

MR. POTTER AND POLYGAMY.

A FEW days ago we replied to a letter written to the News by Mr. W. J. Potter of the Boston Index, but postponed for further consideration his reference to an article from his pen in the Index of May 8th. The article is headed "Mr. Kimball's Plea for the Mormons" and is chiefly devoted to proving that the good things spoken of by Mr. Kimball are not the result of polygamy. We do not understand that the gentleman claimed that they are, but in order that our readers may judge for themselves, we publish today his contribution to the Index in full.

Mr. Kimball has visited Utah and given the subject of "Mormonism" much consideration. That is he has examined both sides. The usual way with visitors is to listen to all the foolish and horrible stories told by its enemies and repeat them, worked over in the writer's or lecturer's own style. Mr. Kimball inquired into the "Mormon" as well as the anti-"Mormon" views of the subject and formed his own conclusions, and these being very different to the common opinions given to the public, were refused publication by some "liberal" and "religious" journals, and even the Index deems it necessary to throw cold water in them for fear it might be accused of favoring polygamy.

Mr. Kimball does not advocate "Mormonism" or the polygamic feature of that system, but merely gives some facts bearing on both not generally known to the public. Mr. Potter attempts to make it appear that Mr. Kimball regards the general happiness and prosperity of the "Mormons" as "due to polygamy." But the gentleman claims nothing of the kind. His facts, figures and argument go to show that the common opinions of the condition of affairs in Utah and of the results of polygamy among the "Mormons" are entirely incorrect. Mr. Potter shows that "only a comparatively small number of Mormons live in polygamous relations," and argues therefore, the difference in morality and the criminality, in favor of the "Mormon" as compared with the "Gentile" population of Utah, is not due "wholly and solely to the difference of the marriage institutions." As Mr. Kimball has not attempted to establish anything of this kind, Mr. Potter's arguments amount to nothing, and the facts and figures and conclusions adduced therefrom in the article on "Gentile Testimony of Mormon Worth," remain unanswered and unimpeached.

But the point in Mr. Potter's article to which he drew our especial attention in his letter, is an attempt to make polygamy an essential crime. He admits the distinction between a legal and a moral crime. But he claims that "it is one of the marks of advancing civilization that the statute law defining crime harmonizes with the demands of enlightened moral sense." Yet this does not prove that it is morally and essentially criminal for a man to have more wives than one at the same time, with the consent and approval of all the parties to the union. The laws and ordinances in reference to the Sabbath are framed in harmony with the prevailing moral sense. But this does not prove that Sabbath-breaking is an essential crime. It is made an offense by divine and human law, but if no enactment of either kind had ever been promulgated it would not have been a crime at all. The same argument holds in reference to the plural marriage which we advocate.

Mr. Potter says: "In our view all genuine marriage to-day rests upon absolute equality in all those relations, affectional, mental, physical, between husband and wife, which the marital relation involves." Again, he says: "Equality is the ideal toward which civilized society is climbing." Polygamy he styles a "perversion of the natural idea of marriage." Thus he endeavors to make it appear that the "ideal" of modern civilization in regard to marriage is the "natural idea," and that "equality" in marriage means "equality" in the sexes.

We regard these notions as incorrect. The modern "ideal" of marriage is acquired, not natural. Many of the most pronounced opponents of plural marriage have been compelled to acknowledge that "man is, naturally a polygamist." Nature does not teach man to restrict himself to one wife. Monogamic laws and regulations have sprung from the necessities of special circumstances, like the scarcity of women which existed in early Roman times and led to the "rape of the Sabines." The modern ideal is the result of education in a certain line, and is outside of the natural idea and tendency. The attempt therefore to trace statutory enactments against polygamy to a monogamic ideal as the "natural law of marriage," is weak and the argument fallacious.

