

## EDITORIALS.

## LAWLESS VIOLENCE.

AMONG the recent acts of violence inflicted upon peaceable persons for no other offence than that they had either taught or embraced the faith of the Latter-day Saints, the Washington *Federalist* of July 30th has the following forcible editorial:

"A dispatch from Charleston, S. C., dated July 23, says that war on the Mormons had been renewed in that State near the Georgia boundary line the night before, and that Vigilants in York county, the Mormon stronghold, visited Richard Harkness, a prominent Mormon convert, tied him, and gave him 25 lashes and ten days to quit the country. It was also understood that the Mormon missionaries near Augusta, Ga., have been notified to emigrate within ten days, and in case they do not go a party of Vigilants will visit them and hang them. These South Carolina basconaters, denizens of the pine woods, should be taught a lesson if they attempt to carry their threats into execution. The Mormons have a right to be there if they choose to, and if these turbulent ruffians do not know that it is a gross violation of law for them to do as they propose, either to the Mormons or any other class, the proper authorities should not be slow in teaching them it. The Albany penitentiary is the right place for such men. It is the fault of our present system of government that outrages of this kind occur."

We will here repeat, for the benefit of uninformed persons, that the excuse offered by mobocrats that these "Mormons" either taught or practised polygamy, is utterly false and without foundation. "Mormon" missionaries do not proselyte on the basis of polygamy. They teach faith in Christ, repentance of sin, baptism for the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. Polygamy is not permitted by the "Mormon" Church among its converts outside of the gathering place of the Saints, nor there except in certain cases under strict regulations. The mobbings, murders and cruelties in the South, which some American editors have either applauded or condoned because inflicted upon "Mormons," were the result of sectarian bigotry, ignorance and intolerance and had no real connection with the doctrine or practice of plural marriage.

## THE HONORED DEAD.

IN contradistinction to those journals which draw their inspiration on "Mormon" affairs from a local anti-"Mormon" sheet which is nothing if not slanderous, the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* gives the following estimate of the character of the late President John Taylor which the aforesaid papers have endeavored to belittle:

"The Mormon Church of Utah has, within a week, lost the brainiest man among its leaders, and has been officially notified of the bringing of a suit to disincorporate the Church and to wind up its business. The death of President Taylor takes away from the polygamous Mormons an individual force potent in church councils and business affairs since the time of Joseph Smith, and it takes away from the polygamists that element of strength that came to them through Taylor's alleged martyrdom. There was a good deal, to the Mormon cause, in the personality of this man, who had been associated with the founder of the church in its early struggles, who shared the imprisonment of the "prophet" in Carthage jail, and who carried through life the bullet marks he received in defending Joseph Smith on the day he was killed by the mob. The fact that Taylor, armed only with a cane, faced the infuriated men who sought Smith's life and turned their rifles aside, was a something to fire the imagination of the Mormon children, and after the death of Brigham Young all such incidents in the life of Taylor were made the most of.

Taylor's wide experience, his fine personal appearance, his literary and oratorical ability (he was regarded the finest pulpit orator among the Mormon preachers), and his great age all contributed to make his enforced absence from Salt Lake City an element of strength to those who were urging the Utah Mormons to stand by polygamy."

The Baltimore *News* makes the following remarks on the decease of our beloved President:

"The death of John Taylor is a reminder of the severe retributive fate which seems to have pursued most of the great spirits of Mormonism. While the wicked undoubtedly sometimes prosper, yet vengeance often appears to descend upon them in this world. Joseph Smith was shot dead while imprisoned in jail, and Hyrum Smith, his brother, came to a similar end. Many others of the shining lights have been suddenly extinguished, and now Taylor dies in ignominy and exile. In his end in this melancholy fashion the Mormon chiefs remaining see an omen of the inevitable doom of their infamous imposition."

