

his sense of justice had been blunted, he would have directed the attention of the government to the fact that a portion of the people whose governor he is are believers in the "Mormon" religion; that they are liable not to vote according to the dictates of political axe-grinders and should therefore be deprived of the power to vote at all. Governor Warren evidently concluded that his people, without distinction, have a right to exercise the franchise according to their choice, so long as they wield it legally. He seemed to have an idea also that the religion of the people or any part of them is a matter with which neither he nor the government has any business, the only question with which they have to deal being the enforcement of the law, to which all are amenable. In fact, so far as the report indicates, Mr. Warren is acting in the spirit of his office, as the Governor of the whole people of Wyoming and not the Governor of a favored faction.

The contrast between the report of Governor Warren and that of Governor Wolfley, of Arizona, in respect to the point herein treated, is strongly marked. The latter selects a part of the people of his Territory and proclaims himself, for political purposes, their enemy. Probably it did not occur to him at the time—but it is nevertheless a fact—that in assuming this attitude, he also became the enemy of the whole commonwealth of Arizona. He asks the general government to step in and, within the confines of his official domain, strike a blow at local rule. The repeal law, which wiped out the abominable anti-Mormon religious test oath, was passed by the law-making representatives of the whole people of Arizona. If we recollect aright, the passage of the measure was nearly, if not quite, unanimous. It was signed by Mr. Wolfley's predecessor in office and became law. Now comes the present Governor and informs the General Government, through the Secretary of the Interior, that the Legislature and Governor of Arizona were semi-idiots and did not know their business. He asks the Government to undo the work of the local legislature, thus aiming a blow at home-rule in his own Territory. Thus he offers an insult to the people among whom he holds an important official position. He does not want them to have the privilege of transacting their own business, he evidently being a foe to home

rule, and an advocate of centralization of power, which is in contravention of the genius of American institutions.

The contrast between his course and that of Governor Warren throws the latter forward in a most favorable light, as a man of fairness and independence.

#### A REVOLUTIONARY PROPOSITION.

JUDGE DEWOLFE, of the district court, whose jurisdiction embraces Silver Bow County, Montana, is a Democrat. The returns of Silver Bow precinct showed that only four or five men voted the Republican ticket. When this showing became known, about a dozen men made affidavit that they had voted the straight Republican ticket, whereupon the county commissioners threw out the precinct. Judge De Wolfe forthwith issued an alternative writ of mandamus, to compel the commissioners to count the whole vote. The hearing on the writ was set for Nov. 7.

Soon a rumor gained currency that Russell Harrison was attempting, or would attempt, to induce his father to remove Judge De Wolfe and appoint a Republican in his place, prior to Nov. 7th, that the hearing on the alternative mandamus might take place before a court in sympathy with the Republican party and the present administration. The New York World has denounced this proposition as revolutionary, and has permitted itself to become somewhat exercised over it.

The supplanting of Judge De Wolfe with a Republican, between now and November 7th, without further ground for such action than has so far appeared, need not be feared. President Harrison has too much sense and principle to commit such a combined blunder and crime. The merits of the Silver Bow contest will, in all human probability, be investigated before the judiciary as at present constituted, unless some occurrence should take place for which President Harrison could not wisely be held responsible.

#### A BAD RELIGIOUS TENDENCY.

OCTOBER 22 we made some comments upon "a scriptural problem" which a correspondent had propounded to the New York *Christian Union*. It related to the destruction of the Amalekites by Saul, according to a command given by the Almighty through the Prophet Samuel. One sentence in the reply of the

*Christian Union*, all of which we gave, indicates a tendency that has of late become marked and widely prevalent among expounders and defenders of Holy Writ belonging to various denominations. The journal named attempts to show that the words "Thus saith the Lord," as used in the Bible, often mean no more than "it is right," or "it ought to be;" and, speaking of this solemn prefix to the command to Saul to destroy the Amalekites, says:

In any case, it shows, as here used, a defective moral judgment, and that Samuel's teachings, like those of all the other Bible Saints, must be brought before the judgment seat of Christ for revision and correction.

This is a remarkable concession to the enemies of the Bible, who continually reiterate the assertion that "defective moral judgment" is displayed by the men who wrote it. In prominence, learning and ability the New York *Christian Union* is probably second to no religious journal in this country, yet it thus explicitly admits the questionable character of the moral judgment of one of the greatest prophets ever raised up to be a mouthpiece of God to man; and by intimation includes all "Bible Saints" in the same admission.

In the same number of the *Christian Union* from which the above is taken, an attempt is made to enlighten a correspondent who asks:

As the world was not created in six days, how could the Sabbath have been instituted by God on the ground that he had rested on the seventh day, as stated in the Fourth Commandment? Do you believe that the commandments and all the laws in the Pentateuch were given by God or, written by Moses? C. P. M.

Following is the reply:

Many of them proceeded from Moses' successors, building on to his work, and so were only involved in, or developed from, what "the Lord said to Moses." What God said to Moses He probably communicated, as now to us, inwardly, by enlightening the mind and conscience to see truth and feel its imperativeness. The Sabbath is of divine appointment, "made for man," as Jesus says, required by the physical and moral nature which God made. That Moses should see this law, written in our nature, and assign a fanciful reason for it, only shows that he was like the rest of us in being better able to see what is right than to give the reason for it.

If what "the Lord said to Moses" was communicated in the manner described by the *Christian Union*,