It must be conceded also that the sexes in many respects are unequal. There are some qualities which are greater in woman than in man, and some in man that are greater than in woman. There are physical reasons why some men might have more wives than one, while it would be unnatural and productive of evil if a woman had more husbands than one at the same time. If the term absolute equality, used by Mr. Potter, means, as he seems to use it, absolute equality, "affectional, mental, physical," between husband and wife, a little reflection on the powers and faculties

of either sex will show that he is greatly mistaken. There are seasons when the wife should be exempt from the conjugal relation, of necessity. These do not occur to the man. He does not bear children, nor furnish them with natural nourishment. He is, in many respects, altogether different from the wife and cannot, naturally, be placed under the same regulations. We believe in equity. The wife should be protected in her rights as a woman as much as the husband in his rights as a man. But their organizations are not alike, their requirements are not alike, their capacities are not alike, and they cannot, naturally, be considered or controlled alike.

Mr. Potter says "This equity of relations cannot exist where the wife has to share the husband's affections and regard with several other wives." There is no such thing as "sharing affections" with several wives. It is a natural impossibility. A man no more divides his affections with his wives than a mother divides her affections among her children. We ask does a mother love her first child less because she is blest with a second or a third? Not at all. She may have more wisdom and discretion attached to that love and govern her exhibition of it, but in truth it is increased rather than lessened with its exercise. It will be objected that this is maternal not conjugal love. We admit this and that there is a difference between them, but the illustration is sufficient in one for the other. And as there is no division of maternal affection between two or more children, so there is no division of affection between two or more wives, when the husband is large-hearted enough to marry and love them.

It will be further objected that if a man can love more wives than one, a woman could love more husbands than one. But this is not a valid objection because the proposition is untrue. A woman is not the same as a man, as we have shown above, and the "absolute equity" or equality contended for, which is necessary to establish the modern "ideal" does not exist as a matter of fact. The nature, capacities, functions and capabilities of man are in many respects essentially different from those of woman, and these must be taken into consideration or egregious errors will be the result.

We commend to Mr. Potter's consideration this proposition: If two or more women agree to be married to the same man and he is willing, the society in which they live sanctioning the arrangement, no natural law is violated, and no essential crime is committed. It may be *malum prohibitum*, it is not *malum in se*. And the laws which have been passed in support of enforced monogamy, though they may be in harmony with the modern ideal, are not in accordance with natural law nor with that liberty which free-thinkers usually claim for the human race.

THE INVADING ARMY.

AN esteemed correspondent writes to the News in relation to the pests which are destroying the foliage of the fruit trees in this city and taking entire possession of our orchards. He thinks that the "nuisance" is one that calls for action on the part of the city authorities, and suggests that an ordinance be passed requiring citizens to cut down all their apple trees, on which the worms seem chiefly to live and thrive. He considers that the work, to be effective, must be general, and that the City Council have ample authority to enact and enforce such an ordinance.

We would be pleased to see the city authorities taking some active measures towards the destruction of the pests which are crawling over the gardens, swarming on the fences and weaving their webs in every direction. But we do not endorse the heroic treatment recommended by our correspondent. We direct attention to a letter in another column, showing how one gentleman, at least, has cleared his orchard of the worms. A general attack should be made upon them now, because in a short time they will develop into winged creatures that will in turn lay their eggs on the trees, to be hatched out next spring and repeat the work of devastation. Where they can be reached they can be crushed or swept off into some receptacle and destroyed. Where they are out of reach some remedy like that recommended in the letter referred to might be employed.

But it is of small use for a few industrious people to make the attack when their idle neighbors do nothing. If the onslaught was made universal a great deal could be done towards the extermination of the army of devourers. Yet in spite of all exertions there will no doubt be many that will escape, to reproduce their own kind for another season. What can be done in that case? We will answer the question as we view the matter.

The moth or butterfly which develops from the voracious grub will deposit its eggs in rings on the ends of the boughs and twigs, chiefly of apple trees. Next winter, when many people have some leisure, let all the trees be topped. That is, cut off the ends of all the limbs and twigs and burn them. By this means the eggs will be destroyed and but few will remain to be hatched out in the spring.

