

DESERET NEWS:

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, EDITOR.

WEDNESDAY, - AUG. 22, 1883.

AN EXHIBITION OF IGNORANCE AND FOLLY.

On Saturday evening, an old soldier from Ohio made an exhibition of ignorance and folly in this city which was truly deplorable. A serenade tendered to him and other visitors by the gallant commander of Fort Douglas drew a crowd in front of the Walker House, when the Ohioan came forward, and after being introduced by the Governor, made a speech which at first elicited great applause. When he spoke of his brave compatriots in the war, he struck a responsive chord in the public breast and his words were greeted with cheers. But when he descended to attack the people who were listening to him, and make statements that any child ought to know were untrue, his audience—a street crowd—abruptly informed him that he lied.

This was rough, and perhaps unjust, for the probability is that he had been stuffed with the rubbish that he uttered, by persons who ought to be ashamed of themselves for playing such tricks upon travelers. But they have become so accustomed to telling absurd untruths about "Mormon" affairs, that repeating those stories has become natural to them whenever they meet the uninformed tourist.

Whoever told Gen. Grosvenor that labor is poorly paid here, that the people are not allowed to rise above the condition of slaves, and that the country here is owned exclusively by twenty-five or thirty men, grossly deceived him and, to use the blunt language of the crowd on Saturday night, they are "liars." The General's folly was in repeating the stuff poured into his ears, in that public manner without investigation. Every man of experience and intelligence knows that there are two sides to a question, and that a strong partisan is not apt to give both sides or present his own views impartially.

If General Grosvenor had taken the pains to find out facts he would have learned that one of the reasons why manufacturing interests have not flourished better in Utah is because of the high price of labor; that skilled mechanics command very high wages; that common labor costs much more in Utah than in Ohio; that there are more people in Utah, in proportion to the population, owning their own houses and lands, than anywhere else in the United States; that there are scarcely any large farms in the Territory, but the land is divided up into small parcels, so that the many and not the few may have "a stake in the country;" that this distribution of material wealth has of necessity the result of making the masses measurably independent, and thus liberty-loving and actually free. These are the facts and, therefore, it was only natural that the General's untruthful assertions should meet, with the rough response that greeted them, while the epithet applied rightly belonged to those who had deceived him.

If General Grosvenor would know the reason "why Salt Lake City is not as large as Denver," he can learn very easily. There are many causes that might be mentioned, but one of the chief is the promulgation of falsehoods like those which, in very bad taste, he uttered on Saturday night. The whole country has been deceived, capital has been scared and kept away, the intriguers and adventurers who are continually lying so as to keep Utah from becoming a State, have been and are the greatest barriers in the way of the material progress of the city and Territory; and while in Denver has been concentrated the chief efforts of capital brought to Colorado, Utah means and labor have been diffused over its arable surface, and many flourishing towns and cities outside of Salt Lake City give increasing

evidence of the thrift and progress of the people.

But there is another difference between this city and Denver which the General did not mention. It is the crime, intemperance, licentiousness, disorder, and all the elements peculiar to "Christian" centres of population, which flourish and abound in the Colorado capital, but are simply incidents here, the accompaniments and concomitants of "Gentile civilization."

The speaker thought he was talking to just such a class of people as were described to him—so much under the thumb of their leaders as to submit to anything. Their quick repudiation of the imputation that they were "slaves" surprised and nettled him, and his insinuation that they were blackguards for hurling back his false statements, did not give evidence that his breeding was better than theirs.

When the General attempts again to address the populace here or elsewhere, we respectfully suggest that he speak on subjects that he knows something about, and however credulous he may be to stories told him by old companions, that he be careful about repeating them until they are substantiated by reliable evidence.

RANK POLITICAL HERESY.

SEVERAL papers have noticed some recent utterances of the *Buffalo Courier* on the "Mormon" question. Not because that journal has advanced anything new in this direction, but because it is a Democratic newspaper, and it is rather surprising that it should endorse such sentiments as are couched in the articles that has attracted attention. The *Courier's* suggestion is simply the project which originated in Utah, to abolish the Territorial form of government and substituted an appointed Commission.

The only difference between the *Courier's* views and those of the political tricksters who broached the scheme, is this: While they would have the fortunes of the Territory and the lives and property of its citizens placed in the hands of some of their own number, the *Courier* would have men "carefully selected, of high character, not mere politicians." But the principle would be the same in both cases. It would be a palpable violation of the principles which underlie and enter into the whole system of American Republicanism. It would be in practical opposition to the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, and subversive of the Constitution. Republicans and Democrats must alike acknowledge this.

But one of the fundamentals of Democracy is the right of local self-government. It is formulated in old Democratic platforms, and put forth prominently in the new. It is an essential in the Democratic creed. The *Courier*, then, in adopting the anti-republican notion of a few office hunting "Mormon" eaters, flies directly in the face of an unalterable tenet of its own political faith, and there is no wonder that its remarks should be taken up and repeated by opposition papers.

