

EDITORIALS.

THE EUROPEAN SITUATION.

The peace of Europe is beginning to be regarded by some, no doubt, as a very much hackneyed subject; but whether this be the case or not, the gravity of the situation across the Atlantic can neither be set aside nor overcome. Those who look back even as far as Sadowa and the more recent Sedan can readily understand why there are subdued perturbations now causing a quivering dread to traverse the nationalities of Europe, and which are greater incentives to war than were any that preceded the conflicts which had their culminating points in those two places. The treatment of Germans in France and of Frenchmen in Germany alone has furnished a *casus belli* time and time again; the Schnaebele affair and the consequent circumstances growing out of it were a greater provocation than either France or Germany would have endured for one day twenty years ago.

The peace between Russia and William's Empire is also an indifferently patched-up affair. A newspaper which has numerous European correspondents and a fine special telegraphic service, thus being in position to speak as one having some knowledge of the subject discussed—we refer to the San Francisco *Chronicle*—considers that the relations of the two countries are of a strained character. The recent ukase prohibiting foreign subjects from acquiring or farming any estates situated on the Russian frontier zone, stretching from the Baltic to the Black sea, is considered as a serious check to German influence and interest in those regions, as German factories, workshops, manufactories and warehouses abound in the towns, while in the country their farms are no less numerous. Those Germans who are too poor to become proprietors enter into service in the houses of their countrymen. Altogether, so powerful an element is thus constituted that the country works and produces, so to speak, for the exclusive profit of the Germans. The Russian government also regards their products as detrimental to the national industry, as competing with the latter throughout the rest of the empire. It is further considered that the majority of the colonists belong to the German army reserve, and might in the event of war, suddenly become hostile outposts, already established in the country, perfectly familiar with its topography, its resources, and its condition from a strategic point of view. They might even, it is apprehended, seek to gain allies among the Poles. The greater part of the rich German element in Russia only hold their lands or houses by virtue of temporary concessions, and when their leases expire they will be unable to renew or prolong them. Deprived in this way of authority, exposed to administrative interference and to the ill-will of the Russian element, it is supposed that the colonists will find themselves so disadvantageously placed that many will return to Germany, followed by the countrymen who serve them and who will no longer find in the country such abundant resources as formerly. Finally, even those who may remain will eventually in great part have no other course but to take their departure, owing to the changed state of things. Such is regarded as the real scope of the ukase in question, and, taken in conjunction with the Russianizing movement in administrative matters which is proceeding in the Russian political circles an ever-widening breach must be produced between Russia and Germany, rendering almost impossible the renewal of their former cordial relations, which have been undetermined by Prince Bismarck's action at the Berlin Congress, the expulsion of Russian subjects and the Imperial Chancellor's policy during the Bulgarian crisis.

When war in Europe does actually break out, it promises in advance to be the most cruel, destructive and erosive of any in modern times; it is the conviction that this is the case that has held the Powers in restraint so much and on so many occasions.

A CAMPAIGN OF SLANDER.

If we had the disposition, or were engaged in the business of making personal attacks upon candidates for office and those who differ from our views of principle or policy, we could make it very interesting for some of the wordy calumniators of leading men among the "Mormons." But the "Liberals" party holds a monopoly in that line and we are quite willing that it should be confined within its appropriate limits. However, there may come occasions where to be silent would be criminal in view of the best interests of the public, and then we may feel it a duty to be more outspoken and explicit.

There are some of the most unscrupulous, depraved and dishonest creatures that ever fastened themselves on the body public for a living, among the foremost declaimers against the "Mormons" and the false accusers of honorable men. The proofs are at hand, and if the respectable non-"Mormon" voters were aware of the character of certain calumniators and aspirants for

"Liberal" favors, they would feel terribly chagrined at the support which they feel almost compelled to give to them.

But we are not engaged in throwing mud, even at those who are casting up mire and dirt at us and our friends in the vain hope of helping a cause doomed to defeat. So we can afford to let the villains run to the end of their rope, and berate and revile the living and the dead, thus exposing their own petty malice and degraded instincts, until justice claims its own, and their impurity and dishonor are developed and proclaimed as with a voice of thunder in the streets and upon the housetops. On one side only, the political contest of 1887 has developed recently into a campaign of slander with a fusillade of vituperation.

ANTI-"MORMON" PETTIFOGGING.

The Chicago *Times* of July 19th has a long editorial on what it calls "Mormon Pettifogging." After indulging in certain personalities, to which we will not reply because they have nothing to do with the question under discussion, the *Times* makes some rather obscure remarks about the phrase in the Utah Constitution: "Bigamy and polygamy being considered incompatible with a republican form of government," etc. It then asks:

"When and by whom has it been considered that keeping a harem is incompatible with a republican form of government? Who has said so? What reason has been offered to show that the harem is more incompatible with the republican form than with the monarchical, or theocratic, or any other form? The critics say that the allegation of such incompatibility is new to them, and they add that, in any case, it is an allegation of nonsense. At all events, that is what the *Times* has said, and repeats.

