



GEORGE Q. CANNON.....EDITOR

Wednesday, Dec. 1, 1869.

THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOLS.

FOR many years, the prominent topic of discussion, agitated alike in political and religious circles, was the slavery question. Its opponents viewed it as "the sum of all villainies," a gigantic evil which it was their bounden duty to uproot. On the other hand, its advocates clung to it with great tenacity, and defended the institution vigorously. Slavery, however, has ceased to exist, and it no longer occupies the attention of philanthropists or politicians. In its place a new subject has loomed up, which the New York Tribune thinks is "destined to rock our fabric of popular government to its foundations."

This new bone of contention is the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Religious antipathy and Sectarian bitterness threaten to make this strife more envenomed and implacable than even the slavery question. It seems to be the determination of those who seek to exclude the Bible from schools, not to be satisfied with its removal; they insist on breaking up the Common School system into Sectarian fragments. Not content to have their children schooled in their texts in the churches and Sunday schools, they seek to have this element of disturbance introduced into the Day schools. They will not allow secular and religious education to be imparted separately; they refuse to unite in upholding the holiness and sanctity of Sunday, and do not wish to have religious instruction given by those not of their own faith, while, at the same time, they declare education without religious instruction to be godless. Of course their wishes cannot be gratified under the Common School system, and if their views were to prevail, that system would be abolished and Sectarian schools would take their place.

The Tribune likes the idea of having the Bible used as a text book in schools, for it cannot realize that its use ever resulted in any harm. It cites the case of the Scotch, as well as the experience of New England, to show what the Bible will do for people when taught in schools. It would, however, rather give up the reading of the Bible in schools than give up schools altogether, and yet it sees no hope for the schools, even in giving up the Bible.

It says:

"If we give up the Bible, we only weaken the Common School system by offending if not alienating many of its oldest and firmest supporters, while we fail to conciliate its enemies, but only incite them to new and inadmissible exactions."

Rather a bad fix to be in! Being united as the Latter-day Saints are may be objectionable to many who would like to see us split up into fragments; but it has its conveniences. We can dispose of all such questions as the reading of the Bible in the schools without difficulty. People, for the want of diverse sects in this country, may not see a number of rival and opposing places of worship; but, though the "freedom" and "liberty," which the devil would like to see men practice, do not find very ample room for exercise under such circumstances, the people of Utah are exceedingly well suited. When they know that they have God's truth and will made known to them, they are content to accept them, and do not imagine they would have a wider scope for their agency, or more liberty of thought and action, if they were to debate and contend upon the subject every day of their lives. The people of Utah may be benighted, in the opinion of many, because they adopt and pursue this course; but the experience of years has convinced them of its correctness, and they are content with it.

KANSAS AND UTAH—DIFFERENCE IN TREATMENT.

"The death of the Hon. Robert J. Walker recalls an incident of the Border Ruffian war in Kansas. While Walker was Gov-

ernor of the State, he made a tour through its southern counties, and was not very heartily greeted by the Free State men. At one of the towns where he stopped for the night, the pro-slavery men held a meeting in his honor, and wound up the affair with a huge bonfire. While the embers were yet smoking, a party of Free State men determined upon treatment of a different sort. Armed with rifles and revolvers, they procured a stout rope, and started for the hotel where Governor Walker was staying, but before they called him out they concluded to consult Mr. Albert D. Richardson, who was then the Kansas correspondent of the Boston Journal, and a prominent advocate of the Free State cause. They showed him the rope, and said: "We have made up our minds to hang him, and let the administration know that its Governors are not safe here." Richardson counselled moderation, told them they would only make matters worse by killing Walker, and finally persuaded them to give up their intentions and go quietly to their homes. Governor Walker left town the next morning, little dreaming how nearly he had missed being executed." The above incident is related by the New York Sun, and vividly recalls to mind the outrageous excesses in which the "Border" men indulged in those bloody days. Denouncing and abusing Federal officers, and robbing and murdering citizens, were so common at that time that had the mob hung Governor Robert J. Walker, as its members proposed to do, the occurrence would not have startled the public particularly. But while those events were transpiring in Kansas "our gallant little army," under Col. Albert Sidney Johnson, was marching to Utah, and rejoicing in the prospect of soon having it in its power to hang the "Mormon" leaders, and for what? For murdering unoffending citizens? For abusing Federal officers? For hanging, or even threatening to hang, the Governor of the Territory?

