

## EDITORIALS.

## BREASTING THE POPULAR TIDE.

THE *Boston Post* has raised a hornet's nest about its head. That is the fate of every journal that attempts to tell the truth about the "Mormons." It is not popular to say anything except on one side of the "Mormon" question. Papers may publish the veriest nonsense, the most absurd trash, the foulest charges and the plainest contradictions on this subject and no fault will be found. But venture to suggest that most of this sort of thing comes from hearsay and that there is another side to the matter, and the motives of the suggestor will be stigmatized, and he will be accused of affiliating with "Mormonism," or a desire to increase his matrimonial pleasures and responsibilities.

The *Post* thus assailed for saying a word in fairness on the situation in Utah, has been compelled to stand up in its own defense. It is quite able to do so. Here are some extracts from its editorial columns:

"We do not ask that portion of the public which we address, directly or indirectly to accept Mormon doctrines, or even so much as admire their institutions, especially that one, which if not most prominent in itself, is nevertheless made so in outside circles because of the natural shock that it gives to our ideas of the family relation. We plead for nothing except justice and common sense. If we can beat back the prejudice and bigotry that have been pursuing these people without discretion, and help to substitute therefor an attitude that is based upon a decent knowledge of the situation, our ambition will be satisfied. Moreover, we like to be accurately reported when we are criticised."

We feel that the Mormons are human beings, and perhaps are entitled to as much consideration as the Ponca Indians. There has been no purpose on the part of the writer of any article in this paper to show that polygamy had not resulted in evil, and we do not think anything that has been said here can be so construed. We distinctly and repeatedly stated that polygamy was an evil, but we believed and believe that it is an evil that will be cured by the changing sentiment of the Mormons themselves much sooner than by any of the ill-considered devices that have been hatched from the violent prejudices of the country reflected by members of Congress. \* \* \*

And when this institution is dead and buried, the Mormons can challenge comparison before the world with their most virulent critics, whether they are found in Maine or among the Gentiles who have come among them and taught them, so far as example could do it, more vices than they ever dreamed of before.

The mistake of the editors of the *Boston Post* was in thinking that justice and common sense would play any part in the crusade against "Mormonism." The believers in that system of faith and practice are not to be considered as human beings with any rights which so-called "Christians" are bound to respect. And those who attempt to declare that they are entitled to any degree of fair consideration must expect to be blamed for standing in the way of the popular current. Clamor does not want discussion. *Vox populi* is often unreasonable and unreasoning. Most newspapers are but its organs of speech or its echoes, and one that has the temerity to utter a word in opposition to the tumult should be ready to meet a Babel of yelling accusations.

Some day the tide of tumult will turn. That which is now denounced without investigation as an un-mixed evil will be found to have features that recommend themselves to the candid seeker after truth and the sincere promoter of virtue. And when the time comes for that fair comparison that the *Post* speaks of, there will be no fear on the part of the "Mormons" as to the verdict and the result.

We feel thankful to the *Boston Post* for its disinterested endeavors on the side of the numerically weak. "A decent knowledge of the situation," which it desires to substitute for the rank prejudice and intense bigotry that now prevent inquiry, is what we have desired to see diffused. But while the public only wish to hear something salacious and sensational about the "Mormons,"

and the press panders to that perverted taste, the present general ignorance about this people and their doctrines and doings will prevail, and those who stand up for any part of the truth may expect to be abused for their pains. However, they will have the satisfaction of knowing that they are right, and that is worth a great deal more than undeserved applause.

## THE REASON WHY.

THE *Chicago Herald*, commenting on the recent Utah election says:

"The result of the election is that the Mormons hold full sway, and will continue to do so as long as their fields are green, their harvests plentiful and their women have the ballot."

We do not think that a change of these conditions would produce a different result. We have seen a time when the fields were not green nor the harvests plentiful, because the grasshoppers had devoured the crops and turned the verdant fields into black and dreary wastes. And this was before the women of Utah had the ballot. Yet the "Mormons" had full sway at elections because they had the majority of votes. If the elective franchise were taken away from the women of Utah, the fields were another color and the harvests should fall through drought or insect devastations, the "Mormons," without counting a single practical polygamist, could outvote their political opponents in the Territory, and the result would be about the same as now.