That there is in the Mormon practice of the harem system, or the Turkish practice of it, or the Moorish, the Asiatic, the Polyneesian, the African, the ancient Israelitish, or any other practice of "plural marriage," concubinage, polygamy, polyandry, or promiscuity, ought that is incompatible with one more than another constitution of government is an assumption without the least foundation of fact or of philosophy, which no person with any respectable measure of sense has made.

"Keeping a harem" is not in controversy. The doctrine and practice of a plurality of wives, which non-"Mormons" please to call polygamy, does not include that feature of Asiatic polygamy known as the harem. If we were inclined to retaliate in the Chicago style we might inquire of this introduction of something foreign to the question in dispute is not *Times* "pettifogging." The idea, too, that polygamy is "more incompatible with the republican form than with the monarchical or theocratic or any other form," is a false conception, entirely the product of the writer in the *Times*. Neither the *Deseret News*, whose editor it assails, nor the Constitutional Convention expressed or intended to convey any such foolish notions as that brought forth by the *Times*. Is it too much to say that this is a little more *Times* "pettifogging?" We agree with "the critics" that it is nonsense, but the Chicago *Times*, not the *Deseret News* is responsible for the absurdity.

That polygamy has been declared "incompatible with a republican form of government" must be known to every reader of the leading papers of the United States. It is for that reason that the admission of Utah into the Union as a State has been opposed in Congress and in the papers. Of course its relations to a monarchical form of government was not in question, from the simple fact that this is a republic and it is only a republican form of government that is here alleged to be affected by the practice. Every time that Utah has applied for statehood the cry has been raised that polygamy was not in harmony with republican institutions, and that as Utah countenanced polygamy she could not be permitted to enjoy the privileges of a State in the Union. The *Times* challenges the production of a single instance of this objection. Without hunting up old files and pub. docs. we will cite two instances of very recent date. The annexed is from the Omaha *Herald* of July 12th:

As *The Herald* pointed out a few days since, the constitution adopted in Utah provides that the section forbidding polygamy shall not be changed except by consent of Congress and the President. Should the Mormons, after gaining power as a State, disregard this compact, there still would be recourse to the United States Supreme Court, under that clause of the national constitution which guarantees to every State a republican form of government, and doubtless that court would hold that polygamy was not in consonance with republican institutions.

The Omaha *Bee* of July 18th said: "The duty of congress is to admit to statehood any territory having a sufficient population for the election of a representative in congress, when a majority of the people of such territory ask to be admitted, the only condition required by the Constitution being that the United States shall

guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." This condition is undeniably political, and unless it could be shown that the conduct and policy of the Mormon Church are unrepugnant, congress would doubtless hesitate to create a precedent by making them a reason for refusing statehood, as the gentiles of Utah demand. If plural marriages are unrepugnant, as well as unchristian, the people who support that system cannot be given the rights of citizenship under a state organization; if they are simply the latter they cannot properly have any weight in determining the question of statehood.

This is a sufficient answer to the challenge of the Chicago *Times*. But we wish it to be understood that neither the *Deseret News* nor the Constitutional Convention has affirmed that "polygamy is incompatible with a republican" or any other "form of government." It is stated in the Constitution that it is so "considered," and the voting people of Utah, who are monogamists in practice declare that it shall be deemed a misdemeanor and punished with certain penalties. What "pettifogging" is there in that? Is it not the very thing that the leading papers of the country called upon the Convention to do as soon as the announcement that it was to assemble was made to the country?

We have never admitted, in all the controversy of years on this question, that polygamy was "incompatible with a republican form of government." The conceit was not ours. If the Chicago *Times* does not believe in its consistency, neither do we, so we twain are one upon that point and the *Times* might have saved half a column of space in controversy with us, as well as its indulgence in quibbles that look very much like "pettifogging."

The *Times* says further:

"Utah is a part of the republic; is a politically organized part of it; has a 'republican form' of government, established by the authority of the republic; and cannot change the existing form by nor in the name of any other authority. The right and authority to alter the local government of Utah can come from no other source. The republic has constitutional power and right to withhold such authority in its own pleasure and discretion, for any reason, or no reason, that to its legislative assembly may seem proper. The practice of polygamy, the existence of the harem, among a large part of the inhabitants of that territory, though not incompatible with a republican form of government, is an ample ground for withholding the national authorization of any project to change the local political arrangements that may be suggested by the inhabitants that not only hold the harem system as a religious belief, but pursue it as a religious practice."

