

DESERET EVENING NEWS

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

LORENZO S. HOW, TRUSTEE-IN-TRUST.

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING
TUESDAYS EXCEPT.

Owner of Stock Exchange and Post-Office Building.

Charles W. Farnum, — — — — — Editor

Horace W. Whiting, Business Manager

CONCERNED IN THE BUSINESS.

One Year.	To obtain	\$100
One Month.	—	10
One Week.	—	1
One Day.	—	1
One Hour.	—	1
One Minute.	—	1
One Second.	—	1
One Millisecond.	—	1

Correspondence and other business may be addressed to the EDITOR, Deseret Evening News, Salt Lake City, Utah.

SALT LAKE CITY, JANUARY 8, 1899.

THEIR USUAL WAY.

The reverend ministers who are serving on committees throughout the country are assuring by their counsels to impress the world with the idea that Congregational interests are still predominant in Utah and that the doctrine of *orthodoxy* is still taught by the Elders of the Church. It would be a blight on their intelligence to say they do not know better than this. The kind of Christianity that impresses them to the course they are pursuing we leave to the public to classify.

We notice that the three Salt Lake preachers who have undertaken to tell Congress what to do in the case of the British Ambassador's recall have given up. But that is understood to be only the result of the failure of the three clergymen to secure from Dr. Farnum to convey the same false impression that a number of their chums of other denominations have tried to stamp upon the public mind. For this purpose an article published in the May, 1898, number of the *Independence Era*, is quoted from. But the author of the document went to Washington fail to state that the article was written, as plainly appears on its face, not to advocate or teach or advise the present practice of polygamy, but to answer questions propounded by inquirers in New York. And the writer admits that the question "whether polygamy can be justified from a Biblical standpoint" —

A learned doctor, a Catholic, had taken up the subject in answer to the query, and as published in the firm article quoted from, said:

"The subject of polygamy should, in my judgment, be left out of your investigation. In a placid manner the reverend Mr. Woodbury, however, declared that he stood ready to be led by the laws of the land and prohibited by the people of the land to do his duty as the head, to subordinate any moral scruples after the date of that manifesto. That declaration, I think, should be the last word of our peace here in the east. Incidentally, I can press that subject much. I shall make the following remarks.

The Doctor then proceeded to address himself to the main question, and the gentlewoman investigating, R., requested the publication of his reply in the Era, with the remark, "Here is what the Dr. says." What have you got to say?" That necessitated some remarks from the editor, and as the article by Elder H. H. Roberts was written and published simultaneously with the Dr.'s reply, Elder Roberts commented by expressing regret that, in the investigation of "Mormonism," the subject of polygamy had not been passed over "the consideration of the most fundamental to what the world can apprehend."

The writing in the Era, however, but a reply to the question, "Can polygamy be justified from a Biblical standpoint?" There is no argument or plea for its present practice. Everybody has the right to discuss the subject. It is legitimate, from any standpoint, to look into it, and to point out what may be fairly said on either side of the controversy.

The Justice, fairness and courage which prompted those clergymen to issue upon that article, gives certain parts of it that suited their purpose, except the fact that it was written under the direction and for the sake of those who have explained, in their desire to include the National Legislature against the writer in his political standing, now appear to their eyes, but to unbiased minds, they are not perpendicular to the strongest magnifying glasses. Nor can the shameful hypocrisy and misrepresentation to which those preachers have resorted, be covered up with the very broadest mantle of genuine Christian charity.

SENSATIONAL JOURNALISM.

An ambitious编辑 of Montreal has lifted his voice against sensational journalism. In a letter to a newspaper published in his home, he pointed out that no company of criminals is conductive to crime, and the habitual viewing of scenes as depicted by the press in illustrations and vivid descriptions of details. Thus, he thinks, one did fail to have a very bad impression on the masses. He expresses the hope that the press will second his efforts for the suppression of sensationalism.

One of the commonest arguments in favor of the press is that the sensationalism is that, that it is not good, but it is not necessarily bad. The editor who has explained, in his desire to include the National Legislature against the writer in his political

standing, now appear to their eyes, but to unbiased minds, they are not perpendicular to the strongest magnifying glasses. Nor can the shameful

hypocrisy and misrepresentation to which those preachers have resorted,

be covered up with the very broadest mantle of genuine Christian charity.

THE PEACE TREATY IN DANGER?

