June 11, 1862. The News says "of late years the "Mormon" press and pulpit have been almost entirely silent on the subject of "patriarchal marriage"- or polygamy. We do not now propose to disturb that silence from any necessity-the "institution" is an established fact, immovable, and no human effort can make it other than it is.-. . ."

Sept. 6, 1865. In an editorial reply to demands for enforcement of anti-polygamy laws, the News says that if the practice of polygamy is stopped, "there would the only means pass from among men, which, if properly understood and righteously employed, would save them from the degradation of being compelled to admit the existence of such a fearfully dominant evil as the "social sin" reveals."

Sept. 13, 1865. From an editorial denying that polygamy is repugnant to many Mormons." Polygamy was none of our seeking. It came to us from Heaven, and we recognized it, and still do, the voice of Him whose right it is not only to teach us but to dictate and teach all men, . . . If one revelation is untrue, all are untrue; if one was revealed by God, all have their origin in the same Divine source."

July 21, 1867. From an editorial on the question of giving up the practice of polygamy. "To ask us to abjure it and at the same time to say that we may preserve our religion intact, is about as reasonable as to have told a Jew who kept strictly the law of Moses that he must not marry the wife of his deceased childless brother, which God had expressly commanded."
July 31, 1867

From an editorial on the remedy for the evils of monogamy.
"The man who marries two or more women and honorably provides for, protects and educates them and their offspring, is doing more for the cause of humanity and the redeeming of the world than ten thousand monogamist who write and preach about morality and virtue."

Nov. 16, 1871

From an editorial commenting on men who give up their plural wives. "Now for a man to marry a woman, believing he is acting in obedience to divine law, . . . . ; and then for him to put away that wife from a miserable fear of being imprisoned and fined for thus doing the will of God, is very small, mean business. Such a man deserves to be despised by womankind. There is no manhood about him morally."

Dec. 27, 1871

From an editorial commenting on the introduction of the Cragin anti-polygamy bill in Congress. "If Congress should pass any such thing of a bill and make it the law of the land, it would prove the death knell of American liberty and this great nation would be much nearer its "decline and fall" than many people now imagine. . . .

"But neither Cragin's infamous bill nor any other, though backed by twice forty million people, will ever destroy Bible marriage, for that will flourish and be practiced and honored when Cragin becomes food for worms."

Dec. 6, 1872

From editorial commenting on the President's message to Congress. "One thing more, if President Grant accomplishes the ultimate extinguishment of polygamy, by the execution of such legislation as he proposes, he will do what has never been accomplished in the history of the world. Plural marriage is
Dec. 12, 1871  From an editorial replying to a N.Y. Herald statement that polygamy is not vital to the existence of Mormonism. "Marriage, plural marriage, is a true and eternal principle, and can no more be denied by those who have received it, than can faith, or baptism or any other true principle."
a correct principle—it always did exist, and we believe always will."

**July 21, 1876**

From editorial comment on those who urge anti-polygamy legislation. "In fact it may be set down as a general rule that when a man is bitterly and unfairly opposed to plural marriage, as taught in the scriptures and practiced by the Latter-day Saints, he belongs to an adulterous and wicked generation, and his deeds will not bear investigation in the light of truth and virtue."

**Jan. 20, 1877**

From editorial comment on the suggestion of the Omaha Herald that the Mormons give up polygamy in order to attain statehood for Utah. The *Deseret News* says that the Mormons "have no fractional or other part of their religious faith or practice that they are willing to barter away for any consideration whatever. . . .

"The fact of the matter is that their religion, being of divine origin, cannot be abolished by them; . . . ."

**Jan. 7, 1879**

From editorial comment on the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of the anti-polygamy law.

"But the question that naturally arises in the public mind is, What are the "Mormons" going to do about it? So far as we understand their views and feelings we should say, they will leave the matter in the hands of the Almighty. . . .

When they took the oath of allegiance to the constitution and government of the United States, they made no promise of submission to any interference with their religious liberty. Neither did they agree that Congress or any court should decide what might or might not be considered a part of their religious faith. . . .
"Celestial marriage, including the doctrine of plurality of wives, was revealed to them directly from God, Congress... passed a statute, declaring what God had authorized a crime against the law. The Supreme Court "now affirms that law to be valid. Does this affect in any way the truth that God has revealed and commanded it? Not in the remotest degree... The issue is between the Supreme Being and those who venture, ignorantly or otherwise, to oppose His purposes and designs."