No; for none of these crimes; but a miserably low scoundrel, who had been sent out here as Judge, and who has since been an inmate of a Penitentiary, circulated lies to the effect that the Territorial Court Records and the Library had been destroyed by the "Mormons," and they were in a condition of rebellion. And because it suited the traitors in the Cabinet and Congress, who were plotting the overthrow of the Government, to apparently attach credence to these falsehoods, in order that attention might be diverted from their own schemes, the army was sent out here, under the leadership of one whom they could trust, and who, afterwards, died fighting against the flag, respect for which he came out here ostensibly to enforce. What cared they for the wrongs of "bleeding Kansas?" Too many eyes were on Kansas, and the army and its movements would have been watched. But it was convenient to raise an outcry against Utah, to create a public opinion that would justify extreme measures against her people. So the politicians, the press and the telegraph wires of the country were subsidized, and a howl ascended from every quarter against Utah and the crimes of her people, and their extermination was loudly called for.

Buchanan, Floyd, et al, would have shed no tears if the lives of thousands of innocent victims had been sacrificed in this hellish crusade; but they were signally foiled. The truth of the French proverb that "man proposes, but God disposes," was illustrated in this case. The inspiration and wisdom which God gave to his servant, Brigham Young, saved the people from the destruction with which they were threatened, and defeated the schemes of villains and traitors. The nation and the enemies of the people of Utah learned a lesson then that they would do well never to forget.

FREE THOUGHT, FORMING OPINIONS AND OBEDIENCE.

SOME writers, in treating upon the affairs of Utah, seem to entertain the idea that the people of this country are dwelling under a mental despotism, without the power to think or act for themselves; rendering servile obedience to a great central authority, which fulminates its edicts to suit its own whims and to more firmly rivet its chains of tyranny. The Omaha Republican in alluding to affairs here, indulges in the hope that the people of this country will soon begin to think and form opinions for themselves, and then, he imagines, they will arrive at conclusions very different from those which they entertain at present. A stranger reading his remarks would suppose that the people of Utah were an ignorant, unreasoning, doltish race, living in a condition of abject serfdom, and destitute of the opportunities for obtaining knowledge which are within the reach of the other citizens of this Republic.

Now, whatever faults the people of Utah may have, the habit of not thinking, or not forming opinions for themselves, is certainly not one of them. Writers who assume that this is the case betray great ignorance of the people of whom they treat. The very opposite of this is the case. If there is any people or community within the confines of this broad Republic who have distinguished

themselves above all others for moral courage in daring to think for themselves, they are the inhabitants of this Territory. Their whole history proves this. If they had not thought, and had not formed opinions for themselves, can any one, who is familiar with this country, suppose for a moment that they would be here? A people who have had the courage and independence to break the shackles of priestcraft, to dissolve life-long friendships, to rend asunder the ties of relationship, to abandon the homes of childhood, to encounter the scorn and contumely of the world, and to go forth into the wilderness and brave all its dangers, have not done so without thought or without forming opinions for themselves. He who imagines that they have, and talks about them as though they had yet to know what free thought is, must either be a fool or knave—a fool if he does not know better, and a knave if, knowing better, he states to the contrary.

What grounds are there for imagining that the people of Utah have been made to bow their necks to a yoke of mental bondage, or that they have surrendered the right of thinking to others? Is there anything in their history to warrant such a supposition? Did they exhibit this feature when they sacrificed their good names and worldly prospects—viewing them from a worldly standpoint—to embrace the gospel in which they believe; and that, too, when religious teachers persuaded and threatened them? Was it seen in severing all their former connections and launching forth into a new, untried and almost unknown country? Did they evince a servile disposition when mobs menaced and attacked them, and when death stared them in the face? Or, even later, when Buchanan, yielding to the schemes of traitors, and in violation of his own oath of office, sent an army with its filthy concomitants to this Territory?

Where is the point in their history that gives the indication that they do not think, form opinions and act for themselves? It has required the highest form of independence, courage and thought, on their part, to pursue the path they have trod. A driftnet, coward or idiot can drift with the stream; but when have the Latter-day Saints ever done so? They have had to stem both wind and current, and have never spread their sails to catch the favoring breezes of popularity.

It has been imagined that because they are united and obedient, they must, of necessity, have surrendered their judgment and fallen into the habit of obeying, unreasonably, the dicta of others. In nothing do their critics show more ignorance than in assuming such to be the fact. In every move which the people have made they have been urged to find out and understand the propriety of it for themselves. After the murder of Joseph Smith a crop of apostate pretenders arose, who each claimed to have received his keys and to have the right to wear his mantle. When it was determined to complete the Temple, and, afterwards, to push out westward, they did all in their power to discourage the people in taking this course, and to have them follow them. Rigdon, who had been one of the First Presidency; William Smith, John E. Page and Lyman Wight, of the Twelve Apostles; and James J. Strang, all used their influence. Then the knowledge which the people had been urged to seek they found of use. They were obedient; but it was to the one holding the legal authority. They knew the voice of the true shepherd, and they followed him; but they did not recognize the voice of the pretenders, and they would not follow them.

