

EDITORIALS.

THE EX-ATTORNEY AND THE EX-MARSHAL.

Two weeks ago the *Denver Republican* contained a mess of slop from the notorious George C. Bates, with a small contribution from the woman he married (?) in this city without minister, judge, justice, witness or ceremony. The poor old broken-down limb of the law managed to impress the editor of the *Republican* with the idea that he had been a person of some importance, and had obtained possession of "Mormon" secrets never before disclosed, and his drivel was published in *extenso* as veritable history.

Among other romancing the poor creature made up a story about John D. Lee and Mountain Meadows, "Mormon" endowments, &c., which the reporter eagerly received. But as it reflected quite as severely upon the United States officials who had charge of the Lee trial and execution as upon the late Presidents Brigham Young and George A. Smith, the libel was not long left without response. Our people are so accustomed to being defamed that they pay little attention to such stories, but others are not so indifferent. On the 8th inst a letter appeared in the *Republican* from ex-Marshall Nelson which we here copy complete:

"The *Republican*, in its spirit of fair play, and to give every side a hearing, publishes the following from Mr. William Nelson, who was United States Marshal at the time John D. Lee was tried and executed. The *Republican* accepted Mr. Bates' story as true, and if true, saw in it much of interest and value. The question is now one of veracity between Mr. Nelson and Mr. Bates, and we will allow them to fight it out."

SALT LAKE CITY, May 3, 1882.

To the *Denver Republican*:

In your issue of the 30th ult. I see a lot of very extraordinary and very false gossip, respecting the trial and execution of John D. Lee, with Geo. C. Bates given as authority for the same. Being one of the Federal officials so unjustly assailed, I wish to enter a general denial of the whole purport and tendency of the article, which was grounded entirely on personal malice. It is not true that the Federal officials or either of them, by pledge of respite, pardon or otherwise, ever asked or tried to induce John D. Lee to make a confession. He was at liberty to have made a full confession at any time, but no inducements were ever pledged to him. It was impossible to have done so in advance of knowing what he would confess. The only confession he ever made was to his attorney, W. W. Bishop, of Kureka, Nevada, who wrote it partly at Lee's dictation in prison, and the contents of this were unknown to the officers, as lawyer and client conferred privately. The autobiography, in so far as Lee had time to complete it, was written in the penitentiary near this city, and was furnished by me to Bishop exactly as it was written. Bishop published the autobiography and confession in a book, which can be found on sale anywhere, and which shows the facts and the agreement between Lee and his attorney as to the proceeds. No portion of any of this was suppressed or sold to Brigham Young; this whole transaction being strictly between Lee and his attorney, and being carried out in entire good faith, as I am satisfied the latter will cheerfully testify at any time.

The statement that "Brigham Young determined that Lee must be tried again," is absurd; the case was on the docket, and was necessarily tried, as any other deferred case has to be, without reference to Brigham Young or any outside parties.

It is not true that on his final departure for Beaver, Lee bought seeds to take to Colorado for planting. There was no thought of any such thing in his mind, and no reason there should be. His case had been decided adversely to him in the Territorial Supreme Court, and he was being taken back to the Second District Court for re-sentence, pursuant to the mandate of the higher tribunal.

Lee never talked to any of his executioners, and didn't know who they would be; none of them ever told him or anybody else that the guns were loaded with blank cartridges. The grave was dug at or near the place of execution for Lee, and his body was not buried there or in that vicinity, nor by any official.

I do not believe that Lee's wife Rachel ever went to Bates' office with a proposition for confession and subsequent respite and pardon; there is no reason why she should have gone to him, for he had nothing to do with the case, on either side; if she wanted to make a proposition of that kind she would surely have gone to the Governor, or somebody who had authority in the matter. The pretended aid rendered by Bates at the second trial of Lee is entirely fictitious.

The statement about Sumner Howard faking the endowment robes of Lee, and his saddle, bridle, etc., is wholly untrue. Howard got none of them, and Lee didn't have any saddle or bridle, that I ever heard about, and if he had been in possession of anything of the kind I would have known, as I had him in custody more than a year.

I believe I have thus categorically denied every material allegation of fact in the article, and this denial can be fully substantiated. As to matters not denied of my own knowledge, I believe each and every one of them to be untrue.

