flaps his ears, and joins his cry to the anti-Mormon chorus. Yet immediately on his presence there being known, Brigham Young courteously tendered to him the pulpit of the Tabernacle for Sunday service!

Touching on the question of Priesthood, he shows that in the "Mormon" Church "every intelligent man is a priest and liable at any moment to be called upon for missionary work," and that at the meetings in the Tabernacle on the Sabbath, "perhaps a merchant, a manufacturer, or a professional man is called upon without previous notice to address the congregation." He passes on to the material prosperity of Utah, gives some interesting statistics and shows the financial condition of the Territory without bonded debt and yet with light taxes on fair valuations. Then follow some facts and figures which demonstrate the superiority of the "Mormon" over the "Gentile" population on the score of morality and the keeping to the law, some of which were quoted by President Taylor in his discourse on Sunday at the Conference, and will be published probably on Saturday, April 15th.

Co-operation is next treated upon with its results. Educational statistics are given showing that

Thus, in the matter of education, Utah stands ahead of many old and wealthy States, and of the general average of the United States in three very important respects, namely, the enrollment of her school population, the percentage of their daily attendance at school, and the amount per capita invested in school property.

Church and State are shown to be separate and distinct in Utah, and the author passes to the subject of polygamy, which he handles without fear, refuting many false notions respecting its practice, showing that intelligent and cultured women indorse the system, and that "Utah is the peer of any State in noble-minded women," and adds the following just tribute to the moral condition of the Territory, and to the character of our honored Delegate:

Here is a Territory having more males than females, yet public opinion, freely accepting polygamy as not only a divine institution, but in its effects carrying with it its own justification. Yet, living as we do, in respect to public morality, in glass houses, a Latter-day Saint whose honor and integrity it is impossible to doubt where he is known; a man before whom the obscene jest or lascivious expression would instinctively die on one's lips, and in whose face women would intuitively discern purity of character—George Q. Cannon—has offended our moral sensibilities! Our Christian people stand aghast at his temerity, in daring to claim a seat among our representatives at Washington, as if their character would be corrupted by association with a man who has hedged around his sexual relations with all the sanctity religious obligations can give! O temporal! O mortal!

Physiological and social reasons are given for plural marriage from the "Mormon" standpoint; the views of several educated "Mormon" ladies are cited in its support, and some of the common objections to it are shown to apply with equal force to marriage apart from polygamy. The writer adds the following concerning plural marriage as a religious principle:

It is a relation entered into by mutual consent, and neither moral nor physical degradation has followed its thirty years' trial. It is as much a tenet of faith as baptism by immersion, and held as a sacramental relation. Are we authorized to conclude that it is in any way violative of social duties, or subversive of good order?

Giving the Supreme Court a hard rub for its nonsense in attempting

to draw a comparison between Thuggism and widow-burning in India, which violate human rights, and polygamy in Utah which does nothing of the kind, he argues that "a decision of the Supreme Court is not accepted as a finality where a moral connection is believed to have been outraged," and declares that:

The Mormons shrink from a civilization that introduces the brothel with its advance guard, fills our papers with unmentionable advertisements, and makes of every city a sink of iniquity. A civilization that converts women to prostitution faster than it does to Christian life, fills our ears with clerical scandals and our criminal courts with "Christian" defaulters; that elevates Restellism into a social institution, and leads to a prevalence of feticide and infanticide which, if its extent were known as only physicians know, might well fill us with horror and dismay.

The concluding portion of the pamphlet, which contains forty-eight pages, summarizes many of the conclusions deduced from the preceding facts and arguments, but we have no further space for quotations except for the following, which we commend to the consideration of the thoughtful everywhere:

We have learned to tolerate the religious heretic—in law, at least—but not the social heretic, and the Mormon problem brings before us a test which will try our boasted liberality to the utmost. When we, as a people, go 2,000 miles to deny the right of self-government because the latter, not the spirit of law permits it; when we deprive citizens of the right of franchise for acts of which those interested do not complain but indorse, and which involves no moral criminality; when we do this to a people upon whose moral character the only blot is in the non-Mormon portion, we strike a blow at the American idea of liberty and toleration that might well arouse Thomas Jefferson from his tomb.