But what is the object set forth in the *Courier* as likely to be achieved by the unprecedented destruction of an incipient commonwealth, ready to emerge into the freedom of Statehood, and the establishment of an oligarchy upon its ruins? Is it the "solution of the Mormon problem" which usually does service as an excuse for the wild schemes that are proposed concerning Utah? Let us see. The *Courier* is quoted as saying:

"While this might prove a step in the right direction it would not settle the Mormon question, which is likely to remain one of the most difficult problems with which the national government has to deal."

If this un-American, extreme and really atrocious nostrum would not be likely to cure the alleged evil, what is the good of resorting to it? Who would be benefited by setting up a despotism in the heart of the Republic? Nobody but a few individuals who, the *Courier* suggests, should "receive ample compensation." The public treasury is to be tapped to send forth a big stream into the pockets of a selected few, to pay them for trampling upon the vested rights of at least a hundred and seventy thousand people, entitled to the protection of that Gov-

ernment which is asked to effect their political destruction. This is Democracy with a vengeance. The *Buffalo Courier* had better go over to the ranks of the blackest of black Republicans, or repent of, or else repudiate, the villainous utterances that its political opponents are copying from its columns.

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY NOT REBELLION.

THE movement in Dakota looking towards the organization of a State government, with or without the consent of Congress, is commented upon variously by the press of the country. We notice that some papers take the ground that the course proposed will amount to rebellion, and they announce that the possibility of establishing independent State governments was settled in the negative by the civil war.

The attempt to draw a parallel between the organization of a State government in Dakota, and the secession of certain Southern States from the Union, is a singular stretch of the powers of comparison. The two situations are entirely different. The intentions of the parties are exactly opposite. The issue with the General Government, if one should arise in the case of Dakota, would be the exact reverse of that which was decided in the four years' war.

Dakota appears to have all the requisites for local self-government. According to the doctrines enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, she has the right to a form of government deriving its powers from the consent of the governed; and when the existing form is subversive of that principle, to change or establish it. And this is declared to be not only a right but a duty of the people whose rights have been denied or abridged.

Dakota has a Territorial form of government, under which her people have endured many usurpations and have been deprived of a truly republican form of government. Having reached a status which justifies her in making a demand for those political rights which it is the duty of the people to demand and of the General Government to secure to her, she has endeavored, by the ordinary method, to obtain them. Failing in this, she proposes to avail herself of those powers reserved by the national Constitution to the people, and organize a State government embodying the political principles which animate other States, and then to ask admission into the Union on an equal footing with them. If Congress refuses her admission, she will just move along under her State Government, ready at any time to render allegiance to the National Government as one of the Confederation, when permitted so to do.

This is not secession. It is the very opposite of secession. It is not rebellion. It is the exact reverse of rebellion. It is no attempt to break up the Federal Union, but is an effort to increase and make stronger the Federal Union. It is a movement in the line of the Constitution and of the Declaration of Independence, its forerunner. States have been organized in a similar manner, since the establishment of the General Government, running for awhile without national recognition but afterwards admitted into the Federal compact.

We believe that if Dakota's people have grit enough and unity enough to stand to their colors they will win. To settle the difficulty Congress will be willing to give them their undoubted rights. It is only a struggle of parties which prevents her admission. She is not denied on any really valid objection. Each of the two great parties is fearful of any augmentation of power to the other from the admission of new States. The claim of Congressional sovereignty over the Territories is based upon such an untenable foundation that it cannot stand a rigid and determined test. The easiest way out of the contention is to admit all the Territories into the Union and settle the vexed question forever. All that Congress is bound to do in the premises is to see that each of the new States has a republican form of government. No other considerations are paramount. The wishes or fears of either political party have no business to interfere with the welfare of the people and the peace of the nation. They should be made to stand aside when the rights of organized communities are demanded,

and should not be counted, in view of the vastly more important considerations.

If it is maintained that Congress may refuse Dakota admission and require submission to the form of government which it has provided, the question of the right of Congress to compel submission to an anti-republican form of government will come up for decision. There cannot be anything plainer than the limitation of the supreme exclusive power of Congress to a region ten miles square in which is the seat of government, and the national dockyards, arsenals, etc., and to make needful regulations concerning the territory (i.e. land) and other property of the United States. The people of Dakota are not the "property" of the United States. The organized commonwealth, incipient or otherwise, of Dakota, is not the "property" of the United States. The people have rights that Congress cannot lawfully contravene. And by a firm and prudent course Dakota may be able to maintain her stand, even though denied the privileges of Statehood, without coming into armed and physical conflict with the national authority. In time, by legal arbitration and with unflinching perseverance she is bound to win, because right is on her side and all that can be arrayed against her besides arbitrary might, is a sophistical, far-fetched and self-refuted rendering of a solitary clause in that Constitution which was framed to protect the people against the encroachments of governmental authority.

THE GENERAL DISSATISFACTION.