It is the political unity of the "Mormons" which forms the strongest feature of their position and is the most obnoxious to their adversaries. It is also the most unaccountable thing to people who imagine that that they know all about "Mormonism" but have never fairly examined it. They allege that the people have to vote as they are bidden, but in view of the absolute secrecy of the ballot and the impossibility of discovering how the voters use the franchise, they can see the nonsense of their charge that the people vote under dictation.

They do not seem to comprehend the fact that every "Mormon" is as much interested in maintaining the supremacy of the People's Party as any of the leaders, that the present true freedom, exemption from debt, and honest and economical administration of public affairs, depend upon keeping out the adventurers and professional politicians who are hungering and thirsting for spoils.

In prosperity or adversity, with bounteous harvests or famine-stricken bins, with or without the vote of the faithful and zealous women citizens of Utah, the "Mormons" will have sense enough to unite to maintain the balance of power, and to thwart the schemes of the "Liberal" locusts whose advent to power would be a worse affliction than any grasshopper army that ever invaded and overwhelmed the Territory.

## THE "PROBLEM STILL UNSOLVED."

THE *New York Times* makes the following rational remarks on the situation in Utah:

"If the Edmunds law has failed—and there are many indications that it is a failure—how are we to deal successfully with polygamy and the Mormon church? It must be admitted that this question cannot be satisfactorily answered. By national law the polygamists of Utah have been disfranchised. Ought the nation to go further and disfranchise every man and woman in the territory who believes that polygamy is not immoral? To take that course would be to punish citizens not because they have violated a law, but because of their religious opinions and belief. We may punish for the act, which is unlawful, but not for the belief. Such legislation as is demanded by the Gentiles of Utah would not only arouse a strong public sentiment in behalf of the subjects of persecution but would also give to Mormons the courage of religious martyrs and cause their church to grow more rapidly than ever. And yet, if we disfranchise only for the act, the political power of the polygamist's church is not shaken. After many years the Mormon problem still confronts us unsolved, although it has engaged the careful attention of the ablest statesman of our day."

## NOT AN OVERSIGHT.

THE *Chicago Inter-Ocean* says:

"The saints of Utah seem to be doing pretty well for themselves under the Edmunds law. The wonder is that the single Gentile was elected. It was doubtless an oversight."

No, it was an undersight. He wasn't elected. "Gentile" foresight counted on one county. But the aftersight forced conviction that the provision was incorrect. Figures did lie for once—on the registry list, but good watching rectified the error. The Saints are pretty well, thank ye.

## PLAYING PARROT.

If a traveler were to take a flying trip through this great country and on his way should stop twenty-four hours in Montreal as the guest of a Government official, and on the strength of this visit should pretend to know all about Canada, its political situation and necessities, its social system and the exact reforms needed to regulate its alleged errors, he would be looked upon as an egotistical idiot. But let the same thing be done in relation to Utah, and the utterances of the conceited oracle are paraded in print as the essence of wisdom, and reporters run after the talking tourist to obtain his views for the enlightenment of a wondering world.

There is Governor Crittenden, for instance, dispensing his panacea for the supposed ills of Utah, after a brief call at Salt Lake and obtaining his ideas of "Mormon" affairs from Governor Murray of mathematical fame. The telegraph credited him with a non-sensical paragraph when he arrived at Ogden on his way to the west to which little credence was attached, because Ogden is notorious for manufacturing bogus telegrams about Salt Lake affairs. But we see from the *Denver News* that Governor Crittenden has been talking similar stuff in the Colorado capital. The *News* states that in reply to a question of its reporter the gentleman said:

"I am confident that the Mormon question cannot be settled by the operations of the Edmunds law. There are 120,000 Mormons to deal with, and it will require something more efficacious to deal with the question than this law. The Gentiles made no opposition to the late election, as it would have been useless, the Mormons being able to outvote them ten to one. The claim is made that a monogamous Legislature was elected, but this will remain to be seen. The commissioners will await the action of this Legislature before doing anything."

