

lumbia University law school, but took command of the two batteries of artillery from Utah when the war started. "Captain Young while in the army wrote a standard pamphlet on the use of the military power in the suppression of mobs."

The following editorial note appeared in the same issue:

#### "OUR NEW STATE.

"Our latest State has borne its share in adding to the glory of the nation. In the battle of Malate the Utah light artillery, whose guns were dragged through deep mud to send shrapnel into the Spaniards' ranks, showed itself deserving of all honor. Utah has had its trouble in the past, but when she sends such a contribution to the nation we wipe out the memory of all trouble."

The citizens of Utah spring from a stock always celebrated for loyalty, bravery and other excellent qualities of American citizenship. The history of Utah testifies to this fact, notwithstanding public opinion has not always been clear upon that point.

#### HONOR TO ALL.

Daniel Montague, first-class machinist on the cruiser New York.

J. C. Murphy, coxswain on the Iowa. Osborn Delgnan, coxswain on the Merrimac.

George F. Phillips, first-class machinist on the Merrimac.

Francis Kelly, water tender on the Merrimac.

R. Clausen, coxswain on the New York.

George Charette, gunner's mate on the cruiser New York.

These are the names of the heroes who went with Hobson on the Merrimac and became the unwilling guests of the Spaniards for a time as a result of their hardihood. The "News" takes pleasure in observing that other papers are giving them publication and hopes the practice will continue till all that have not already done so have given the men this deserved prominence. So much has been made of the lieutenant himself—not undeservedly, of course—that his comrades who were as brave and deserving as himself have fallen into invidious obscurity. It should not be. Let the press arise to the occasion and accomplish such justice as it alone is capable of and (apparently) willing to bring about.

#### "FIGHTING BOB" OF UTAH.

As Captain Robley D. Evans is a Utah contribution to the naval forces of the United States, there is quite a feeling hereabout to know more of the man—where he came from originally, what kind of a career he has had and so on. A correspondent of the Richmond (Va.) Dispatch, writing from Floyd Courthouse in that state, shows that while it is not generally known it is still a fact that Evans is a son of the Old Dominion. He was born on top of the Blue Ridge, in the little town of Floyd, the capital of Floyd county. His father was Dr. Samuel A. J. Evans, who went there in 1841 and remained till 1856. About a year after his arrival he married Miss Sallie Jackson, a sister of the man who shot and killed Col. Ellsworth at Alexandria, Va., in 1861, for pulling down the Confederate flag which waved over his (Jackson's) hotel. Robley was the second son of four children and was born in 1846.

From an early age young Evans showed a decided predilection for fighting, being ready for a "set-to" on the slightest provocation. The following

interesting statement is in the language of the correspondent:

"Dr. Evans left his estate heavily involved in debt, and son after his death all of his property, real and personal, was sold, and his family left homeless and penniless. They lived for a while on the top of Laurel ridge, in this county, and then moved to Fairfax county. Dr. Evans was elected to the legislature from this county in 1846 and served two years in that capacity. Mrs. Evans afterward married Captain Joel W. Pepper of Montgomery county, and went back to that county, where she died several years ago. Robley got his appointment to the Naval Academy, it is said, from the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Utah, through the influence of Judge Henry W. Thomas of Fairfax, who married his mother's sister."

There have been other accounts conflicting materially with this one, which seems to be authentic throughout. One of the conflicting ones is that of a correspondent of the Cardiff (Wales) Western Mail, who pronounced the hero of the Iowa a son of the late Captain David Evans, who shortly after the war was stationed on the Pacific coast in command of the revenue cutter Lincoln.

#### ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

When hostilities between the United States and Spain first were talked of, it was apparent that the continental powers of Europe were determined to make the Cuban question one of European concern. France, seconded by Austria, opened negotiations with Russia and Germany and the last named country responded cordially to the propositions. The plan failed, however, because Great Britain, whose co-operation was deemed essential, refused to be a party to the scheme. The idea of the European cabinets was to induce Great Britain to undertake a naval demonstration off our Atlantic coast in favor of the European "concert," and in case the Americans should refuse to yield to this display of power, the worst that could happen would be a quarrel between the two English-speaking nations, and while this lasted Europe would be free to pursue its own plans elsewhere.

England perceived at once the situation and refused to lend itself to the well laid plot. Public opinion in Great Britain sounded a note of warning to Europe, and the powers reluctantly abandoned the plan of treating Cuba as they had Crete. They found it dangerous to assume the role of "peace-makers" so often played at Constantinople, and the war was commenced with assurances of strict neutrality. Spain, undoubtedly relying on Europe, was simply left to her fate.

A contributor to the July Fortnightly Review, London, takes the view that the English policy regarding Cuba is a complete reversal of her former attitude on this question and that this change of front is a positive evidence of the existence of an Anglo-American understanding. He argues that the Cuban question has never before been regarded as purely American, or even Hispano-American, but one in which four powers, the United States, Spain, England and France have been interested. He quotes the language of Lord John Russell in 1852, when President Fillmore had hinted that Cuba was no concern of Great Britain and France, as follows:

"If it is intended, on the part of the United States, to maintain that Great Britain and France have no interest in

the maintenance of the present status quo in Cuba, and that the United States have alone a right to a voice in that matter, her majesty's government at once refuses to admit such a claim. Her majesty's possessions in the West Indies alone, without insisting on the importance to Mexico and other friendly states of the present distribution of power, give her majesty an interest in this question which she can not forego."

While fully admitting the right of the United States to reject the proposal, Great Britain must at once resume her entire liberty and upon any occasion that may call for it, be free to act singly or in conjunction with other powers as to her may seem fit."

This view has been set forth repeatedly. When, therefore, in the present war, Great Britain has changed her position, the reason must be sought in new relations between the two countries of such a nature as to leave no room for the jealousy and suspicions which made the previous policy necessary.

This reasoning appears plausible, and the matter is of peculiar interest because of the clouds of war that seem to be gathering over the horizon of eastern Asia. There is a war spirit in Great Britain at present. The people are demanding aggressive action in order to prevent Russia from expelling British subjects from a field where they have a right to protection while engaged in lawful pursuits. Possibly the matter is not yet beyond diplomatic resources, but it is believed that war must come ultimately. The request of Mr. Goschen for money to build four new battle ships, four cruisers and twelve torpedo boat destroyers and the statement that Russia's "program" necessitates this addition to the navy, indicate the seriousness of the situation. But whether the catastrophe comes now or later, the United States, supposing the existence of an Anglo-American understanding, must be prepared to play some part in it, and the question is to what extent this country is bound by such an understanding. Our interests must be with Great Britain in every exploit for the cause of humanity, for freedom and civilization.

#### A NATIONAL CELEBRATION.

Chicago has a project for a national celebration to be held next year in that city, commemorating the victory of the United States over Spain. One of the features of this celebration is to be the laying of a cornerstone of a triumphal arch, similar in design to those that adorn some European capitals. The sculpture, however, is not to represent chariots with captives following, but something suggestive of the achievements of peace. The arch is to be built of granite and marble at a cost of from \$100,000 to \$150,000. It is proposed to erect this structure from money gathered all over the Union by popular subscriptions.

So far we have not noticed any press comments anent this proposed national celebration in Chicago. When the scheme is ripe enough to receive general attention it will undoubtedly occur to most people that the place for a national monument in memory of the nation's victory is at the nation's capital and not at Chicago. To place such a monument anywhere else would give to the selected place an undeserved honor and consequently be in a certain degree an injustice to all other cities that have contributed equally to the results obtained. A national celebration would best be carried on simultaneously in all the states, if not cities, in the Union, and a national monument should adorn Washington in preference to any other place.