The work is unique as well as interesting. It bristles with good points, and is a fair statement of the "Mormon" side of a public question by a "Gentile" who has held a Federal office. It should gain a wide circulation, and will have the effect of correcting much prejudice and many incorrect notions about Utah, which have been formed through the misrepresentations of the designing. "Utah and Its People" is a valuable pamphlet, and its author is deserving of great credit for the literary ability displayed in the work, as well as for his candor and courage in the defence of a maligned and unpopular community.

## THE GOVERNOR'S IMMORAL TEST OATH.

A GENTLEMAN residing in this city considers that we did Governor Murray an injustice in our article of April 11th, touching upon the oath which the Governor now requires all officers to take who apply to him for commissions. We would not intentionally do an injustice to any one, and would much rather have it in our power to speak favorably of the acts of the Executive of this Territory than find it necessary to complain of them. If we say anything of the official doings of the Governor in the least unjust or incorrect, we shall be willing at any time to retract and set the gentleman right before the public. Let us see if in this instance we have erred or indulged in improper criticism.

Governor Murray requires officers applying for commissions to take the annexed oath, a few words of which we put in italics, because they contain the gist of the objection which we entertained and expressed:

TERRITORY OF UTAH, } ss.  
County of \_\_\_\_\_

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am not a bigamist or polygamist; that I am not a violator of the laws of the United States, prohibiting bigamy or polygamy; that I do not live or cohabit with more than one woman in the marriage relation, nor does any relation exist between me and any woman which has been entered into or continued in violation of the said laws of the United States prohibiting bigamy or polygamy.

Subscribed and sworn to before me—  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ A.D. 188—

The gentleman who complained that we were unjust could not deny that this oath is required by the Governor, but claimed that the requirement is not new; that it was not made since the passage of the Edmunds bill nor for conditions growing out of that measure. To this we reply that we have not claimed that the earth was either new or old, framed in relation to the Edmunds bill or otherwise. Reference to the article in question will show that. It is stated that the oath was copied from the Willets bill and has been in use here for some time.

But the question of time or of origin is altogether extraneous. What matters who originally concocted the thing or how long it has been in use? The Willets bill is not a law. The objection is not to its age or its author, it is to its inherent infamy and its "premium on immorality." As to its previous existence, we have not been in ignorance. In our issue of February 4th, 1881, just fourteen months before drawing attention to it again, we published the same oath, word for word, showing that it was required of persons applying for commissions as notaries public. It is not any better because it is a year or two old than if its age was only one or two months or one or two days.

It is a requirement not authorized by any law. It is a piece of assumption on the part of the Governor, as illegal as the issue of the fraudulent certificate as to the election of Delegate, which now stands condemned by the whole country. Governor Murray commenced this oath business with notaries public; but now demands it of all officers requiring commissions from him. He cannot point to any statute, either of the United States or of this Territory, which gives him the shadow of a right to require this oath. If it be claimed that the Edmunds bill provides that no bigamist, polygamist or person cohabiting with more than one woman shall be eligible to office, we answer that neither the Edmunds bill, nor any other bill, makes the Governor of Utah the judge of the qualifications of any person for any office whatever. His business is to commission those who are elected or appointed to certain offices. And the law of Congress in relation to his duties says that, "He shall commission all officers who are appointed under the laws of the said Territory." It is not his business to sit in a judicial capacity. He is merely to issue a commission to persons appointed. If he refuses to issue a commission to an appointed officer, under any such pretext as omission to take the oath, which he has in his presumption concocted or adopted, he should be compelled by mandamus to perform his sworn duty. This "one man power" is exercised in his case with an arrogance and stretch of authority that is beyond the limits of proper endurance. It is time that he should be taught a lesson that he can understand. The verdict of Congress and the country upon his extra-official course in the certificate matter does not seem to be sufficient. Perhaps the judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction might help him to comprehend the bounds of his office and to remain within them, where he is much of a gentleman and displays qualities to be admired.

