

OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

CHICAGO, June 2, 1884.

Editor Deseret News:

Some philosopher once remarked that if rogues knew the advantages of honesty they would be honest from sheer roguery. And it is popularly said that honesty is the best policy, but the man who is honest for policy sake is little better than a rogue. At all events, whatever view we take of the matter, experience plainly proves that

DISHONESTY IS A TWO-EDGED SWORD, and capable of cutting both ways. Some of our sensational preachers are finding this out, and at present they stand little better in the popular regard than the criminal lawyers of Ohio a short time ago. If the chapter of accidents had developed any excitement in the public mind during the last few weeks, the chances are that the churches and their pastors would be the objects most likely to bring the too palpable dissatisfaction to the culminating point, and the disgraceful spectacle of a riot against religion itself inaugurated. It is not at all improbable that in the near future some such manifestation of public disapproval will be exhibited against existing orthodoxy, its sophistry, false doctrine and spurious philosophy. Even now, to mention a preacher's name as an authority on any subject, among a gathering of working men, is as much as one's personal safety is worth. Theological stock is looked upon as more heavily watered than even railroad and bank securities.

That mercenary itinerant of alleged gospel the

REV. JOSEPH COOK

has come and gone, or rather has come, has seen, but has not conquered. His wretched diatribe on Utah was a pronounced failure. The press merely noticed him. The *Tribune* gave a few sentences to show the gist of his discourse, but dismissed him editorially with a line or two. The *Times* did not notice him editorially at all, but gave a synopsis of his lecture. The *Inter-Ocean* gave a fuller report of the lecture than the others, but dismissed the lecturer with a curt paragraph. The religious papers did not even mention his name, so that publicly the Rev. Joe was an abortion. During his stay here, he consorted with persons riding hobby-horses similar to his. One had the Romanist nightmare, another the Mexican bugbear, another the municipal authorities until the symposium resembled one of those old Gaelic concerts where sixteen pipers all simultaneously playing each a different tune made the air resonant with discordant melody. The symphony, or more properly the polyphony may not do much harm in music, but in statesmanship or religion it is different. However, the matter is worthy of serious thought and it behooves us to approach subjects of this importance with gravity and dignity. Social, climatic and other agencies have so rendered us the creatures of impulse that we often bring our impulsiveness to bear where reason and judgment ought to act. Therefore let us see what others would say, or could say, or do say on Mormonism and kindred themes. The Rev. Mr. Cook opens his discourse with the name of Edmund Burke, here is

WHAT MR. BURKE SAYS

on a similar topic: "The science of constructing a commonwealth, or renovating it, or reforming it, is, like every other experimental science, not to be taught a priori. Nor is it a short experience that can instruct us in that practical science, because the real effects of moral causes are not always immediate, but that which in the first instance is prejudicial may be excellent in its remoter operation, and its excellence may arise even from the ill effects it produces in the beginning. The reverse also happens, and very plausible schemes, with very pleasing commencements, have often shameful and lamentable conclusions. In States there are often some obscure and almost latent causes, things which appear at first view of little moment, on which a very great part of its prosperity or adversity may most essentially depend. The science of Government being, therefore, so practical in itself, and intended for such practical purposes—a matter which requires experience, and even more experience than any one can gain in his whole life, however sagacious and observing he may be—it is with infinite caution that any man ought to venture upon pulling down an edifice which has answered in any tolerable degree, for ages, the common purposes of society, or in building it up again, without having models and patterns of approved utility before his eyes." The man who uttered these golden words has held, and holds, and will forever hold a place in the foremost ranks of statesmanship. The purity of his character and the integrity of his principle have never been questioned. His name as a patriot and world-wide humanitarian is universally acknowledged. This man with a foresight almost prophetic could conceive the possibilities of the future America for the science of experimental government, and its capacity for embracing, extending, and even originating new forms of commonwealth. This man whose labor and sacrifices in the cause and for the right of a people foreign to him in race, language and perhaps to one of whom he never spoke, are such as to make even the infidel acknowledge the heaven-born origin of man. This man who recognized and respected the religion of the

Indian, and accorded it rights, and respected its sincerity, and labored to preserve the British nation from the disgrace of being the supporter of the infamous Warren Hastings. This man was Edmund Burke, and with this name, that all humanity, irrespective of race or creed should hold dear, the imbecile Joe Cook had the impudence to open his miserable harangue on Mormonism in Chicago last Sunday. Yes, it is, in truth, a sacrilege to mention the name of Edmund Burke in one page with Joe Cook.

