

his system. It would be just as logical to assail Queen Victoria because the same does not prevail in Hindostan.

Mr. Stead graphically portrays the Russian ruler's position as follows: "Nominally the Czar is the Vicegerent of the Almighty; his will is omnipotent throughout the whole of Northern Asia and Eastern Europe; his slightest word has the force of law. There exists no institution with authority to withstand his ukase, nor is there within the whole of his vast dominions a noble or demagogue among all his subjects whom he could not destroy with a wave of the hand. The greatest army in the world would march unhesitatingly even to defeat and destruction if he chose to lift his finger, and upon the meanest income of the poorest of his peasant subjects he can levy what tax he pleases. From Archangel to Odessa, from St. Petersburg to Vladivostock, there exists no journalist upon whose pen the Czar does not keep control; nor is there any department of human activity, religious or secular, in which the Czar has not the sovereign right of arbitrary intervention."

Notwithstanding this incarnation of absolutism which the Czar presented to Mr. Stead, the impression left in the latter's mind after a close study of Russia, its people and its ruler, was, that the Czar is impotent, not omnipotent. Even if he desires to transplant western civilization on Russian soil, he could not do it. Peter the Great could not do it. If George Kennan were made Czar tomorrow he could not introduce the ballot box, the House of Representatives, or the Constitution of the United States, simply because the people would not accept them, nor know how to use them. The City Councils of Moscow and St. Petersburg are more or less representative institutions. But the people take no interest whatever in them. Even the members can not be persuaded to attend regularly, and frequently no business can be transacted for want of a quorum. The rural assemblies are somewhat of the same pattern, and when established it was thought they would make a connecting link between ruler and ruled; but they are having the contrary effect. The people would ignore them altogether were it not for their being subject to fines if delegates are not sent. Even the delegates would not attend, but they too can be punished; therefore they attend and at the same time protest against the grievance.

As to the Jewish question, the Czar honestly believes that the Jew is the social and economic cancer of his empire. In this belief he is supported by

the people at large, and his attitude on the matter secures for him a certain popularity. If he desired to extend toleration, the people would not entertain the idea.

Mr. Stead sees in the Stundist movement a change for Russia's salvation. The Stundists are the religious reformers of the country, and are similar to the dissenters of England some two centuries ago. They are so called from the German word *stunde*, an hour—because their religious service lasts exactly that brief time. They do not believe in the established church, and make the Bible their rule of faith. They are being harassed and persecuted on every hand, but they are increasing, especially among the peasant population.

Mr. Stead's article is really an instructive production. The Czar himself might read it with profit, and find that it was written not by an Englishman, nor a Frenchman, but by a citizen of the world. Even the Jews and the Russian people might peruse it with advantage.

A LESSON IN TEMPERANCE.

THE members of the Western Association of California Pioneers have done themselves honor. At their banquet in Chicago, held for the purpose of celebrating the forty-third anniversary of the finding of gold near Sacramento, they had a splendid time. They made speeches and told interesting stories about their pioneer experiences. All were in high spirits, but this was not the result of pouring spirits down their throats, but the contrary. At the banquet there was nothing drinkable of an intoxicating character. As a result the speeches and anecdotes were not inspired by whiskey, but came from clear, unfevered brains, in a normal condition—the best state for a genuine "feast of reason" and a "flow of soul."

The common custom of associating public banquets with intoxicants as well as feasting ought to be discouraged. We hope that, in this imitative age, the example of the California Pioneers will have a salutary effect. The way they celebrated an important event in the history of this country ought to be a profitable object lesson.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

It is amusing to watch the perplexity of persons who, a few days ago pretended that they would rather have statehood than the so-called "home rule" measure. They have placed themselves in a peculiar position. Their assertions about statehood were

a little premature. They did not suppose that the Republicans were so ready to take the Utah difficulty by the bit, and turn it in the way that would best serve their party. The Teller bill has staggered them, and they scarcely know whether to fight it as well as the Faulkner bill, or to let matters take their course without opposition.

We hope neither of these bills will provoke that bitterness of feeling which engenders misrepresentation and abuse of the masses of the people of Utah. They are not responsible for either of these propositions. Of the two, we believe they would prefer the enabling act, even if the dates contained in it were changed so as to defer statehood to a more distant time. They would then have something definite before them. So would the minority. Both political parties could make proper efforts to "educate" the "Mormon" people, which they claim to be one of their chief objects.

At the same time we must say that in our opinion the Teller bill, as it stands, gives all the time that is necessary for every purpose. However, there are some who do not view it in that way and think the masses are not ready for statehood. But there is a good deal of nonsense and misconception about the people in our country districts. They are much better versed in political matters than is generally supposed. One paper has stated that they do not know how to conduct a political gathering. If this means that they do not make a bear garden, or a bedlam, or a smoking and drinking, shouting and yelling pandemonium of a political assembly, perhaps it is correct. But there is not a village in Utah of a size to give it fairly that appellation, where political meetings are not and have not been held for years, conducted under parliamentary rules and characterized by order, intelligence and instructive speeches and discussions.

As between the two national parties there remains a doubt in the minds of many. The tariff and silver questions, the line between the legitimate and proper powers of the national government and the State governments, and a few questions that are supposed to be sharply defined points of difference between the two great parties, are as yet unsettled in their minds, and on these they want more light. "Education" will come in here, profitably. But we do not hear much real argument for their benefit from either party. Subjects that have no legitimate bearing are dragged in, and attacks are made from either side which exhibit more in-