But if Governor Murray imagined that the Edmunds bill justified him in requiring an oath from applicants for commissions, why did he insert the words "in the marriage relation" in that portion referring to cohabitation with more than one woman? That is an interpolation. The new law does not confine the offence aimed at to cohabiting with more than one woman "in the marriage relation." It applies to such cohabitation irrespective of marriage. But Governor Murray's oath would exclude from office a man cohabiting with two women in the marriage relation, and admit a man cohabiting with any number of women so long as he was not married to them or either of them. If this is not a "premium on immorality" what is it? And if it is, wherein were our strictures unjust?

Let us look at this oath a little closer. The applicant is required to swear that he is not "a violator of the laws of the United States prohibiting bigamy or polygamy." He may be a violator of any other law of the United States or of the Territory. He may be a murderer, a thief, an adulterer, a whoremonger, a swindler, a drunkard, a gambler, a violator of the revenue laws, a trampler upon any and every statute, rule, regulation or obligation, so long as he has not married more wives than one and does not live with them in the marriage relation. How much morality is there in this? If Governor Murray has any shadow of excuse for requiring an oath at all, why does he confine it to one special thing, and leave out all the crimes and offences which are dangerous to society and subversive of good government? The reason is obvious, there is no need to say anything about it.

We point to the Governor's action in this particular as another of the many proofs that those who make such a terrible outcry against "Mormon" plural marriage on the

pretense of regard for the public morals, are merely trying to humbug the country. They care nothing about morality. They are willing that the most corrupt scoundrel on earth shall vote and hold office so long as they can exclude a "Mormon" from the polls and from official position, who would perish before stooping to the acts of which many of his accusers are guilty. That oath ought to be published to the ends of the earth.

## A FRIGHTFUL POWER.

THE Eureka (Nevada) Sentinel has the following sharp remarks on the recent measure to wrest the government of this Territory from the people and place it in the hands of a few individuals who are anxious to control its affairs and handle its finances:

"The law of Congress enables five men and their agents to be selected in a great measure on account of their hostility to the people concerned, to punish as for crime, by disfranchisement, the whole population, or any portion of it, without presentment, indictment, trial or conviction. This is a frightful power. In the hands of the wisest and best of men, it could not be exercised without the infliction of the grossest wrong; and in the hands of such as are likely to have it here, the possible abuses cannot be contemplated without deep concern. The five men not only determine who shall vote, but they canvass the returns and declare the result according to their pleasure. The avowed object of all this is to procure a Legislature composed exclusively of alien adventurers to deal with the people and property of the long settled and wealthy Territory. The bill will accomplish this. It may give up Utah to pillage; it may subject a vast amount of tempting property, slowly accumulated by the patient toil of the fanatics, to spoliation or destruction, and it may put a stop to many profitable industries, which have heretofore enjoyed the protection of honest government, while it is to be feared that it will produce no effect whatever upon the practice of polygamy unless possibly to confirm or increase it."

## A CYCLE OF EARTHQUAKES.

THE New York Sun has the following on the numerous shakings and convulsions of Mother Earth, which have lately caused commotion and disaster:

"The recent terrible earthquake in Costa Rica recalls again the fact that we are now witnessing one of the most remarkable periods of terrestrial disturbance that has ever been recorded."

The fact that we hear of so many minor earthquakes, more tremblings and shakings which cause more or less alarm without doing much damage, may be owing to the system of observation that has recently been adopted. The study of earthquake phenomena as a special branch of science is comparatively new, and the men who have established what may be described as earthquake observatories, or rather observing stations, at various points on the globe do not allow any tremor of the ground, however slight, to go unnoticed.

But besides the many slight shocks that have been felt in almost every country, there have been within a year or two, several destructive earthquakes, the like of which the world, fortunately, does not frequently see. In November, 1880, occurred the great earthquake shock at Agram. About a year ago in this same month, Casamicciola was destroyed. A month later followed the still more terrible disaster at Chios. Shocks of less intensity were felt at times at both Agram and Chios during the whole of last year, and the disturbance has not even yet ceased altogether.

It was hardly to be expected that the Central American countries, crowded with volcanoes and forming one of the great centres of earthquake commotion, would escape shaking, and the recent disaster in Costa Rica is, therefore, not a matter of surprise. More than a year ago there was evidence of the struggle of internal forces in that region when the surprising phenomenon of a small volcano bursting out of the middle of a lake was witnessed at Ilopango in San Salvador.