We have never stated that Utah is not a part of the republic. But we do dispute that it "has a republican form of government." The chief officers are appointed without the consent of the people by a President and Senate in whose election the people thus governed have no voice. The acts of the people's elected legislators may be rendered void by the absolute veto, or failure to sign, of a Governor foisted upon them from another community, and not even a unanimous vote of the assembly is made equal to this one-man power. Is that a republican form of government? Is it not rather autocratic, and more despotic than some monarchical forms? We have no representation in the body that makes laws for our obedience, nor vote in the election of officers in whose hands are our lives and liberties and who have frequently trampled under foot both law and right in order to persecute and oppress us.

As to the right to alter this form of government we also differ from the views of the *Times*. What we have quoted above from the Omaha *Bee* we endorse, so far as it relates to this point of the controversy. We hold that the people have some rights as well as Congress. The principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence are ours. They do not harmonize with the doctrine, virtually set forth by the Chicago *Times*, that the people in a Territory are the vassals of Congress and have no political rights but those which that body chooses to confer upon them. We do not believe that Congress has "the constitutional power and right" to bestow or withhold "in its own pleasure and discretion for any reason or no reason" what to it may seem proper. We think that Congress must be governed by the Constitution and that its powers are limited thereby.

Will the *Times* please to quote from that instrument the particular section or clause that endows Congress with the extraordinary authority assumed for it? Also the part or parts in which Congress is authorized to withhold the rights of Statehood from an organized community having the usual qualifications, solely on account of their religious belief or their religious practice.

We agree with the Omaha *Bee* that the question and the condition are "undeniably political," and must be viewed and treated from a political standpoint. And as polygamy, according to the august authority of the Chicago *Times* is "not incompatible with a republican form of government," it must of necessity become

patible, that is—see Webster—in "harmony," "accordant," "consistent" with and "suitable" and "agreeable" to that form of government. Why, then, should the Chicago *Times*, or any other high authority on the meaning of terms and the constitutional powers of Congress, object to the admission of Utah be cause a minority of her habitants practice polygamy? To an unprejudiced observer, does not the objection, viewed in the light of these admissions and assertions, appear extremely like what the *Times* itself calls "pettifogging?"

The *Times* takes exception to our reference to the States as "partners in the federal compact," and endeavors to identify it with "secession doctrine." We think we are justified in again repeating the phrase it has used against the "Mormons" and calling this more "pettifogging." We have advanced nothing that leans in the bent of secession. Our endeavors have been in the very opposite direction. We advocate going into the Union of States not seceding from it. But did not the several States, when the Union was formed, enter into a "compact" and was it not "federal" in its nature and effect? What is a compact? Webster defines it as "an agreement between parties; a covenant or contract either of individuals or nations." "Federal" is that which pertains to such compacts. Will the *Times* pretend to deny that the several States entered into a compact or agreement to relinquish certain rights to the general government and retain others in their individual and several limited sovereignties? And was not the compact federal in character, as the word is defined by Webster? We pointed out the effort of the Convention to conform to the institutions of those several partners and become one with them in the Union. Where is there in this even a faint odor of secession?

The fact is, the Chicago *Times* smells something Democratic in the movement for Statehood in Utah, and therefore essays to stamp it out with the heels of ultra Republicanism shod with the unyielding metal of centralization. But even if Utah should lean toward the doctrines of Democracy it does not follow that it would have the flavor of "secession." A Federal compact does not necessarily imply the right of the parties to withdraw from it at pleasure. A compact or contract implies mutual obligations, and partnerships cannot be rightfully dissolved except by mutual consent or some lawful process or recognized authority. The *Times* has utterly failed to make out a case against the *Deseret News* and the Utah people who have inaugurated the movement for Statehood, and in its play upon words and mis-statements of the position it attacks, has exposed itself to the derision of "the critics" and made a boomerang of its unjust charges of "pettifogging." The country will find that from a political and natural standpoint the action of the monogamist "Mormons" is not only loyal, logical and legitimate, but is intensely in earnest, and that its promoters have no need to descend to the arts with which political and editorial pettifoggers seem to be familiar.

MORE KICKING THAN THINKING.

The Chicago *Journal* sagely cites the fact that at the late election in Utah for school trustees, "many Mormons did not vote because they refused to take the oath to abandon polygamy," and puts that against the argument of George Ticknor Curtis in favor of the Statehood movement. The *Journal* will perhaps be surprised to learn that there were many "Gentiles" who did not vote for precisely the same reason; they would not take the test oath. If the *Journal* will show how either fact affects Mr. Curtis' irrelevant argument, we will be pleased to give the explanation deserved attention.

