

alleged sacred books that, the passages quoted by the Brahmins were falsely quoted, and in some instances declared the very reverse of their rendering. [It was on account of this identity of argument that I quoted at Salt Lake from the original volumes of the Mormon faith their strong denunciations of polygamy.] In the sixteenth century the Mohammedan Emperor Akbar prohibited the suttee, but without effect. After the East India Company obtained power there, they endeavored for a dozen years to regulate it; requiring, among other things, that the sacrifice of the widow should be unquestionably voluntary. But such was the influence of the "religious" teachings of their leaders that the attempted regulation utterly failed. In Bengal, alone, from 1815 to 1826, there were no less than 7,154 cases of suttee recorded. Finally, Sir Wm. Bentinck, Governor General of India, determined to extirpate it, denounced it as murder, and required it to be treated and published as such. This, history tells us, created much excitement in Bengal, and, indeed, all over India, the Brahmins denouncing it with great violence (as the Mormons denounce our anti-polygamy law of 1862) as an "interference with their religion." They even sent an agent to England, with large sums of money, to procure its repeal. But England disregarded their "religious" arguments, and stood as one man, with the whole power of the kingdom, by the Governor General; and wherever English power is recognized, there, this so-called religious rite is now sternly forbidden and prevented. England, with united voice, said "Stop!" and India obeyed.

Such is my answer—the answer of England, the answer of history—to the Apostle's argument. The Brahmin reasoning that the woman consented (akin as it is to the Mormon argument now) had no effect. For England understood the power of religious fanaticism; of assumed revelation, of a potential public opinion. The claim that "religious faith" commanded it was powerless; and it went down as a "relic of barbarism," unfit to be tolerated where a civilized people had the power and the will to abolish it.

I pass over the obvious argument that wherever polygamy prevails in the world woman occupies necessarily a degraded and inferior condition; and wherever monogamy has been the law, she has been elevated, till all good men recognize her as the equal sharer of her husband's happiness and home. And I come now to another one of Apostle Taylor's arguments, a favorite and daily argument with all Mormon preachers.

"Let me here," he says, "respectfully ask, is there not plenty of scope for the action of the Government at home? What of your gambling hells? What of your gold rings, your whisky rings, your railroad rings, manipulated through the lobby into your Congressional rings? What of that great moral curse of the land—that great institution of monogamy—prostitution? What of its twin-sister, infanticide? We can teach you a lesson, polygamists as we are. You acknowledge one wife and her children. What of your associations unacknowledged? We acknowledge and maintain all our wives and all our children," etc.

I might answer some of these questions with the argument *ad hominem*. As to "infanticide," I might ask, What did the Mormon sexton's report of deaths in Salt Lake City, the month before we were there, show, as officially published? that over seven-eighths of all the deaths were infants. I do not charge infant murder, of course; but no such mortality is known in the absence of pestilence where monogamy exists. As to "rings," I might reply that the whisky rings and gold rings have already felt the power of this Administration; and I might ask, in return, by what authority the Mormon Territorial Legislature granted to the magnates of their church—their "rings," to use the Apostle's phrase—valuable properties that did not belong to them, and without compensation too? But I prefer to meet this argument on the main point squarely. The "great moral curse of the land," as he calls it, is but the exception to the general rule. How much of it exists in our forty millions of people I do not pretend to compute. But it is everywhere banned by the law, banned by public opinion, banned by religion, banned by morality, and exists, where it does exist, in defiance of all; while the great bulk, the overwhelming proportion of the people, live faithfully, as our first parents did, one husband with one wife. In Utah, what they condemn as "the great institution of monogamy" is practiced under the pretence of religion, of revelation, of duty, of morality. Nor is this all. "Religion" teaches them that a man may take as one of his wives his half sister, the offspring of his own mother. "Religion" tells them that it is right and fitting that the daughters of his own brothers and sisters may be made the mothers of his children. "Religion" assures them that a man may take a mother and all her daughters into the sacred companionship of wifehood together, living alternately in that relation with each as the weeks and months pass by, and having the children of them all, by one father, domiciled under the same roof. Need I pursue this argument further? If such incest and bigamy are to be tolerated and vindicated as "religion," it is certainly no wonder that the Apostle finds it "difficult to say" whether the Hindoos ought to be restrained in their fiery "religious" rites, if they immigrated hither.