Now, that this great name is introduced would it not be well for the legislators of the republic to dwell on the words quoted. Would it be out of place if a little more consideration were given to

OTHER SUBJECTS AS WELL AS MOR-MONISM.

The folly of treating questions of State from the average preacher standard, is apparent to the shallowest mind. The average preacher is all vehemence, little reason and no understanding. As a factor in politics he is a positive injury. He is not a credit to religion. His Sunday lucubration is an abstract disquisition on morality or virtue or ethics delivered with a view to dramatic interest or newspaper notoriety. It never occurs to his narrow mind that morality is evolution, and that a people or a congregation must be educated to it and maintained in it by example, precept and practical application, and not converted in a day or an hour by a wordy rigmarole of incongruous rhetoric and emasculated morality. Yet, it is on the flatulent oratory of the preacher most of the legislation of the last 25 years is built. And still we are foolish enough to tolerate more of it. Even now with Mormonism in its third generation and free from paupers, criminals and outcasts, with mental and physical diseases reduced to a minimum, without proposing or attempting to abolish any existing or established form, but accepting all and evolving something new, without conflicting in any form with the body politic, yet we are called on to sweep it away summarily. If Edmund Burke were alive would he encourage this exterminating business. Most decidedly, no. He would give Utah autonomy in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, and he would depend on the majesty of humanity and the progress of the age, and the influence of contemporary civilization to settle those social topics which occasion so much alarm to the hybrid preacher and statesman. He would apply this doctrine

NOT ALONE TO UTAH,

but to the affairs of other States, and without sanctioning or driving them into secession he would give them a fair opportunity of settling internal and domestic troubles. He would anticipate these troubles and even accept them as necessary to the strengthening of the corporate whole as well as the individual member. His idea of a nation would not be one maintained in unity by the sword or the depot, nor would it be one savoring of a calico or cotton ball partnership, dissolvable at pleasure. His State or nation would be a partnership of all art, all science, all virtue and all perfection; a partnership between the living, the dead and the unborn. Each contract of each particular State would be a clause in the great primeval contract of eternal society, linking natures high and low, connecting the visible and invisible world, according to a fixed compact sanctioned by the invisible oath which holds all physical and all moral natures in their appointed place. While reprobating any tendency to dissolution, founded on speculations of a contingent improvement, he would not advocate breaking law, disobeying nature, and exiling the rebellious from the world of reason, order, peace, virtue and fruitful penitence, into the antagonist world of madness, discord, vice, confusion and sorrow.

In the mind of the individual Mr. Cook one serious charge

AGAINST UTAH ADMINISTRATION

seems very prominent, and that is geographical nomenclature. He is terribly aggravated because such words as Zion and Stake, etc. are used. Perhaps no better answer to this can be given than that of Mr. Sheridan in reply to Counsellor Law in a similar case. Sheridan said: "This is the first time in my life in which I ever heard of special pleading on a metaphor, or a bill of indictment against a trope; but such is the turn of the uneducated divine's mind, that when he attempts to be humorous, no jest can be found, and when serious no fact is visible." And this will apply to the whole of Mr. Cook's pulpit vapors. There is not a single charge of any kind to base an argument on for the measures he advocates. He talks of an emasculated voice and of an arrogant Mormon who wanted to introduce six wives, but still nothing specific. He talks of a lady born weeping and died crying, and still nothing specific. He speaks of Mormon bullets whistling in the air around the heads of himself and missionary teachers, and yet he does not produce even a bullet as a souvenir, nor does he show us a hole in his hat. And after treating us to a nauseating dose of windy abstraction he would have us turn the

GUNS OF FORT DOUGLAS

towards the Tabernacle and blow it to the winds. Perhaps we had better let the noble-souled Sheridan reply as

he did once before when just such a similar proposition was executed against an Indian Sanctuary. "Sheridan says: 'What do your Lordships think of the atrocity of a man who could threaten to profane and violate a domestic or religious sanctuary, by declaring that he would storm it with his troops, and expel the inhabitants from it by force. There is my lords displayed in the whole of this black transaction a wantonness of cruelty and ruffian-like ferocity that, happily, are not often incident even to the most depraved and obdurate of our species.'" Even Middleton, a minion of the infamous Hastings shrank from executing this threat or even entering the Zenana.