While the *Journal* is about it perhaps it will show us what part of the oath requires a voter to "abandon polygamy." No polygamist is permitted to vote anyhow, so he cannot take the oath and it would do him no good if he did. Those who take it are required to obey the laws; and as they had never entered into polygamy they do not promise to "abandon" it.

The oath includes several sexual offenses which are generally recognized as "Gentile" pet peccadillos, and as some of that class of citizens would not bind themselves to abstain from that particular grade of vices, they did not and could not vote at that election. If editors would but examine this Utah question they would less frequently show the ear-markers of a certain quadruped with stronger heels than brains. If they would think more and kick less it would perhaps be better for them as well as the "Mormons."

REPUBLICANISM IN CATHOLICISM.

In the procedure of the different organizations connected with the Roman Catholic Church, the representative system largely prevails. One of these is known as the Hermits of the Order of St. Augustine, the chief officer of which is called a Provincial, and as it is an important body occupying an exalted sphere in the machinery

of the Church, the head office is of necessity a high and responsible station. A trial has been going on within this organization for nearly a year, in relation to the conduct of Rev. John P. Gilmore, of Waterford, N. Y., who at the late election of Provincial voted for himself and was elected by one majority; the choice being thus consummated by himself was considered a great scandal and a subject for the prompt reprobation of the Church. In addition to this, it was claimed that he acted like a genuine "all-round" politician, by inducing others to vote for him on the promise of procuring good positions for them in the event of his election.

The case was carried on with considerable zeal in the American court and even that of the Holy See at Rome itself; considerable bitterness was shown and the whole facts were brought out without reservation, but so well disciplined were those having it in charge that no word of the proceedings leaked out and the public were kept in ignorance of the matter until a result was reached, which appeared as a telegraphic dispatch in the *News* a few days ago. The violator of the rules of his church and of good taste as well, was found guilty as charged and at once deposed from his high and responsible office.

Taking this circumstance in connection with the rigid rule invoked and exercised in the case of Father McGlynn, it looks very much as if the Church of Rome would have no backsliders nor any who are unwilling to yield a full allegiance to the faith or observe the commonly understood rules of propriety within its fold.

DANGER IN ELECTRIC WIRES.

The danger attending the practice of having overhead telegraph and telephone wires, was illustrated a short time ago in St. Louis. A lad in that city happened to catch hold of a guy wire attached to a telegraph pole and the wire having come into contact with one bearing the electric current, he was hurled violently into the street.

The account given of the occurrence is to the effect that an exciting scene ensued. His screams brought a large number of men to his aid. But he was unable to let go his hold, and whenever they touched him they received shocks which threw them wildly about. A man who rushed up with a chisel to cut the wire was stunned, as was another who attempted to pour water upon his arm, the coat sleeve having taken fire from the electricity. Various expedients proved unsuccessful, and the boy's agony was increasing, when a man wrapped the wire with a cloth, and although severely shocked himself, succeeded in freeing the lad's hand from its terrible hold. The flesh was found to be literally roasted from the inside of his arm, and his sufferings were terrible, his escape from instant death being considered almost miraculous.

Accidents of this kind have not been very numerous but there have been enough of them to necessitate a caution to the public. We would be sorry to say anything that could be construed as in opposition to those wonderful inventions and conveniences that have become necessities in modern times, but refer to such incidents as the above as a warning to careless and meddlesome people. "Don't monkey with the buzz saw!" is a rough but common caution at primitive lumber mills. Electric accidents have been sufficiently frequent and fatal to warrant the warning: "Don't monkey with telegraph or telephone wires!"

A STREET SQUALL.

It will be seen by a statement in our local columns, that Attorney J. L. Rawlins and Mr. Patrick H. Lannan appeared this morning in the role of participants in a street fight. It seems that the attorney got the better of the encounter. Although he resorted to arguments not recognized as strictly professional, he used them as effectively as if he was an old hand at the business. He delivered a legal left-hander on one cheek of his assailant, while he felt for the other cheek with his right. Owing to the expansive character of the mark it was next to impossible for either to miss the objective point, so Mr. P. H. Lannan involuntarily embraced the sidewalk with his back. Had a colored man not interfered and held Mr. Rawlins, the prostrate form of Mr. Lannan might have been reduced to something like sausage meat, but into which he doubtless had no desire to be transformed. It appears that although Mr. Lannan went down, it was not without a struggle, one evidence of which was Mr. Rawlins' battered hat, which appeared to be the main centre of his antagonist's attack, although the efforts were doubtless in reality directed at "the head that was in it."

We are not familiar with the cause of the squabble, any further than that on the surface it has appeared that considerable ill feeling has existed between the parties—the last phase of it.