IV. IS UTAH WITHIN THE UNITED STATES?

Here only, in the whole civilized world, are practices like these I have referred to tolerated. Here only, in the nation, are the laws of the United States openly ignored and defied. Here only, from ocean to ocean, dare any man proclaim that, as he has done before, he will drive out the officers of the Republic if they perform their duties objectionably to him. Four long years the nation struggled, in an agony of blood, to compel obedience to its laws and submission to its authority all over the South. I would not revive the recollections of that struggle, now happily ended, except to say that hundreds of thousands of those who warred against us were led by the pulpit and by statesmen alike, as well as by the public opinion which surrounded them, to believe that they were right. But the nation resolved that wherever the territorial area of the Union extended, and wherever the flag of the Union had a right to float, there the laws of the Union should be obeyed and the authority of the Union should be respected. Unlike those, however, who sought to secede from the Union, the Mormons claim the benefit of every law they see fit to approve—homestead, naturalization, protection of property by courts and Government, legislative and judicial offices in their Territory, &c.—and trample under foot such other laws of the Government under whose flag is their home, as they see fit to reject. It is time to understand whether the authority of the nation or the authority of Brigham Young is the supreme power in Utah; whether the laws of the United States or the laws of the Mormon Church have precedence within its limits.

I have endeavored fairly, and without bitterness, to discuss this question in the various phases in which it is presented by the Mormon preachers themselves. I have not looked to armies as the solution of this question. But there is a moral power in the people of the United States, if they speak in regard to this stain on the national escutcheon, with one united voice, as England did to the Brahmins. There is an authority in the Congress of the United States which is everywhere else recognized. And in that power, and in that authority, if combined and made manifest, I have faith and hope.

Reply of John Taylor to the Honorable Schuyler Colfax, on

THE "MORMON" QUESTION.

EDITOR DESERET NEWS:

Dear Sir:—Having been in the country and not hearing of Mr. Colfax's reply, while absent, is the reason why this answer has been so long delayed.

Mr. Colfax has replied to my article by another, published in the New York Independent, December 2nd, headed "The Mormon Question."

I have always been taught to reverence men in authority. My religion has not lessened the force of that precept. I am sorry to be under the necessity of differing from the honorable gentleman who stands second in authority in the greatest and freest nation in the world. My motto has always been and now is: Honor to whom honor is due; yet, while I feel bound to pay homage to a man of his talent and position I cannot but realize that "all men are now free and equal," and that I live in a land where the press, thought and speech are free. If it had been a personal difference I should have had no controversy with Mr. Colfax, and the honorable gentleman, I am sure, will excuse me for standing up in the defense of what I know to be a traduced and injured people. I would not accuse the gentleman of misrepresentation. I cannot help knowing, however, that he is misinformed in relation to most of his historical details; and justice to an outraged community, as well as truth, requires that such statements should be met and the truth vindicated. I cannot but think that in refusing the proffered hospitality of our city which, of course, he had a perfect right to do, he threw himself among a class of men that were, perhaps, not very reliable in historical data.

I am not surprised at his apparent prejudices; I can account for his antipathies, but cannot permit Mr. Colfax, even ignorantly, to traduce my friends without defense. He states that "The demand of the people of Utah Territory for immediate admission into the Union, as a State, made at their recent conference meeting and to be presented by their delegate at the approaching session of Congress, compels the nation to meet face to face, a question which it has apparently endeavored to ignore."

