

## EDITORIALS.

## "COWARDS" AND "SCOUNDRELS."

THE New York Post publishes a private letter from a gentleman in this city who, that paper says, "has unusual means of knowing what is going on" here and is "a man of good sense and judgment, and is not partisan." Here is the portion of his letter which appeared in the Post:

"I believe I would know as soon as anybody if there were to be trouble here, my relations with both Mormons and Gentiles of influence being such as to give me knowledge of much of the 'inside' business of all parties, and I can assure you that nobody in Utah, apprehended or apprehends any trouble of the character indicated in the telegrams from the East. The people of the country have been imposed upon by some malicious persons here (Federal officials I fear). There may be an occasional street fight between two roughs or a couple of fanatics, like the unfortunate affair between Deputy Marshal Collin and the young Mormon, McMurrian, neither of whom sought the collision, but both of whom were ready and willing for it to take place. The Mormons are not going to fight, though some of their enemies would like to excite them into making a demonstration of violence. The Saints are fanatical, but they are not fools. They know what a show of resistance to the authority of Government would mean. It was different twenty-five or thirty-five years ago, when the 'Kingdom of God' was a thousand miles from the nearest neighbor, and there were no railways covering the distance. Besides, Brigham Young was above ground in those days while now only John Taylor is here.

"You may set it down as true, and stick to it, that there will be no fighting between Mormons and Gentiles, except in individual cases, as might occur in any community; that both Gentiles and Mormons are as safe here now as they have been at any time in twenty-five years; that an 'outbreak' by the Mormons is simply out of the question, and that matters here are more quiet now than they were a year ago, when the enforcement of the Edmunds law was begun."

We do not believe there are twenty persons in this city who would deny the foregoing statements, except perhaps to dispute the remark concerning McMurrian and Collin, that "neither sought the other." Opinion is divided on that matter. It is thought by some that McMurrian intended to assault Collin; we do not believe that any one seriously entertains the belief that there was any intention to kill Collin. So far as the evidence has gone, the writer of the above letter is in the right. McMurrian's signed deposition, fully supposed by him and everybody around to be an anti-mortem statement, was that he ran against Collin in the dark, struck at him and received two bullets in his body in return, and that no one was with him.

Collin, it is said, has made some statements to the effect that other men were in the lane at the time of the collision, but this statement has not been made in court, or in public in any way, and at present does not count. What purports to have been his statement has appeared in the Tribune of this city, but the various and conflicting assertions in that unreliable and vicious sheet only cause confusion in the public mind, and cast doubt upon the whole supposed Collin side of the question.

The Tribune has repeatedly stated that McMurrian had a club and that this was found where he lay. This appears to be a fabrication. It stated first that "five shots were fired," then that "more than a dozen were fired." It made up a very mysterious story about a hat which was picked up. When it learned that this was McMurrian's hat, it started the yarn that three hats were found and proceeded to elaborate more dark and bloody insinuations. And its latest invention is that "two other men were wounded in the same place and that they are both devout Mormons, and one of them a high officer in the Church."

And the mendacious sheet which hatches up these falsehoods and seeks with them to inflame the public mind abroad against the "Mormon" people, has the temerity to attack the above temperate and truthful letter and assail the writer in its common libelous and blackguard manner. We hope the gentleman, whoever he may be, will take the Tribune's abuse as a compliment, as other intelligent "Gentiles" have when they have been assailed by the daily libeler for not falling into line under its dirty lash.

The Tribune, in the article alluded to, gives what it claims to be "the full purport of the dispatches sent by the Governor," which deceived President Cleveland and caused such a commotion in military circles. Here is the "full purport":

"That there had been an attempted murder, that it, coupled with a whole train of facts extending over months, showed the extreme bitterness of the Mormon people caused by the enforcement of the Edmunds law; that in this excitement a street fight would be liable to precipitate a riot; that the entire constabulary of the Territory was in Mormon hands; that the Marshal would

be entirely helpless to resist a riot, and asking that a small contingent of troops might be stationed in this city and that the Commander of Fort Douglas might have such orders as would enable him to act with promptness, in the event of trouble simply to protect public property, and the lives of peaceable people before they should be strangled with red-tape."