Rigdon would have left the Temple untouched, had the people scattered or gone with him to Pittsburgh. Lyman Wight would have taken them to Texas. William Smith and Page urged the folly of going into the wilderness, and tried to appal them by picturing to them the tyranny they would have to submit to from the rule of President Young and the Twelve; and James J. Strang, to whom some foul, lying spirits representing Joseph and others had appeared and given authority—at least this is what he claimed—called upon all to accompany him to Voree.

Was it want of thought, or of a disposition to form opinions for themselves, or was it unreasoning obedience, or a neglect to exercise their agency that caused them to turn their backs on these wretched impostors? Would they have manifested higher thought, or more reasonable obedience if they had become apostates than they did in clinging to the truth? Let the results which have attended the two lines of

policy answer. Where are Rigdon, William Smith, Wight, Page, Strang, Thompson, and their followers to-day? Who shall write their history? If anything is known by posterity concerning them and their follies, it will be from details written by those whom they denounced for their blind and slavish obedience to rightful authority. So will it be with others who pursue the same course.

"MOUNTAIN MEADOW MASSACRE."

IN the delivery of the lecture "Six Months in Utah," by Mrs. St. Clair, on Tuesday last at the Theatre, there was an allusion made by the lecturer to what is known as the "Mountain Meadow Massacre." There was nothing in her treatment of this point in her lecture that was offensive to her audience; but she evidently was unfamiliar with the facts, and as a general misapprehension exists abroad in relation to them, simple justice demands that they be correctly stated. Our silence upon this subject is frequently construed as an evidence of the inability of the people of this Territory to defend themselves against the cruel charges which have been made against them in connection with that tragedy.

It is almost a pity to break this silence now, for there is a class of anti-"Mormon" writers whose entire stock of trade consists of the "Mountain Meadow Massacre," and a few other acts of violence which have occurred in this Territory, and upon which they ring constant changes, holding the "massacre" over our heads somewhat as an old schoolmistress would a rod over a naughty child. We scarcely know how these threats and menaces sound to people who live outside of this Territory; but they only excite either amusement or contempt here where the facts are understood.

After Governor Alfred Cumming had reached this city and was fairly installed in office—considerable having been said about the massacre of a company of emigrants at Mountain Meadows the previous Fall—ex-Governor Young urged upon the Governor and U. S. District Attorney Wilson the propriety of taking steps to investigate this occurrence. In the wish for a thorough examination he was seconded by the entire community, for all felt that most cruel and unjust aspersions had been cast upon them. To render what aid he could President Young proffered to go with the Federal officers to the vicinity of the outrage, and use every effort in his power to sift the matter to the uttermost, and discover the guilty ones. But this was no part of the policy of the Judges who were then here nor the attaches of the camp. Such a course would settle the question; but they were interested in keeping it open.

At Provo, in the Spring of 1859, a Grand Jury on U. S. business undertook the investigation of the "Mountain Meadow Massacre." They requested the U. S. District Attorney, Mr. Wilson, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be present with them and examine the witnesses. Two Indians, Mose and Looking-glass, had been committed for the crime of rape perpetrated upon a white woman and her daughter, a girl of ten years. In the midst of the investigation of the Mountain Meadow case, the Judge, John Cradlebaugh, called the Grand Jury into the court room and administered to the members an abusive lecture, and summarily discharged them! At the same time, he turned the savages, Mose and Looking-glass, loose upon the community. The Grand Jury protested, but in vain, against this unwarrantable proceeding by the Court. District Attorney Wilson, also reported that he was present at the deliberations of the Grand Jury, and, at the request of its members, had examined the witnesses and that the Jury were proceeding in the matter efficiently. Thus ended the attempt to have the transaction investigated judicially.

From the earliest years that white men traveled through the country now incorporated in the southern portion of this Territory and the northern part of Arizona, outrages upon the Indians were frequent. When Colonel Fremont passed through the southern desert in 1842, his party killed, without any provocation, several Pah-Ute Indians near the Rio Virgen. When New Mexico was organized, Governor Calhoun, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, recommended, to the Department at Washington, the extermination of the Pah-Utes. Emigrants passing through by the southern route to California had also frequently shot them whenever they came in sight. To such an extent had this custom prevailed that when Presi-