We do not believe that the destruction of our apple trees now will rid us of the invaders. They are attacking other fruit trees, they cover the bushes and plants and are clustering on posts and corners of buildings. Make a general onslaught upon them now and a general clipping of fruit trees next winter or before hatching time comes, and we believe they can be exterminated, while the "topping" process will benefit instead of injuring the trees themselves. If the City Council can do anything in aid of some general measures in this direction, we believe they will be willing and pleased to make the endeavor.

AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT.

TO-DAY we publish an interesting communication on the subject of water reservoirs. This is the method of supply so largely adopted as to be nearly universal in the world, and has consequently been scientifically demonstrated as the best, besides being, in many portions of the globe, the only practicable one.

We apprehend that there is a good deal of truth in the prediction of our correspondent in relation to the future adoption of an extensive reserve system throughout this region. This country is only in the incipient stage of its development. Population will yet flow into this part of the world in broad streams, and great tracts of land, now so many unfruitful wastes, will, in the very nature of things, have to be brought under cultivation. This can only be rendered practicable in many localities by the construction of reservoirs in high places, that water may be conveyed to the desert land.

This fact is beginning to receive faint recognition in several portions of Utah, where reservoirs of varying capacity have been constructed, and are the means already of relieving considerable stretches of land from barrenness. The force of example is sure to have its weight, and every demonstration of this character is an incentive to people in other places to "go and do likewise."

A chief objection raised against the adoption of a reservoir system is the supposed danger attending it. We believe this view to be somewhat superficial, the general topography of this region being admirably adapted for reservoirs. In fact in numerous places there are natural depressions into which water could be turned and lakes formed, nature itself offering the storage facilities independent of any great amount of labor. In other localities there are little side valleys adjacent to the mountain streams where the closing of a single outlet would be sufficient to provide for water storage, and where the needful work would be very limited in extent and could be rendered, by the application of the necessary skill and materials, as practically secure as the mountain sides themselves, without the expenditure of enormous sums of money. Speaking of water supply, an English gentleman interested in such matters, while on a visit here, said, after looking around the country, "In Utah Lake the Almighty has provided one of the finest reservoirs on the face of the globe," or words to that effect.

In regard to providing a water supply for the people of the north-east bench the City Council have taken a practical and progressive step in appropriating means for the development of the Dry Cañon springs. Since the corporation took hold of that property, and the labor done upon it, a continuous stream has flowed from this source. It is intended by tunneling and other processes of development to swell the body of water. Men of experience in such matters, among them Mayor Sharp, hold the opinion that the volume of water in Dry Cañon, can, by well directed labor be greatly increased.

We learn that the work of putting in a redwood flume from the forks of the cañon to convey the water now there to the upper bench ditch, will be begun as soon as the materials arrive. This will constitute a means of considerable relief to the people. Should the quantity of water be sufficiently increased by developing the springs it is intended, in course of time, to establish a system of waterworks reaching a sufficient elevation to permanently settle the water question in that locality. The present step is one in the right direction, and the people on the bench and feel correspondingly hopeful.

NOT GONE FOR GOOD.

YESTERDAY we made some remarks in relation to Dr. D. Banks McKenzie, on account of the falsehoods he is credited with palming off upon a newspaper reporter. It might be inferred that in taking his departure he intended "going for good." We are informed that such is not the case. He is said to have a scheme on hand. Schemes are his forte. And with him they are a synonym for fizzle. The phantasmagoria now in "his mind's eye" is a "first-class hotel in Salt Lake City," for which, we are told, he has gone East to raise the necessary funds. Judging from the Doctor's lack of success in everything he has attempted here, Eastern people will do about as profitable a thing to put their money in a sand bank as to place it in the hands of D. Banks for any purpose whatever.

That "first-class hotel" is a will-o'-the-wisp so far as he is concerned.