These dispatches have been called for repeatedly. The Governor's organ gives the foregoing as their "full purport." Why not publish the dispatches themselves? A Tribune garbling doesn't count with the public. They know its tricks too well. This attempt to soften down a deliberate plot to make disturbance here and to bring the Territory under martial law, will not satisfy the people who have been grossly misrepresented to the Government. Everybody here knows that there was not the slightest reason to anticipate a dangerous outbreak. The statement in the Post on that point is absolutely correct.

The Tribune says the Governor's dispatches were "endorsed by the best citizens in this city." That is another Tribune falsehood. Trot out their names! Let us know who are the "best citizens." For every one who endorsed the dispatches prompted by craven cowardice or scheming malignity, or both, we can point to a hundred of as good citizens as can be produced who will affirm to the contrary. And the failure of the Governor or any of the "best citizens" to bring forward a single fact or person to corroborate their sensational dispatches, when challenged or requested to do so in a public meeting of the civic authorities, is a sufficient disproof of their telegraphic alarums.

On investigation every assumed incident to justify those dispatches turned out to be a lie. They were so groundless that even the Tribune had to admit, when challenged as to its bogus sensations, that they were only "street rumors." And yet that mendacious sheet, reckless as to its own disproof of its own assertions, still tries to justify those dispatches and to make it appear that "the Gentiles here have never had protection for life or property from Mormons ready to start out with fire and sword."

The untouched presence for years of that infamous receptacle for the gatherings of press scavengers, the slanders of depraved wretches, the filthy jests of ribald lechers, the blasphemies of infidels and the tricks which priests and perjurers utter against individuals and the community, is a standing testimony to every sane mind who knows anything of the facts, that all rumors of danger to obnoxious Gentiles from the "Mormon" people are groundless and absurd.

The Tribune, in pouring a peck of filth upon the head of Phil. Robinson because he speaks a good word for the "Mormon" people, says: "If after nightfall he carried a Derringer to stand off possible enemies, the fact only proves that he was a coward as he before demonstrated that he was a scoundrel." Were we to judge those scribes and the persons whom they defend by this standard, what cowards and scoundrels they would appear.

The Tribune scribes more than once, frightened by their own shaking shadows, have had arms stored in their office when there was not the remotest danger from any source. And recently they aided in the lying and despicable plot to bring troops into this city without cause for the purpose of precipitating trouble on the community. In the light of the facts and on the rule they have laid down, let the public judge who are the "cowards" and who the "scoundrels."

## "THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH."

THE discussion of the Deseret University question by the Salt Lake Democrat on Friday evening, which we have not had space to notice till now, was fair and dispassionate. It contained an error, though, nearly at the commencement; it is this:

"Governor Murray vetoed a bill appropriating some thousands of dollars to the institution on the ground that it was a purely sectarian school."

The proof that this is a mistake is in the fact that the proviso desired by the Governor as to the non-sectarian disposition of the money, though entirely unnecessary, was inserted in the bill, and that after its insertion he still refused to sign it, although he had promised to do so on that condition. The real reason of his refusal was his unsatisfied desire to nominate the Regents. If the Legislature had permitted him to do so he would have signed it without hesitation. The Legislature could not permit such an innovation without violating an unrevoked law standing on the statute books of the Territory, which would have been self-stultification.

That the insertion of the non-sectarian clause was needless is evident from the Democrat's remarks on the University, which we consider unbiased and moderate. We have frequently taken the same ground as to the position of that institution. "It is not the plan of the University to teach the doctrine of any sect nor to teach against such doctrine." Quite correct. It is a Territorial educational establishment and must of necessity be free from sectarian bias, because sustained by the taxes of citizens of different shades of opinion. It is not sectarian,

it has not been sectarian, and the objection Governor Murray had in the insertion of the obnoxious clause, was to place on record something that would convey the idea that it had been sectarian, which would have been a standing lie, by implication, on the public documents of the Territory.