Is there anything remarkable in a Territory applying for admission into the Union? How have other States entered the Union since the admission of the first thirteen? Were they not all Territories in their turn, and generally applied to Congress for, and obtained admission? Why should Utah be an exception? She has from time to time, as a constitutional requisition, presented a petition with a constitution containing a

republican form of government. Since her application California, Nevada, Kansas, Minnesota, Oregon and Nebraska have been admitted. And why should Congress, as Mr. Colfax says: "Endeavor to ignore Utah?" And why should it be so difficult a question to "meet face to face?" Has it become so very difficult for Congress to do right? What is the matter? Some remarkable conversation was had between Brigham Young and Senator Trumbull. Now, as I did not happen to hear this conversation, I cannot say what it was. One thing, however, I do know, that I have seen hundreds of distinguished gentlemen call on President Young and they have been uniformly better treated than has been reciprocated. But something was said about United States officers. I am sorry to say that many United States officers have so deported themselves that they have not been much above par with us. They may indeed be satraps and require homage and obeisance; but we have yet to learn to bow the knee. Brigham Young does not generally speak even to a United States Senator with honeyed words and measured sentences; but as an ingenuous and honest man. But we are told that "the recent expulsion of prominent members of his church for doubting his infallibility proves that he regards his power as equal to any emergency and has a will equal to his power."

I am sorry to have to say that Mr. Colfax is mistaken here. No person was ever dismissed from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for disbelieving in the infallibility of President Young. I do not believe he is infallible, for one; and have so taught publicly. I am in the Church yet. Neither have I ever heard President Young make any such pretensions. Mr. Colfax is a good politician, but he makes sad blunders in polemics. He makes a magnificent Speaker and President of the Senate; I am afraid, however, that as a preacher he would not be so successful. The honorable gentleman now proceeds to divide his subject and commences:

"I. THEIR FERTILIZING OF THE DESERT."

"For this they claim great credit, and I would not detract an iota from all they are legitimately entitled to. It was a desert when they first emigrated thither. They have made large portions of it fruitful and productive, and their chief city is beautiful in location and attractive in its gardens and shrubbery. But the solution of it all is in one word—water. What seemed to the eye a desert became fruitful when irrigated, and the mountains, whose crests are clothed in perpetual snow, furnished, in the unending supplies of their ravines, the necessary fertilizer."

Water! Mirabile dictu! Here I must help Mr. C. out.

This wonderful little water nymph, after playing with the clouds on our mountain tops, frolicking with the snow and rain in our rugged gorges for generations, coquetting with the sun and dancing to the sheen of the moon, about the time the "Mormons" came here took upon herself to perform a great miracle, and descending to the valley with a wave of her magic wand and the mysterious words, "hiccory, diccory, dock," cities and streets were laid out, crystal waters flowed in ten thousand rippling streams, fruit trees and shrubbery sprang up, gardens and orchards abounded, cottages and mansions were organized, fruits, flowers and grain in all their elysian glory appeared and the desert blossomed as the rose; and this little frolicking elf, so long confined to the mountains and water courses proved herself far more powerful than Cinderella or Aladdin. Oh! Jealousy, thou green-eyed monster! Can no station in life be protected from the shimmer of thy glamour? must our talented and honorable Vice-President be subjected to thy jaundiced touch? But to be serious, did water tunnel through our mountains, construct dams, canals and ditches, lay out our cities and towns, import and plant choice fruit-trees, shrubs and flowers, cultivate the land and cover it with the cattle on a thousand hills, erect churches, school-houses and factories, and transform a howling wilderness into a fruitful field and garden? If so, why does not the Green River, the Snake River, Bear River, Colorado, the Platte and other rivers perform the same prodigies? Unfortunately for Mr. Colfax, it was "Mormon" polygamists who did it. The Erie, the Welland, the Pennsylvania and Suez canals are only water. What if a stranger on gazing upon the statuary in Washington and our magnificent Capitol, and after rubbing his eyes were to exclaim, "Eureka! it is only rock and mortar and wood." This discoverer would announce that instead of the development of art, intelligence, industry and enterprise, its component parts were simply stone, mortar and wood. Mr. Colfax has discovered that our improvements are attributable to water.

We next come to another division and quote

THEIR PERSECUTIONS.

"This also is one of their favorite themes. Constantly it is reiterated by their apostles and bishops, from week to week, and from year to year. It is discoursed about in their tabernacles and their ward and town churches. It is written about in their periodicals and papers. It is talked about with nearly every stranger that comes into their midst. They have been driven from place to place, they claim, solely on account of their religious belief. Their faith

has subjected them to the wickedest persecutions by unbelievers. They have been despoiled, they insist, of their property; maltreated in their persons, buffeted and cast out, because they would not renounce their professions and their revelations."

