



Goodwin's Weekly

EDITORIALS

UTAH has again gone over the top. The Third Liberty Loan holds no terrors for her citizens. They more than met their allotment a week ago and since then it has simply been a matter of heaping up the measure in characteristic Utah fashion. It is all very pleasant to contemplate, and to chronicle.

Whether Utah has won the right to fly the honor flag, is for others to decide. We do know, however, that by our prompt and generous response to the latest call of the nation we have again demonstrated our right to stand in the very front rank of the great sisterhood of states. But, while we are congratulating ourselves on this splendid achievement, it does not become us to rest idly on our laurels. There is still one week of the campaign remaining and there is much that we can and ought to do. There should be a Liberty Bond in every Utah home, and during the coming week every citizen should voluntarily constitute himself a committee of one to attain this object. Those in charge of the campaign hope to sell 81,000 bonds. Let's make it 100,000.

In comparing our achievement to date, it is essential to bear in mind that Utah, "due to the war," is not in as easy circumstances as most if not all of her sister states. This for the very good reason that for her the war has held no financial compensations thus far—it has been chiefly a case of giving generously and getting little or nothing in return. In the distribution of government contracts Utah has been sadly overlooked. We view this rather singular situation in no spirit of complaint—most certainly it embraces no good reason why any loyal Utahn should refuse or fail to buy a bond—but it deserves consideration nevertheless, when the roll of honor is finally reckoned.

Another thought suggests itself: The several states and districts that were first to respond to the government's recent call for cash were all of the middle and far West. There is a peculiar satisfaction in contemplating this circumstance, especially in view of the feeling that was current in the East some time since that "the West was not awake to the war," and the other charge recently made in our very city by a critical down-easter that we are far behind the East in the open display of patriotic sentiment. Our answer at the time was that while we perhaps were not such good flag-wavers as our fellow citizens farther East, we nevertheless were in the habit of stepping out in front of the national procession when Uncle Sam called for substantial support—and we still stand on that assertion.

While recounting Utah's more recent contributions to the cause, it is worth while referring to the two new brigadier generals that she has had the good fortune to furnish during the past two weeks—Richard W. Young and Frank T. Hines—both native sons, both splendid soldiers, and both typifying the very flower of Utah manhood and citizenship. All told, we seem to have accumulated a splendid record for ourselves as a state and as a people during the month of April, 1918.

* * * *

NIPPED IN THE BUD.

PRESIDENTIAL interference in the affairs of Congress sometimes has its advantages, and so it is that all sound-thinking citizens will heartily endorse the attitude of President Wilson in serving notice on the Senate of his unalterable opposition to the Chamberlain bill, which would provide for the trial of sedition cases by military courts.

The President takes the position that to subject civilians to court martial would not only be unconstitutional but bad public policy as

well, which is the sensible view to take. The argument advanced in behalf of the proposed measure is that military courts can more effectively deal with spies and disloyalists and thereby curb a wave of mob violence which it is feared is about to break loose over the country. There is no doubt that popular indignation is on the rise against the suspects that are being uncovered on every hand, and that Judge Lynch is likely to preside over many a trial unless the seditious schemes are promptly stamped out, but that is no good argument against the civil courts and authorities now holding jurisdiction over such crimes.

When all civil agencies fail in their attempts to cope with the alarming situation, then it will be time for the military agents to take a hand. Should that time arrive when it becomes necessary for the safety of the country for military tribunals to supersede the civil courts, then it would seem that the President would be justified in declaring a state of martial law throughout the nation. But between these two extremes we can see no justification or security in a half-way measure for enforcing justice, such as is contemplated in the Chamberlain bill. So long as the morale of the great American people remains unshaken and their sanity unquestioned, the civil authorities will be able to cope with all emergencies that arise in their midst. To lose faith in the competency of our courts in all such matters is equally dangerous to losing faith in their integrity. They must be maintained in their present exalted position at all hazards.

* * * *

CORRECTING THE COMMONER.

IN the April issue of THE COMMONER Colonel Bryan comments on the rumor that Chairman Hays of the Republican national committee is behind Colonel Roosevelt for the Presidency in 1920, in the following fashion:

"Mr. Hays ought to read history to better advantage. There was once a candidate for president who also ran on the platform of 'the war is a failure,' but it is very difficult for the average man to remember his name."

We take it that Colonel Bryan refers to the inglorious campaign waged by General George B. McClellan against President Lincoln in 1864. If so, then he is seeking to draw a rather invidious comparison. To the clear thinker, the position of McClellan in that momentous contest and the probable position that Roosevelt will assume in 1920 are in no sense parallel. It is true that "Little Mac" was against the administration, and that the basis of his campaign against Lincoln was the charge, "the war is a failure," but it must be remembered in all fairness that the underlying purpose of McClellan and those who supported him was to stop the war and allow the South to go its way.

Their reasoning was quite simple; it was to this effect: General McClellan was the most popular and generally supposed to be the most capable Union soldier during the first years of the war; he had been in supreme command of the Army of the Potomac for over two years, during which time he had not been able to make a dent in the Confederacy; hence his friends and followers naturally assumed that if he couldn't win the war there was no use trying. The mistake they made was in failing to reckon with Grant and all the other able commanders that the patient Lincoln was slowly but surely assembling for the final and successful drive against Richmond. That General McClellan was a failure was no sign that the war was a failure, a fact which was to be demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of everybody concerned in due time.

But it strikes us that The Commoner is over-reaching himself a little in assuming that Colonel Roosevelt intends to run for the Presidency in 1920 on the platform, "the war is a failure." The assumption