From editorial on the question of giving up polygamy.

"Being part of our religious creed and having been so held by us for many years, it would be a suicidal policy now to reject it."

From editorial on attempts to stop polygamy by legislation.

"Bonds, pains, penalties and proscription never yet destroyed a religious innovation. They never will. The convictions which are stamped upon the souls of the people here in regard to plural marriage, cannot be burned out by the fire of the faggot nor stifled by the close air of a prison cell. Force will only increase their intensity and act as an incentive to active resistance!"

From editorial in reply to the advice of the friendly Omaha Herald to give up polygamy because it is at war with public opinion and is against the law. The News says that to abandon the principle because it is at war with public opinion would be "cowardly, inconsistent and shameful..."

"... It is true that the practice of polygamy is judicially declared to be a crime..."

"But this is the situation as we view it, and it is..."
use to think we can see it through any other eyes than our own: God has revealed to us a law commanding and regulating the practice of plural marriage. Congress has passed a law declaring that which God "has established a crime. What is our duty in the premises? Is it not clearly to respect the law of God, and leave those who have created a conflicting law to take what steps seem right to them? Why should we abandon our position, unless we become convinced that we are in error? Congress cannot make right wrong. Governments cannot abolish the law of heaven.

The News adds that any man who would abandon his wives and brand his children as bastards "to satisfy the demands of a corrupt and adulterous generation", should be regarded "as a cringing, cowardly scoundrel. He should be despised of God and man, and become the scorn of angels and the derision of devils."

"... But let a nation steeped in sin, black with social corruption, and rank with offenses against heaven, cease its howling against a people who, while practicing a form of marriage distasteful to the majority, are seeking to establish a system for the regeneration of society, and who however mistaken they may be considered, are at least earnest and sincere."

From editorial reply to more advice from the Omaha Herald.

"God has given the Latter-day Saints a law; Congress says we shall not obey it, or that if we do we shall be punished with certain pains and penalties. It is for each Latter-day Saint to act on his own responsibility and risk the consequences of respect or disrespect for the law of God, or submission or disregard to the law of man."
"If the Church were to comply with the suggestion of the Herald and other friends who, we believe, speak from excellent motives, it would stultify itself completely."

From editorial on Revelation. "At the same time it is our intention to abide by the laws of our country. When we refer to the laws of the land, we wish it to be understood that we make one exception, that is, the law framed and pushed through Congress for the express purpose of preventing us from following a revelation from God, which we had followed in faith and practise for many years."

From editorial on the question of obedience to the anti-polygamy law, since it has been declared constitutional. The News says that those who break the law "must risk the consequences and stand ready to endure the penalties. But neither law nor morality, nor religion, nor common sense requires us to help those who are authorized and paid to enforce and execute the law against us."

From editorial on the Mormon attitude toward the anti-polygamy law. "What course are the members of the Church to pursue under these circumstances? Each one must act for himself. He can obey the law of God and ignore the law of the land, or ignore the law of God for fear of the law of the land. Supposing he chooses the former course. He must then be ready to suffer the penalty of the human law should he be convicted of breaking it. On the other hand, if he prefers to violate the dictates of his conscience in order to submit to a human law, he must stand ready to accept the consequences as Eternal Justice may determine. . . .
"Our course is clear. We have no warfare to wage. The conflict is not ours... let those who want to inaugurate a crusade engage in the fight at their own peril. The Lord and them for it."

Sept. 28, 1883 From editorial comment on the constitutionality of the anti-polygamy law. "The decision of the Supreme Court may be again cited to settle this point. But we have the right to dissent from that opinion and to show, if we can, its fallacy from its own reasoning." The News adds that the Mormons' "moral and religious convictions are at variance with a law which has been specially framed to prevent the free exercise of those convictions. They are legally but not morally bound to respect those enactments."

Dec. 23, 1884 From editorial comment on methods used by law enforcement officers to obtain evidence against polygamists.