GOOD LAW, SOUND LOGIC, BUT POOR THEOLOGY.

A GREAT many foolish comments have been made by a portion of the press of this country on the speech of Senator Brown, of Georgia, against the Utah bill now pending in the Senate of the United States. They are foolish because they are inappropriate and were made without knowledge of what the gentleman really said. The fact that he had spoken in opposition to the bill was enough to set the anti-"Mormon" fanatics in a fury. And they assumed at once that he was defending the cause of polygamy. His exposure of the immorality of New England, which furnishes the chief insane assailants of "Mormonism," aroused a storm of invective the more bitter because his facts and figures could not be refuted.

The brief report furnished to the press in the dispatches was insufficient on which to base so many and so positive comments. And that the Senator's remarks may be understood, we shall copy them in full from the *Congressional Record* of May 28th, giving the first instalment to-day.

It will be seen from what we publish that Senator Brown is vehemently opposed to polygamy, the "Mormon" form as much as the New England variety, the "Christian" as well as the Mohammedan method. Therefore the statement put forth in many papers that he is a "defender of polygamy" is untruthful and unjust. We do not reproduce the Senator's remarks because we agree with them. But we want them to be correctly presented to the public, so that those who misrepresent him may be corrected, if not made ashamed.

In our opinion, Senator Brown is weak in his theology, while powerful in law and logic. It can be shown that his views of the teachings of the Savior are incorrect, being in accord with the traditions of sectarianism and formed under the influences of orthodoxy, but his presentation of legal and constitutional principles is not subject to the same objection and his reasoning upon those principles cannot be overthrown. He is opposed to the practice of polygamy and desires to see it destroyed, but recognizes the constitutional principle that no person can be lawfully deprived of any right either of person or property under the pretense that he is a bigamist or polygamist, or through any pretended admissions of his own. Unless he has been convicted by due process of law all punishment is unlawful and indefensible. The right of free belief, too, is so strongly guaranteed to all citizens of the United States, that every law which prevents any of them from the exercise of legal rights or privileges, is unconstitutional and despicable. These points Senator Brown presents clearly and irrefutably.

The ideas entertained by Mr. Brown in regard to the meaning of the Savior's teachings on the subject of divorce, are those of most modern professors of fashionable Christianity. But they are, in our opinion very much mistaken, and we will now endeavor to show why. The subject treated of by the Savior, as recorded in Matthew xix, quoted by Mr. Brown, was not polygamy or monogamy. He did not touch upon the rightfulness or wrongfulness of the former, nor of the benefits or defects of the latter. He was answering this question: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" (v. 3). The question was worded as to a man and his wife—not wives, and the answer was given in accordance with the inquiry. Neither query nor reply involved the subject of a plurality of wives. It was not in question at all. The denunciation of the Savior was against those who put away their wives, not against men who married more than one wife. That plurality of wives was practiced among the people to whom Jesus ministered, it is in vain to deny. No one attempts to dispute the fact but the sophist and the unprincipled. The influence of Rome was being felt among the Jews of that day and monogamic customs were creeping in among them. If Jesus had desired to proclaim the doctrine of one wife only, here was a fine opportunity for its promulgation. But this would have involved the putting away of all wives but one. And "putting away," was just what Jesus denounced. He said not one word, either then or at any other time against a man having more wives than one at the same time, but he proclaimed against the practice of putting away one wife for the purpose of getting another. Yet, strange to say, the pious Christians, so-called, of to-day practice this crime which Jesus denounced, and cry out against the "Mormons" for doing that on which Jesus was entirely silent, although it was common in his age and country.

But Mr. Brown claims, with many others, that the saying, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh," excludes the idea of more than one wife as the two are one flesh and there is no room for another." But this is merely jumping at a conclusion. This saying of the Savior's was a quotation from Genesis ii, 24. The words "they twain," do not occur there. But this does not matter. The object of

the quotation was not to show that no more could be added to this unity, but to prove that the union was intended to be perpetual, or at any rate indissoluble by human authority. God joined the parties together, and the argument was that none but God can properly put them asunder. Therefore human divorce laws are improper.