THE *New Orleans Times-Democrat* thinks if Congress wishes to break up "Mormon" polygamy, it will have to discover some better mode than that suggested by Senator Edmunds. We do not believe that Senator Edmunds or any of the "twin-relic"-shooters care a jot about polygamy. The object of the legislation which has been crowded through Congress is political, not moral in its nature. The preachers and pretended puritans of the country have made polygamy their battle cry in the war against "Mormonism," and have forced a good many members of Congress to take up the refrain and echo it in the halls of the Capitol. But those who have been active workers in the measures that have been pressed upon the lawmakers of the nation, have had in view a political revolution in Utah, by which the Territory should pass under Republican control. The Edmunds law, which was hailed with delight at its passage as "a death blow to polygamy," but is now ridiculed and reviled by the very men and papers that cried for it and supported it, was designed to place the local offices within the grasp of the anti-"Mormons."

Senator Edmunds was himself deceived by the schemers who worked for the bill. He thought polygamists were much more numerous in Utah than they turned out to be. The subject had been magnified out of all fair proportions by the anti-polygamy monomaniacs. And he imagined that with the disfranchisement of practical polygamists and the facilities afforded by his bill for counting every non-"Mormon" vote, and with a stampede of "Mormons" supposed to be ready to revolt, the "Gentiles" would capture the Territory and thus put an end to the alleged difficulty. Like most public men he did not understand the true situation and was misled by designing knaves. His bill, which was forced through the lower House in a most undignified and unfair manner, has undoubtedly failed in its real object, but it has accomplished what it purported to be designed for. It has excluded from the polls and from the tickets of officers to be voted for, all persons who have ever lived in the plural family relation. But it has not turned over the local offices into the hands of the anti-"Mormons" nor done anything towards making Utah a State under the auspices of the Republican party.

The promoters of the plan in Congress were deceived as to the number of polygamists in Utah, the number of non-"Mormon" voters, and the disposition of the monogamic portion of the "Mormon" population. The workings of the

law have proven that the practical polygamists are comparatively few, that the "Gentile" voters form in number but an insignificant minority of Utah's citizens, and that the supposed pressure upon the bulk of the "Mormon" people by their leaders and those who previously had charge of the elections, was a fragment of the imagination or a huge piece of "Liberal" deception.

And now dissatisfaction is loudly expressed against Senator Edmunds' measure. It comes from Republican and Democratic sources, although both parties unite in deploring it. They should have taken time to examine it when the bill was brought before their attention. Every defender of constitutional liberty should have joined in opposing its retro-active and despotic provisions, instead of hurriedly yielding to priestly and sectarian clamor, and sanctioning by vote or silence what they knew to be wrong and believed to be ill-advised and premature.

"Some better mode than that suggested by Senator Edmunds" has been called for to put down polygamy. After a while the majority of Congressmen will find out, what men have seen for some time, that the much exaggerated and misrepresented marriage system of the "Mormons" cannot be destroyed by legislation. If it is morality that is sought to be promoted, would it not be better to relegate the matter to its proper sphere and leave it out of politics? If it is party advantage that is sought, would it not be quite as well to strive for its own merits, and cast away the cant against polygamy which the loudest bleaters care nothing whatever about? If the desire is to prevent the "Mormons" from having any voice in their political affairs, and to deliver them over, bag and baggage, as a prey to a few office-seekers, political adventurers, government paper-mongers, hangers-on and dependants upon official patronage, who are attaches of the Republican party and would bring Utah into the Republican party line, why not come out boldly and avow it and work for it? But this hypocritical pretense of great moral ideas, and this warring against the private family affairs of a handful of Latter-day Saints, is one of the greatest shams of the age and ought to bring all the humbugs who join in it into public derision and contempt, as we verily believe it will before long.

To do what the enemies of the "Mormons" desire, will necessarily be a violation of the fundamental principles of republican government, blindness to popular rights, the ignoring of justice, the adoption of monarchical methods, a defiance of constitutional restrictions and the exercise of might over right. It cannot be accomplished by legal means, nor by anything else than brute force. If the country is prepared for such work, to satisfy the greed of a small clique of dependants upon place, and a horde of gospel-mongers who wish to destroy what they cannot convert, the sooner it is commenced the easier it may be to consummate. But we do not believe that such a course is likely to commend itself, yet, to the leading minds or common sense people of this magnificent country.

CANVASSING BOARD APPOINTED.

RELATING TO THE RETURNS OF THE LATE ELECTION.

Order of the Commission, adopted Tuesday, August 14, 1883:

In pursuance of the provisions of Section 9 of an Act entitled "An Act to Amend Section 5,352 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in reference to bigamy and for other purposes," the following named persons, viz: Arthur L. Thomas, chairman; O. J. Hollister, H. V. O. Margary, W. W. Rife, and James Dunn, are hereby appointed a Board to canvass the returns of the general election held in the Territory of Utah on the 6th day of August, 1883. Said Board will convene at the rooms of the Utah Commission at the Walker Opera House in Salt Lake City, Utah, on Tuesday, August 21st, at ten a. m., when the election returns will be opened in the presence of this Commission and said Board will proceed to ascertain the number of votes cast for each person, and they, or a majority of them, will determine all questions coming before them, including the awarding of certificates of election, and shall