

destroy, the possession of improved weapons is rather an incentive than otherwise to their use in conflicts of an extensive nature.

As to the financial war the statements made are true to a certain extent. But when a man is sorely pressed financially and is being robbed and feels that by a resort to force he can regain what he regards as his own, he is very likely to take that course. So with nations; and while money is necessary to carry on war successfully, if a government has ability to secure it by force, and the emergency arises, the ability will be called into action. A financial conflict between nations is an invitation for the one most sorely pressed to resort to violence to maintain its rights.

Instead, therefore, of the fear of destructive weapons and financial manipulations being a barrier to red-handed war, the possession of such weapons and the pressure of such manipulations are more likely to produce it. The passions and ambitions of men are not restrained, neither have the nations arrived at a point where they will "hang the trumpet in the hail, and study war no more."

THE TEMPLE LOT SUIT.

A dispatch from Kansas City, Mo. states that the appeal from the decision of Judge Phillips in the so-called Temple lot suit, by which the title to a certain piece of ground in Independence, Jackson county, Mo., was awarded to the religious denomination commonly known as Josephites, has been perfected, and the case will now be passed upon by the United States court of appeals. The dispatch contains the misleading statement, that "the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints held possession of the lot for years until recently when the title was wrested from it by a decision of Judge Phillips;" which is a huge error in that the possession referred to has been held by the present appellants, the so-called Hedrickites, who, the dispatch again assumes to state, are supported by the Mormons of Salt Lake City, "who hope the higher court will reverse the decision of Judge Phillips."

The News has formerly had occasion to state that the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, beyond a desire to see the laws of the country administered with impartiality and justice, have no particular interest in the suit referred to. The Church is no party thereto in any sense whatever and its status can in no way be affected by the court's decision.

The lot in controversy was in 1832 acquired by Bishop Edward Partridge for funds furnished by members of the Church, to be held as the property of the Church. When the persecutions thickened and the Saints were threatened with expulsion, Edward Partridge deeded the property, it is claimed, to three children of Oliver Cowdery. This was in 1839. The "Josephites" base their claim on a deed of quit claim executed in 1887 by one Charles Johnson and his wife, a sister of the Cowdery children, while the "Hedrickites" claim title first through a deed of conveyance

from three of the heirs of Edward Partridge and second, by adverse possession. By a process of logic which does not appear to be distinguished for clearness, Judge Phillips arrived at the conclusion that the "Hedrickites" could not claim possession of the ground, while the "Josephites" were entitled thereto both by virtue of the alleged Partridge deed to the Cowdery children and as the real "successors" of the exiled Church and consequently the true beneficiaries of the trust.

It is the first question, we suppose, which the superior court will be asked to decide, the question of the merits of the legal documents on which the litigants base their claim. The second is a side issue, not in the suit and certainly not depending on the decision of a Missouri court. The question of true "succession" is mainly one of history, not of law, but to speak of succession to a church that never was dissolved is unreasonable. True, the Church was in early days harrassed on all sides by enemies on the outside and traitors within, all of whom longed for an opportunity to crush the young organization out of existence. But it weathered the storms, growing stronger and stronger as the adversaries multiplied. The Church itself by almost unanimous voice settled the matter of a successor to the martyred Prophet long before the "Josephite" movement was ever agitated. This came too late by many years to solve the problem of a successor to Joseph the Prophet, and as to the idea of succeeding the Church, the necessity has not yet arisen, and never can. The Church has had an uninterrupted historical existence since the day of its foundation in 1830 and up to the present time and will so exist until its glorious mission is fulfilled.

ELDERS ARRESTED IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

The *Daily Register* and the *State*, both published in Columbia, South Carolina, contain in their issue of the 5th inst. an account of the arrest, the day before, of two Utah Elders laboring in that vicinity, G. L. Braley and Alvin Smith. The charge against them was vagrancy, the warrant being sworn out by one W. D. Caughman, and the arrest was made at the house of Wm. Sloan, who is understood to belong to the Church, and who lives seventeen miles below Columbia. He wanted to resist the arrest, but was advised to yield to the officer's mandate; and the two Elders were forthwith haled before Justice Taylor, who found them guilty of the charge and sentenced them each to pay a fine of \$10 or to imprisonment for twenty days. They were taken the same day to Columbia by Constable J. T. Neely and lodged in jail. The foregoing particulars are gleaned from the accounts of the incident given by both the papers named, which supply also the usual reportorial remarks on the "pernicious doctrines" taught by the Elders, etc., etc., and which add the information that an excited crowd surrounded the officer and his prisoners after the trial and

made dire threats of whippings or even of "worse fare" if they ever returned to the county again. The *State* asserts that the original arrest included a third Elder; this was Elder W. G. Patrick, president of the conference, who was there on a visit to his fellow-laborers; but he was discharged on the ground that he had only been in the neighborhood five days.

Editorially the *Register* makes no allusion to the incident. The *State*, however, speaks up bravely for American freedom. In the same issue with the local account referred to, appears the following editorial paragraph:

Mormon missionaries may be, and evidently are very unwelcome visitors in South Carolina; they may teach false and repulsive doctrines; but the glory of this country is its religious freedom, and men who drive out even Mormon preachers with threats violate law and constitution and the spirit of liberty, as well as the teachings of Christianity.

And in its issue of the 8th, the same paper, editorially referring to a lengthy communication from the Elders themselves, which it publishes in full on another page, comments as follows:

We commend the letter of the Mormon missionaries to the people of Richland. It is a pity that South Carolinians should have put themselves in a position to receive instructions in Christianity and American liberty from Utah itinerants. But that it is needed the persecution of these men demonstrates.

The communication thus referred to makes three-fourths of a column, is signed by Elders W. G. Patrick, G. L. Braley and Alvin Smith, and appears under the heading, "The Mormons Speak—What They Say in Defense of Themselves and Their Religion." We make a few extracts:

All reasonable and fair-minded people will agree with us that there are two sides to every question, and in order to judge a matter intelligently, it is necessary to hear both sides of the question. * * * We have been and are preaching the Gospel in Richland county, as well as in a great many more counties of the state. But we most emphatically deny the charge of preaching a pernicious doctrine and we venture to say that those who make such statements are entirely ignorant in regard to our teachings. We teach a doctrine that is infallible and that no Bible believer can deny. We were arrested on Monday last, as stated in your columns, on the charge of vagrancy. But we fail to see on what grounds Trial Justice Taylor convicted two of us. If we understand the term vagrancy correctly, it is one who has no visible means of support. When we were arrested we had over \$25, and we also proved this before his honor. We also proved that we were licensed ministers of the Gospel. Our accuser and the witnesses, with one exception, were men we had never seen before and were just as foreign to us as some men in China. Elder Braley had stayed with one of the witnesses two nights, but he never went to his house without an invitation. If they call this vagrancy it is something new to us. In the face of all this evidence, two of us were convicted. We were not brought to Columbia because we could not pay the fine, but because we took an appeal to the higher court. * * * If we commence persecuting any religious sect, however despised or however unpopular, on account of opinion's sake, we know not how soon the fires of Smithfield may be rekindled or the gallows of New England for witches be again erected. It is a shame that free-bor-