Let us suppose the lectures delivered by Mr. Cook were the production of a sane man, honestly believing that Mormonism was really dangerous to modern society, and let us

EXAMINE IT ACCORDINGLY.

In the first place one would naturally look for something tangible in the way of facts, figures and special charges. We find none of these, but exception is taken to the names used for geographical convenience or religious commemoration. He speaks of an emasculated voice, but he does not tell us how many syphilitic patients, how many idiots, imbeciles, dwarfs, monstrosities, etc., he has seen. He speaks of an unjust and tyrannical judiciary system under church dominance, but he does not adduce a single instance of what he would expect his audience to believe would be the natural result of such a system. He talks of poultry-yard theology, to this the Mormon might reply dog-kennel theology, but recrimination never yet settled an argument. He speaks of an editor and his wife and their baby, but he does not give a name, a date, or a circumstance. He speaks of a Mormon with six wives entering a railroad car and wanting to present his six partners to him (Mr. Cook). It looks really foolish to see a grown man who has traveled a little, and read a little, and ought to know that he was addressing an audience of full-grown men with some amount of reason, indulge in nonsense of this kind. After a charge is preferred the next thing required to support it is evidence containing facts and statistics and given by real live witnesses.

His

TREATMENT OF POLYGAMY

is by no means worthy of a rational man, to tell us that it has its origin in licentiousness is to tell us what is a palpable falsehood; because a community with a licentious polygamy could not last a dozen years. If he had shown in what way polygamy was an evil in itself, either physically, socially or religiously, then he would be perhaps acting inconsistently with himself. If he had shown that nature or Christianity forbade it, or that it was antagonistic to physiological science then he would have performed something sensible. We have never had a polygamy with Christianity, except it was in the early ages of the religion, and we have but an imperfect history of it in those times. Christianity must have degenerated at a very early date, because Macaulay tells us that when it reached Britain it was already corrupted. This author maintains that it absorbed and assimilated too much old pagan rites and ceremonies and sacrificed much of its own system. He says it triumphed over Gothic ignorance, Syrian asceticism, Roman policy and Grecian ingenuity, but that it also retained much of the characteristics of the vanquished, in fact so much that it was no longer the early church. Yet it retained enough of the sublime theology and benevolent morality of early days to elevate many intellects and purify many hearts. But it lost enough to lose its claim to the broad religion of Christ which was destined to embrace all humanity and extend over all climes. It lost enough to make it already antagonistic to nature, to restrict its influences and doctrines so that it became a mere nostrum. It assumed the character of the modern theology which would attempt to grow bananas in Alaska and fish for seals in Florida. The result is that Christianity is to day a failure, and the world is just as it was about 1,800 years ago. At one of the recent Secretarian conferences one gentleman graphically pictured the present condition of the universe. He said: "The world is weary of its

BURDEN OF SIN.

Hinduism is weary of its funeral pyres and Juggernauts, its shriveled arms, its child widows and ferocious cruelties. Islam is weary of its relentless ritual, its meaningless fasts, its vain repetitions, its decimating pilgrimages to Mecca, its millions of women staggering broken-hearted down to a hopeless grave. Buddhism is weary of its dreary philosophy in which is no inspiration of hope, and whose highest aspiration is the wretched negation of a non-existence. Its literature teaches all vice all virtue a dream; that true knowledge is attained by doing nothing, holding fast to nothing. Japan is weary of vain prostrations, of calling far ages on deaf and dumb images without a response or hope of relief. The millions of Africa are weary of centuries of internecine war, of cannibalism and living burials, of the horrible fears of dark superstition, of the sickening atrocities of slavery and the slave trade, of debasing sensuality, cruelty and crime. The Brahma Somey call for an oriental Christ, one fitted for India and the Hindoos etc." This is not an ex-

