

Commissioner Robertson. Their organ now attempts, in two columns and a half of incoherent ravings, to defend them and misrepresent the declaration. This was to be expected. No one supposed that anything the President of the Church could do or say would please or satisfy the kind of persons who daily slander good men, and for argument heap vile abuse upon their opponents no matter what may be the subject in dispute. The declaration was not published to please them or with any consideration concerning them.

But we will notice one or two of their pretended objections which are sufficiently respectable to be quoted in our columns. Here is one:

"Governor Thomas had a right to say that the language of the manifesto was indefinite, because it was. If the editor of the News was put under oath to explain that language, he would be forced to say that it was the advice of President Woodruff as a man."

There is not the slightest need for any explanation of that language. It is definite enough for any person that can read. And he who on reading it declares that it is "simply the advice of President Woodruff as a man," proclaims his own inability to understand ordinary words, or his utter disregard of honor and truth. The language of the declaration is "I, therefore, as President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." It is in his official position as President of the Church, the one man who can speak with authority to and for the Church on such a matter as this, that President Woodruff makes five definite announcements. They are these:

First, he says the statement, telegraphed as being in the Commissioners' report, that forty or more plural marriages have been contracted in Utah within a certain period, is false.

Second, he declares that the leaders of the Church are not teaching plural marriage or permitting any person to enter into its practice.

Third, he denies that any number of plural marriages have been solemnized in the period mentioned, either in our Temples or in any other place in the Territory.

Fourth, he declares his intention to submit to the laws forbidding plural marriage and to use his influence to have the members of the Church over which he presides do likewise.

Fifth, he publicly promulges his advice to the Latter-day Saints to refrain from contracting any mar-

riage forbidden by the law of the land.

The document is signed by Wilford Woodruff as "President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints."

With any person who cannot understand this language and its purport it is useless to dispute. And the dishonesty of one who declares this to be only the advice of Wilford Woodruff "as a man" there is no need to denounce.

The *Tribune* writer says, in relation to the denial mentioned in the third announcement above:

"Our recollection is that he says he knows nothing of such marriages. No one has told him of them since. Hence he knows nothing of them."

He then proceeds to argue on the basis of his false "recollection;" that is to call names and pile up vituperation, which form the essence of *Tribune* reasoning. Reference to the declaration would have corrected this alleged "recollection," but that would have spoilt the excuse for this wilful misrepresentation.

The objection is made that this is "not an edict by the head of the Church pronounced in the usual way." Who can produce any edict by the head of the Church? The President does not issue "edicts." The First Presidency, in matters that require their concurrent action, do not utter "edicts." There are no such things in the Church. The power of the Priesthood is exercised by persuasion, by counsel, by instruction, by enlightenment, and not by force, command or constraint.

President Woodruff's declaration comes with all the authority that attaches to any epistle or other document of a similar character that has been issued by the Presidency of the Church.

Another assertion of this utterly unscrupulous sheet is that:

"It is not considered a crime by any member of the 'Mormon' Church to commit perjury in behalf of what he thinks is the best interest of the Church."

To this we can only point to the doctrines of the Church as contained in its standards and to the character and reputation of its members. There is no person in the Church, so far as we are aware, that entertains such an abominable sentiment and if there is, his conceptions of "Mormonism" are the very opposite of all that he has been taught by the letter and spirit of his creed.

The writer of the vile libel is but reflecting upon others the image of his own character, exhibited through a series of years in almost

daily wilful falsehoods and misrepresentations, until doubt overshadows everything he writes no matter what may be the subject. And we will dismiss further notice of his latest disgraceful effort with two lines from the article we have briefly reviewed, and which contains his favorite epithet and his stereotyped and most powerful argument:

"Every man has his own status and the sneer of a scrub has no weight."

THEY WILL NEVER BE SATISFIED

It has been telegraphed through the country that the Utah Commission complained because the leaders of the "Mormon" Church in some authoritative and explicit manner had not declared against plural marriages, and also that those leaders had continued, in the Tabernacle and elsewhere, to teach the people the doctrine of polygamy. These, it was made to appear, constituted two of the great objections against the "Mormons."

The declaration of President Woodruff forms a complete answer to this and ought to be "authoritative and explicit" enough to satisfy anybody.

But it is not, either to some members of the Utah Commission or some portions of the American press. The thing they have asked for is not the thing they want, and if the whole Church were to arise and repudiate the doctrine of plural marriage, declare their disbelief in it, and if every man who has a plural wife were to utterly discard, forsake and cast her off, for time and eternity, it would make little or no difference to the hostility against the "Mormon" Church and people.

The history of the Latter-day Saints has demonstrated, beyond a reasonable doubt, that it is useless for them to attempt to please the world or satisfy the demands made upon them by their enemies. No matter what they may say, it would not remove their opposition to the Church and their hatred of the Saints, their encroachments will never be stopped by submitting to their clamors, but every point yielded will only encourage them in their oppressions and increase their determination to destroy. If the Saints were to give up one tenet alleged to be the great object of aversion, another would be objected to with equal dislike and similar demands, and so on with every point receded from, until the creed of the Church would be entirely