

owner of South Carolina, was also found willing to talk. He says:

"I have just come from Charleston by the way of Atlanta, and was a little bit startled at the intense feeling on this matter among the people of Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. The movement toward a Southern convention to take active steps in opposition to the force bill was started, I believe, by the *Atlanta Constitution*. That paper has always been conservative in its attitude toward the North. Mr. Grady in his great speech on 'The New South' revealed the true sentiments of our people, and when his paper takes the course it has now adopted it means that the entire South feels itself outraged and insulted by the government in whose defense it would be the first to spring to arms. For years we have toiled as no one but ourselves can ever imagine, to build up not only shattered fortunes, but a ruined country. If there were any wrongs done us we have forgiven them and would have forgotten them even, had we been allowed to do so. Were the sole basis of Republicanism anything but sectionalism—and many of its leaders hold that as their alpha and omega—there would be no such thing as a 'Solid South.' If anything like a true union is desired again, Congress will not dare pass such a bill as this. The whole South is aroused on the matter and I cannot but believe that it will really carry out its threat to reply in the future upon itself and upon Europe in case the bill passes.

L. P. Hillyer, cashier of the Merchants' National bank of Macon, Ga., is equally outspoken against the bill. He says that the most active kind of opposition to it is contemplated in Georgia. Here are his own words as expressed to a *Post* reporter:

"If we were left alone we would get along all right; but if this force bill be passed and the government send federal officers down there, the negroes will believe it is for their protection, and the amount of arrogance they will assume in the belief that they are so important will make them unbearable. All this trouble is due to Tom Reed and his gang and to John Sherman and that inan Ingalls, whose brayings about outrages in the South are taken by the North as the truth. I believe that those agitators know that the passage of the force bill means trouble, and I feel sure that nothing would suit them better than to see trouble. Light on the true relations of the whites and blacks in the South is what is needed in the North, and the press should see to it that such light is afforded. A few days ago I met an old Massachusetts friend of mine. When last I had seen him nothing was in his mind too bitter to say against the southerners for their treatment of the blacks. For the past few years he has been living in Florida, and when I saw him he told me that his experience had taught him that the southern white man's attitude toward the black was the only correct one. I hope," said Mr. Hillyer in conclusion, "that the bill will not pass. I am a lieutenant of the Macon Volunteers, and though my term of service has expired I continue with them for fear that some day I may be needed. The force bill is not needed in the South and its passage will be looked upon as an outrage."

It is plain that if this bill becomes a law there is trouble ahead. The boycott will figure largely in it. Though, as Mr. Thurston says, the

boycotting of Northern commerce and capital would be for the South industrial suicide, yet a boycott can be carried out something on the Irish plan. Under the provisions of the obnoxious bill one hundred republicans in a district must petition for its enforcement to put it in operation. We all know white republicans are not numerous in the South, and black ones are largely dependent on democrats for a livelihood. Suppose one hundred blacks petitioned for the bill, and immediately they did so a boycott was put in force against them, thus depriving them of food, wages, work and all commercial intercourse, of what avail would they be under the Lodge bill. Boycotting in this way was effective in Ireland, though all the power of the British government antagonized it. It would be a sad state of affairs to see such a system prevailing, and yet that or civil war seems to be the only result.

Elections in Utah are now under control of the Federal authority. Perhaps it is the wanton abuse made of this authority by a horde of vagrants which so alarms the South. Under the Lodge bill better men would certainly be sent South to represent Federal authority, and thus make matters smoother. In this way the proud Virginian, Mr. Tucker, will be ahead of the much abused Utanian, for the former can felicitate himself on the fact that his throat is cut by a gentleman, while that of the latter is cut by a conscienceless, characterless, professional trickster.

The *Chicago Tribune* would say there was poetic justice in the fact that Mr. West, a Southern democrat, urged on for Utah the necessity of a Lodge bill, and got his compatriots to support him; now they won't take a dose of their own medicine. Here is where the selfish brutality of the savage is still visible among us. Indian tribes nor Celtic clans could not be got to cooperate against a common enemy. One by one they allowed themselves to be wiped out. Their barbarous pride kept them from seeing that what threatened the liberty of one threatened all. So it was with the States both North and South now threatened with the Lodge bill: their barbarous pride and self-assumed sanctimoniousness kept them from seeing the foot of the anarchist despot on the neck of an American in Utah, and that is why they are now preparing their own necks. The Lodge bill can be made a party machine in Illinois as well as in Georgia. But that would be poor consolation to Utah, though, as the *Chicago Tribune* said of the confiscation business in Salt Lake, there might be poetic retribution in it. Revenge, retribution, selfishness and spite are poor factors in a nation. No matter what outrage and infamy he heaped on Utah people, these people should not entertain such feelings neither among themselves nor in a petty way against outsiders. Let them with the little temporal might they have protest against the desecration

of American liberty, the spoliation of American citizens and the degradation of American manhood, and there is a Power far higher than State or federal or municipal that will do the rest. This nation was not established to be the shuttlecock of political knaves.

The *Chicago Tribune* in its issue of July 23, has an editorial entitled "Democracy and Mormonism." It is written on the interchange of personalities between Senators Vest and Edmunds during the debate on the appropriation for the Salt Lake Industrial Woman's Home. As a matter of course, Senator Vest is most stupidly misrepresented, and and he is made not the apologist but the champion of polygamy. The *Tribune* says: "Of course Vest could not refer to any anti-polygamy bill which he had prepared or introduced. He had opposed the measures of the Judiciary Committee but had not proposed others in place of them." Yes, he opposed measures which were inhuman, unconstitutional and tyrannical, but that was not advocating polygamy. It might as well be said that the man who denounces lynch law is opposed to capital punishment and is an advocate of horse stealing.

Senator Edmunds says of Vest:

"He is opposed to polygamy and thinks it a very great wrong, and, to use his phrase, an absurd thing; but he is like some of the Northern Democrats in the time of the late war who were very much opposed to secession, indeed, but still more opposed to the United States taking any steps to put it down. That is the attitude of my friend from Missouri on the subject of polygamy."

The *Tribune* makes this a text for a little political homily which reads as follows:

"So, too, with the Democratic party in general. Much as that organization may declare itself opposed to polygamy no law can be proposed for the correction of the evil which will get any hearty and effective support from the Democracy. It will always be found that such measures infringe on Democratic notions of 'personal liberty,' or are opposed to the Democratic theories of 'home rule' and 'local self-government.' The position of the Mormons is identical with that of the Rebels at the opening of the war, in that they only ask to be 'let alone' and allowed to manage their own affairs in their own way."

Forty years ago the same thing was said of the democratic party in regard to celibacy. The war against celibates then was nearly as virulent as it is now against polygamists. Celibates were tarred and feathered, and measures projected for punishing them of a similar character to those of Edmunds. The democratic party then in its vigor and true to its Jeffersonian instincts actually stamped on those measures, and came out boldly and heroically for religious toleration, but it did not propose enforcing or preaching celibacy.

In another issue of the *Tribune*, that of July 26, is an editorial entitled "Sectarian Appropriations by Congress." There are three schools conducted by celibates among the Indians, one in Indiana, one in Cal-