The Democrat speaks of a bill to be introduced in the coming Legislature to create the "University of Utah," and to transfer all the property of the University of Deseret to this new institution of learning. It designs to make the Governor of the Territory ex-officio Chancellor of the University, and the Territorial Superintendent of District Schools ex-officio a Regent. The Democrat thinks this will make the University more popular and hopes the contemplated change will be effected.

We do not think the coming Legislature will seriously entertain such a proposition. In the first place there is no need for any such change. The University is doing well under its present name and organization. It is our old established institution of learning and has been steadily improving with its opportunities. It is accomplishing its object. It is sufficiently advanced in its courses of instruction to suit the times and the advancement of the Territory. There is no need to change its form or its title. All it wants is proper support from the funds of the Territory.

Why the Governor of the Territory should be the Chancellor of the University does not appear. There is no necessary connection between the two offices. There is no reason of which we are aware why the Executive should have control in any way of an educational establishment. The gentlemen who have officiated as Governors of Utah have not usually manifested any eminent qualifications for the proposed position. They have rather exhibited their needs of a little common school tuition. A man might make a good Governor, but a very poor Chancellor. The uniting of the two offices would presuppose necessary fitness for both.

The Territorial Superintendent of District Schools has sufficient to do in his own sphere without requiring him to attend specially to the duties of a Regent of the University. That institution is separate and distinct from the common school system of the Territory. It has no connection with it organically, financially or in any other way. We see no very great objection to his being on the Board of Regents but do not perceive any necessity for it or any particular good it would accomplish. And if the Edmunds proposition should prevail, and the superintendent should be appointed by the Supreme Court of the Territory, we should dislike to see an officer thus arbitrarily appointed, probably against the wishes of the people, pushed by their own folly into a still further position in which to them he would be irresponsible.

The Democrat says: "The institution has had the reputation of being sectarian, whether justly deserved or not." In a previous paragraph it said: "We firmly believe that the institution has been thoroughly misunderstood, and that through such misunderstanding it has been much wronged." This being the case, the wrong impressions should be effaced by every proper means, and the press can do much towards setting the matter right before the public. But the falsehoods told about the institution are, we think, no argument in favor of changing its name or its constitution. The untruths and insinuations concerning it have been chiefly the work of designing Federal officials and their supporters, and have never been backed by a single fact. The proper thing to do is to sustain the maligned institution and help it to ride triumphant over factions and bigoted opposition, that it may reach the position for which it was designed, and grow into a grand University in the full sense of that comprehensive appellation.

## HOT SHOT FROM OMAHA.

THE Omaha Herald, that fearless and outspoken defender of the oppressed and exponent of true democracy, in its issue of Wednesday last contains the following pungent thrusts on the local situation:

## "NOW REMOVE THE REPUBLICAN RASCALS."

And now the Federal authorities recognize how ineffectually the recent 'Mormon scare' was, and withdraw the orders holding troops in readiness to menace the citizens of Utah. Such withdrawal is a virtual acknowledgment that the whole excitement has been found to be a fraud, a burlesque and travesty on the military authority and importance of the government. Having acknowledged so much, can the Federal authorities neglect to probe this piece of tom-foolery to the bottom and punish the perpetrators?

The Herald calls upon Prest. Cleveland and his cabinet to give this matter their attention. No leniency need be extended any wrong-doing Mormons. Neither should any be yielded to the unprincipled rascals, who, for the sake of melodramatic effect and to secure themselves in power, have done this grievous wrong to the people of Utah.

If Prest. Cleveland will give to Utah an entire new set of officials he will do that which is in his power in the way of reparation. Such a change would have a beneficial and quieting effect upon the public mind, and would go far to encourage the Mormons to quiet

acquiescence to the laws of the country.