"We are afraid that someone is going to get hurt in that kind of business. We are of the opinion that men prowling around in the dark, peering into people's windows and lying in wait in mystery will be mistaken for burglars and be treated to a dose of buckshot. If they expose themselves to this danger they must take the consequences. . . .

"We advice such persons to be a little more cautious, and a little less inquisitive. . . .

"If these cowardly sneak who try to take advantage of the supposed absence of the male members of a household, and to question women and children about the private affairs of the family, continue in this law-lived, dirty business, it may become necessary to inaugurate some means to suppress the
nuisance. If it is needful, let it be done and done effectually, without child's play. It is sometimes requisite to "fight the devil with fire"."

Jan. 27, 1885 From an editorial on the question of giving up polygamy. The News says that, for the Mormons, the only alternative to going to jail is to cut their wives and children adrift. Then: "It may as well be understood now as at any other time that the alternative will never be accepted."

Mar. 23, 1885 From editorial comment on a press report that the Mormons appear to be backing down on the polygamy issue. "... There may be a few cowardly poltroons who will try to save themselves by casting adrift those who are helplessly dependent upon them; but they will be few and far between. ... No good Latter-day Saint will ever "go back" on his family. ... The coward, the sneak, the hypocrite, the corrupt, the traitor are being gradually brought to the surface. ..."

"Suppose this goes on until the culminating point arrives. Suppose it should ultimately appear as if all the advantages, in the eyes of the natural man, were on the other side, and that the church looked as if it would be overcome and swallowed up by the powers of earth and hell arrayed against it? What would be the effect? The unworthy would step over to the side that seemed the stronger, but which is in reality the weaker, and by that climax the Church will be purer, brighter and better, and the Lord would make bare his arm in behalf of His people remaining steadfast."
From an editorial. "The Only Constant Course"—The News says the chief object of the anti-polygamy crusade is to "get the Church to apostatize" and after asking what is necessary to bring about this apostasy, the News replies: "Simply to renounce, abrogate or apostatize from the "new and everlasting covenant of marriage in its fulness. Were the Church to do that as an entirety God would reject the Saints as a body. The authority of the Priesthood would be withdrawn, . . . . The heavens would permanently withdraw themselves, and the Lord would raise up another people of greater valor and stability, . . . . Therefore the Saints have no alternative but to stand by the truth and sustain what the heavens have established and propose to perpetuate. This they will do, come life or death, freedom or imprisonment, and there is, so far as we can observe, no use to attempt to disguise this fact."

From an editorial "An Object Spectacle", commenting on the fact that, on May 1st, Claudius V. Spencer had promised to obey the anti-polygamy law and had thus received a suspended sentence. "The spectacle presented yesterday morning in the Third District Court, connected with the case against Claudius V. Spencer, was exceedingly repulsive. The piteous pleading for judicial clemency, . . . has had a sickening effect upon the Latter-day Saints.

. . . . But returning to the attitude assumed by Mr. Spencer, . . . . what did he do yesterday? He renounced his sacred and religious obligation. . . . He inexcusably degraded one who was taken by him professedly at least if not otherwise, for better or for
worse... He debased her... The News adds that such conduct leads "inevitably to one of three conclusions. They are the outgrowth of hypocrisy, cowardice or both... While we regret, nay, unqualifiedly detest the conduct of Mr. Spencer, it is not accompanied by any unkind feeling toward him personally... To the Latter-day Saints we say: "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." Fear not man, nor what he can do, but stand firm in your allegiance to your Father in heaven.”

June 5, 1885

From an editorial "No Relinquishment". "The Edmunds Act is grossly unconstitutional, and therefore is not essentially a law of the land in the true sense of the term... If it were a constitutional law there would be no conflict between it and the revelation on celestial marriage. There being a clash, there is no alternative but to sustain what God has given.

"It may be argued that the Supreme Court has decided upon the right of Congress to pass the Edmunds Act, and that settles the question of Constitutionality. It settles it in a legal sense, but not as a matter of fact. No statement from any source in existence could render the statute referred to Constitutional as a fact."

Sept. 19, 1885

From editorial comment on the fact that Bp. John Sharp had promised to obey the anti-polygamy law.

