

But when it comes to the test they have not the manhood to come out in defense of a community so unpopular as this. They dread the ridicule of those who think they know all about the "Mormon" question, and the abuse of those cowardly scoundrels of the press who assail every decent man that dares to advocate "fair play for the Mormons."

Capt. Colman has already received the compliments of the same vile libeller who emptied his bucket of invective upon Judge Carlton. In characteristic billingsgate he likens the Captain to a dog and says, "he likes to get down and grovel in filth;" that "he never hesitates to tell an untruth," that "he fell down and wallowed in the system here from the first," and that he is a case of "total depravity." But all this throwing of dirt strengthens the testimony and the arguments of the gentleman so attacked. It does not cast any discredit upon the one or make any reply to the other. It virtually admits their truth and shows that they have enraged a professional retailer of falsehood whose only resort is this kind of base retaliation.

Captain Codman holds some views with which we do not agree, but never on that account have we considered him either insincere or evil-minded. We respect his opinions, admire his valor and endorse most of his communication which we have reproduced. And we are sure that its common sense and clear exhibition of facts cannot be successfully controverted, and certainly will not be covered up or injuriously affected, by the slops and mire ejected upon him through the columns of the vilest paper published on the American continent.

#### TRYING TO BREAK ITS FORCE.

It is interesting to note the malignant efforts that are being made, through a prostituted use of the telegraph wires and of the press of the country, to break the force of the manifesto recently issued by President Woodruff, and which was sustained and accepted by the general Conference of the Church on Monday, October 6. One of these contemptible attempts appears in the *Denver News*, in the form of a dispatch dated at this city.

The attitude of our Denver cotemporary in relation to what has been called "The 'Mormon' Question" has, as a rule, been consistent and just. The person who supplied

the dispatch in point has endeavored to mislead it, however, and probably expected to cause it to change its consistent attitude. There is at present no evidence of his having succeeded, as no comment on the dispatch appears in the *News* columns.

The sender of the telegram states what took place at the Conference when the manifesto was adopted, fairly enough, but he appends a lot of anti-"Mormon" rubbish to it for the evident purpose of destroying the effect of the document and the action taken upon it by the general assembly of the Church. He was afraid to leave the matter to the dispassionate judgment of the readers lest they might get a proper understanding of the subject. The dispatcher thus comments:

"The news that the conference had endorsed the manifesto against polygamy spread rapidly throughout the city, but it created no consternation or surprise. In fact, it scarcely occasioned any comment. The anti-Mormons rather expected such a move, and viewed it in the light of projected legislation and said it was only another trick of the Mormon Church to retain control of the Territory."

The thin-brained deceiver who penned this could not see the conflict in his own statement. Just imagine an incident spreading "rapidly throughout the city" causing "no comment." The very fact that the news of the fact spread with such rapidity, proves the universal comment it created. As it completely swept away the anti-"Mormon" hobby the local active politicians have been riding so long, the consternation it carried among that class may be more readily imagined than described. This consternation is being exhibited by such persons as the fellow who sent the deceptive dispatch to the *Denver News*, as they are in mortal terror lest the manifesto be taken for what it is, a genuine expression of the attitude of the "Mormon" Church in reference to the laws of the United States forbidding plural marriages.

The "official declaration" was what the anti-"Mormons" demanded, so long as they believed that the head of the Church and the Church itself would not issue and adopt such a measure. The moment it is done, however, they characterize it as a subterfuge. Such repudiation, without a scintilla of evidence to back it, is villainous.

The only attempt at evidence offered by the clique to which the dispatcher belongs is what he says occurred five years ago, when the

Latter-day Saints, voicing their sentiments in a mass meeting, formulated a petition to the President of the United States setting forth their grievances against the conduct of certain Federal officials who had gone outside the law in an anti-"Mormon" crusade. In that document the *belief* of the Latter-day Saints in the doctrine of plural marriage was honestly set forth. This declaration of belief is still further emphasized by the dispatcher by the following quotation he gives from the report of the Utah Commission to the Secretary of the Interior, forwarded about the same time as the petition referred to:

"This article of their faith is as much an essential and a substantial a part of their creed as their belief in baptism, repentance for the forgiveness of sins, and the like. All orthodox Mormons believe polygamy to be right and that it is an essential part of their creed."

From the use made of these proceedings of the past it would appear that a class of political tricksters and religious fanatics and bigots take the ground that the right of petition and *belief* should be denied to the "Mormons," and that when they exercise them they should be denounced and hounded and robbed. The Supreme Court decisions, subsequently rendered, sustained the position of the petitioners in reference to the persecutive conduct of certain federal officials, whose actions the court of last resort overturned.

And further, if there is any citizen, religious or otherwise, within these United States who is to be deprived of his rights because his *belief* does not agree with the belief of somebody else, it is time that fact was understood. We have always had the impression, backed by express language used by the Supreme Court of the nation, that the laws only deal with overt acts and not with *belief*, which is without the pale of legislative action.

The crowning absurdity is reached by the fellow who sent the telegram to our Denver cotemporary when he cites past teaching and practices of the "Mormons" as evidence that the manifesto is not what it purports to be. There is no one that we know of that is attempting to deny that the doctrine has in the past been a practical institution of the Church. If it had not been it is to be presumed by every sane person that the manifesto declaring the *present* position of the Church on the subject would have been entirely unnecessary.