DESERET EVENING NEWS

Organ of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

LORENZO SNOW, TRUSTEE-IN-TRUST.

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING (EXCEPT SUNDAY)

Corner of South Temple and East Temple Streets, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Charles W. Penrose, - - - Editor
Horace G. Whitney, Business Manager.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES.

One Year	in advance	$6.00
Six Months	"	3.00
Three Months	"	1.50
One Week	"	12
One Month	"	50
Sunday edition, per year	"	2.00
Semi-Weekly	"	2.00

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR.

Address all business communications to THE DESERET NEWS, Salt Lake City, Utah.

SALT LAKE CITY, JANUARY 26, 1899.

DON'T BE RIDICULOUS!

The San Francisco Chronicle which ought to know better, falls into the error which has been pointed out more than once in these columns, that a person convicted of an offense against the law "loses his citizenship." Speaking of the amnesty proclamations, it says:

"By the terms of the proclamations only those disfranchised Mormons who should faithfully conform thereto and the Edmunds law could secure citizenship.

"The ignorance displayed in that sentence is both marvelous and boundless; yet there are a number of editors of influential journals like the Chronicle who exhibit the same lack of information.

In the first place, citizenship is not lost or regained, forfeited or restored by action of law or executive proclamation. What the Chronicle means, probably, is the elective franchise. Every person born in the United States is a citizen of it thereof," that is United States law. Every person naturalized under the laws of the United States is also a citizen. The elective franchise does not come by birth or naturalization. It is conferred as a privilege by sixteen Each State makes its own laws as to the suffrage. A woman is a citizen as much as a man in every State of the Union. So is every child born in this country. But neither women nor minors, although they are citizens, have the right to vote, except that in a few States suffrage is conferred on women.

In most of the States conviction for felony deprives the criminal of the right to vote, and, generally speaking, that right may be restored by executive pardon. But whether disfranchised or not, the convict is still a citizen. That is a point which seems to be misunderstood by a great many people.

In the second place, the disfranchised Mormons, alluded to by the Chronicle, were restored to political rights by the Enabling Act for the admission of Utah as a State. That act was passed by Congress and signed by the President subsequent to the Edmunds law and to the authority proclamations. It superseded them all. They were in operation in the Territory of Utah, but Utah is now a State with an equal footing with the rest of the States, and has her own laws regulating the suffrage. Every citizen over twenty-one years of age, male or female, who has resided a given time in the State and district, is a voter and eligible to public office. Every male citizen with those qualifications and who is of proper age is eligible to a seat in Congress.

There is one thing more to which we direct the attention of editorial writers on this subject, and that is that convictions for a misdemeanor does not work forfeiture of the franchise either in Utah or in any other State in the Union, so far as we are aware. Ignorance of that fact has caused a great many comments on the Utah situation in leading newspapers. Men lawyers are liable to make such mistakes as defined by law, may cause forfeiture of the franchise, but not of citizenship. Misdemeanors do not have either effect. Granting that polygamy, that is, cohoiting into polygamous or plural marriages, would be misdemeanor, no such marriages have taken place in Utah for many years. Therefore the arguments of the Chronicle and other journals on Utah affairs, being based on a misunderstanding of both the law and the facts, are pointless, worthless and without force.

ANOTHER "HOLY TERROR."

One of the holy terrors now held up to frighten the good "Christian" by modern critics—those pretty (?) civil and marital liberty is never (?) indulged—is the announcement that the Mormon Church is endeavoring to re-establish the institution of polygamy. This is preached from pulpits, and declared from platforms by prominent men and influential women, and published in both religious and secular newspapers.

The only evidence brought forward to substantiate this awful charge is the statement of a gentleman living in Utah who is reported to be "in the hard and sound categories." What that, if true, would have to do with the alleged effort of the Mormons does not directly appear. But to calm the fears of the terrified and agitated people of the United States, we would draw their attention to the fact that polygamy or plural marriage or whatever they may please to call it, has never included in Utah even when the "Mormon" people were in the entire exercised the legislative, executive and judicial powers of the Territory.

Re-instituting polygamy, then, is a misnomer. It cannot be done, for the reason we have stated. Further, there is no attempt, or intent, to state any proposal to re-establish polygamy whether by legislative or other means.

The election of the Representative to Congress from Utah, as we have repeatedly stated, was as much the work of non-"Mormons" as of "Mormons" officials, and had no support from the Church or its authorities, by ecclesiastical influence. Many of the Church leaders and thousands of Church members voted against the successful candidate, and the whole furore raised over this matter started through the representations of a few prevaricating preachers, and an anti-"Mormon" press which is now trying to sneak out of the responsibility of setting on their miserable trail.