"What would you substitute for the Edmunds law?"

"I believe that the President of the United States ought to appoint the Legislature for the Territory. I know of no constitutional objection to a law to this effect. If the Government has the right to interfere to protect people and property in the Southern States, it certainly ought to have such power in the Territories."

"Do you consider this necessary in Utah?"

"Yes, undoubtedly. There never was in Southern States, if there was such an organization at all, such a thoroughly organized system of kluksluxism as exists in Utah against the Gentiles."

"Would not the Mormons let the Gentiles alone if the latter attended to their own business and did not attempt to interfere with their institutions?"

"No; if let to themselves the Mormons would not allow a Gentile to settle in the Territory. As it is, they will transact no business with the Gentiles and do all in their power to injure them. Let a Gentile take a ranch and he is at once persecuted and interfered with by depriving him of water privileges and other matters, that he finds it impossible to succeed in his undertaking. There is one fact which goes to prove that the Mormons will not allow the Gentiles their constitutional rights is that you cannot find a single Gentile in the Territory who does not complain of the Mormon persecution. There are many highly respectable Gentiles, men who are not carpet baggers, and who can be relied upon, but they are all united in their complaint of the Mormon interference with their rights."

Did you talk any with the Mormons?

Oh, yes, and they are very adroit in their arguments. Of course they have had time to prepare as able a defense as possible for their system. There is no system in the world which cannot be supported by argument. We visited the temple and heard Bishop Woodruff speak. He was aware that there were strangers present, however, and was prepared for the occasion, delivering a conservative and adroit sermon. The fact remains, however, there is need of effective governmental interference to protect the citizens in their rights, and I know of no better way to do it than to have the President appoint the Legislature."

We are doubtful as to which party should be accorded the palm for senility, the Governor of Missouri or the *News* of Denver. If the gentleman is vain and childish for supposing that a look at Salt Lake City and a that with a bitter anti-"Mormon" qualified him to suggest to the country a solution of the "Mormon" problem, the newspaper that hung upon his words was quite as simple and silly, in thinking that he could say anything on the subject that would be of any value because he had sniffed the breezes from our saline lake, and had sat at the table of Utah's executive. Why, he hadn't "gumption" enough to know that the "Mormons" do not hold public services in the Temple—an unfinished building anyhow—and that the speaker he heard is not a Bishop. He had the egotism, however, to think President Woodruff's remarks were framed specially for his ears, while everybody who knows the speaker understands that he does not frame his speeches to please anybody, but always talks that which is prompted at the moment. These are small things, but they show Governor Crittenden's inaccuracy. They would be perfect, pardonable in a stranger making a short visit and unfamiliar with our affairs here, but when they come from one playing Sir Oracle, we have a right to look for some degree of correctness.

Governor Crittenden says whether "a monogamous Legislature has been elected will remain to be seen." No one here has ever cast a doubt upon that fact. It is undisputed. But he believes that "the President of the United States ought to appoint the Legislature for the Territory." Really. And for what reason? "To protect people and property." Has any one told him that people and property are not protected in Utah? If so they simply lied to him. There is nothing akin to Ku-Kluxism in Utah, and there is no "Gentile" persecuted in the Territory in regard to water privileges or anything of the kind. We do not doubt that he was told a lot of stuff like that he gave to the Denver reporter, but it was nothing more nor less than lying. A non-"Mormon" who has been for some time in this city expressed in our hearing, but a few days ago, his surprise on finding out that otherwise respectable men—"Gentiles"—living in Salt Lake City whom he had met and supposed to be gentlemen, when they talked about the "Mormons" would positively lie, as he had proven to his satisfaction. Somebody has evidently been lying to Governor Crittenden, and his blame is in repeating the falsehoods told to him as facts and as if they had come under his own observation.