Is it a correct principle that only two can be made one, and that if two are made one "there can be no room" for another? We think not. How about the Holy Trinity? The three in one. On this all modern Christian theology is founded. "Three persons, but one God." Good orthodox "Christians" say, "We worship one God in trinity and trinity in unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance," and Jesus prayed that this unity might be accomplished among all his disciples and those who believed in him through their word. Here is unity on a broad scale. It is not confined by any means to "twain" made one. This principle of unity between husband and wife was enunciated "in the beginning." How strange that Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Gideon, Josiah, David and other great men highly favored of God, blessed with his personal teachings and positive approval, never saw the divine injunction in any such light as modern theologians have attached to it! Those worthies married other wives than the first and evidently believed that they were joined to them in the same way as the first, to become bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, and so that "man should not put them asunder." The custom of divorce against which Jesus spoke was instituted under the imperfect law of carnal commandments, but was not part of the patriarchal system which preceded it, and does not belong to the Christian dispensation which was the older system restored.

Some will contend that to make more than twain one flesh is impossible. But that is a hard word. It is not only a possibility—it is an actuality. It was done in ancient times; it is done today. If a man marries a wife in the new and everlasting covenant they become one flesh; if he marries another or others in that covenant they also become one flesh. They are his. Sealed to him by the law and power of God for time and all eternity, they are made part of him, one as much as another, and he owns them, and they have a claim upon him in this world and the world to come. Man cannot dissolve the bond in either case. As God joined them in one, only God can dissolve the union.

There is nothing in all the teachings of Jesus Christ which directly touches on the question of plural marriage. Indirectly he sustained it. He never said a word condemning it. But he endorsed Abraham and his works, and said to those same Pharisees who questioned him, "tempting him" on the subject of divorce: "If ye are the children of Abraham, ye will do the works of Abraham."

Mr. Brown's theology is the popular man-made system of apostate Christendom, and is therefore unreliable and open to dispute. But his law and his logic, based upon the constitution, are not derived from sectarian sources and are convincing and admirable, as will be seen when his powerful speech is read in its entirety.

LOW GRADE MORALITY.

AMONG the most flagrant inconsistencies indulged in by some newspaper men it is seldom that one meets with such a glaring absurdity as the *Butte Inter-Mountain* was recently guilty of. In an article treating upon Senator Brown's speech in opposition to the pending anti-"Mormon" legislation, the following paragraph appears:

"His objection to the law disfranchising a plural wived Mormon, while the Gentile who is perhaps unfaithful to his marriage vows, is allowed to vote unchallenged, is either very shallow or conspicuously dishonest. The non-Mormon who practices adultery does it under the ban of society, and conceals his offense from his fellowman; while the follower of Joseph Smith asserts divine warrant for his sin, and publicly proclaims that future exaltation will be the reward of his lustful indulgence."

It is perhaps needless to state that the religion of the Latter-day Saints absolutely forbids "lustful indulgence," which merits and brings inevitable punishment.

The logic of the *Inter-Mountain* is that the "Gentile" should be exempt from punishment for the sexual crimes he perpetrates—first, because he commits them "under the ban of society;" second, because "he conceals his offense from his fellowmen." Pursuing the logic of the silly scribbler still further, according to his reasoning it is not the commission of crime that is reprehensible or punishable, but its publicity. If this remarkable view were correct, the amount of punishment administered ought to be in accordance with the extent of publicity it attains, which, to say the least, would involve the exercise of a degree of judicial discrimination beyond the reach of ordinary mortality.

See how the logic of the northern solon applies to the "Mormons." The "ban of society" as applied to the "Gentile" defiler of female chastity is rather gauzy, plainly shown by the clause in the oath which each elector of this Territory has to take to en-