"With the gentleman named it was a supreme occasion. It was the one opportunity of his life to sustain a principle which he had accepted as emanating from a divine source in the form of a sacred obligation... he chose to turn in a direction the antipodes of that which every true and consistent Latter-day Saint had a right to expect of him.” The News adds that the effect of Bp. Sharp's action will "Not be of sufficient
magnitude to interfere in the most remote degree with the
main question, which is as unalterably fixed as the everlasting
hills and will never be receded from, come what may. Neither
will any person be induced to follow his lamentable example
who is not already predisposed in that direction. . . . There
is but one side to the question with the body-religions, and
that ground will be maintained, sink or swim." The News adds
further that, in agreeing not to teach others to violate the
law Bp. Sharp was at "direct variance" with his position in
the Church, and that while he might not need to teach the
principle of plural marriage, to promise not to teach it,
"is a species of humiliation which can only be looked upon by
his genuine friends with unqualified regret. . . .

"To the Latter-day Saints we would say: No matter what
position any single man or number of men may take in regard to
what God has given, the truth must be sustained and vindicated
at all hazards."

Jan. 16, 1886
From an editorial. "The Benefits of Persecution".

"We look upon the events that have happened in Utah as
providential. Our enemies will not allow any of our doctrines
to become stale or uninteresting. . . . The only danger to
"Hornism" is that stagnation that might come of indifference. . . .
The assaults of our foes mean continued vitality and vigor to
our system. . . . Love of ease and dislike of strife cause us
to wish to be let alone. But a let-alone policy on the part
of our enemies would be more conducive to a decadence of
"Hornism", or at least a hindrance of its spread and con-
solidation, than anything else we know of."
Feb. 11, 1886

From editorial comment on the Salt Lake Tribune statement that Geo. Q. Cannon could, "by a word", stop the prosecutions against the Mormons. "This is a grand mistake. The meaning of it is, that Prest. Cannon could, by a word, change the doctrine of the Church and the faith of its members, in regard to celestial marriage which includes the plurality of wives."

"Let it be understood that no such power is held by any man on earth. The word of no mortal being could accomplish any such revolution."

Apr. 3, 1886

From a long editorial on the anti-polygamy crusade.

"Wives and children are hunted down as a prey to spies and informers, and insulted as unworthy of respect. Traitors lurk in the circles of the Saints and a man's foes are often they of his own household. . . . The basest creatures under the sun berate us with impunity, and vile and loathsome libertines and debauchees invade our houses and force virtuous women and tender children before courts and inquisitions. . . . We naturally want to do something. Retaliation impulsively suggests itself. Violence wants to grapple with violence. It would be easier to use in our might and our union and make a clean sweep of the wretches who assail us." But the News adds that these are the emotions of fallen humanity, and the better course is patience. Then: "Let no Latter-day Saint be discouraged. The Mighty One is a God at hand and not a far off. This is the day when He will "cut His work short in righteousness." Events will happen with marvelous rapidity. Small things unfold into mighty changes, and just when the wicked seem to have reached the object of their conspiring, lo! a Hand they saw not will smite
them down and turn their objects into blessings for His people. . . . As God lives the day of your redemption draweth night.

**July 1, 1886**

From a long editorial "Gods Will And Man's Law," arguing for disobedience to laws which conflict with the laws of God. "Any man who says that he really and firmly believes a certain law of God is binding on him, and who will not obey it in preference to a conflicting law of man or a decision of a court, has either an unsound mind or a coward soul, or is a most contemptible hypocrite."

**Aug. 12, 1886**

From an editorial defending the July 1st editorial.

"When God gives a commandment, that is supreme. The only question that can reasonably arise is as to the divinity of the law. If it is of God it must be above all human enactments. That any man professing to be a representative of M'cly can place a human enactment before and above and superior to a law of the Almighty, is an amazing piece of folly and a sure evidence that his claim of divine (divinity?) is a sham and pretense. . . . A God that is subordinate to human authority is a bogus deity and is unworthy the adoration of any rational being. The God of Israel is above the nations, and the time is coming when every kingdom and organization which will not serve and obey Him, will utterly perish from the face of the earth."