

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

THE ARBITRATION TREATY.

The arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain needs careful consideration and a practical test, before its true nature can be clearly understood. When the announcement first was made, that the terms of the treaty had been agreed to by the proper representatives of the two countries, it was promptly designated as the great measure of this age. Friends of peace hailed it as a signal victory for the principles they maintain, inasmuch as they considered it certain that the example set by the two leading powers of the world would be followed by others. This hope may, however, be doomed to disappointment.

When the Russian minister in Washington asked for information as to whether the treaty was in the nature of an alliance, offensive or defensive, or both, and Secretary Olney replied that in a certain sense it was, that it was a recognition on the part of Great Britain of our Monroe doctrine, the important document was held up in a light entirely different from that in which it was viewed at first. The question naturally arose, If Great Britain has agreed to support the United States in her foreign policy as indicated in the Monroe doctrine, what concessions, what promises have our government given as an equivalent? Is the United States on the road to entering the arena of European politics and support England in her claims, against Russia for instance? But it appears that there is not the slightest ground for anxiety on this account, for in government circles in London it is said to be denied that Great Britain has by the treaty bound herself to recognize the American Monroe doctrine. There is apparently some misunderstanding between Washington and London as to the nature and effect of the understanding entered into, which cannot fail to operate against the measure from the outset.

There are those who take the view that the treaty is a direct surrender on the part of our government of the right to enforce the Monroe doctrine. It is pointed out that if Great Britain by purchase, or otherwise, acquires territory in Central or South America, and her right to doing so is questioned, then the United States, by the terms of the treaty, is bound to submit the question to arbitration, the decision ultimately resting in the hands of a European monarch, or his representative. This conclusion seems hardly warranted, though, for the treaty provides that in questions involving territorial disputes, either of the contracting parties can protest against the final decision of the tribunal, and this makes it invalid. The next step is to invite the friendly mediation of one or more powers, and if this fails to settle the dispute, an appeal to arms may be taken. It does not deprive the United States of the right to enforce the Monroe doctrine, but it binds both countries to postpone an armed conflict

until every other means of adjustment has proved ineffective. Still, it cannot be denied that a war in defense of a cause a judicial opinion has declared wrong would be waged under additional, serious disadvantages. And this fact alone may be by many considered important enough to detract from the merits of treaty.

The agitation in the world for peace is—whatever the merits or demerits of the first practical efforts to secure it may be—one of the hopeful signs of the time. We know that it will succeed ultimately. There are, however, many tangled knots to unfasten before universal peace can come, and some of them must be cut by the sword. The nations of the world have by brutal force taken territory belonging to somebody else. Oppression has been necessary to maintain this condition, and at present almost every kingdom contains within its borders an element watching for an opportunity to take some measure of revenge. The condition of Spain is the actual condition of the greater part of Europe. The stronger races hold the weaker ones in subjection with iron hand. All these conditions must be adjusted according to what is right. The establishment of an arbitration tribunal, impartial and just, would undoubtedly aid the accomplishment of this revolution in the political affairs of the world, for it would give the weaker a hearing as well as the stronger, but, as already stated, how a full and satisfactory adjustment can be reached without previous war, is not clear. In the Apocalyptic visions the Millennium is preceded by the pouring out of the vials of wrath, and history proves that this arrangement is general—first storm, then calm.

THE AGREEMENT FOR PEACE.

The announcement that President Cleveland and Secretary Olney have fixed it up with Spain as to how a settlement of the Cuban war will be effected, and that the agreement only stands in need of the insignificant item of Cuban consent thereto, will not strike sympathizers with Cuba as being a very satisfactory outcome of the recent agitation of the question in this country. In effect it is a declaration against Cuban independence—that the government of the United States is using its offices to prolong the Spanish rule on the island instead of the opposite course, which seemed to be demanded by public sentiment here. In becoming a guarantor for the institution of certain reforms in the island, the United States also guarantees that its influence will be to have the Cubans accept those reforms. Thus the weight of influence from this country is to be thrown for Spain, since the autonomy offered the insurgents has been held out for some time by the Madrid government on the condition that the Cubans would lay down their arms. In this the advocates of independence get practically nothing, and the revo-

lution is a failure. Perhaps the present war would finish that way anyhow, but if not, then the insurgents may be expected to refuse to surrender, even at the request of the United States. The compact is directly opposed to the sentiment so freely expressed just before the holidays in and out of Congress.

NOT ASSOCIATED PRESS.

It is denied by the Associated Press representative in this city that the dispatch referred to in the News yesterday was sent out by that association. It appeared in a California paper, and an examination makes it clear that the dispatch was one of those sent from here by the United Press and wrongfully credited to the Associated Press. This being the case, it shifts the responsibility to a correspondent not in the Associated Press service, that association's representative having been blameless in the matter. This correction and explanation is made to place the responsibility where it belongs, that no injustice may be done.

MR. SMURTHWAITE'S LETTER.

The DESERET NEWS has received from Elder C. A. Smurthwaite, of Ogden, a letter, accompanied by one addressed to Elder B. H. Roberts, in which the Ogden writer attempts to refute the arguments presented by Elder Roberts's letter on Church discipline, published in the News a week ago, and written by him in response to a communication from Ogden. Elder Smurthwaite, in his letter to the News, says that since the first communication and Elder Roberts's extended reply thereto had been published in the News, this second letter also should, in justice to him, receive publicity through this paper. Elder Smurthwaite's communication to the News is dated at Ogden on January 12. This issue of the News is the 15th—three days later. Since the receipt here of that communication only one issue of this paper—that of the 14th—has been made in which it would have been possible for it to appear. Yet Elder Smurthwaite rushes to the Tribune, which gives the letter this morning—less than three days from the time the one to the News was written. And on his behalf the Tribune charges that the News had held his letter for three days—a statement which is not true, nor intended to be. This much to characterize the nature of his eagerness. As to the justice Elder Smurthwaite assumes to claim, in having his second letter to Elder Roberts published before the latter had a chance to see it, much less to make a response, the claim is manifestly unfair and unjust. Assuming that the letter has been sent to Elder Roberts, who is now out of the State, justice to regard to its publication would have said that Elder Roberts should have had the opportunity to make rejoinder, so that the second communication and response thereto could have appeared together, exactly as was done in the first instance. To