

"We see Oakes Murphy before a congressional committee, advising them to deprive the Mormons of Arizona of their right to participate in the affairs of government in this territory, and knowing the gentleman well, we are forced to ask why he seeks to perpetuate this wrong. In the town of Mesa, sixteen miles from the capital of Arizona, is what is termed a Mormon settlement, and contains a population of probably one thousand souls, and a more law-abiding, thrifty little community does not exist in the west. They pay their taxes, obey the laws, maintain public schools, cultivate the soil and live as virtuous and honorable lives as does Mr. Murphy or any of his friends.

"They do not either practice or preach polygamy, and, as far as known, their only crime is that of being Democrats, as a rule. As a question of their standing with the people of this county, we would be willing to wager their right of suffrage against that of Mr. Murphy's that any one of twenty men of this reviled settlement can defeat Mr. Murphy for any office he may select, the Mormons to refrain from taking part in the election—in other words, any one of twenty men chosen from this settlement stand as well in the estimation of the people of this county as does Oakes Murphy, and the gentleman is popular in our county also. We will challenge the gentleman to the contest, and allow the Republicans and Democrats of Maricopa to express their opinion as to whether those people ought to be debarred from voting or not; and leaving Mr. Murphy out of the question, no unpartisan, thinking man denies that the Struble bill now before Congress, which has for its object the disfranchising of those people, is unconstitutional.

Under the precedents established by the decisions of Congress, when dealing with the "Mormon" question, according to the declarations of the best constitutional lawyers who have ever discussed that question in that body; according to the admissions of the ablest and most thoughtful journalists that have treated upon the subject, it would be a flagrant and dangerous breach of the American constitution to deny a man the privilege of the ballot because his religious views or associations were objectionable to the majority. This proposition is elementary and any denial of its soundness must arise from sheer ignorance of the nature and intent of the provisions of the country's basic law which relates to the matter, or from a reckless disregard of the truth and consequences. As this ignorance can hardly be attributed to the members of Congress, it follows that every one of them who may vote for the Struble bill will do so for the reason that he prefers to break the organic law of the land rather than permit the Mormons to possess and exercise the privilege of citizenship.

HUMAN EFFORT AND DIVINE OVERRULING.

THERE is nothing better known to the Latter-day Saints, connected with the history and progress of the Church to which they belong, than the fact that the persecutions and trials through which they have passed since the martyrdom of Joseph the Seer were predicted by that great Prophet and repeated by

his successors with further details. We do not mean by this that every incident was specified and particularized, but the general events were so foreshadowed that the student of Church history has had no occasion for surprise at any of the outrages which have been committed, whether under color of law or otherwise, upon the Church and its faithful members.

It is fully expected by the Elders of this Church that the departures from constitutional principles and guaranties which have already commenced will be continued, as occasions permit and excuses can be manufactured, until the supreme law of the land will be entirely disregarded, in so far as it protects the Latter-day Saints in their religious liberties. And that this contempt for the restraints of that instrument will increase until other people and other interests will be affected, and the Elders of this Church will, at length, be instrumental in the hands of Divine Providence in saving it from utter destruction.

All this may be treated with that ridicule which arrogant skeptics indulge in regarding things held sacred by believers. But that will not hinder the course of events nor prevent the fulfilment of prophecy. Neither will it obstruct the vision of those whose eyes are open to the gradual unfoldment of the plans and purposes of the Almighty.

The scoffer, however, interposes what he thinks is a logical and unanswerable query, and wants to know why if these things are "the decrees of the Lord" the Saints take any steps to prevent them. He also argues that any paper believing in these predictions stultifies itself, even in expressing a hope that the legislators and courts of the country will take a different course.

In the first place a prediction is not a "decree." Foreknowledge is not fore-ordination. Observation of a present act or occurrence does not imply responsibility on the part of the observer for that act or occurrence. Perception of the doings of men or nations before they are done does not make the seer a party thereto. A divine or human being who foresees an evil does not become its author because of its prescience. Some minds are so constituted that they cannot, seemingly, distinguish the difference between the gift of foresight and the performance or prevention of the things foreseen.

In the next place, although a

man may believe that injustice and wrong will be accomplished, he would not be justified if he refrained from doing all that lay in his power to prevent or hinder its accomplishment. If he were to refrain, he would to some extent share the responsibility for the wrong effected. It is the duty of every one to hinder or prevent evil if he can, and also to point out the wrong so that the perpetrators may be left without excuse for their evil deeds.

It is also reasonable and right to entertain and express the hope that although offenses will come, persons now entrusted with power and authority will not commit them. And every attempt at their perpetration should be lawfully resisted and its character and effects be exposed.

It might as well be argued that the Almighty, who knows the end from the beginning, is foolish in forbidding evil when he foresees its practice, and criminal in not preventing that which he foresees. Such logic is the conclusion of ignorance and the reasoning of weakness or wickedness. The agency of man is assured. God does not interfere with its exercise. The good and the evil are both before all men. Each individual takes his choice. Nations are individuals aggregated. All are responsible to the Supreme Being for their acts. They are forbidden to do wrong; they are told what is right. Judgment will follow sin as sure as effect follows cause. To prevent wrongdoing by force would destroy man's agency and make him no longer a responsible being. Rewards and punishments would have to be abolished.

We believe that the time will come when "ALL nations will look upon Zion and say 'let her be defiled.'" But we consider it the duty of every son and daughter of Zion to maintain the right, warn the world, protest against injustice, put forth the truth though the floods of error and falsehood may seem to be overwhelming, and struggle to the end of mortal life in resistance of that which is wrong, even though they may know that their efforts will not be presently successful.

The Latter-day Saints do not live simply for today or for this world. They know they are in eternity and that eventually truth will come uppermost and finally justice will be done. Therefore they will stand for principle and strive against wrong, whatever may be the immediate result.