

# The Deseret Weekly,

PUBLISHED BY

THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY,

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, . . . \$2.50.

Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50.

IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSS, . . . EDITOR.

Saturday, . . . November 8, 1890.

## A POOR APOLOGETIC EXPLANATION.

A DAY or two since O. J. Hollister arose—in the columns of the chief anti-“Mormon” organ—to explain. His explanation was in the nature of an apology for Mr. Goodwin, the “Liberal” candidate for Delegate to Congress. Its writer has an exceedingly loose way of making his points, which are invisible to the naked eye after the manufacturing process is complete. His mind appears to be of that contracted cast that prevents it from taking in all the bearings of a subject. He is therefore always unequal to the task of preserving its consistency throughout. Consequently he is in the habit of defeating his own object, which, in our view, is never honest.

The object of the apology was to show that Judge Goodwin was not the originator of the scheme for the disfranchisement of the “Mormons,” as he did not step upon the stage of Utah politics till 1880. The writer of this remarkable manifesto then goes on to show that the “Liberal” Party had clamored for the disfranchisement of their political opponents as far back as ten years before that year.

Thus it will be seen that the man who has acted in the role of the most venomous viper in the whole of the reptilian period of Utah “Liberal” politics wishes to shift the responsibility of the disfranchisement infamy from the shoulders of the present candidate of the party on to the crooked back of the party itself.

This is lovely logic, the difference being that which exists between tweedle de and tweedle dum. Yet, if there be any object in this explanation at all; it must be, from a political standpoint, that Mr. Goodwin should be an acceptable candidate to those electors who view disfranchisement for belief with repugnance and as a traitorous invasion of American institutions. This is, in view of the fact that the “Liberal” candidate has been, dur-

ing his entire career in Utah, one of the most pronounced and unscrupulous advocates of the disfranchisement of those who are opposed to him in politics, exceedingly attenuated and ridiculous.

It can be shown, however, within the limits of his own apology for Mr. Goodwin, that O. J. Hollister has, in this explanation, been guilty of a conspicuous inexactitude. [The reader can interpret the last two words of the previous sentence for himself.] He cites the Cullom bill of twenty years ago. Like all other similar measures, it was the product of the “Liberal” party, having been drafted in this city, in the office of a lawyer named Robertson, long since dead. The object of Hollister’s reference to this measure was to show that it provided for disfranchisement. The fact is—even as shown by his own quotations from the bill—that it provided only for the disfranchisement of those living in the *practice of polygamy*. The Cullom bill failed to pass the Senate, but the object of it was attained in 1882, by the passing of the Edmunds act. That fragmentary disfranchisement scheme with which Goodwin had nothing to do in originating is an accomplished fact. The process has been in operation over eight years. The disfranchisement conspiracy now complained of, and of which the candidate of the “Liberal” party has been the foremost champion, would apply to all “Mormons,” without respect to their commission of any act. It would strike the blow from their hands on the ground of their *religious belief* only. More than that, it would deprive them of the rights and privileges of citizenship because somebody else believes that they believe something that is objectionable to the believing party of the first part.

The chronic Federal office holder who, in his manifesto of the other day, made such a flabby presentation, comes down to about 1880, at which time he asserts that the “Liberal” candidate was installed as editor of the *Tribune*—the foulest and most liberty-curtailling paper on the American continent. At that time he explains, in his apology, that the Gentiles—meaning himself, Goodwin and a few others—asked for a legislative commission, providing for the disfranchisement of all citizens alike. He seems to gloat over this patriotic appeal for self-degradation, of which all honorable men would be ashamed. But the richest phase

of his apologetic dissertation is his claim that this clamor for self-dom was a manifestation of Gentile sincerity. We are quite willing to admit that it was the kind of sincerity common among such office-holding, office-hunting self-seekers as Hollister himself. His claim is exhibited in the following quotation:

“The fact that the Liberals for years devoted all their energies to securing this measure, which disfranchised them as well as the Mormons, proved beyond dispute that their motives were disinterested, and also proves beyond dispute the emptiness of the Hon. John T. Caine’s charge that the only object and aim of the Liberal party in Utah has been to secure the rule of the minority.”

History and the existing official status proves, in our opinion, Hollister’s hypocrisy and demonstrates the justice of Mr. Caine’s declaration. The active politicians who clamored for a legislative commission expected, in the event of their scheme being consummated, to manipulate that body. They would have filled every office in this Territory, great and small. Through working on the commission they expected to procure, through that agency, laws that would re-enfranchise them and retain their political opponents (the Mormons) in political serf-dom. That is the species of honesty of which Hollister is a fitting, example and appropriate exponent.

A claim of sincerity from such a source is highly amusing. One might as well expect logic from a lunatic, whose condition on the “Mormon” question Hollister, in our view, closely approaches. To reason with him on anything associated with that subject would be as barren of result as would be the administration of medicine to a corpse. He is not only a chronic office-seeker of over twenty years standing, but also a religious fanatic. He is a sort of local pope of the Congregational denomination, putting on dictatorial airs, and scheming to depose pastors who are not after his own heart—assuming, of course, that he is the possessor of that organ of human anatomy when named as a figure of speech.

The fact is that the sincerity of such a man as this malignant mis-representer extends, in our view, to the use of energy and plotting to rob the majority of the people of Utah not only of their political rights, but of their real and personal property. The facts of history demonstrate this to be a