It is all very well for Mr. Bates to air his silly self-importance and vanity by a lot of absurd and false gossip, but you, Mr. Editor, might well have paused before circulating such scandalous and baseless charges against anybody on such worthless authority.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM NELSON.

The truth is that the Lee trial

demonstrated the falsehood of the long held and widely repeated theory of the complicity of the "Mormon" leaders in the awful crime committed at the Mountain Meadows. Sumner Howard, the United States District Attorney, freely acknowledged this. The evidence established it. But the old story had served so well its purpose that the enemies of the "Mormons" cannot afford to let it remain buried, though killed beyond doubt at the trial of the assassin Lee. Anything that gives promise of its resuscitation is therefore laid hold of with avidity, and those who love lies in preference to the truth rejoice at the slenderest prospect of its rising.

The "question of veracity" between Bates and Nelson would not remain an open one where they are both known. The writer of the foregoing reply in the *Republican* is not regarded with any great favor by the "Mormon" people, but the word of the befuddled ex-Attorney would not stand the ghost of a chance in contradiction of the statement of the ex-Marshall. The refutation of Bates' rhodomontade though referring specially to a portion of his falsehoods, may be considered as applying to the whole. It is a mess of trash—untruth mingled with vanity and bombast. Not long since the same half-demented victim of alcoholism communicated one of the most atrocious pieces of nastiness to one of the *Denver* papers that has ever appeared in slander of the "Mormon" people. It was too vile for reproduction. Any person who has sunk so low as to utter such filthiness and attempt to fasten it upon a people like those who have built up this Territory, must have a heart steeped in corruption and be lost to all sense of shame and decency. If the *Republican* has any self-respect it will let the scandal-loving sot severely alone. Let him drift down to the doom which awaits the wilful liar and the slave of vice.

McMILLAN THE MENDACIOUS.

The people of Utah are familiar with the name of McMillan. Not because the person bearing it has ever done anything extraordinary, but in consequence of his figuring in a fiction which has been widely copied, about an attempt to assassinate him in Sanpete. He is a Presbyterian preacher of the ordinary kind, but circumstances have given him opportunities for a little brief distinction. The story which we allowed to be repeated, acknowledging its falsity in private to the "Mormons," but never contradicting it in public to the "Gentiles," was not original. As we have previously shown, it was but a Presbyterian plagiarism of a Methodist myth, concocted by one Lyford, who gleamed dimly for a very short period as a preacher at Provo, but whose light went out suddenly after he had made the begging tour of the east now common to his tribe.

We have heard of McMillan's using this falsehood about carrying a Bible in one hand—or pocket—and a pistol in the other, as necessary companions to a missionary career in Utah, but have understood that he denied on his return having repeated it while away. But we have caught him at it this time. The *Denver Republican* gives a long report of a discourse delivered by him in the Central Presbyterian Church of the Colorado capital, on Sunday evening, April 31st. The object, it is needless to say, was a fat collection, or to use his own expression, the Rev. Hays, the pastor in charge, used him and his "Mormon" romance "as a cat's-paw to pull money out of the pockets of the people."

He was introduced to tell "the story of Mormonism by a man who carried the Cross into the camp of the Danites in the face of Christ, and preached the Gospel of Death with his hand on his pistol." What a taking announcement! We do not propose to follow the reverend romancer through the tortuous windings of his imaginative and mendacious harangue, but will make a few extracts therefrom, that the people of Sanpete—the reporter got it Sand Creek—may know of his doings and that the Utah public may be satisfied as to his baseness.

After mingling up a small modicum of truth with a great deal of falsehood about "Mormon" doctrine, "blood atonement," the "theocratic principle" and so forth, he said: "Each movement is watched and

guarded, and the church agents know every egg, chicken, vegetable and pig that a man owns. A man may be surprised by the Bishop arising in the pulpit and denouncing him for his insubordination. Then he pronounces a curse on the man's crops, that they might wither away. Then he shuts off the victim's water supply for irrigating purposes, and the curse, of course, comes to pass. The water and everything is under the control of the Bishop, and if a man attempts to flee from the curse and leave the country, he leaves his life."

Referring to the endowment, about which he knows as much as a donkey knows of the solar system, he remarked concerning the Saints:

"They are first taught that their first duty is to the Mormon church. If they take an oath outside the church they are taught to break it if it conflicts with the church, and this is the reason a Mormon cannot be brought to justice."