We can imagine similar remarks being made by unbelievers in former times. Most of the Prophets whose sayings are now treasured by profes-

sing Christians, came to a violent death or departed in "ignominy and exile." "Most of the great spirits" who pioneered the way of every religious movement that has been a potent force in this world, met with a similar fate. The great head and founder of the Christian faith died in the most ignominious manner known to his age, and to make his end more contemptible to the populace he was crucified between two thieves. His Apostles were pursued and punished in the same spirit and came to an untimely death. Those "shining lights" were "suddenly extinguished." Their end may be viewed as "an omen of the inevitable doom" of those who follow them in the teaching and practice of what their skeptical contemporaries denounced as an "infamous imposition."

The conclusion jumped at, then, that the treatment experienced by "the great spirits of Mormonism" was "retributive fate," is not warranted by the teachings of history nor the facts in present cases. When Joseph and Hyrum were "shot in jail" their murderers exclaimed, "Law cannot touch them but powder and ball shall." They had not broken the law, but they had incurred the hatred of evil men because they taught, with divine authority, doctrines which were in direct opposition to orthodox creeds and which were incontrovertible, and this enraged the professional sectarian preachers and their unreasoning dupes. And those leading spirits could not be made the tool of plundering politicians, so they became the objects of their malice and vengeance.

President John Taylor broke no law of the land. He lived within the law. His plural marriages were contracted before the Act of 1862, the first Congressional law on the subject was enacted. He conformed to the law of 1862 and therefore was not legally amenable to its penalties. He was pursued in the same spirit as that which murdered Joseph and Hyrum. The forms of law perverted to excuse his persecutors, were a prostitution of the law for the injury of the innocent. The plain and evident meaning and intent of the anti-polygamy laws have been ignored in the administration of the law as regards the "Mormons," and unprecedented, warped and contradictory rulings have been substituted. This, too, in the spirit of vindictiveness and hatred on the part of the law's representatives who, from bench and bar, with trembling anger and white-lipped passion have abused, insulted and labelled the helpless victims of their unlawful fury.

The "retributive fate" which must overtake the workers of iniquity, will come to the wretches who have thus wreaked vengeance upon the servants of God, going outside of the provisions of law to gratify their malice and their spite. It is as sure to come as the night when the sun goes down. Time is essential to the retribution of a just Justice. The tide will turn in its season and no human hand can stay it. The fate of the active persecutors of the Saints is foreboded by the many wrecks that line the shore of the immediate past. It will overtake them all as the years roll on.

"The Mormon chiefs remaining" are stimulated to do their duty, even unto death, by the illustrious examples of such men as Joseph and Hyrum Smith and John Taylor. They never faltered or flinched from any known duty or placed any personal consideration before it. They filled their missions and have gone beyond the reach of their enemies. And their associates who remain will persevere unto the end, regardless of the taunts of the scorners, the abuse of the libeller and the shafts of the would-be slayer of the just. And in the archives of eternity, on the same pages as stand inscribed the names of the prophets and benefactors and saviors of the race, now esteemed by the world but once despised and condemned, will appear the names of the seers and leaders of the latter-day dispensation, who lived for the truth, died in its defense, and won a martyr's crown, which will be their mark of honor throughout eternal ages.

## NO TEMPORAL INDUCEMENTS.

We have received a letter of inquiry from a gentleman residing in Lima, Ohio. He states that he has often thought he would like to join his interests with those of our people. He has heard our Elders preach, and asserts that he has now made up his mind to join the Church and come on to Utah. Following this declaration is an inquiry as to whether he could find here suitable employment by which he could make a living. This interrogation is followed by a description of his person and character.

