

EDITORIALS.

HERE are two ideas in regard to the "solution of the Mormon question," which we find in the *Colorado Miner*—

The solution of the Mermon question will never be accomplished by prosecuting them before legal tribunals for their polygamous habits. Settle up the country with gentle population. Overpower the Mormons at the ballot box and the great work of rooting out the many wife system will be thoroughly done forever.

Let government encourage emigration to Utah by giving to actual settlers a section of land to all married persons, and a half section to bachelors and unmarried women. This method will work the peaceable solution of the Mormon question in a short time.

The first idea, that the "solution" will never be accomplished by prosecuting the "Mormons," persecuting them would be a more proper term, for such indeed it is, stripping it of all disguise and letting the proceedings appear in all their naked deformity, is just and true. It is expecting altogether too much, if it is expected that the doctrine and custom of plural marriage, when believed and practiced as a portion of the religion of a community, which, beyond all controversy, is the case with the Latter-day Saints, will be abolished by vexatious and malicious lawsuits. Such an extinguishment of a great principle, a principle of vast antiquity and very widely prevalent acceptance in all ages, is not reasonable, is not probable, and perhaps we might say not possible. It is not in the nature of things that malicious proscription, legal or illegal, to destroy a people by destroying a fundamental principle of their religion, should be successful. And if successful, it would brand the brows of the perpetrators of the infamy with a more odious mark than that which was set upon Cain. It appears to be a favorite subterfuge with many of those who are operating in the crusade against "Mormonism" to profess that they are not operating against a religion, but merely executing the law. They evidently are very anxious to carry out an odious law, rather than backward to do so, and they do not care a straw what injustice they perpetrate in their work. Justice is not what they wish to execute. If they did they would act very differently to what they do. If they had lived in the days of Nebuchadnezzar they would have been just as forward to carry out his senseless edicts as they are in the present crusade. If they had lived in the time of Herod, they would have been among those who carried out his infanticidal decrees, because they are so very anxious to execute the law, let it be wholesome or pestiferous. Of course if you execute the law, and the law is infamous, in may be that the law will be repealed sometime, but that will not restore the blood shed, the time wasted, the substance eaten up, nor make amends for the annoyance and distress caused by the execution of the law. Somebody must be held responsible for all this before the bar of justice, and although the perpetrators of the infamy may wash their holy hands in presumed innocence, Pilate like, yet that will not justify them for having any hand in the iniquitous proceedings—the debt must be paid, the atonement made, by somebody. And herein is the reason that such proscription can not be ultimately successful—justice will not permit it, there is a wrong done, and it must be righted; truth is trampled underfoot, but it cannot be destroyed, for truth finally is omnipotent and in the nature of things must prevail; a germ of deathless vitality is warred against, but, as it cannot be killed, it will eventually outwear and outlive and triumph over all opposition.

In the second place, the *Miner* presents a very good idea in the proposition for the government to give actual settlers in Utah, if married, a section of land; if unmarried, whether bachelors or maids or widows, half a section. We will vote for that proposition. But then we must give our vote in strict justice to the heroic settlers, the *bounty* side settlers. Now it would not be just to begin with the settlers of 1871. No, the only proper way would be to begin with the settlers of 1849, and follow the years down to the present date. The older settlers were far more worthy of such substantial encouragement than are those of this present year, for the country was supposed to be worth nothing then, but now it is considered

very valuable. Then the discouragements were numerous and great, now the encouragements preponderate decidedly. Let the grants be made, but begin at the beginning and not at the end, the wrong end of the business. Make a good and straightforward and upright work of it, and then see who will triumph at the ballot. To justice, strict justice, we never demur.

To the Editor of the "Deseret News," Sir:—Permit me to ask you in good faith and in all candor, the following questions:

FIRST.—Is Polygamy a crime according to the statute law of the land?

SECOND.—If it is, are not the courts and officers of the law bound by their duty and by their oaths, to enforce the law against Polygamy just as any other act made criminal by law?

THIRD.—What would you think of Judges that should wholly ignore any other act made criminal by law,—when brought to their notice?

FOURTH.—If then, it is the duty of the Courts to reform the law—whatever difference of opinion there might be as to its propriety or justice—how can the said courts be reasonably censured? Now I ask these questions in perfect good faith, and shall be glad to have an equally candid reply.

FRIEND OF HUMANITY.

THE writer of the above communication has addressed us anonymously, without furnishing us his real name; we are not, therefore, under any obligation to reply to his inquiries. But as he says he asks in good faith, and requests an answer in "equal candor," we waive our usual custom and reply to him.

