

The Deseret Weekly.

PUBLISHED BY

THE DESERET NEWS COMPANY.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

Per Year, of Fifty-two Numbers, . . . \$2.50.

Per Volume, of Twenty-six Numbers, . . . 1.50.
IN ADVANCE.

CHARLES W. PENROSE, . . . EDITOR.

Saturday, . . . August 3, 1889.

THE IMPENDING CRISIS.

WAR is established for the immediate purpose of destruction, whatever may be the ultimate objects aimed at. It means destruction of everything before it, everything that does not yield, and sometimes yielding provides no exemption from the stroke of the destroyer.

The strides recently taken in the direction of scientific warfare have no reference to a mitigation of its horrors or a lessening of its deadly effects—vastly otherwise; they mean more destruction in less time, and a wider field for the carnival of death to be held in. It is simply a game of attrition, with adventitious circumstances and skill figuring largely as factors. "Improved guns" means guns that will fire oftener and with greater effect and precision than their predecessors, thus slaying more men and demolishing more structures within a given period of time.

War cannot, of course, be otherwise. Without this death and destruction it would not be war. Bellicose proclamations, not having those objects in view, would simply be the edicts of stage potentates, and military maneuvers which do not lead directly to them would be as devoid of consequence as a school-boy's parade. When, therefore, a hostile army advances, it expects to slay and perchance be slain; the sooner the killing to the point of helplessness on one side or the other is done, the sooner it will all be over.

The tendency of the age, notwithstanding the numerous peace congresses, is in the direction of war. Europe has been shadowed with war clouds for a dozen years; these have been darker or lighter in accordance with the condition of the elements, but several times it has seemed as if the storm was about to burst. The awful calm preceding an outbreak now prevails, and all are waiting with bated breath the hour when the first shot shall be fired.

It is doubtless the fact that a long and bloody struggle has been held back for the very reason that all are prepared for it. The Powers today are a vast series of armories, the greater part of their adult population, soldiers in undress uniform awaiting the word of command to change their attire, arm themselves and go to the front. And for what? Because they are ordered to do so, and for no other reason. Is there a disposition on their part to kill their neighbors because of a dispute between the rulers or for any other reason? No. The order comes to advance to the slaughter and it is obeyed without questioning. Many, perhaps the majority, of those who survive will not know what they fought for even when it is all over.

How strong and striking, in contemplation of so fatuous a condition of things, sound the words of a Parisian paper—*La Justice*. Speaking of the success of the Exposition, it says: "The kings and princes are against us, the peoples of the earth are for us." And yet the people of France were not for the government when Napoleon III proclaimed war against Germany, albeit they hastened to respond to the call and went into the one-sided, bloody conflict with all the courage and devotion of men whose hearts and souls were all their selfish and inconsiderate ruler's.

Most of the European wars are not begun for the protection of the fatherland from invasion and with the purpose of sheltering the fire-side. Such objects would be justifiable and commendable. In nearly every instance, enlargement of territory, increase of empire, the strengthening of a dynasty and a feeling of distinct and pronounced jealousy—one or all—are the underlying motives of the aggressive party, perhaps of both parties. The violation of one injunction of the Decalogue, "Thou shalt not covet," is simply the precursor and generally the only excuse to be offered for the violation of another, "Thou shalt not kill."

THE IDAHO INFAMY.

THE Republicans, who have had control of the Idaho Constitutional Convention and have jumped as Fred T. Dubois pulled the string, have succeeded in their work of incorporating the infamous test oath in the instrument under which they intend to ask admission into the Union of States.

They have even gone further. Under the territorial statutes no member of the "Mormon" Church could vote or hold office, but "Mormons" were eligible to jury service. The section of the alleged Constitution relating to the suffrage also excludes them from serving as jurors. Unless a great change shall come quickly in the character of the population of some parts of Idaho, the courts will have to remain idle for lack of a jury, should this provision ever become the law.

There may be some inaccuracies in the dispatch which we copy in another part of the paper. But we suppose that in the main it is correct. If the clause in Section Three is properly given, the wise men of the convention have fallen into a common error, which is about on a par with the effort of the late disreputable Legislature of that Territory in making regulations respecting naturalization. It speaks of criminals being "restored to citizenship." This is simply nonsense. A person may be deprived of certain civil or political rights and privileges through conviction of an infamous crime, but he cannot be thereby deprived of his citizenship. That goes with his life, unless he is expatriated by his own act and becomes a citizen of another country.

There is no such thing as "restoration to citizenship" by executive clemency as supposed. A pardon may restore civil or political rights and privileges, lost by conviction of crime, but a citizen is still a citizen no matter how many of such privileges he may have lost under legal penalties. If born in the United States he is a citizen thereof, whether he violates the laws or not. So with one who becomes a citizen by naturalization. He remains a citizen when deprived of some of the rights and privileges of citizenship. If they are restored to him by executive clemency, or otherwise, he is no more of a citizen after than before such clemency; he can simply exercise certain rights and privileges of which he had been deprived.

There are other defects in the section which will be pointed out at the time and place where they will do the most good, and so we will leave their discussion until then. But the provision, in our opinion, will defeat its own object. It is so utterly unrepugnant and undemocratic that it will vitiate the entire instrument which contains it. We do not believe it will be accepted by