"Suppose," he said, "that John Smith should commit a terrible crime in Colorado, and should fly to Utah—I use the name Smith as it will probably not touch any one here—and John should become a good Mormon, go through the Endowment House and receive a new name, and stand in with the priests. When John died, and the angel should call out John Smith, accusing him of having committed these crimes, there would be no John Smith to answer for them as John would have dropped his name when he put off the flesh." [Laughter.]

In the Endowment House a woman is also given a new name, but this she must tell to her husband, and if he happened to forget it she can never rise up from the grave, nor can she rise if he does not call her. Their future life all depends upon their husbands."

Passing on to his residence in Sanpete, he declared that he went there "in face of warnings that he was perilling his life." He said, "There were in this valley 20,000 Mormons and only one Gentile, a sewing machine agent." He was invited to preach in the church there and accepted. But "after the sermon they began on him, and one after another denounced him." Then Brigham Young came down and, according to McMillan, "denounced him, and the town for allowing him to come in, using violent and profane language and defying the Government." The consequence was an assault on the speaker's house, when he "forgot he was a minister and thought only of his revolver," and valorously drove away his assailants.

"An adventure was related where the Mormons threatened the speaker at Ephraim, but he talked back and talked shooting. At the meeting which took place he was advised not to speak, but to plead illness. He asked the Bishop to go on the platform and announce to his friends that he was ready. He was armed and intended if there was trouble during the services to draw his revolver and hold the Bishop as a hostage. And so for seven years he wandered up and down the valleys until to-day they have thirty-three schools, eleven churches, sixteen missionaries and by the grace of God they will continue in the work until the Mormons will fear the Christian woman with her Bible more than the law or Congress."

The fighting preacher closed his discourse by a brief plan for the settlement of the "Mormon problem."

He would have Congress to govern Utah as the District of Columbia is governed. The speaker closed by asking for the prayers and aid of his hearers. He believed the dawn was near.

Just think of the hypocrite, after uttering the falsehoods set in solid type above, asking for "the prayers of the people" he had been deceiving for an hour for the purpose of "pulling money out of their pockets!" If there has been any doubt among the folks in this region as to the mendacity of this preacher, it must now be completely dispelled. To liken him to Ananias would be a libel on the man struck dead for lying. It is useless to expose him to the "Christian" public of the East, for they look for just such tales as he has to tell about the "Mormons," but he will be known here now for what he is. And one of the plainest proofs that his stories of danger among the "Mormons" are utterly without foundation, is the fact that he can return among the people whom he has been maligning abroad,

and not a voice nor a hand will be raised to do him injury. Let him fill up the measure of his meanness and pass, as he will, into oblivion and finally into the place prepared for them who love and make a lie.

WATCH THEIR CAREER.

PUBLIC men who step out of the line of their duty to make a special onslaught upon the "Mormons" generally come to grief. Give them time enough and disgrace, oblivion or death is their doom. They never prosper long. The experience of half a century has proven this to the satisfaction of those who have watched and waited. We have no doubt that the future will correspond with the past in this particular. Haskell of Kansas, Edmunds of Vermont, Cassidy of Nevada, and others who have thought to gain favor and renown by figuring as prominent anti-"Mormons," will seek to shine and strive for position; but clouds they never dreamed of will come up to obscure their firmament, and stumbling blocks they never calculated upon will trip their feet on the way to expected eminence.

Among these latest candidates for glory on the anti-"Mormon" platform is Speaker Kelfer. To his unjust, unprecedented and indefensible rulings may be attributed much of the wrong done to Utah in the present Congress. He commenced his career as Speaker by playing into the hands of the plotters who had determined on depriving Utah of representation, and he has continued in the same kind of game. The following from an eastern exchange expresses the feeling with which he is already regarded, even among members of his own party:

"The most offensive blockhead in conspicuous public place to-day is undoubtedly the Speaker of the national House of Representatives. He was chosen to his place by a political intrigue of a disreputable character, in the face of the fact that he was without qualification to discharge his duties. His first action in office was shamelessly to pack the committees of the House to gratify those who had carried out the scheme of his election; and in doing this he not only sacrificed fairness towards his fellow-members, but he seriously interfered with the interests of the government. Since then he has pursued a constant course of bull-headed blundering, varied occasionally by a worse demonstration."