This, sir, is all true; does it falsify a truth to repeat it? The Mormons make these statements and are always prepared to prove them. I referred to some of these things in my last; Mr. Colfax has not disproved them. He now states, "I do not attempt to decide that the charges against them are well founded." Why then are they made? Has it become so desirable to put down the Mormons that unfounded charges must be preferred against them?

"Their church was first established at Manchester, New York, in 1830, and their first removal was in 1831, to Kirtland, Ohio, which they declared was revealed to them as the site of their New Jerusalem." (A mistake) "Thence their leaders went west to search a new location, which they found in Jackson county, Mo., and dedicated a site for another New Jerusalem there, and returned to Kirtland to remain for five years avowedly to make money;" (an error) "a bank was established there by them; large quantities of bills, of doubtful value issued, and growing out of charges of fraudulent dealing, Smith and Rigdon were tarred and feathered." This is a gross perversion, Smith and Rigdon were tarred and feathered in March, 1832, in Hiram, Portage county; the bank was organized Dec. 2nd, 1836, in Kirtland.

Mr. C. continues: "And unjustifiable as such outrages are this one was based on alleged fraud and not on religious belief." Allow me to state that this persecution was based on religious belief and not on fraud, and that this statement is a perversion, for the bank was not opened until several years after the tarring and feathering referred to. But did the bank fail? yes, in 1837, about five years after, in the great financial crisis; and so did most of the banks in the United States, in Canada, a great many in England, France and other parts of Europe. Is it so much more criminal for the Mormons to make a failure than others? Their bank was swallowed in the general financial maelstrom, and some time after the failure of the bank, the bills were principally redeemed.

"They fled to Missouri, their followers joined them there, they were soon accused of plundering and burning habitations and with secret assassinations." Was there no law in Missouri? The Missourians certainly did not lack either the will or the power to enforce it. Why were not these robbers, incendiaries, and assassins dealt with? Mr. C. continues:—"Nor do these charges against them rest on the testimony of those who had not been of their own faith; in October 1838, T. B. Marsh, ex-president of the twelve apostles of their church, and Orson Hyde, one of the apostles, made affidavits before an officer in Ray county, Missouri; in which Marsh swore and Hyde corroborated it."

"They have among them a company consisting of all that are true Mormons, called the Danites, who have taken an oath to support the heads of the church in all things, whether right or wrong. I have heard the prophet say that he would yet tread down his enemies and walk over their dead bodies; that, if he was not let alone he would be a second Mohammed to this generation, and that he would make it one gore of blood from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean." I am sorry to say that Thomas B. Marsh, did make that affidavit, and that Orson Hyde stated that he knew part of it and believed the other; and it would be disingenuous in me to deny it; but it is not true that these things existed, for I was there and knew to the contrary; and so did the people of Missouri, and so did the Governor of Missouri. How do you account for their acts? Only on the score of the weakness of our common humanity. We were living in troublous times, and all men's nerves are not proof against such shocks as we then had to endure. Mobs were surrounding us on every hand, burning our houses, murdering our people, destroying our crops, killing our cattle. About this time that horrible massacre at Hauns Mill took place, where men, women and children, were indiscriminately butchered, and their remains, for want of other sepulture, thrown into a well. Messages were coming in from all parts, of fire, devastation, blood and death. We threw up a few logs and fences for protection; this, I suppose, is what Mr. Colfax calls, "fortifying their towns and defying the officers of law." If wagons and fences and a few house logs are fortifications, we were fortified; and if the mob, whose hands were dripping with the blood of men, women and children, whom they had murdered in cold blood, were "officers of the law" then we are guilty of the charge. I cannot defend the acts of Thomas B. Marsh or Orson Hyde, although the latter had been laboring under a severe fever, and was at the time only just recovering, no more than I could defend the acts of Peter when he cursed and swore and denied Jesus; nor the acts of Judas who betrayed Him; but, if Peter, after going out and "weeping bitterly," was restored, and was afterwards a chief apostle; so did Orson Hyde repent sincerely and weep bitterly, and was restored and has since been to Palestine, Germany and other nations. Thomas B. Marsh returned a poor broken down man, and begged to live with us; he got up before assembled thousands and stated: "It