The men now in authority in Utah are many of them as fanatical in their persecution of the Mormons as the latter are in the pursuance of their religious belief. President Cleveland cannot afford to place a blot upon his magnificent administration by becoming, or appearing to become, a partisan of those persecutors.

Battery D. was rushed out to Salt Lake at a rate of forty miles an hour on a special train to put down an imaginary Mormon uprising. A fierce snow-storm was raging when the battery arrived. In other words, it was a cold day for the "meelishitary."

Special trains to convey military companies at the rate of forty miles an hour cost money. So do corrupt republican officials who get up bogus Mormon scares. The sooner the latter are wiped out the less need there will be for the former.

## THE LATEST ANTI-"MORMON" COLLECTION SCHEME.

MANY of our readers are probably not aware that there is a person in this city by the name of R. G. McNiece. He generally contrives to get "Rev." placed before his name. They may have heard of him in the public prints some time ago, but latterly he has not figured prominently in his peculiar sphere. He is chiefly noted for lying about the "Mormons" for money. He carries his sponge principally to the East, and therewith sucks up dollars and dimes from the soft-headed and soft-hearted. He appeals to their sympathies and their pockets with lugubrious and hobgoblin stories about the wicked "Mormons."

The time has about arrived when something fresh has to be presented for another sponge-dragging campaign. The old stories have been worked so much that they have become monotonous. The Methodists used to be the only compeers with the Presbyterians in that profitable business. But latterly the Congregationalists and the Baptists have competed for the lucre, and the stale and mouldy crusts of gossip and slander with which they have regaled their eastern audiences, have become so common that the effect of their age and flatness is seen in the collection boxes. These anti-"Mormon" chestnuts will not go down alone. McNiece has struck a new lead. He is not the original discoverer, though. You need not look for anything really original in him. He has simply worked his way into another's claim. The bogus "Mormon uprising," was invented by Federal officials. "An attack on Christian ministers" is the plagiarism which is to do service in the next clerical cash campaign.

On Sunday last McNiece startled his hearers when he arose to preach, by announcing that it was reported his name was "on the list." The "list" being a record of persons who had been seen by the police frequenting houses of ill-fame for lewdness. Thereupon the preacher threw himself into convulsions over the rumor, which the public heard for the first time from his own lips, and flouted into tantrums about the "priesthood," and construed these rumors into "a covert intimidation of the freedom of the pulpit."

These pulpit antics are exceedingly ludicrous. They are also very disgusting. But they will doubtless serve a purpose. Watch the course of the pious money-grubbers when they salify forth to prey on eastern benevolence again. You will see that this dodge will be worked for all it is worth. The poor, persecuted "Christian" ministers here who are scarcely ever noticed except by their own scanty following, and who can pound their pulpits and slander the "Mormons" to their hearts content right in the heart of this city, and no one will resent it, will make this imaginary "intimidation of the freedom of the pulpit" a profitable cry in country congregations in the States.

We do not believe there are a score of individuals in this city who ever heard of this "covert" charge against McNiece till he published it himself from the pulpit. The animus of his trumped up story is exhibited in his intemperate attack on the Priesthood and First Presidency of the "Mormon" Church. What had they to do with the rumors which he has done most to circulate? What have they to do with the "list" on which his disordered brain has traced the characters of his own insignificant name? His object is apparent and his bluster is transparent.

But his gymnastics in the Sunday pulpit were only part of his programme. Read this, which has been prepared for eastern circulation:

## WARNING TO THE PUBLIC.

The grand jury has unearthed a conspiracy on the part of Mormon officials to blacken the characters of public men. The attack on Christian ministers has begun. We warn the Eastern public against these slanderous reports emanating from Mormon sources.

R. G. McNiece,  
Pastor Presbyterian Church.  
S. J. CARROLL,  
Pastor Methodist Episcopal Church.  
F. N. PUTNAM,  
Rector St. Mark's Episcopal Church.  
J. B. THRALL,  
Pastor Congregational Church.  
C. M. ARMSTRONG,  
Pastor St. Paul's Episcopal Church.