Senator Edmunds is well understood to have an eye on the presidential chair. His ambition is gaining notice, but not in the way that he desires. He has not only posed as a "Mormon"-eater, but has a view to popularity, but has been strutting as a war orator, with the intention of firing the heart of the North with the old animosities against the South. But the *New York Times*, the organ of his own party, sits down upon him effectually, says "every man in his senses knows better" than to endorse such nonsense as Edmunds has uttered, and declares that "the old rebel States cannot do without us, and persistent nagging at communities with whom we are indissolubly bound savors neither of statesmanship nor common sense."

If all the ambitious assailants of this God-fearing community do not reap the fruits of their folly and sin, in trampling upon constitutional principles to gain the applause of the multitude, it will be because history has ceased to repeat itself. Watch their career and behold their fate!

JOSEPH SMITH, OF PLANO, AS AN ANTI-MORMON.

At one of the anti-"Mormon" meetings held in Chicago during the excitement that preceded the final passage of the Edmunds bill, Joseph Smith, son of Joseph the Prophet, addressed the audience. We present herewith a report of his speech as it appeared in the *Chicago Tribune* of February 23rd, as we think that it should be placed on record, and that the Latter-day Saints should be made acquainted with the fact that the leader of the so-called "Reorganization" is allied with the enemies of his father, and of the Church which was organized by that martyr for the truth, and that he is in league with those who

counsel violence as the proper means of settling the "Mormon" question. He would have force applied where argument fails; and although possessed of positive information, proving beyond the possibility of a doubt that his lamented father introduced and practised the system of plural marriage now held by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, he still, in the spirit of a lawyer and against the spirit of a gospel teacher, technically disputes and virtually denies his father's connection with that principle and attempts to attribute its origin to Brigham Young.

The most atrocious thing in the speech is the vile and filthy falsehood about the contamination of women by "Mormon" Bishops. It is a lie the blackness of which cannot be painted. No one but a depraved and corrupt being, whose conscience is seared as with an iron heated in the infernal pit, could utter such calumny. It is hard to believe that one who knows something of the sanctity which attaches to the relations of the sexes in this Church, could descend so low in the scale of mendacity as to utter such a gross and uncalled-for libel upon "Mormon" men and women.

Thus this man not only seeks to deceive the public upon an important point, and, as will be seen from his address, attempts to misinterpret the teachings of the Book of Mormon on this subject, but he descends to the level of the liar and defamer, and joins in an endeavor to bring trouble in not destruction upon the people who live but to carry out the revelations of God received through his father as the mouthpiece of heaven.

He was introduced as "Bishop Smith" by Hon. John Wentworth—a nice specimen of Chicago morality—as "a man who has suffered more in the cause to be discussed than any other man on the face of the earth." It would have greatly puzzled Wentworth or any other man to show wherein "Bishop Smith" had suffered anything whatever in that cause. Here is the report of the speech:

"With a few introductory remarks, Bishop Smith said the question whether Congress may or may not pass such laws for the suppression of polygamy as will have effect and be equal to the emergency which seems to exist, is one that is engrossing the earnest thought of the nation. One reason why Congress has not taken hold of the question before is doubtless through fear of antagonizing that principle in the Constitution which guarantees to every citizen the liberty of religious thought and action. There has been a well defined reluctance to interfere with polygamy on that account. The question is being more clearly understood of late, however, and the law-makers and people are looking at the problem in a different light. The Constitution provides that the State shall not establish a religion, and gives to the people the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, but it was never designed that this provision should be used by any sect to protect its members from the consequences of a violation of laws that have been framed for the protection of public morals and the social fabric. Congress has dealt with the polygamists with excessive tenderness."

It is quite true that Congress should not be permitted to prescribe or proscribe any form of religion, but law-breakers should not be given immunity from punishment for the commission of crimes under the assumption that the criminal conduct is a form of religion. The development of our country and the advance of civilization have brought about several very important changes in what were esteemed for a long time to be principles sacred from popular interference or question. The first of these was the question of state rights; the second was the right of secession, and the third was the right to own slaves. These questions have one after another met the arbitrament of time. Polygamy will follow.

There is one very important feature in this question it might be well for Congress to consider, and that is the fact that polygamy is not a tenet of the Mormon religion. Polygamy was no part of the Book of Mormon, and had no place in the creed of the Saints until after the departure of the Mormons from Illinois. It was not until 1852 that polygamy was attempted to be introduced in the teachings of the church. Its introduction was a shameless trick of wicked men, who were obliged to find an excuse to