aggerated picture of what the world is at the present time. But unfortunately for humanity it is a forcible definition of what modern Christianity is. The one church, one baptism, etc., that Christ speaks of where is it? The hide-bound Presbyterian says "here;" the loose-skinned Methodist says here;" the latitudinarian says "I am he;" the Romanist, the Hubert of the pack, answers with the notes of its early baying, but sounded through toothless gums, here is the one church, one faith of the real Christ. Yes, this is the

CHRISTIANITY OF TO-DAY

which makes angels weep and demons laugh; which as some writer observes displays its monkey sympathy when one sect exhibits a rent or a sore, all the others sympathize by pulling the rent or sore wider open. This is the Christianity that proposes to evangelize benighted Africa, superstitious Asia, civilized Europe and savage America. This is the Christianity that wants to make of the American Constitution what it has made of the Bible, a kind of Donnybrook fair, until a large class will be demanding its removal owing to the patchworks made of it. And yet this American Constitution, next to the Bible, the broadest instrument for the welfare of humanity, and like the Bible, as wide as nature and comprehensive as the universe, it is already tattered and mutilated, and that in the name of liberty, the same as the bible is in the name of religion. But whatever the errors, faults or crimes of the statesman or alleged Christian may be, or whatever demands or restrictions in his blindness he may impose, it is the duty of every Mormon, and every non-Mormon who has common-sense enough to believe that Christ has not turned his back on mankind, to uphold intact the institutions of the modern Zion, and not like its prototype, the early church, be corrupted by the Joe Cooks, or overawed by the Governor Murrays of the time. Let them turn their guns and their bayonets, let them put females to the torture, but human majesty and heaven's potency shall and must prevail.

The organ of the communists in this city, taking Joseph Cook as a

TYPE OF ALL RELIGION

indulges in a kind of metrical estimate of his, which translated would run in such strains as this:

Hurrah for Joe Cook,

That mal-odorous spook,

And ill-omend rook,

Of a wretched religion:

Elongation of tongue,

With vociferous lung,

And brains of horse d—g

Work this vagabond widgeon:

How the press lets him slip,

And indulge in his lip,

But awaits him to strip,

And to preach with a pelt on.

It is said without doubt,

That this gasbag and clout,

At street corners will shout,

With the great Macnamara;

Let demons then tremble,

When Joe doth assemble,

His trick, loop, and thimble,

For in hell he'll cause sorrow;

His blood is now boiling,

And for flight he is spoiling,

While religion's recoiling,

At his heart 'neath the harrow.

Perhaps this is sufficient to illustrate the spirit of the poem as well as the esteem in which the Rev. Joseph and his compeers are held by the communistic world. JUNIUS.

[From the New York Independent, May 8.]

SIX QUESTIONS ON THE MOR-MON PROBLEM.

BY JOSEPH COOK.

WITH REPLIES BY THE REV. DR. MC-NIECE, JUDGE BOREMAN, JUDGE ROSEBOROUGH, EDITOR NELSON, ATTORNEY ROYLE AND PROFESSOR COYNER, OF SALT LAKE CITY.

SALT LAKE CITY,

March 17th, 1884.

Dear Mr. Cook:

You ask me the following questions, to which I give the following answers: 1. "Do the ablest opponents of Mormonism in Utah endorse President Arthur's scheme for governing the Territory by a Commission?"

They do, almost without exception. Indeed I have met but two intelligent opponents of Mormonism who do not favor President Arthur's plan. But I think it was because they had a wrong idea of the proposed plan that they did not favor it. It is known here as Governor Murray's plan, since he was the first man who publicly proposed and officially advocated it for Utah. This plan for Utah was first proposed in a political convention of Americans here by two lawyers of this city—Judge Roseborough, whose name is attached to this paper, and Judge McBride.

2. "What do they think of Senator Hoar's plan for confiscating the funds unlawfully gathered?"

