

nations with a preconceived idea of the inferiority of all that they find on the native soil. They condemn customs and ridicule sentiments the historical grounds of which they fail to see or to understand. They endeavor to break down and destroy, not considering that religions are organisms that may be successfully grafted, but which cannot be built up by force. Their course is opposite to that of the great "Apostle of the Gentiles," who became everything to everybody, in order that he might gain some. All great religious advances in all nations have been made through the instrumentality of men and women who have identified themselves with the people to be advanced. The work of Luther is one illustration of this fact. He was enabled to set a revolutionary force in motion, because in addition to his love for truth and his disinterested zeal for its advancement, he was in his whole life the embodiment of the sentiments of the people among whom he labored. In him the German "Volksgeist" centered.

Were this fact recognized in the dealings with nations on the missionary field, and if further genuine Christian principles, not man-made doctrines, were carried to the world at large, the results would be apparent and there would be but little ground for adverse criticism on the part of those who now have been led to look upon foreign missions as a failure.

THE CHURCH AND POLITICS.

To All Whom It May Concern:

Inasmuch as there has been so much written and said concerning the proceedings of a Priesthood meeting held in the Assembly hall, on Monday, the 7th day of October, I feel it my duty to make a statement concerning it.

I consider it the right of every man, woman and child on earth to enjoy their religion, let that religion be what it may, for that is between themselves and their Creator. So I say with regard to politics. Every man has a right to enjoy his political belief unmolested, let this be what it may. There is not a Democrat in Utah Territory who can truthfully say that I ever asked him to vote a Republican ticket, or join the Republican party. Neither can any Republican say that I ever asked him to vote a Democratic ticket or join the Democrats.

A part of my own family are Republicans and part are Democrats. I have never counseled one of them to change his politics. They are, all of them, strong, independent men, and they enjoy their freedom without any interference of their father.

Now, concerning that meeting referred to, there was not, according to my recollection, one word said about Democrats, Republicans or politics. Joseph F. Smith's remarks were upon the same subject that the Apostles had taught through the Conference to ten thousand people. When the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was organized, it was with the holy Priesthood in its various orders and quorums. And when a man was appointed to the Apostleship, or Presidency, or in any office, as a teacher of the people, it placed on him a very grave responsibility;

and no man was counted a liberty, from the organization of the Church, to engage in any branch of business, politics, or anything else to take him entirely away from his calling, business, duty or responsibility for a length of time, without first consulting with the Presidency of the Church, or with his quorum, on its propriety, and getting permission to do so. This order has rested upon us all alike. This has been my position for sixty years of my life, and that, too, without interfering with my manhood. And this course does not require a man to give up his position in the Democratic party or in the Republican.

Every man has his own free agency. He has the right to withdraw from his quorum, or the Church, if he wishes. But while he remains in his quorum, or in the Church, we think he should be subject to the same rules that we are ourselves. But that duty does not require any man to withdraw from the Democratic or Republican party, or give up his political principles.

WILFORD WOODRUFF.

To the foregoing card from President Wilford Woodruff, the News needs but to add a word of explanation. Since the general Priesthood meeting in the Assembly Hall on Monday, October 7, political circles have been disturbed to an extraordinary extent by the report of certain remarks alleged to have been made there as to the duty of the men who hold high ecclesiastical positions consulting with those who preside over them before accepting calls of a public or even a private nature which would interfere with the performance of their other duties. The reports circulated as to what was said have been in many instances greatly distorted, as is always the case; and even where they were correctly given, they have been seized upon by politicians on both sides and improperly construed. The injury in a political sense has been two-fold: it has caused hot-tempered Democrats to assume that the Church was opposed to the election of some of their candidates, when as a matter of fact neither candidates nor parties were mentioned nor intended; on the other hand it has caused impetuous and unwise Republicans to assume that their party and candidates had unexpectedly received a strong endorsement, and that the First Presidency had manifested its desire for their success.

Now, the News is in a position once more to say, in all conscientiousness and truth, that there was no intention to influence any man present or elsewhere in the exercise of his suffrage. The speakers whose remarks have been so extensively referred to had no desire to favor either side or candidate, or to convey any impression of preference for or opposition to any man or party. To Church members and officials in their relationship to the Church and the duties of their calling, the Presidency claim the right to give counsel and advice. This right implies the authority to criticize or approve. And this right, and this only, was intended to be exercised on the occasion spoken of. It is accordingly unfair and untrue to accuse the Church of interfering in politics, or desiring to

defeat any one or two candidates or to elect any others. The Church desires now as ever that each voter shall use his ballot in freedom and intelligence—it would not, if it could, restrain any one in the exercise of the utmost independence in all political affairs. Whoever improperly construes anything said or done at the meeting referred to—no matter which side said improper construction comes from—is therefore not only unjust to the Church and its leaders, but to the candidates themselves, the parties, the people, and the whole State in all its hopes and prospects. President Woodruff's own words appear above; no man who reads them and knows him, will for a moment doubt the absolute truth of the statements he makes and the entire sincerity of his position. We commend them to the attention of the people of Utah, to the end that unwise and intemperate conduct and utterances may cease, and that the activity of the parties and their candidates may not be further disturbed by an alleged menace for which there is no foundation in fact.

THE CASE OF LYONS.

Is crime a disease? The question has been asked a thousand times, but there has been no unanimity in the answer. From scientists, moralists and specialists come arguments pro and con, according to the point of view; and one of the greatest developments of modern times for the cure of crime is rather in the line of prevention and the improvement of the environment of the individual.

A case of great importance as an illustration is dwelt upon in recent Chicago papers. Henry Lyons ("Butch" Lyons was his better known name) was hanged by the neck until dead last Friday at high noon. He had mauled a companion to death, and when he came up for sentence, neither the judge who presided at the trial nor his own attorney could find anything to warrant an appeal for mercy in his behalf; the prosecutor declared that he was a criminal from birth. That this statement was no exaggeration is shown by his record. At the age of nine he was sent to the bridewell. He served terms repeatedly for minor offenses between 1877 and 1885, when he was committed to the house of correction for the serious crime of robbery. In 1888 he was arrested for rape. In 1889 he was sent to the bridewell for burglary. In 1894 he was again arrested for burglary. Within six months he was again arrested for a criminal assault. When he killed his companion he had served one term in the penitentiary and twenty-one in the bridewell; and he had been arrested over 200 times.

Such has been the life of a youth who at the age of 27 closes his career on the gallows. His father was a drunkard, his mother a poverty-stricken and heart-broken working woman. By birth he was alcoholic, by surroundings an enemy to law and order, by instinct a wolf-child among men. There was hardly one chance in a hundred that he should have turned out much better than he did. And while specialists go on discussing whether or not crime is a disease and the result of environment,