As this is a sample of many similar letters which we receive and are expected to answer, that whatever reply we may have to offer may cover as much ground as practicable, we present it through these columns. A conclusion to take so serious a step as to make a covenant to serve God by identification with the Church of Christ should be based on an understanding of the truth of the principles of its faith and practice and a love for them, repentance of all sin being also an indispensable prerequisite. Every idea of securing temporal advantage from the step should be discarded. The

Gospel should be embraced, employment or no employment, prosperity or adversity, the disciple making every needed sacrifice for the sake of the truth. If our correspondent has heard the Gospel in its purity, it is his privilege and that of all others similarly situated, to yield obedience to its requirements and take cheerfully the consequences, which frequently appear in the shape of abuse, vilification, persecution, occasionally poverty and other inconveniences to match. No immediate temporal inducement is, or at least, should be held out to cause people to join the Church. The promise is simply that to those who "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness all things shall be added." During the intervening period pending the addition of the "other things," many perplexities, annoyances and discomforts may frequently be encountered. Our correspondent and others in a similar situation who are sincere in their efforts to learn and obey the truth have our heartfelt sympathy and best wishes for their success, but we can hold out no inducements or immediate hopes of a temporal character. Those who join the community simply in that regard cast in their interests with them and take their chances with the balance.

## THE TABLES TURNED.

A SHORT time since we published a New York *Sun* dispatch in reference to certain mobocratic dolings in Georgia. A band of Ku Klux, accompanied by a bright newspaper correspondent, went in search of the "Mormon" Elders with the intention of giving them a coat of tar and feathers and a notice to leave that part of the country within twenty-four hours. Elder G. S. Spencer was found. He addressed them in such a persuasive way that the whole gang marched off under cover of the woods.

We have received a clipping from another paper giving a similar statement of the affair and additional details. The sender of the extract informs us that the journalistic account was substantially correct. The correspondent who wrote it subsequently interviewed Elder Spencer and concludes his narrative as follows:

"I then left and went in search of the 'brave Ku Klux band' and found them some distance from the house lying in the woods. Not a man spoke as I joined them, but after walking some distance one of the party said, 'Well, I was willing to go, but nobody would follow me.' All of course then said they would have followed, and stated that they would catch him again. I reminded them that it was not yet too late, but not a man in the entire party of about fifteen had the spunk to return and carry out their purpose."

I am heartily ashamed of Richmond County for containing such a party of cowardly men, and think it would be an excellent idea for the Mormons to convert the Ku Klux and carry them to Utah. It would rid Richmond County of a crowd that she takes no pride in calling citizens. So long as the Mormons remain in the Wrightsboro locality they need not be interfered with, for they can make it no worse than it is."

Privately we learn that the correspondent has brought down upon him the wrath of the "regulators," who intimate that they will be avenged upon him for reflecting upon their courage.

## FOREIGN LAND OWNERSHIP.

IN the recently adopted Ohio Democratic platform, it is declared that all lands of the Government should be held for actual settlers who are citizens or who declare it to be their intention to become citizens. This gives special interest to the late reply of the Attorney General to the President in regard to the act of March 2d, 1887, which restricts—in the Territories—the ownership of real estate to citizens.

The following were the interrogations of the President:

"First—Was the act intended to apply, and does it apply to mines?"

"Second—Can aliens lawfully acquire, own and hold shares of stock issued by an American corporation which is the owner of mineral lands in the Territories?"

"Third—Would the advancement of money by aliens for the purpose of developing mining properties be lawful under the act?"

"Fourth—Can aliens lawfully contract with American owners for working mines or making any proper use of mineral lands for a term of years?"

The conclusions of the Attorney-General show that, according to his construction of the law, it will necessarily tend to cripple the mining industry. After giving his reasons he thus states them concisely:

"First.—As mines are real estate, or inheritable interests in real estate, the act does not apply to them."

"Second.—As stock in a corporation is personality, an alien can lawfully have, own and hold shares of stock issued by an American corporation which is now the owner of mineral lands in Territories; but if the holding by aliens exceeds twenty per cent,

such corporation can neither acquire, hold, own, or hereafter acquire real estate while more than twenty per cent of stock is held and owned by aliens."

