

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

THE EAST INDIAN UPRISING.

Those who imagine that the present revolt of the natives of India against British rule is as yet anything like the great uprising of many years ago headed by Nana Sahib are greatly mistaken. What it may lead to cannot just now be told, but it is evident that there is so far, as compared with the mutiny previously spoken of, a lack of general concert and well settled design, the trouble seeming, on the surface, to partake more of the nature of what diplomats recognize as sporadic cases than anything else. However this may be, it is quietly but extensively recognized that British domination in the Indian empire is not the choice of the natives and is maintained only by superior mental and military power and skill. Even with that duly considered, it still must be the case that a complete and spontaneous uprising of the East Indians having in view the termination of foreign rule would as surely be successful in the end as that 200,000,000 people on their own soil are more powerful than 75,000,000 residing chiefly elsewhere, notwithstanding the advantages otherwise spoken of.

As is customary on such occasions, there are the wheels within wheels, the plots and counterplots to be contended with, all the more dangerous because unseen. The "rebels" are composed largely of the Afridi tribe, and are the most powerful, desperate and turbulent of all the inhabitants of that mountainous region. They are known to be superb marksmen, utterly fearless in battle, splendidly armed, and, being Mohammedans, they are said to have been roused to a pitch of almost uncontrollable enthusiasm by the victories of their Turkish co-religionists in the war with Greece. This feeling extends to the people of Afghanistan, who, like the great masses of India, are anti-Christian, and who, under the tutelage of their priests, have been taught to believe that the triumph of the Turks over the Greeks is the beginning of a revival of the Moslem power, which shall extend to all the nations of the earth. The Orientals, sensitive to sentiment and superstition, are particularly responsive to the influence of religious fanaticism, and a "holy war," in which the Mohammedan counts it a boon to die in defense of his faith, is a possibility of which Great Britain has an ever-present terror in her Indian government.

The hand of the Muscovite is thought to be again apparent in the disorder. The acquisition of new territory is ever with the czar a hope by day and a dream by night. His path to increased military prestige and commercial power runs through the strongholds of the Moslem. He can only advance upon India via Afghanistan, and the control of the Mediterranean can only come through the occupation of Constantinople. Russian diplomacy has steadily cultivated the Ottoman power, finally obtaining a good footing at the Turkish capital and well nigh destroying English influence there. A war whose chief line would extend from Constantinople to Calcutta and embrace the rugged eminences of Afghanistan among its series of bastions with the active consent of the ameer, would be anything but holy in act or intent but it could properly have no other name, the fanatical and furious zeal of the Mohammedans in their religious capacity being the prevailing impulse.

If the movement prefigured is to be

really the outcome of the present revolt, her majesty's government has a grave situation to deal with. In the language of a New York paper, British supremacy in India was never so insecure as it is today. The native population is burdened with taxes; agriculture is almost hopelessly depressed; large portions of the country have lately suffered all the horrors of famine and plague, and these causes have combined to provoke discontent, suspicion and disloyalty among the people. Social and political conditions are such that a spark, like that which has been struck by the revolt in the northwestern provinces, may be easily fanned into a conflagration by fanaticism and intrigue. A "holy war" would imperil the whole system of British control in India, and if such a conflict were begun it would be with the ready and even joyous assent of Russia, if not at her secret instigation.

There seems to be but one means of escape available just now—hasty and irresistible military action by England. If the uprising be not crushed summarily, whatever the original design, it will surely gain ground and eventually acquire what so far it seems to lack, universal participation. So far the British forces have had very much the worst of it, but nothing of a decisive character has yet occurred. A great defeat inflicted upon the natives would discourage them and their alleged allies, while even trivial victories fill them with hope. The Asiatic situation has a bad look to it.

"INDEPENDENT" AND THE "NEWS."

The Springville Independent takes the "News" to task for an editorial expression in a recent issue of this paper. The "News" is not disposed to be hypercritical and passes over many things in some of the country papers, notable among these the Independent, which are not of a character contributory to the moral and spiritual excellence of the people; but the Independent's attack is so grossly subversive of right both as portrayed in demonstrated science and in revealed religion that we would not be just to its readers who are also readers of the "News" were we to allow this incident to pass unnoticed. The "News" remark to which chief objection was taken is as follows:

"Both sexes should be taught to marry because the married state is the proper one for honorable people to occupy; that it should be for love and eternal union."

There is but one issue possible on that point: either the married state is the proper one for honorable people to occupy, or it is not. The "News" affirms that it is, both from the standpoint of the scientist and of that which has a still more comprehensive view of life, the word of God, which recognizes both spiritual and temporal. That word is that "he who forbiddeth to marry is not ordained of God; for marriage is ordained of God." The state of continued singlehood was not instituted by Him. As a condition precedent to fatherhood and motherhood, He instituted the union of the sexes in marriage. He gave them command to multiply and replenish the earth. If "single blessedness" were the proper state, then marital union in its effect upon offspring is unnecessary; if this "single blessedness" were to be without off-

spring, then there would be none to obey the primal command referred to. With either horn the "single" condition is a violation of moral law. The best men and women of the world from time immemorial have not remained single, the Independent to the contrary notwithstanding. People who aimed to be good have done so; but the condition of the world exhibits, as a direct effect of that unpolarizing of marriage, the corollary of disregard for marriage vows that is working havoc to the human race.

The Independent calls the "News" statement "somewhat remarkable—for this day and age;" doubtless having reference to modern enlightened view as being in contrast with what the "News" said. Perhaps our cotemporary may fairly plead ignorance of the position of advanced scientific thought in that regard. On this point it is opportune to quote the reiterated statement of Dr. G. Stanley Hall during his recent lectures in Provo and Salt Lake City. The editor of the Independent will perhaps recognize the fact that this scientist stands among the foremost, if not the foremost, exponent of recent biological science—a man beside whom Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall, great as they were, already are back-numbers. He told the teachers, and repeated the statement in different lectures, that no greater menace to our civilization could be found than the growing tendency to regard marriage as a doubtful blessing; or than the growing tendency in the world to refuse to pass "the torch of life" on to future generations. Dr. Hall maintained that the highest morality which could be drawn from the study of biology was that it is man's first duty not only to transmit the stream of life which has come to him, but to transmit it pure and holy. At the close of his third lecture at Provo, someone passed to the stand President Brigham Young's definition of love, as the yearning in every natural human heart to find bodies for spirits yet unborn, and the doctor pronounced it as good a definition of true love as could be given.

The Independent refers to the "News" position as "a carnal or sensual one," which remark reveals the carnal or sensual mind which would so characterize the marriage relation "ordained of God," and which in its exemplification by honorable people is the highest, holiest, purest, and most self-sacrificing as concerning sensuality, of any relation that exists between the sexes, not omitting the vaunted celibacy of our cotemporary, and which is not even that of pure-minded people who have felt that in their individual circumstances the married state was not available for them. As confirming our definition of the Independent's position on this particular point, note the following from its article on the sentence from the "News":

"Hear that, all ye elderly maidens and bachelors, and hasten to throw off this condition of dishonor, and rush headlong into a state, which, while it will make you honorable in the sight of the saintly News, will yet be a hell on earth."

Whether the state of our editorial assailant's mind is a result of his intimate relations with a "hell on earth" we will not pretend to say, though we have a decided opinion in the premises; but it is emphatically not the outcome of observance of the holy order of marriage ordained by the Creator and carried out in all its relations according to the commands of the Almighty. And further, no person, whether Christian, pagan or infidel, who values morality in either the spiritual or temporal creations, can regard with other than abhorrence the