

mention precedents in too reckless a manner. The case of Alsace-Lorraine in particular would better not be alluded to, lest the question of a money indemnity be remembered too. If Spain were prepared to pay a billion dollars, the United States might consider the precedent and generously shoulder the so-called Cuban debt. As it is, it is safer and cheaper to make a precedent than to follow some of the old ones.

There will be expenses enough connected with the reconstruction of Cuban government. One of the first matters to attend to is the establishment of schools, America, after having sent her ships and soldiers to Cuba to tear down everywhere the emblem of oppression, must send an army of educators capable of instructing the people. It will be necessary now to give every child in the island the benefits of education. Common schools must be established, and then higher schools. All this will have to be done under the experienced guidance of American instructors. Much philanthropic and missionary work will be needed before the fruits of American victories can be enjoyed by the Cubans. This is a debt the Americans now owe the people. That will be paid, but Spaniards must settle their own accounts.

PORTO RICO COMES IN.

According to program, the Stars and Stripes now float proudly from the public buildings of San Juan de Porto Rico, signaling to the world that Spanish rule has ended in that island forever and American rule has begun. Half a year ago such a thing was not in the minds of more than a score of men and even with them only a figment of the fancy; now it is an accomplished fact. Not only is the island a part of the United States, but the leading officials and doubtless a great majority of the other people have signified their intention of becoming naturalized citizens of this country. Thus do we progress nationally, and the end is not yet even foreshadowed.

Porto Rico in the Atlantic, Hawaii in the Pacific, added to the possessions of Uncle Sam, constitute a beginning which may well cause other nations and a good many people in this one to reflect. The actuality is presented to them that the great American Republic is no longer a "pent-up Utiqa," but a bounding, expanding, irresistible force in the affairs of mankind. Its career is upward, onward and outward, and cannot now be checked or retarded by the likes or dislikes of any other power or any class of people in all the world.

MORE RESOLUTIONS.

The Presbyterians of Utah have at last specified their intentions relative to the majority of the people of this State, and as near as we can judge of the matter, they have given notice that they are tired of the era of peace that has prevailed during the last five years or more, and are determined, if they can, to effect a change. It does not matter to them, it seems, whether almost healed wounds are again torn open, or whether the material interests of the State are being jeopardized. They seem incapable of both forgetting and learning, bent only upon fanning into flame any spark of hatred that may be smoldering in the ashes.

Probably they feel justified in adopting such a course. Undoubtedly there is much disappointment on account of the slow progress of their propaganda; possibly also jealousy on account of the onward march of Mormonism, and small souls, when disappointed and inspired with jealousy, naturally contemplate revenge.

We are led to these reflections by the

fact that the Presbyterian synod in session at Ogden adopted a resolution urging "all people everywhere in our country who favor law, order and morality, to at once begin the necessary agitation and unite in a memorial to Congress petitioning that body to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution and submit the same to the legislatures of the various states, defining legal marriage as monogamic and forbidding polygamy under whatever guise it may exist, as cohabitation, polyandry, polygamy and celestial or plural marriage;" also "that the Synod of Utah hereby appeals to every presbytery in our church to overture the next general assembly in harmony with the above."

The alleged reason for these resolutions is of course the charge again repeated to the effect that the doctrine of polygamy is being taught in Utah as a "fundamental doctrine" and that it is openly practiced in violation of the laws of the State.

It is evident from this that the reverend gentlemen are trying to foment as they say, an agitation—one that shall lead to an appeal to Congress. For the purposes of these "Christian" missionaries, it seems necessary to have an "agitation" through which it shall appear that a people known for industry, virtue and loyalty are the proper objects of the wrath of the Federal government. By the way, are these Presbyterian missionaries sent to Utah for the purpose of keeping up a perpetual "agitation," or to preach the gospel of Jesus? Let the people here know the true character of the "angels" they sometimes entertain unwares.

