

bitter antagonism has followed the Church throughout its wanderings and reached this Territory. At a conference of the sect held in Ogden, those who composed it, speaking of "Mormonism," said: "It should not be reasoned with but ought to be stamped out."

Do the brethren wish to aid and abet the establishment among them, by their means and otherwise, of an anti-"Mormon" stamp mill to grind up the religion whose adherents they profess to be? To decline to participate in such an operation is certainly not illiberal, but decidedly sensible.

By taking part in a Methodist manufactory Latter-day Saints strengthen the ranks of those who have prominently sought to rob them of their liberties, as witness a resolution passed at the Ogden conference before referred to:

"Resolved—That the laws of this Territory should be made by a council appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate."

Thus is exhibited the fact that the question involved is political as well as religious.

Another illustration of the attitude of the Methodist Church towards the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was furnished in a meeting of that denomination held in this city on Sunday, May 7th, 1882. It was claimed to be one of 10,000 others held under the auspices of the same sect which took place on the same day throughout the United States. Their object was exclusively anti-"Mormon." The proceedings in the one held in this city were participated in by local politicians prominently known for their intense bitterness against the majority of the people of Utah. It was stated with pride, by the clergyman who presided on the occasion, that the church to which he belonged had taken a more active and conspicuous part in opposing the "Mormon" Church than any other religious organization, and that it was principally through its efforts that the Edmunds law was passed.

Dissatisfaction with that measure was expressed by him, he claiming that it was, however, a "step in the right direction." If his statement be taken as correct, inferentially the same body has taken an active part in producing the legislation under which the Church is now being flagrantly robbed of its property. Do these prominent Provo Latter-day Saints desire to

take part in the manufacture of crusaders against the Church to which they belong, and share in introducing into Utah a religious element whose leading purpose is to disintegrate the community with which they are associated? If they do, their position is not liberal, but simply inconsistent and unreasonable.

The position is made still more clear when the attitude of the Latter-day Saints in a religious sense is considered. They positively take the stand that Methodism and all other "isms" have gone out of the way, having departed from the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and while having some truth to convey are largely engaged in the dissemination of error.

This being the case who that claims to be a Latter-day Saint can engage in the work of disseminating darkness in place of light and have any claim to be recognized as possessing the genius of the work of God?

What motive there can be in assuming such a position as that taken by some of our brethren at Provo is not easy to define. It cannot be, from their standpoint, the spiritual advancement of mankind, for the opposite would be the result. Is it because a presumed material advancement would accrue through the establishment of such an institution in their midst, that they desire it? If so, has it come to this—that some of us are willing, so to speak, to sell our birthright for "a mess of pottage" and grasp after material matters to the detriment of those that are higher, because spiritual?

These views are expressed in all kindness; but we unreservedly state them without qualification, and unhesitatingly assert that our position is the antithesis of that which is alleged to be that of some of the prominent brethren at Provo. We are not illiberal. We favor and demand toleration for all; but it does not follow that toleration includes participation in the establishment and the dissemination of that which is understood to be erroneous.

If our Provo friends desire to see the opposite of the attitude which they have taken, they would have only to go into a Methodist community and propose to establish in the midst of it a Latter-day Saint University or Academy. They would immediately see that, instead of encouragement, the stamping-out process would be at once resorted to.

So far as regards the proposition

to tender the temple site for the purpose of building on it such an institution as the one contemplated, the bare proposal of such a thing will meet with unqualified dissent—not to use a stronger term—from the great body of the people composing the Church.

### AN IMPROPER COURSE.

It is according to the genius of the institutions of our common country that the people of localities shall be left, so far as practicable, to manage their own affairs. This is especially the case with regard to elections. The American citizen who has the welfare of the commonwealth at heart views with disfavor anything in the form of outside interference in that connection. It would have been well if United States Marshal Dyer had considered the propriety of this position as relating to the Ogden election yesterday.

There was nothing improper in him and his deputies being on the ground for the purpose of aiding in the maintenance of the peace of the municipality. But he did more than this; in fact, what he did do was of a nature liable to disturb the equanimity of municipal affairs. The local officers were on duty and acted in accordance therewith, their object being to assist in preserving not only the general peace, but the purity of the ballot. In pursuance of this motive they arrested a number of persons charged with illegal voting. They had a perfect right to do this. If it could be proved that they had taken this step illegally, in contravention of the rights of citizens, the law is so framed that they would be liable to punishment for such an infraction. But their action, so far as we understand it, has no such appearance.

The Marshal, in arresting them because they arrested the parties thus charged, assumed the role of an obstructionist and an intimidator. The nature of his office demands that he shall be non-partisan. He did not so act at the election which took place yesterday at Ogden. His step in arresting the officers for the performance of what was their duty was an act bearing injuriously, in the shape of intimidation, upon one of the parties involved in the contest, while it acted as a stimulus of encouragement to the other side.

In proceeding as he did in this matter the Marshal placed himself in an unenviable position, because inimical to one class of the people and favorable to another. His attitude should have been entirely neutral, that being the only proper ground upon which he could stand. It would be well for him to remember that he should confine himself strictly to the duties of his office, and not interfere unwarrantably with the business of the populace.