

as well as the postmasters, and that even the registration officers and judges of elections are appointed by a commission appointed itself by the President and Senate of the United States. No "Mormon" would so mistake the situation, because this anti-republican condition of affairs is a constant source of "Mormon" complaint. And no well informed anti-"Mormon" would commit such a palpable error, which the writer himself refutes in the sixth chapter of his first contribution.

Minor inaccuracies still further prove the compiler of these articles to be a person unfamiliar with actual "Mormon" life, however diligent he may have been in culling anti-"Mormon" literature. He speaks of "The United Order of Orderville" as a present organization, when it has not existed for many years. He quotes a notice issued over forty years ago in this city by a Bishop long since deceased, as being now posted in all the settlements. He says that in each town beside the ward Bishops there is a Presiding Bishop, which is not true. He entirely misrepresents the functions of the ward Teachers, and by many erroneous references shows that his statement that he is "a 'Mormon' of nearly sixty years' standing" is transparent and wilful fraud and deception.

This of itself should, in the eyes of all reasoning readers, vitiate his entire contribution to the literature of the day. But there are some statements artfully interwoven with the fabric of his story which require specific refutation. Others may be dismissed with a general denial. He puts remarks into the mouth of the late President Brigham Young and other Elders of the Church which they never uttered, attributes acts to them which they never performed, repeats stories that are taken from anti-"Mormon" works as though they were utterances of his own, and expresses sentiments as entertained by the "Mormons" which are entirely foreign to their belief and feelings and intentions. These all lead up to the main object of the articles. That is to deceive the American public, and foster the latest scheme for the disfranchisement of the monogamous "Mormon" people, by conveying the idea that polygamy is still taught and entered into in Utah, that the Church dominates the state, and that the "Mormons" are under military discipline and ready to fight against the government. To this end the oft-repeated and spurious story of the Mountain Meadow massacre is told, as fabricated by Utah romancers, and the blood atonement fiction is reproduced after the style of the dime novelist. As to the former, while the general public believe that the tragedy was perpetrated under the sanction, if not by the direction, of Brigham Young, the evidence elicited at the trial, which resulted in the conviction of John D. Lee, demonstrated the entire disconnection of President Young, and the Church over which he presided, with the awful occurrence that has been so widely misrepresented for evil purposes. The United States district attorney officially and publicly announced this at the trial. He declared he had received all the aid he could ask for from the Church authorities to get at the root of the matter, and the accused was convicted of murder by a jury composed principally of members of the "Mormon" Church.

It is a fundamental doctrine of our creed that a murderer cannot be

forgiven; that he "hath not eternal life abiding in him;" that if a member of our Church, having received the light of the Holy Spirit, commits this capital crime, he will not receive forgiveness in this world nor in the world to come. The revelations of God to the Church abound in commandments forbidding us to shed blood. There are no people living who have a greater horror of this offense against the law of God and of man than the Latter-day Saints, commonly, but erroneously, called "Mormons." This Church was no more responsible for the massacre at Mountain Meadows than any Christian church is for the atrocities that may be committed by persons professing to be its members. It is but just to the memory of President Brigham Young to say that the evidence against his complicity with this dreadful crime, as accessory either before or after the fact, is abundant, convincing and complete.

It is part of our faith that the only atonement a murderer can make for his "sin unto death" is the shedding of his own blood, according to the fiat of the Almighty after the flood: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." But the law must be executed by the lawfully appointed officer. This is "blood atonement" so much perverted by maligners of our faith. We believe also in the atonement wrought by the shedding of Christ's blood on Calvary; that it is efficacious for all the race of Adam for the sin committed by Adam, and for the individual sins of all who believe, repent, are baptized by one having authority, and who receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of authorized hands. Capital crime committed by such an enlightened person cannot be condoned by the Redeemer's blood. For him there is "no more sacrifice for sin;" his life is forfeit, and he only can pay the penalty. There is no other blood atonement taught, practiced, or made part of the creed of the Latter-day Saints.

We do *not* believe, as stated by the pretended "Mormon," that "divulging the secrets of the Endowment House, marital unfaithfulness on the part of the wife, leaving the 'Mormon' Church," are unpardonable, or that "the only atonement that can be made for any of these offences is the atonement of blood." The statement that "this doctrine is part of our duty" is another proof that the writer is not a "Mormon," and that he does not understand, or else that he wilfully misrepresents, the faith which he pretends to explain.

The connection drawn between this alleged doctrine and the murders committed at Mountain Meadows also proves the falsity of the claim that the writer is a "Mormon," and demonstrates his misapprehension of his own subject. The company that fell victims to Indian ferocity and white vengeance and rapacity were not "Mormons." They had revealed no secrets, they had not left the Church, they had done nothing to justify their slaughter, even on the false theory of blood atonement copied by the writer in the *Illustrated American* from old newspaper fiction. This should be evident, even to the casual reader.

Another statement is equally absurd and obviously untrue. Speaking of the "Mormons" said to have participated in the massacre, he says: "Some of them are alive to-day. They nod to me familiarly on the streets