Reply to question No. 1.—For the first time in the history of the country a law was passed in 1862 making the practice of a religious doctrine a crime. That law has been viewed by many sound jurists, whose sympathies have not been with the religion assailed, as unconstitutional. Of course, the people against whose faith the law was leveled, have always held that the law was a palpable violation of the first amendment of the Constitution, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Reply No. 2.—The Courts and officers of the law are bound by their duty and by their oaths to uphold law, and not to violate it; to sustain the liberties of the people, not to assail them. If they respect their oaths, they will not perpetrate actual wrong to correct seeming wrong; they will not, through eagerness to remove an evil (so-called), be guilty of greater and more dangerous evils.

Reply to No. 3.—"Friend to Humanity" asks us, in this, a very direct question, and it is one that covers the position now occupied by certain officials in this Territory. Cannot he see that in their anxiety to reach and punish certain practices, they close their eyes to the existence of glaring crimes? and that they have wholly ignored those Statutes which would interfere with the successful carrying out of their schemes, while they have given prominence and force to those Statutes which are likely to serve their purpose? By such conduct we think they have exposed themselves to impeachment.

Reply to No. 4.—Where censure of the Courts has been expressed, it is not for enforcing, but for violating the law.

We have thus endeavored to comply with our correspondent's request and give a candid reply to his questions. But he doubtless perceives that they are not germane to the cases at present at issue in the Courts.

SOMEHOW or other, when people attack "Mormonism," it seems as if their good sense and good judgment, such as they have, are taken away from them. If it is not so, what can be the reason that they make such inconsistent and unwise assertions as they frequently do when they are speaking upon that subject? The other day, among some extracts which we made from the *Philadelphia Press*, was the following—

Now, best of all, Mormon jurors are excluded from the jury box.

Any man possessing a grain of good sense, fairness, love of justice, would at once consider that the writer of the above was in an unsound state of mind. What is there for an honest man to rejoice over in the fact that a whole community are arbitrarily excluded from the jury-box in an enlightened Republic like the United States? Is not such exclu-

sion equivalent to the arbitrary abolishment of juries, and the institution of despotic and irresponsible trial, which would be worse than martial law or the court of Judge Lynch? Is there anything for congratulation in such a state of things, and especially when the people so abused constitute all but a small fraction of the community, and the community, especially the so abused portion of it, by common consent of candid and well informed men, is one of the soberest, quietest, most industrious, most moral, most law-abiding and order-loving communities in the land? One would think it utterly impossible for any justice-loving man, indeed for any sane man, to make such an observation as the one quoted from the *Press*. Why should an American glory in the fact that nine-tenths of the community are excluded from the jury box, without conviction, without trial, without being charged with criminality, but solely because they will not deny their religion and their God?

Let any sober minded man reflect for a few minutes upon the nature of the principle and the policy involved in the above quotation. The jubilation of the *Press* is over the fact that the "Mormons" are excluded. Would not the "Mormons" have equal right to rejoice if Methodists were excluded, the Methodists if the Catholics were excluded, the Catholics if Protestants were excluded? How would the *Press* man like to read in his own paper—"Now, best of all, Catholic jurors are excluded from the jury box; now, best of all, Methodist jurors are excluded from the jury box; now, best of all, Baptist jurors are excluded from the jury box?" And all this could be done with as much reason as similar things are done regarding the "Mormons." And more, if such unwarrantable exclusion be permitted against the "Mormons," it will ere long be instituted against other religious bodies, and the precedent will be there to give force and prestige to further extension of the policy. If it is in the choice of men whether or not they shall commence to work iniquity, it is not within the compass of their discretion where the iniquity will end, nor whom its blighting effects will reach.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED.—The *Omaha Herald*, of the 15th, has the following:

Omaha Herald, please answer these two questions:

Do you believe in the divine origin of polygamy?

Do you believe that your friends, Brigham Young and George Q. Cannon think the "revelation" more than a sham and a lie?

That's all we want to know this time.—*Corinne Reporter*.

These questions were probably considered pertinent by the *Reporter*.

The first one, in this case, was asked without knowledge that the *Herald*, long ago, reviewed and denounced polygamy in as severe terms as its poor use of language enabled it to do. Its editor denounced it, in like manner, to the abject of the Mormon leaders when he met them in their homes, face to face.

It is not presumed that the clergymen of Chicago, who, pending the defeat of the Cullom Bill, preached able sermons in defense of the religious rights of the people of Utah, believed that polygamy was a divine institution, or that they personally sanctioned its practice any more than we do.

To the first question, we give emphatic answer; No. We do not "believe in the divine origin of polygamy."

