

## LOCAL NEWSPAPERS' STANDING.

THE Salt Lake Times has squarely put itself in line with the newly-organized Republican party in this county, and may accordingly be regarded as the particular organ and champion of the movement. The *Herald* of course is as valiantly Democratic. This gives each national party a local journal in which to expound its doctrines and defend its policies; and it may be certain that whoever from this time on is unable to compare to the satisfaction of his own mind the respective beauties of the policy of centralization with those of the doctrine of States rights, as well as the soundness of the policy of protection with that of free or freer trade, will have to admit that his own unwillingness alone stands in the way. The issue is made, and the lines are drawn. The bloodless contest is sure to be interesting, and it ought to be instructive.

The attitude of our anti-"Mormon" morning cotemporary during these pregnant days is one of singular consistency. It has many a time and oft repudiated the charge that it is an anti-Democratic sheet; and it would fain masquerade as the true lover of any and all parties who possessed the one qualification of undying hatred to the settlers and the people of Utah. Yet it has ever been a Republican organ at heart, and has championed with its ablest endeavors the cause of the "grand old party" in even its most radical features. Hence it contented itself with mildly ridiculing the Democratic movement which came into active life here two weeks ago; it apparently didn't care what the Democrats did anyway. It could still be outwardly "Liberal" and more staunchly Republican. But what a change when the leaven began to work among the Republicans! Then its fury knew no bounds. It accused many of its old-time friends with hypocrisy, suggested improbable bargains that had been made, railed at the stupidity of its sometime adherents who showed an inclination to break the leading strings with which it had held them, and finally it came out with studied insults and brutal innuendoes against the men who had fallen under its displeasure. It has succeeded, therefore, in the short space of three weeks, in proclaiming itself not only anti-"Mormon," but also anti-Democratic and anti-Republican. It is left almost without party and hence without policy. Its floundering in the depths of desperation would be pitiful if they were not so ludicrous. It is now more defiantly than ever the enemy of the advance-

ment of the Territory, and has again given proof of what we have always claimed: that peace was its nightmare and incessant hate and warfare against the general prosperity the food upon which it reveled and gorged itself.

## THE CONFISCATION SCHEME.

The principles of sovereignty and paternalism announced for the United States government by the Supreme court in its decision in the case of the Latter-day Saints' church property, which was discussed last week, are of more consequence to the American people at this time than appears in the mere enunciation of the principles; though in that, as we have seen, there is accomplished, as far as the court can go, a total revolution in the principles of government which were established by the makers of the American Union. This can be more clearly illustrated by following the lead suggested by the court. It will be remembered that the court cited Rome as one of the authorities for the position which was taken in the decision; and by a brief examination of the Roman governmental system, in its principle and in its workings, in connection with certain claims and movements which are becoming quite popular in this country, the full meaning of that decision can be more clearly discerned.

In the Roman system the government was supreme, absolute, paternal and divine. "The idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics; and within that was included all actual realization of the highest good; hence the development of all other goods pertaining to humanity was made dependent on this."—*Neander*. Man with all that he had was subordinated to the State; he must have no higher aim than to be a servant of the State; he must seek no higher good than that which the State could bestow. "The first principles of their law was the paramount right of the State over the citizen. Whether as head of a family, or as proprietor, he had no natural rights of his own; his privileges were created by the law as well as defined by it. The State, in the plenitude of her power, delegated a portion of her own irresponsibility to the citizen, who satisfied the conditions she required, in order to become the parent of her children; but at the same time she demanded of him the sacrifice of his free agency to her own rude idea of political expediency."—*Merivale*.

It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The individual was a part of the State. There was no such thing as the rights of the people. The right of the State only was to be considered and that was to be considered absolute. "The more distinguished a Roman became, the less was he a free man. The omnipotence of the law, the despotism of the rule drove him into a narrow circle of thought and action, and his credit and influence depended on the sad austerity of his life. The whole duty of man, with the humblest and greatest of the Romans, was to keep his house in order, and be the obedient servant of the State."—*Mommsen*.

Thus every Roman citizen was a subject and every Roman subject was

a slave. It would be difficult to conceive of a system of government whose principles were more radically opposed to those of the United States, than were these.

As the State was paternal the Emperor was father of the people; and as such he gave to the people land, he fed them, he gave them money, in short he dealt with them as a father with his children. But even before there was an emperor this principle was the principle of the government. The only change from the times before the emperors, to the times of the emperors, was that in the imperial authority there was merged in one man that which before pertained to the government composed of the senate, consulate, and tribunate.

In the days of Tiberius Gracchus, B. C. 133, the public lands were leased by the government to capitalists. And although there was a law which forbade any single holding of more than three hundred and thirty-three acres, the law was of ancient standing and had been gradually disregarded until practically it was forgotten, and the capitalists had entirely monopolized the public land which they cultivated by slave labor, and the citizens without capital being unable to compete with capital in control of slave labor, were virtually crowded off the land. Tiberius determined that the monopolies should be broken and that the public lands should be restored to the citizens. It was done, and within two years the commissioners appointed to distribute the land had settled forty thousand families upon public lands which the monopolists had been obliged to surrender. But the commissioners soon became unpopular. Those who were compelled to resign their lands were exasperated, of course. On the other hand, those to whom the land was given were not in all cases satisfied. It was certain that some would be given better pieces of land than others, and that of itself created jealousy and discontent.

But the greatest trouble was, that in the great majority of cases it was not land that they wanted, in fact it was money that they wanted first of all; and although the land was virtually given to them and well improved at that, they could not get money out of it without work. It had to be personal work, too, because to hire slaves was against the very law, by virtue of which they have received the land; and to hire freemen was impossible; (1) because no freeman would work for a slave's wages—that, in his estimate, would be to count himself no better than a slave; and (2), the new landed proprietor could not afford to pay the wages demanded by free labor, because he had to meet the competition of the wealthy landowners who worked their land with slave labor.

The only alternative was for the new landholders to work their land themselves, and do the best they could at it. But as the money did not come as fast as they wished, and as what did come was only by hard work and economical living, many of them heartily wished themselves back amid the stir and bustle of the busy towns working for daily wages, though the wages might be small. The discontented cries soon grew loud enough to