

propose to allow the Mormons to be driven out. With their teacher they insisted that they would combat armed force by armed force if necessary. This had the desired effect. The basis of this action of the schoolboys was that the Elders had gained, by their conduct and worthiness, the confidence of the youth.

Thus it may be wheresoever the Elders go. Wherever the qualities which characterize prudent, energetic missionaries will gain for them access to the people to preach the Gospel, there their labors will be profitable to the cause, and consequently to them. When these qualities cannot make their way, the introduction of different forces should be left to other powers.

GRAVE BREACH OF PROPRIETY.

Out of all the dispatches and correspondence and rumors concerning the unfortunate conduct of Acting Rear Admiral Stanton in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro, the simple fact remains undisputed that that officer disregarded the plainest principles of international law and was in a fair way to involve our country in embarrassing foreign complications. This conduct consisted in his firing a salute to the rebel Admiral Meilo, receiving a salute from him in return, and then exchanging visits with him. Of course this was a grave insult to the regular and legal government of Brazil, which could not but look upon it as a recognition by the United States of the insurgent movement. Even to pay the rebel leader this attention as a "belligerent" would have been an offense—governments are not prone to look upon insurrections while still unsuccessful as deserving of anything but suppression and punishment. There was obviously nothing for this government to do but to apologise to Brazil for the blunder of our naval representative at Rio, and relieve him immediately of his command. The latter was promptly and peremptorily done, and a court-martial, with possible dismissal from the service, will follow. Meanwhile the action of the Washington authorities has done as much as was possible toward removing the evil effects of Stanton's indiscretion. Brazil itself is apparently satisfied; and—what is more important—the European governments which were at first disposed to attach to the act much significance—are seemingly convinced that there is no occasion for farther complication from it.

It is unaccountable that an officer of Stanton's experience and training should have perpetrated a mistake so egregious. One of the subjects most thoroughly treated and taught the cadets at the U. S. Naval academy is law in its various maritime and international aspects. It is in the highest degree necessary that the officers graduated from that institution should be familiar with all the points and distinctions that will enable them when in foreign waters or on the high seas to maintain the dignity and circumspection that should characterize representatives of a great government. As a general thing they are conspicuously prudent in these respects, and it is rare indeed that one of them lays himself or the authorities at Washington liable

to reproof for any violation of the proprieties. An incident illustrative of their care and conservatism in this line is recalled by the present episode, though it happened more than twenty years ago. It probably never appeared in print until the editor of the *New York Recorder*, a few days ago, gave it to his readers, and as germane to the matter at issue it is well worth reproduction. Rear-Admiral Temple of our navy and Mr. Andrew D. White, minister at St. Petersburg, were two of the four actors in it. The other two, Dr. Howe of Boston and Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio, are dead. Messrs. Wade, Howe and White were Gen. Grant's commissioners to San Domingo in 1871. Admiral—then Captain—Temple commanded the frigate *Tennessee*, on which they sailed. Batz, then president of San Domingo, had a rebellion on his hands, under the leadership of Gen. Cabral, who was somewhere in the interior of the island. The members of the commission conceived the idea of interviewing him, and arranged an expedition for the purpose. They asked Capt. Temple for an escort of marines or sailors and the American flag as a measure of protection. The captain declined on the ground that it would be a violation of duty on his part which might lead his government into unforeseen complications. Capt. Temple knew more about international law than the ex-president pro tem of the Senate, the president of Cornell university and Dr. Howe combined.

If Admiral Stanton had shown even a modicum of this thought and foresight he could not have committed the error which has proved so humiliating to him, so disappointing to his friends, and so unfortunate to his government.

BANNING A BOOK.

Readers of the *News* will remember a paper under the heading "Saturday Talk by an Ex-Editor," written by President George Q. Cannon, and published in these columns some time ago, commenting on the startling magazine articles of Sir George Mivart entitled "Happiness in Hell." They will also have noticed that these articles came under the scrutiny and later the condemnation of the Catholic church, the articles being finally banned or proscribed or whatever the usual term in such instances may be. Sir George Mivart was too good a Catholic to resist the interdiction, and he obediently signified his retraction of the opinions he had incautiously advanced.

Now comes a writer in the *Nineteenth Century* and details in an interesting manner the formal and deliberate steps taken by the church in the banning of a book. From his account we learn that the members of the congregation of the index are some six or seven cardinals appointed by the pope. It has a prefect, or president, an assistant and a secretary, the last named being always a Dominican. It has attached to it a number of consultants, selected from the ranks of the secular and regular clergy of Rome. Its method of procedure is naturally a replica, more or less, of that of the congregation of the Inquisition, and its sentences are, in a majority of instances, supplementary to sentences already

passed in the older congregation. A large proportion of the books condemned by it have previously been condemned by the Inquisition. Sometimes, however, it takes the initiative, and it then proceeds as follows: A book is denounced by some zealous Catholic to the cardinal prefect as hurtful to the soul, and the denunciation is laid before the secretary of the congregation. The denouncer, or delater, as he is technically termed, has to give full reasons for his complaint. The secretary has then to examine the book for himself with care, and to associate with himself two advisers, chosen by him with the consent of the holy father or the cardinal prefect. If their collective judgment is against the book, a further adviser has to be selected who is an expert in the special subject of which the book treats. He has to give in a detailed report to the secretary, marking the particular passages to which exception can justly be taken. After this a preliminary meeting of the body of consultants is held, the secretary being present with at least six consultants who are familiar with the topics discussed in the book. Finally a general meeting of the cardinals composing the congregation is held, whose procedure is exactly the same as that of the congregation of the Inquisition. There is the same full discussion, the same reference to the consultants, and finally the same report of the proceedings and of their result to the pope, with a view to his approval of the sentence passed.

There would accordingly seem to be neither undue haste nor unfairness—though the hearing is in a sense *ex parte*—in reaching a conclusion that means so much to the publisher of unorthodox views. Mr. Mivart, at any rate, has coincided with the criticisms of his church superiors, and in promptly accepting their verdict he intimates a belief that no injustice has been done him. The incident is noteworthy as illustrating that in these latter days of boasted independence in thought—which, however, is frequently a euphemism for stubbornness against reason—there are still leading spirits that yield readily to the pressure brought by the eleven jurymen against the one.

INDIANS AS SOLDIERS.

Major-General Schofield, the head of the regular army of the United States, in his recently completed report to the secretary of war, makes thoughtful and interesting reference to the introduction of Indians into the army. According to the report the enlistment of Indians and their organization into companies attached to the regular regiments appear thus far to have accomplished in a very satisfactory manner the principal objects contemplated in that policy. These are understood to have been the withdrawing from the warlike tribes and giving satisfactory employment to a considerable number of young men who were generally dissatisfied and liable at any time to become hostile; the educating the Indians in the rules and customs of civilized as contrasted with those of savage warfare, and the assisting in the efforts of the government to transform the Indian character from that of