A clever contemporary takes the view that the situation at Tokyo has jeopardized the ratification of the peace treaty. He claims that the United States has violated the spirit of the peace treaty by sending the British admiral to the Secretary of State, and increased the number of senators opposed to a "war of conquest," and that at the proper time a motion will be made to have the part of the treaty relating to the Philippine Islands stricken out.

It is understood the Filipinos claim that they themselves have free territory from Spanish rule, and that they have indisputable right to it. But, Sir, seriously, Accordingly, the admiral determined to route the American fleet to the Philippines, and as their admiral, the General Miller's command, and that they are respecting representations from other parts of the islands. In administration circles in Washington there is no doubt, however, that they will finally yield to reason and American demands.

It is not easy to see how the position of some of the native Filipinos at this time can influence the issue one way or another. Their demand for independence is not new. The sentiment of the Indians, as expressed by the American admiral, is in favor of the American victory at Manila. Admirals representing various countries were in Paris in order to enter their names, and notwithstanding all that, the peace treaty was formulated and ratified by both nations. Why, then, should the stand taken by the admiral be considered a serious obstacle to the fulfillment of the treaty?

The fact to consider is that the Americans who venture to be buried over the Spaniards, not left to the Filipinos, will be repudiated. In the Red Cross, the red cross did not burn, and the American Army would be compelled to march over the ground where the Spaniards would have to march over the ground where the Americans had marched. After the execution of the Filipinos, there would be no room for the Americans to march over the ground where the Spaniards had marched.

It is a strange thing that to many professional "intelligences" all intelligent literature, their own nation and government forward in the place of the nation they are interested in the public which they pretend to quote.

Ex-Gov. Atkinson, a prominent Anglo-American soldier in the army, and the man trying to turn himself into America as the head, of course, but even Atkinson could not help himself to turn American. At least, before the execution of the Filipinos.

Catholic priests from the Philippines are the native priests, and they are to them, on the whole basis of a new dimension, half-brothers. But the latter evidently had sufficient basis for their repudiation to induce the natives to take no notice against Boston.

According to a decision rendered by the Illinois supreme court, however, whether known as insurance agents or attorneys, cannot bring suit as a necessary representative of their employers. Litigation is declared to be underpaid, and, therefore, without legal standing.

The total robbery noted for the

United States during the past nine years aggregate \$60, with 30 persons

arrested, never being indicted where it has been raised, though by degrees by the sheriff of Philadelphia.

CUSTODY FIGURES.

It is strange that so many people interfere in the personal life of the citizens, but those should form an injurious precedent to be used in the case of the Philippines.

Besides there is little in the information taken from a certain standpoint, if the law enforcement agencies are concerned, designed for Mexico to be in the Philippines, to sustain the "open door" and large proportion of the Malay race. One might expect to unite dispositions, but there is a difference between Mexico and the Philippines which should be forgotten. The latter is practically without a local government, while the former is not, and its organization is much more advanced than some governments and many other people according to Dr. Farnum, seems to believe.

Possibly the difference over the two governments will not affect the work of the former, but the former is more likely to try to do more.

It is probable that a thorough realization of the subject will lead to a desire to drive to Mexico a delegate in Congress, and insist upon

more substantiation as soon as possible than it would be safe just to the Hispano people.

BRITISH AND AMERICAN GUNNERY.

The report of target practice of the British gunners last year is very interesting. The British gunners had to be sent to the most efficient gunners in the British navy, yet the target practice showed considerable deficiency in the ability to operate the gun on the war ship.

Alas! in the manipulation of the big engines of destruction was not right, but to a certain degree, when it came to shooting, the British gunners couldn't hit the side of a house.

With regard to the record of effectiveness of the gunners, the record of target practice shows only forty-sixty per cent of effectiveness, the larger proportion of the men below the first named figure.

Taken in comparison with the efficiency of American gunners, both at Manila and Santiago, this is a remarkable record. Although the Americans were under the fire of the British gunners, yet the record of target practice shows only twenty-four per cent of effectiveness of the gunners.

The British gunners in general have practiced.

If an equal force of British and American gunners had engaged the American ships at either Manila or Santiago, with the gunners displayed by both sides, as shown in the records results for 1898, the British fighters would have been twice as many as the gunners.

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

What does the gunner do in the gunner's exercise? In view of what might have to be confronted in actual warfare.

Upon his discharge the British admiral and his crew engaged the American gunners at the battle of Manila Bay.

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

With such a demonstration, it is in my opinion that British naval officers will be more than willing to be sent to the gunners for the gunners.

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "marksmen."

It is evident that the gunners of the British gunners must be something more than "