There is no more likelihood of the "Mormons" attempting to re-establish polygamy, by law or without law, than there is of the people of the South attempting to re-establish and legalize negro slavery.

A DANGEROUS DELAY.

The latest advices from the Philippine Islands are by no means encouraging. It seems that there are some native people, ready to obey the orders of Aguinaldo and fight for the so-called proclaimed republic, and that others may join the forces in the event of actual hostilities. On the other hand Aguinaldo himself has powerful enemies among his own people, who are not a mediation to surrender. Reports from the remote group of islands may be confusing in some particulars and fail to convey a clear idea of the situation, but it seems certain that the cry of those who desire the place of the native rule of tyranny.

This is serious, because the United States is displacing Spain, accepted the responsibility of establishing law and order there, and that responsibility was further undertaken in the treaty of peace ratified by the Senate on Saturday. It would be a crime to refuse to fulfill the situation. The strange delay of the United States Senate in taking action on the treaty of peace may be some extent be the cause of the Philippine situation. Had the Senate at once ratified that treaty, there would have been less business on the part of the followers of Aguinaldo, and less excuse in European government circles. As it is the impression is created that the act of patriotism is acting out in this country, and the result is the humiliating demand from a power never with a few still more savage followers, that he be recognized as a power with which the United States is to treat on equal terms. The cause of further may not be unbearable, but the loss of prestige among the Filipinos is different. This may cost us another war.

There is undoubtedly much misconception in this country regarding the Filipinos. That there are savages in the interior of some of the islands, just as there are aborigines in this country, is no doubt true, but people not familiar with regarding the native islanders speak very highly of them. Many have been educated in Europe or America. Some are highly intelligent. For centuries they have longed for and strived to obtain freedom. At last Spanish rule has been every where shaken off, and the achievements of American skill and patriotism. They know that whatever form of government they are given our American absence means individual freedom, and they are willing to accept it as an answer to their prayers. They dread being left to the tender mercies of a European or Asiatic power, and look to America for the support necessary for advancement in civilization.

Simon Reyes Lala, author and lecturer, a native Filipino, but naturalized American citizen, some time ago delivered a lecture on the situation in his native land. He said among other things:

"Although I believe we have a great future, I cannot disguise to myself the conviction that we are not yet ready for independence. More especially because the Filipinos have not had the preparation for self-government possessed by the founders of the American Republic. And I appreciated that, in talkative with their new-found liberty, the Filipinos might properly exercise that result properly. I am sorry to say I feel this all the more when I consider that the revolutionary leaders—Aguinaldo and his Cabinet—are though far not patriots who do not represent the best class of our countrymen, who, almost without exception, are for a protectorate, or for annexation.

"And it is this that I, too, a Filipino, have come to believe, that it is an American protectorate, a territorial government, the judiciary, the customs, and the control in the hands of Filipino officials, the interior and domestic administration in the hands of the Filipino officials, and their subordinate officials will run understandingly and well without further advice, would be highly impossible for about Philippinesia, together of a western civilization."

He said further:

"Naturally, some are not yet ready for all the duties of citizenship, all the functions of statehood. But under an American protectorate you can educate them to a proper appreciation of the duties, and time become self-assured, self-controlling, self-governing, self-reliance, and self-respecting, and then, when the question of annexation

Mr. Lala undoubtedly represents the sentiments of the best element in the islands. If we the action of the Philippine problem is allowed to rest indefinite as the opponents of a policy of humane civilization endeavor to place themselves and frighten the nation.

CRIME IN PLAY.

The story of Raphael Moffit, the eleven-year-old Mt. Vernon boy, who is said to have confessed to a number of burglaries and now to have killed Edward Ellsworth, the illustrated "dime novels" and other sensational stories, and published in both religious and secular newspapers.

The only evidence brought forward to substantiate the awful charge is the statement of a gentleman living in Utah who is reported to be "in the hard and sound categories." What that, if true, would have to do with the alleged effort of the "Mormons" does not directly appear. But to calm the fears of the terrified and agitated people of the United States, we would draw their attention to the fact that polygamy or plural marriage or whatever they may please to call it, has never included in Utah even when the "Mormon" people were in the entire exercised the legislative, executive and judicial powers of the Territory.

Re-instituting polygamy, then, is a misnomer. It cannot be done, for the reason we have stated. Further, there is no attempt, or intent, to state any proposal to re-establish polygamy whether by legislative or other means.

The election of the Representative to Congress from Utah, as we have repeatedly stated, was as much the work of non-"Mormons" as of "Mormon