

till Christ comes. From this the Judge draws the inference that the Church claims and exercises the right to control its members in temporal as well as spiritual things, but he fails to show where, in the least degree, this infringes on the liberty of the citizen.

He also announces the extraordinary decision that "one of the doctrines of the Church" is that "for certain offenses the offender shall suffer death, as the only means of atoning for his transgressions, and that any member of the Church has the right to shed his blood." The truth is, the evidence shows to the exact contrary. We unhesitatingly brand as a wicked falsehood the statement that the Church teaches, or holds, or has ever taught or held such an abominable doctrine. All the one-sided utterances of individual opinion which the Judge has selected, fail to bear out his assertion. In an unfair and clearly partial manner, he injects remarks as to the meaning of those speakers, into his comments, conveying ideas that they did not express or entertain.

For instance, speaking of Jedediah M. Grant's sayings in regard to covenant breakers, he says: "That is, those who leave the Mormon Church." Also: "Referring to the right of the Church to shed the blood of those who apostatized, Brigham Young used the following language."

These are the Judge's own fabrications and are not the sense of the quotations he makes, but are gratuitous misrepresentations of both the language and the intention of the speakers. Quoting from a discourse by the Editor of the DESERET NEWS, he gives three isolated paragraphs and carefully suppresses the explanatory context, and thus conveys a meaning contrary to that actually proclaimed and expounded by the lecturer. The plain declaration and proofs that "blood atonement" only relates to murderers and adulterers who have made special covenants not to commit such sins, and that no one except a legal, civil officer has the right to execute the death penalty, Judge Anderson omits and thus leaves a false impression the very opposite of that which the discourse conveys. Comment on this is needless.

Judge Anderson says: "Brigham Young for years resisted all attempts of the authorities to instal the proper officers for carrying on the Territorial government." "He claimed the

right to say who the officers of the Territory should be," etc. We denounce this as utterly and entirely false. History is against the Judge in this particular, as published matter is against his erroneous assertions on "Mormon" doctrine. The repetition of the stale falsehood that the United States flag was trailed in the dust when Brother Wells was released from prison, and of the stupid notion that half-masting the flag, which has ever been viewed as a token of grief, was intended as an insult to the Government, shows the bias of the Judge and his eagerness to father and sanction the vain imaginations and bald absurdities of anti-"Mormon" fanatics.

The editorial opinions of the DESERET NEWS, for which this paper alone is responsible, he distorts into "pressure brought to bear by the Mormon leaders to prevent members when convicted of violating the laws from promising obedience." They had nothing to do with the utterances of this journal, and what we have said on this matter related not to obeying the law, but agreeing to be governed by the lawless and conflicting constructions of the law by the courts, which involved promises dishonorable to any man placed in the position referred to.

Judge Anderson has suppressed from his opinion the documentary evidence of the patriotic sentiments entertained by the leaders of the "Mormon" Church which was introduced in profusion. He has done the same with the proofs of devotion to the institutions of this Republic on the part of the "Mormon" people, presented by counsel for the applicants. He has drawn conclusions utterly unwarranted by the premises. He has done all that the conspirators to capture this city desired he should do so. He has denied citizenship to men proven to be of good moral character, sober, industrious, honest, peaceable, and thoroughly desirous of the perpetuity of American republicanism, and this because they are "Mormons," while Liberals whose very faces and manners proclaim their vices and who have had to confess their unchastity, can be welcomed as citizens and viewed as of good moral character.

We do not know what further steps can or will be taken in this matter, but we do not propose to let it rest here. The opinion of Judge Anderson is not an exposition of "Mormon" doctrine but an echo of the misrepresentations of its

unscrupulous adversaries. The truth may have a hard struggle against the errors official and unofficial, which are massed against it, but, thank God, it will ultimately prevail. And there is a day appointed when all things and all men shall be tried, and to the Supreme Judge on high we appeal for final arbitrament and eternal justice.

KILLING FOR APOSTACY.

ONE of the most infamous things from an infamous source that we have seen for a long time, was the attempt of the "Liberal" organ on Thanksgiving Day to make it appear that the Wardell fiction was a fact, and "an actual infliction of the death penalty for the crime of apostacy." If any statement of a witness was ever completely annihilated it was the story told by the poor, cranky tool of the "Liberal" instigators of the latest attack on American liberty. Not a shred of it was left. We do not believe a dozen men in Utah, out of a lunatic asylum, can be found who have read the evidence and who believe Wardell's imaginary or fabricated testimony.

The labored effort of the "Liberal" organ was intended for foreign consumption. This is one of its common exhibitions of chronic mendacity. After giving a colored and illuminated version of the Wardell novelette, it pretends to present the evidence in rebuttal as though to show both sides of the story. Instead of doing so, it suppresses entirely the strong points in the rebuttal which punctured and tore to tatters the painted and inflated bag of falsehood that the semi-imbecile Wardell had been induced to hold up, and then resorts to absolute falsehood in order to turn aside the force of the exposure made by his family. Here it is:

"It was discerned that the family of the witness had adhered to the Church, and at once they were summoned to say that they knew nothing of Green or the murder, as if they would have expected them to know anything."

What are the facts? Why, that Wardell's son, who, the witness swore, drove Green's teams and wagons into the tithing yard, was the first of the romancer's family sought for and called to testify, and that he is an apostate, having "given up the whole business," by which he expressed his secession from the Church, three years ago. His evidence was not and