To the second question we give equally emphatic answer; Yes. We do believe, without a shade or shadow of a doubt, that our friends—and we are proud to call them our friends—Brigham Young and George Q. Cannon, religiously and sincerely believe that "the revelation" is something more than "a sham and a lie," and that polygamy is of divine origin.

Any more questions?

The editor of the *Herald* is one of the large souled, broad minded class, who, while he may differ with others in opinion, is willing that all should enjoy the most untrammelled freedom of thought and conscience. He is not a champion of "Mormonism," but of human rights.

APPREHEND NO DIFFICULTIES.—The *New York Tribune* of Oct. 11th says:

The official authorities in Washington have no apprehension of any difficulties between the Mormons and the United States troops. Gen. Augur, now in Washington, has been consulted on the subject of affairs in Utah. The troops will be transferred to another camp, and a change made in the command, Lieut. Col. Morrow of the 13th Infantry succeeding Col. DeTroband.

Those sensation-mongers will be rather disappointed over such news. May the plots of the wicked ever fail.

A REIGN OF TERROR IN PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA, October 10.—A terrible riot commenced about eleven o'clock this morning in the neighborhood of Sixth and Lombard Streets. The negroes assembled in vast crowds, creating much noise and interfering with the election.

The mayor appeared on the ground and stated that the court ordered him to preserve the peace. He said all would have fair play. He then placed the chief of police in charge of the poll with a large body of officers.

A prominent colored man named Henry Lewis attempted to vote and was immediately challenged by a policeman. This led to high words and a fight took place.

The policeman shot at Lewis three times, one ball taking effect in the right side of his face, and another in his right leg. Several other persons were wounded in the fight, among them Mr. W. S. Hine, a newspaper reporter, who was struck in the face with a brick.

Lewis was taken to the hospital. He is not expected to live.

Charles Dennis, colored, was also severely beaten, and it is thought his injuries will prove fatal.

A number of negroes afterwards made an organized attack on the police, and the latter fired several volleys with their pistols, and succeeded in beating back the crowd. A large number of casualties occurred, but none, so far as known, have proved very serious.

The colored people still threaten to clean the police out.

The polls closed at 7 p. m. over one of the most exciting elections ever held in this city. The contest has been signalized by unusual quiet in most of the wards, while in others most desperate fighting has taken place, resulting in a number of murders. In every case the victims were colored men. This has naturally acted to combine the negroes in a firm intent and purpose to wreak vengeance on those whom they term their oppressors.

This afternoon, on South street, between Eighth and Ninth street, the peculiar quarter of the colored people, Professor Octavius V. Catto was shot through the heart and almost instantly killed—as some say, by a policeman and others by a white man, who met him and had some words relative to the political situation. This act of undeniable murder on the highway, apart from a polling booth, greatly disturbs all classes of people.

The excitement is augmented by the fact that Mr. Catto was a very quiet gentleman and an erudite scholar, being Principal of the Colored High School of this city. He was much esteemed by President Grant and many other persons of national reputation in the country.

About 1:30 o'clock this afternoon a person, known to the police as "Reddy," approached Mr. Isaac Chase (colored) and brained him with an axe upon his own door step in presence of his wife and children, in Emmeline street, without cause or provocation.

There were serious rows in the Eighth, Tenth, and Fourth Wards, resulting in the wounding of a number of persons, some of whom were mortally injured.

Major General Provost, at the Mayor's request, has ordered the First Division of National Guards under arms.—*New York Star*.

DON'T UNDERSTAND IT.—The *Reese River Reveller* says—

All our Salt Lake exchanges reach us regularly but the *News*, which is received in all conceivable irregularity. Sometimes direct; sometimes eleven days old; sometimes not at all, and then a whole batch at once. We are really anxious to get the *News* regularly, for it carries news and helps supply our copy greatly.

Our mailing clerk says that the exchanges leave this office regularly every day. Our cotemporary, therefore, must look to the Post Office officials for a regular and prompt delivery.

THOSE TO BE INDICTED.—A Salt Lake correspondent of the *New York Tribune* says—

Members of the bar assert that new indictments will be found against the Mormon leaders, and that in tracing out the crimes which have been from time to time committed in this Territory testimony is sought against prominent Mormons only, the more obscure, even though not less guilty, persons being passed by.

The same correspondent in the same letter also has the following—

For a male member of the "Church" to be guilty of any lewd act is for him to secure universal condemnation. In fact, I have little doubt that some of the sudden deaths which have from time to time occurred here would, if traceable, be found to have been only the ordinary and prescribed punishment for some act of sexual infidelity.

This does not at all agree with the "lacivious" indictments. But that's nothing to gentlemen who are devoutly given to carrying out the letter of the "law."