"Third.—Under the act the advancement of money hereafter by aliens for the purpose of developing mining property is lawful, but no interest in the real estate can be acquired by such advancement, nor would an alien have the right to purchase the real estate nor any interest therein on a loan made since the passage of the act, even if sold on his own security or lien."

"Fourth.—Aliens may lawfully contract with American owners to work mines, by personal contracts for hire, or by bona fide leases, for a reasonable time."

## SAUCE FOR UTAH, GALL FOR WASHINGTON.

A GREAT deal of nonsense is being indulged in by the press over the case before the courts in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of the Edmunds-Tucker Act. It is strange to see the ignorance of every-day writers for the information of the public, upon matters with which they should be fully acquainted, before they attempt to instruct others. In nothing is this so manifest and widespread as upon anything that relates to Utah and "Mormon" affairs.

The general journalistic ignorance of "Mormon" doctrines and doings is not so surprising as their lack of information as to the secular aspects of this popular question. They think they understand all about "Mormonism" when they imagine the evils of polygamy, oblivious to the fact that the marriage tenets of the "Mormons" are not the hundredth part of the system. But they doubt surely to know something of the language and meaning of the laws which they seem so anxious to have enforced. Yet they do not comprehend the tenor and purpose of those laws, and therefore cannot realize how they have been perverted in the persecutions against the "Mormons."

But this case in the District of Columbia has stirred them up considerably. It is suddenly discovered that a law which they supposed was meant only to apply to the "Mormons" is probably applicable to other people in certain places. If they had read the law when it was passed by a howling mob in the House of Representatives, many of whom knew as little about it as these editors who have waked up to a dim perception of some of its provisions, they would have seen at once that certain penalties therein were likely to fall upon other than "Mormon" heads.

The original Edmunds Act—passed in 1882—against polygamy and unlawful cohabitation applies to any offender "in a Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction." The Edmunds-Tucker Act was amendatory of the Act of 1882. It provides penalties against adultery and fornication. These are recognized here as "Gentile" indulgences. Officers engaged in extreme measures against the "Mormons" have acknowledged that those crimes are rare among the "Mormons" and that our people are comparatively free from them. These new penalties were designed by the framers of the law to operate specially against the "Mormons," but they did not understand the situation nor perceive what a boomerang those provisions might prove to be.

If the District of Columbia is not a place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction," then there is no such place in the country. And the gravity with which editors will question the applicability of this law to the District of Columbia, shows that they are ignorant of its provisions. They are astounded that anybody but "Mormons" should be brought under its operations.

What seems to be the most objectionable feature to some writers, is the provision that punishes the unfortunate female who is partner with the male criminal in the crime of fornication. Of course they think it was all right if it could be applied only to "Mormons" living in plural marriage. But it is called "monstrous," "cruel" and "savage" as applicable to non-"Mormons" and in the District of Columbia. The peculiar logic and code of morals which seems to guide many of these writers amount to this: The "Mormons" practice their plural marriage system believing it to be right, therefore they ought to be punished without regard to mercy or any other consideration than the enforcement of the law. The "Gentiles" who indulge in illicit intercourse know that they are doing wrong, therefore they ought not to be punished by the laws that are applied to the "Mormons" and the woman ought not to be punished at all. Funny, isn't it? It is so much worse to do a thing believing it is right, than to do the same thing knowing it to be wrong!

