

## MORE "PROOFS" AND DEAD ISSUES.

It is not worth while to follow the mendacious *Tribune* through another column and a half of stale fiction, seasoned with here and there a fact half told. It is of no use. The truth remains that the failing concern has injured the Territory and still seeks to injure it by its defamation of the majority of the citizens, and that it never retracts a falsehood but seeks to justify itself by telling more, or by recriminations upon those who expose its infamy.

Only one or two things in its vaporings of this morning are worthy of notice. Its perversions of history are mere repetitions of former fabrications with which the Salt Lake public are familiar. One item we will refer to is this: In attempting to prove that "an Apostle ordered the Chief of Police to take a prisoner from the United States Marshal," the *Tribune* says:

"It was told by a man who was then and is now, high in the Mormon council, to J. C. Young and by J. C. Young to us."

The simplicity with which the writer of these frequent, improbable stories presents, as proofs beyond dispute, a rumor started by some unnamed person, is ludicrous in the extreme. Sometimes it is "a reliable gentleman." Next it is "a truthful old woman." Then it is "a person of respectability." Now it is "a man high in the Mormon council," whatever that may mean. What is "the Mormon council," anyhow? As for the person who, the *Tribune* says, told the story to the editor, the very fact that the tale came from him, if it were a fact, would be sufficient to settle its value. But it is exceedingly doubtful if even he ever told any such a stupid yarn.

The *Tribune* is always unfortunate when it attempts to cite authority for its reckless assertions. And its lack of sense as to the value of evidence makes it a laughingstock among all legal and logical minds. "Somebody said so, and the story was brought to us, and that proves it is true." Is not that a firm foundation on which to build up a theory, or to rear a superstructure of conclusive deduction?

Of course the gang that controlled Murray approve of the course which cost him his office, for it was what they dictated. All the same, it was not only infamous but foolish. It was a terrible blunder as well as a piece of malignant wickedness. The *Tribune* virtually admits that his veto of the appropriation bill was in retaliation upon the Legislature because, it says, that body had "insulted him" and he "stood upon

his dignity." The insult was omitting to bend to his autocratic dictation—a *Tribune* echo. And his revenge did not affect the Legislature as a body, but did affect the whole Territory which was left without a dollar to meet its expenses. It killed Murray officially, the Territory managed pretty well with the help of some patriotic citizens, and having got rid of Murray it was that much better off. But the wrong intended was just as vile, and the *Tribune* gang that lured the Governor to his ruin are branded with their part of the shame.

As to the guns fired in the streets during the "Liberal" parade, it is useless for the *Tribune* to continue its denials, for nearly the whole town knows about the firing. But its "proof" that no such firing was done is as delicious as its conclusive evidence about the Chief of Police. "Any one the News may wish to send" may see some "toy guns made of wood," and this will prove that the Scott Zouaves did not fire any guns at the parade a year ago. *Quod erat demonstrandum.* More *Tribune* "logic;" more "reasoning like a philosopher!"

Would it not be better for the Territory and safer for the *Tribune* to abandon this continual raking up of old issues and defamation of the "Mormons," with its absurd citation of groundless rumors as authority for its hobgoblin and penny dreadful stories, and make the present prosperity and future glory of Utah the themes of its writers?

Its rejoinder may be, "why does the DESERET NEWS still harp upon these old strings?" To which we would reply: It is done in simple self-defense. We do not notice a tithe of the *Tribune's* misrepresentations, but when it takes advantage of our silence, becomes more than commonly mendacious, and construes that silence into acquiescence in its libels, we meet it squarely and confront it with facts. But we never borrow its methods by misstating its position, nor fall into its loose logic or its low scurrility. As sure as the progress of the times, dead issues will have to be buried and old hates with them, and papers that seek to carry them along will go speedily into the same grave.

## A STORMY CAREER.

AS ALREADY announced in this journal, on January 30, Charles Bradlaugh, member of Parliament for Northampton, departed this life. The cause of death was uremia.

Mr. Bradlaugh's position in England was rather a unique one, to say the least. In a country which reverences

royalty he was a republican, in a country which has always upheld religion of some kind, he was an atheist, and in a country and among a people which prizes the family and childhood above any other in the world, he was a Malthusian. It is little wonder that during a great part of his life he was an object of hatred and detestation to the typical, conservative Britisher.

He was born in Hoxton, London, on September 26, 1833. Owing to the poverty of his parents, he got little if any schooling. From childhood he was a politician. During the political excitement of 1847 and '48 he used to address street gatherings. While yet a young lad, and attending a Sunday School he satisfied himself that the 39 articles of the English Church were far from being founded on the four gospels of the New Testament. Though only 16 years of age he told the Bishop of London that the English Church was not apostolic. The young lad was then a messenger in a law office, in which his father was a clerk. The father, outraged at his son's infidelity, turned the lad out of doors.

For some time young Bradlaugh supported himself as best he could. Finally he enlisted as a soldier, and was assigned to the Seventh Dragoon Guards, then stationed in Dublin. His spare time he devoted to the study of Greek, Latin and Arabic. At first his companions treated him harshly, throwing his Latin grammar out of doors and making sport of him in various ways. Finally he thrashed one fellow so soundly that the others ceased their persecutions. In a short time he became a favorite with officers and men, and always championed the cause of a private when harshly treated. About 1853-54 he left the army, being enabled to purchase his discharge by means of a small legacy left him by a relative. On his return to London, he found his father dead, and his mother without means of support. He went to work in a law office, supported his mother, and took an active part in political and religious disputations.

In 1859 he was widely known as the editor of the *Investigator*. This failed, and about 1860 he started the *National Reformer*. This proved a financial success. As a lecturer and speaker he had some stormy experiences. He fought the Sunday-Trading bill, he defended the right of the people to meet in Hyde Park. He defended Bernard and Truelove against the French Government. He liked Mazzini but detested Napoleon the Third. He espoused the cause of the North against the South in our war of the rebellion. He was the prime mover in the Hyde Park riots of 1866, when the railings