Those I have conversed with do not regard this plan favorably, because of the very great, if not insuperable difficulty of separating the funds unlawfully gathered by the Mormon Church

from those which justly belong to it. Hence, it would be very hard to defend such a measure from the serious charge of arbitrary interference with the rights of property. For my part, although thoroughly disgusted with the superficial and trivial legislation for Utah heretofore, and in favor of radical measures, yet I do not wish to see Congress adopt any measure which cannot be defended on a basis of justice and I would not know how to defend this measure proposed by Senator Hoar, unless he puts it upon the ground that the Mormon people, by continued hostility to the Government, have forfeited all political rights of every kind the right of property included. But I have seen only in abstract of this bill.

3. "Are they in favor of a national constitutional amendment, prohibiting polygamy?"

There seems to be some division of opinion concerning the wisdom of such an amendment. But I think those who have studied the matter most carefully are not in favor of having such an amendment adopted now; and for this reason. They think it would remove from the public mind the apparent objection to the admission of Utah as a State, and that this admission would at once take place upon the adoption of such amendment, while the real objection to Utah's becoming a State would still be just as serious and unanswerable as it now is. For what would hinder polygamy from being practiced in an underhanded way then, just the same as now? If Congressional enactment cannot stop polygamy now, as it does not, how could a constitutional amendment stop it?—And if Congress cannot handle the territory, as it has not yet, how could it handle the State? I confess that I cannot see my way through these objections to the proposed amendment; although, if Utah should, by some political trick, become a State, with the majority of her people still, at heart, in favor of polygamy, I would then jump at the chance of having such an amendment. You know that slavery was first abolished before we had the amendments against it.

4. "What would be the prospects of Gentile enterprise in Utah, including churches and schools, if the territory were to become a state, with a constitution nominally prohibiting polygamy, but with the despotic power of the Mormon priesthood not broken?"

During my nearly seven years' residence in this city, I have often heard this question discussed by the Americans living here, and the only opinion I have ever heard expressed is this: "That if Utah were now to become a state, even with a professed anti-polygamy constitution, there would be no protection here for Americans, either for life or property. With Utah as a state, the Mormon priesthood have supreme control of all branches of the government. And every intelligent American, who has lived in the midst of this priesthood, knows full well that, while it controls the majority of votes, it will never permit a republican form of Government in Utah, and will never give up polygamy, no matter how beautiful the constitution this priesthood may profess to adopt. That this is no random assertion may be seen from the startling fact that this priesthood has had control of this territory for thirty-five years; and there never has been, and is not now, a republican form of government here. The election districts in the territory and the municipal wards in the cities are merged together for the very purpose of destroying their independence and preventing a republican form of government. The consequence is that although in the Territory and this city, the Americans pay about two-fifths of the taxes they are un-represented in the Legislature and in the municipal government of this city. In two or three cases Americans have been elected to the Legislature, but have not been allowed to take their seats.

Now, if this priesthood will not permit a republican form of government in Utah while it is a Territory, and will not protect the life and property of Americans and secure to them their political rights—which they have notoriously failed to do thus far—is it not very absurd to suppose that all this will be done by this priesthood at once if the Territory becomes a state, and the priesthood has a chance to elect its own Governor, appoint its own judges, manage its own courts and control every office?

The only protection to the life and property of Americans here, which they can rely on, grows out of the fact that the Governor and Secretary of Utah, and the higher court judges are Americans, and represent the American ideas of government. These officers are now appointed by the American people through the President and Congress; and the Governor is armed with absolute veto power. That is, the Mormon Legislature can pass no law over the Governor's veto. Now, let Utah become a State, and let the governor, judges and all other officers be the representatives of the Priesthood, as they inevitably would be; every intelligent American here knows and feels that the sooner he got out of Utah the better. I have heard this view expressed again and again by the most intelligent and courageous men here. And from what I have seen of the bitter, anti-American and diabolical spirit of the Priesthood, during the nearly seven years of my residence in Utah, I believe that opinion is altogether too well grounded. If Utah were to become a State, I believe the life of no Christian teacher or minister would be safe in Utah outside this city and Ogden, where the Americans are mainly concentrated. With a brave and effi-