The Washington case alarms a good many people in that virtuous city, and it perfectly dazes them to think that this anti-"Mormon" law can possibly apply to them. The following appears in the New York *Mercury*, and we copy it for the benefit of our readers who have not followed the vile case in the telegraphic dispatches. The *Mercury* calls it "Stretching the Anti-Polygamy Act." "That pious disciple of the ancient Puritans, Senator Edmunds, should

see that his anti-polygamic law is so amended as to consort with good sense and good morals. It was passed to wind up plural marriages in Utah, but the ruling of a Judge Montgomery, of the District of Columbia, applies it to that unfortunate piece of ground over which Congress lords it in Czarish fashion and in which our so-called statesmen meet. It seems that one Dr. Crawford, of the navy, and in charge of the Naval Hospital, who stands high in Washington society, social circles, victimized a young and beautiful girl named Eva White, the daughter of a corn doctor, who, according to technical lexicography, is a "chiroprapist." Of course the aristocratic Crawford thought it no great harm to ruin the prospects of a child of a corn doctor, although she was but thirteen years, yet seemingly from a physical appearance some sixteen years. The open threats of the girl's brother to shoot Crawford brought the seduction into court, and if the charge against the doctor be true he deserved to have been visited with summary punishment. The fact that his friends made efforts to compromise is a circumstantial evidence of guilt. Dr. Crawford is a Virginian, and in that State and in other Southern States he would have fared badly; for it is not likely the matter would ever have reached a court at all. To ruin the honor of woman is a great crime, and when extreme youth is forever dishonored the crime is not paralleled by the foulest murder. But the strangest part of the disgusting story is that Judge Montgomery holds that Crawford is amenable to imprisonment not exceeding six months or a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars under the Edmunds Utah anti-polygamy law! He regards the law in force in the District of Columbia because it is a Territory. Under the Edmunds law as now construed an unmarried woman can consent to undue intimacy at eighteen years! In the Crawford-White case the poor girl is as liable to indictment and punishment as the man who ruined her hopes for life, if the charges are maintained. Because the Utah law specifies as guilty both unmarried men and women. Can there be anything more cruel, and indeed savage? There be women like Miss Cooke, of Kentucky, who imitate the fabled Nemesis in dealing with men who degrade and abandon them. That betrayed young person married Colonel Sharp on the express condition that he would kill her betrayer, Beauchamp. Such a bargain could never have been made if the law had quickly reacted her case. It is a disgrace to Congress that the District of Columbia has no law to protect unmarried females, and particularly young girls, from male villainy, and that a judge has to fall back on a law made for the Mormons, and in which the innocent and the guilty are alike liable to fine and imprisonment."

## WHAT THE COURTS DEMAND OF "MORMONS."

IT has been told to the country, perhaps a thousand times, that all the "Mormon" people and their leaders who have been pursued by the millions of the law had to do to secure immunity, was to make a promise to obey the laws in future. This falsehood has been refuted so completely that every body of ordinary sense in these parts understands its untruthfulness. But it is still uttered and repeated for effect abroad. It is intended to deceive the press at a distance and prejudice the popular mind still more against the "Mormons." It is now vamped up anew to do duty against the late President Taylor, and offset the certain fact that he was hunted and hounded by spotter and informers, although it was well known he had not violated any law of the United States either recent or remote.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to throw light once again upon the deceptive statement and show what a willful lie it is. Our relation of the facts need not be taken alone. They are matters of record. They are beyond dispute. What "Mormon" defendants have been required to do, in order to free themselves from the penalties imposed, is to promise to obey the law as construed by the courts. That is quite a different thing to an agreement to obey the laws as enacted by Congress. At first sight the requirement may appear to be perfectly consistent. But when its meaning is brought out, every fair and impartial mind will pronounce it not only inconsistent but infamous.

The law "as construed by the courts" is an indefinite and unsettled thing. It has been construed in a dozen different ways to suit as many cases. In the raids that have been made to break up "Mormon" families and desolate "Mormon" homes, the ruling of one day as to the meaning of the term "unlawful cohabitation" has been reversed the next, and that has given place to a third and different ruling, which in turn has had to make way for another, and so on as the current construction failed to apply as desired by the prosecution in a fresh case. There has been no competent and settled judicial decision on this point. The only one formally given by the Supreme Court of the United States was afterwards withdrawn, so the matter has been left to the kaleidoscopic variations of the