

STRANGE PROCEEDING.

The Latter Side of Mountain Meadows Massacre—Whose Trial?—Who is the Criminal?—Bishop Sutherland on the Ham.

Page.

Correspondence Tribune.]

BEAVER CITY, July 29, 1875.

On the 21th inst., Philip Klingensmith, Bishop of Cedar City in September, 1857, and who was in the Church Council at that place when the question first arose as to the destruction of the Arkansas emigrants, composed of men, women and children, was asked by Mr. Baskin in the direct examination for the prosecution of John D. Lee, what was done in that council?

Judge Sutherland (for the defense)—I object, your honor; the object of this prosecution is to fasten guilt upon some one else not a party to the indictment.

Mr. Baskin—The gentleman is afraid that his *real client* will be affected.

On the 26th inst., in the course of the same trial, Joel White, a material witness for the prosecution, was asked to state what office did John D. Lee hold in 1873?

Judge Sutherland (on his feet in a moment)—I object, your honor; this does not tend against Lee, but some one not a party to the indictment.

Mr. Bates—The gentleman's zeal in protecting others is praiseworthy.

These little episodes in the course of the famous trial of a *particeps criminis* in the most iniquitous outrage against humanity ever perpetrated, and to which recorded history furnishes no parallel, might be passingly considered as unmeaning and insignificant, without pertinency direct or remote in effecting the guilt or innocence of the prisoner at the bar. But let us take a more searching and analytic view of the matter, and pursue, if possible, a line of inquiry which would result in an identification of

THE "REAL CLIENT,"

whom an attorney for the defense of John D. Lee would over-zealously shield, in the face of certain facts sought to be adduced on the part of the prosecution, establishing substantial premises to deduce, at least, strong suspicion of the real client's guilt, before the fact or after the fact, or both, in the Mountain Meadows Massacre. Klingensmith testifies that on or about the 6th of October, 1857, he and John D. Lee were in Salt Lake City attending Conference, and whilst there called on Brigham Young together, when the subject of the massacre was introduced on the part of Brigham Young; he told us that the property of the emigrants should be turned over to Lee as Indian agent and "never to speak of the massacre, not even amongst ourselves." Lee, prior to this meeting, in obedience to orders from Haight, had seen Brigham Young and told him all about it. Brigham Young, President of the Mormon Church, assuming the prerogative of God's viceroy on earth and Governor of Utah, had set and listened to the story of this horrifying carnage from the lips of one who participated in shedding the blood of men, women and children to the number of one hundred and thirty fellow-beings, and God's creatures, in a manner never before equalled, and by means of the foulest treachery under the sacred covenants of a flag of truce. What would any other man have thought and done but Brigham Young, and what would Brigham Young have thought and done if he had been innocent? Any other man would have stood aghast at the story and have struck the miserable fiend of self-crimination

DEAD UPON THE SPOT.

Any other Governor would have raised an army (if necessary) and invited every able-bodied man to its ranks to go in quest of the miserable blood-hounds of that dread slaughter. Did Brigham Young do this or any part of this? No; but he chatted and joked the miserable felon who scarcely a fortnight before was fresh, blood stained and infamous, from that inconceivable and indelible butchery. The property of the emigrants was computed to be worth \$200,000 or \$300,000, why were not the proceeds sold and appropriated to the maintenance and education of the seventeen little children, waifs and orphans left to the cold charities of a selfish world, with no family inheritance, not so much as the names of their parents, who went down under the treacherous fire of their supposed deliverers, and the savage fury of yelling Indians?

THAT PILGRIMAGE.

Again, at whose instance and to execute whose orders did George A. Smith make a pilgrimage to Southern Utah, in the month of September, 1857, preaching in every settlement a crusade against the Arkansas emigrant company, and admonishing the people on their route through Utah, not to sell them anything, under penalties of excommunication from the church? And because one man in Beaver City violated this injunction and sold them a few pounds of cheese, he was cut off, from his church for a simple act of Christian charity, and told that he could worship God no longer at the religious altars of his own choosing. Will any man dare say that Brigham Young did not know all this and was not cognizant of the object of that mission? Supreme as he was in authority, and despotic as he was at that time, in the exercise of temporal and spiritual power in him vested, the thing would have been impossible, absolutely impossible. "The guilty flee when no man pursueth;" if Brigham Young took no part and gave no orders adverse to the emigrants, why has he remained silent for eighteen years? Would any reasonable and innocent man bear the fearful imputations and suspicions against this old man without an effort to wipe out the foul stain on his character? Of course not. But Brigham Young is doing all in his power to obstruct an investigation. "Tis strange, 'tis passing strange," that such conduct should be consistent with a guiltless soul. Judge Sutherland is in attendance at the trial of John D. Lee, not so much to defend the real prisoner, but the "real client." Although this

REAL CLIENT IS NOT "A PARTY TO THE

INDICTMENT,"

he must be defended or shielded in a court of justice, when he is neither charged or tried as principal or accessory. A psychological problem is here presented, which can only be solved in the deduction of a result contravening any proposition advanced, tending to exculpate Brigham Young from any knowledge or connection with the Mountain Meadows Massacre.

We have often read, and many have witnessed the horrible incidents of civil war; the blood-stained battle fields, where lay the mutilated bodies of dead and dying heroes, exposed to scorching suns and fierce-driven storms; but nothing of this kind or description leaves such horrible and sickening impressions on the mind as the story before and after the massacre at Mountain Meadows. The poet's imagination can not picture, nor the historian's pen describe, the slaughter of the emigrants. Had they not been so perniciously betrayed by the cut-throats, villains and assassins, who decoyed them out, leaving their arms behind, by which they had so long and so valiently defended

their wives and little children, and then murdered them; in utter violation of a law sacred alike to civilized and savage races, the piercing screams of the women and the agonizing cries of the little children that they rent the air, and which made the sight so inexpressibly horrible, all will admit that the Mountain Meadows Massacre might be somewhat less cruel and terrible. On that occasion the law of man and the law of God, which He sanctioned on Sinai with His thunders and lightning, was broken as never before.

IF BRIGHAM YOUNG BE NOT GUILTY,

why does he not come forward and wipe out the crimson stain on his character, which has been for so many years written against him. Duty to himself, to his family, to his thousands of followers, and duty to the world, requires that he should speak on his own behalf; and if he does not, the verdict of civilization against him will not be set aside, and the terrible philippic of outraged humanity will follow him forever while living, and beyond the grave. Up to this time, the world believes, and is constrained still to believe, that this old man of so much notoriety, has the guilt of this foul, strange and unnatural massacre written on his soul, and that for eighteen long years, he has lived in the ghostly solitude of that guilt, "serene, self-complacent and infamous."

NEMESIS