The charge made has previously received proper attention through these columns. From what has been said on the subject it is sufficiently clear that if Congress takes the matter up in the form of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, Utah will be among the first states to ratify such an amendment. But there is no necessity for Federal interference. The Constitution and the statutes of the State are emphatic and explicit on the subject of polygamy, unlawful cohabitation and kindred offenses.

But the Presbyterians propose to reach Congress through their general assembly. We beg to suggest to this body, that before it takes any step in accordance with the appeal of the framers of the Ogden resolutions, it institute a thorough and impartial investigation into the question. Such an investigation would reveal the fact that not a single case of polygamous marriage is known to have been contracted in the Mormon Church in Utah since the Manifesto of Oct. 6, 1890. It would further make the peculiar situation, resulting from previous conditions, clear. It would above all, prove that there are ample facilities in Utah for reaching any violators of the law—and where in the wide world is there a spot in which some law-breakers are not found?—through the courts controlled by judges and other officers of sterling worth and integrity. These facts the agitators carefully conceal for the furtherance of their own plans and purposes, but will the general assembly of the Presbyterians wrong an entire religious community on the suggestion of professed agitators and refuse to hear both sides?

When the demon of persecution seizes upon individuals, or communities, some plausible excuse for carrying out its promptings is always found. Nero did not lack such excuse. Nor did some of his successors. There was a plausible ground for a war of extermination against the Valdenses and Albigenses, and for the massacre of the Huguenots. Persecution has always found a cloak of propriety under which to hide its

loathsome features. The Presbyterians themselves, were the methods they use against the Mormons applied to them, might be found wanting in some respects. We need not tell the reverend gentlemen that those who, unauthorized, place themselves in the judgment seat against their brethren, incur a tremendous responsibility, if the divine assurance still is true that "with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

"IS" OR "ARE?"

One of the questions that will not let it, probably—is that of whether the United States as a nation should be spoken of in the singular or the plural number. There are, or have been, weighty authorities on both sides, and the matter seems to have settled down to one of personal preference in accordance with one's training, conclusions or prejudices, whichever the deciding factor may happen to be.

It is noticeable in this connection that the bulk of authority in favor of the plural proposition comes from ante bellum (as relates to our Civil War) times. It is thus spoken of in the old Constitution and the state papers of many of the Presidents. This is not to be wondered at, no matter how the reader may view the subject; on the contrary, the old-timers could scarcely adopt any other view and be consistent with the logic of the situation as it then was. The national fabric was simply a compact growing out of the necessity for mutual action as a means of internal growth and defense against the common enemy. Like the people of a village in the troublous days with the savages, a common peril united them and common interests kept them more or less united; but each household was as sovereign and independent as the community itself. It was, in fact, an aggregation of sovereignties, the individuality of each being maintained and asserted throughout, no matter how closely they were bound together by actual or implied compacts. So with the colonies constituting the original thirteen states. After a long and exhausting war with Great Britain they found themselves all at once invested with independence, and so great was the transition, so novel the situation, that for a time even the best and wisest of the revolutionists were bewildered. Such a thing as a compact and inseparable aggregation having but one head and front and one common and indivisible purpose was not to be thought of, for one reason because the nation from which they had just been liberated was conducted on that plan and something as different from it as could be and a national fabric of any kind yet remain was the thing wanted. No individual and no state must lose his or its identity, nor must such identity be even obscured. A union of states meant not such a union as obliterated state lines, but one that represented and rested upon such lines, while it would preserve and perpetuate them. A chief magistrate over all was provided for, but he was not to be chosen by the nation, but by the states which formed the nation, and his powers and privileges were so safeguarded that his tenure would always depend upon the will of the representatives of the states.

Under such circumstances the sturdy patriots of the latter part of the last century and their immediate successors in the first part of this one, would have been looked upon as unpatriotic if not irreverent had they spoken of the national compact in any way that would have caused the entities to disappear for even the time being. It was the United States.