Just think of the absurdity of the statement that "the Mormons will not allow the Gentiles their constitutional rights!" Whoever heard anything worse than that, unless it was the rubbish that was given for truth to poor General Grosvenor, and which he was silly enough to publicly repeat in this city, where its falsehood and absurdity were known to all men, instead of keeping it like Governor Crittenden's nonsense, for people who do not understand the situation.

Neither Governor Crittenden, Governor Murray nor any other "Gentile" can point his finger at a single right of which he is deprived by "Mormon" influence. There is no such thing. What right enjoyed in any part of the Union is denied to a "Gentile" in Utah? He cannot vote for President of the United States. Is that the fault of the "Mormons?" He and his friends cannot elect men of their own number to local offices. Whose fault is that? They are in the minority and have plotted and schemed and are trying still to take away the political rights of the majority, and have thus strengthened the union of the latter against themselves.

Whose fault is that? Then the minority have all the Federal offices, every place worth a cent that is in the gift of the Government, but they want all there is, and therefore cannot be satisfied. If their votes do not count for anything in local elections because they are too few, whose fault is that? If they belonged to the losing party in an election in any part of the country, how much would their votes amount to in the end? Just as much as they do here, and no more.

The statement that "if left to themselves the 'Mormons' would not allow a Gentile to settle in the Territory," is a piece of information that would make Governor Crittenden the laughing stock of the country, if similar falsehoods were not told very frequently. Why, there were "Gentiles" in Utah who made fortunes in merchandize, while the "Mormons" were in complete control of affairs, before the railroad was projected, and while the people here were isolated. There is nothing in the "Mormon" faith nor a "Mormon" practice that warrants such a notion. And it is nothing but an opinion, not of Governor Crittenden's, for he has not expressed an original thought on the "Mormon" question, but one put into his head from the same source as his other errors. He is only playing parrot.

The truth is that the batch of tomfoolery, gravely repeated by Governor Crittenden and published by the *Denver News*, was manufactured long ago by the little clique in this city that is working for the appointment of a Legislative Commission to control the Territory, by which they and their friends may gain possession of our local treasury and blind Utah blind. That is the whole story. There is no part of the country where a man or woman of any creed or party, or none at all, is safer, or is better protected in the rights commonly enjoyed than in Utah, and every man in this city, be he Governor, Judge, parson, or editor who says to the contrary, knows that he lies for the purpose of deceiving the country and for nefarious and wicked ends. And those who swallow these stories and repeat them abroad, as facts, ought to despise themselves for their folly, and their vain repetitions ought to find no place in the columns of a respectable newspaper.

## THE LATEST ANTI-"MORMON" NOSTRUM.

THERE is firing all along the line again. A general fusillade on the "Mormon" question comes from the eastern press. The most prominent object of attack is the Territorial Legislature. Quite a number of journalists are endeavoring to create the impression that they have a new missile to hurl against the "Mormon" stronghold. It is the somewhat stale measure, proposed by the Utah clique, to abolish the Legislative Assembly and substitute an appointed Commission. The people of this Territory have heard this until it is like the monotony of an old song on a dilapidated hand-organ. But in other places it may pass for a new way to settle an old difficulty. The *Cleveland Leader* has the annexed paragraph:

"Congress ought to abolish the Territorial law-making power, rule the Territory through a commission. Congress itself makes the necessary laws for the government of the District of Columbia, and not for Utah? Until the Mormons are excluded from all participation in the Territorial government, there will be trouble and polygamy will continue to flourish."

To this the *Omaha Bee* thus responds:

This is the heroic remedy urged by ex-Senator Paddock. But what right has Congress to disfranchise thousands of law abiding citizens in Utah because a portion of the voters in the Territory profess a belief in polygamy. Under the Edmunds law polygamists have already been disfranchised. A government by commission would increase political patronage, and furnish fat provisions for chronic office-seekers. But these minor advantages would be more than set off by the pernicious example of the establishment of a territorial tyranny under whose rule the habeas corpus would be suspended, the right to trial by jury abolished, and all citizens both in