JOHN WALKER JACKSON,  
Chaplain Fort Douglas.  
A. B. PEEBLES,  
Congregational City Missionary.  
P. A. H. FRANKLIN,  
Pastor Scandinavian Methodist Church.  
G. D. B. MILLER,  
Head Master St. Mark's School.  
EDWARD BENNER,  
Principal Salt Lake Academy.  
J. J. GARVIN,  
Principal Salt Lake Seminary.

If that isn't crying out before they are hurt, or even threatened with being hurt, what is it? Who has ever mentioned the above names or either of them in connection with the dreaded "list" till now? No one that we have heard of. Where is the attack on "Christian ministers" that these men say has begun? What a nice set of mendacious ministers they are to put their names to such a patent lie as that "The grand jury has unearthed a conspiracy on the part of Mormon officials to blacken the characters of public men." The grand jury have done no such thing. No such a conspiracy has been unearthed by any one. The grand jury report does not charge anything against "Mormon officials."

The facts are, that an effort has been made to bring to justice the male consorts of the notorious prostitutes of this city, and the evidence obtained is of such a complete and irrefutable character that it cannot be overthrown. And these "Christian" ministers, instead of aiding in a movement to cleanse the city by striking at the root of the evil, throw in their influence on the side of corruption and debauchery, by the fabrication of the above document, and meanly and falsely try to prejudice the public by making their charge against "Mormon officials." Shame on them for their perfidy! Shame on them for their pretended fears of a phantom! Shame on them for lending themselves to such a libel!

No man is in any danger of that which they seem to fear who has not been seen in flagrante delicto by several witnesses whose testimony cannot be impeached. None but the guilty need be in any trepidation. We do not believe these persons entertain any alarm on the grounds that they allege. The whole scheme, it will be seen, has outside effect for its object, and dollars for Utah sectarian preaching and teaching establishments will be found to be the grand desideratum. Woe unto all hypocrites who preach for hire and divine for money!

## AN "EXPLANATION" THAT NEEDS EXPLAINING.

AN Ogden paper, miscalled the News, undertakes to explain the new Edmunds bill so that its readers may understand it without taking the trouble to read it. If people depend on some of the explanations so given they will be misled. For instance, in summing up the effects of the provisions in regard to certain sexual crimes that paper says:

"This practically subjects women who are guilty of sexual acts, under pretense of divinely ordered marriages, and women so guilty not claiming to be married, to punishment, just as any other 'illicit' conduct is punished. Heretofore, the pretended wives and women not claiming to be wives have been free from punishment. Now, 'wife No. 2,' is an adulteress; and an unmarried woman, so acting, a fornicatress, punishable, etc."

This "explanation" is incorrect and the assertions made in it are untrue. A plural wife is not and cannot be subject to punishment under either of the definitions of sexual crime in the new bill. If she is considered as a married woman she cannot commit adultery with her husband. If she is considered as an unmarried woman, the bill only makes the man guilty of the crime of adultery. If she is a married woman the crime of fornication as defined in the bill cannot be attributed to her, for that is intercourse between unmarried persons. The plural wife who co-opts only with her husband is not reached by either section nineteen or section twenty of the bill. She is exempt from punishment for a purpose.

The great "morality" in this new special measure to effect something that will never be accomplished, is exhibited in this undisputable fact; that it punishes a woman for improper intimacy with an unmarried man, and leaves her free and without punishment for improper intimacy with a married man. And that is how Senator Edmunds proposes to protect the "sanctity of home" and preserve the "purity of the family."

The Ogden News had better give its readers a little news instead of "explaining" something that it does not understand. Its attempt at explaining requires considerable explanation.

## "A WORD TO YOUNG MORMONS."

AN anti-"Mormon" paper gives the following advice under the above heading:

"Young Mormons, men and women, listen to the News a moment. Take what we say in good part and in serious thought. We ask you to think over this carefully.

"Don't be a polygamist, actual or