

all the various crimes, as well as murder, that exist on the face of the globe; when we see mankind committing them; see all manner of degradation and lust; see the human family destroying one another, the question might arise, What has produced all these evils among men? They exist because a monogamic couple transgressed the law of heaven.

The learned gentleman referred us to a saying of that great man, Martin Luther, concerning the relationship that exists between husband and wife. It was a beautiful argument. I have no fault whatever to find with it. And it is just as applicable to polygamy as to monogamy. The answer of Martin Luther to the question put to him. Why God took the female from the side of man is just as appropriate, just as consistent with the plural form of marriage as it is with the other form. He did not take the woman from the head. Why? The argument was that the man should be the head, or as Paul says, "Man is the head of the woman," and that is his position. I believe my learned opponent agrees with me perfectly in this, so there is no dispute upon this ground. Why did He not take the woman from the foot? Because man is not to tyrannize over his wife, nor tread her under foot. Why did he take her from his side? Because the rib lies nearest to the heart, showing the position of woman. Not only one woman, but two women, five women, ten women, forty women, fifty women, may all come under the protecting head. Jesus says: "No man can serve two masters," because he may love the one and hate the other, cleave unto the one and turn away from the other; but it is not so with women under the protecting head.

Now let us examine polyandry, for that was referred to yesterday; and the reverend gentleman could not see why, if a man has the privilege of taking more wives than one, a woman should not have the same privilege. If that is expressed in the Bible we have not found it; the other is expressed there, and we have proved it, and call upon the reverend gentleman to show the opposite. When we come to polyandry, or the woman having more husbands than one, there is no sanction for it in the Scriptures. What is the object of marriage? Companionship, we are told. I agree with the gentleman. Another object he says is procreation. I agree with the gentleman also in the second object. Another was prevention. Here I agree with him so far as the argument is carried out in a true light. Let us examine the second, namely procreation. The Lord instituted marriage—the sacred bond of marriage—for the purpose of multiplying the human species here on the earth. Does polyandry assist in the multiplying of the human species, the woman having four, or five, or ten, or fifty or sixty husbands? Does it tend to rapidly increase the race? I think monogamists as well as polygamists, when they reflect, will say that a woman having more than one husband would destroy her own fruitfulness. Even if she did have offspring, there would be another great difficulty in the way, the father would be unknown. Would it not be so? All knowledge of the father would be lost among the children. Is this the case with a plurality of wives? No, by no means. If a man have fifty wives the knowledge of the father is as distinct as the knowledge of the mother. It is not destroyed therefore. The great principle of parentage on the part of the husband, on the part of the father, is preserved. Therefore it is more consistent, more reasonable, first for procreation and secondly for obtaining a knowledge of parentage, that a man should have a plurality of wives than that a woman should have a plurality of husbands.

Again, a man with a plurality of wives is capable of raising up a very numerous household. You know what the Scriptures have said about children, "Children are the heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is His reward." This being the case, a faithful, righteous, holy man, who takes, according to the great, divine institution of polyandry, a plurality of wives, is capable of multiplying his offspring ten or twenty-fold more than he could by one wife. Can one wife do this by polyandry? No. Here then is a great distinction between the male and the female. Look at that great and good and holy man, called Gideon in the Scriptures; a man to whom the angel of God was sent, and who, among all the hosts of Israel was chosen to go forth as the servant of the Most High. For what purpose? To deliver Israel from their enemies, the Midianites and others that had gathered against them. Was he a polygamist? Yes. He had many wives. He

had seventy-two sons. How many daughters he had I do not know. Could any woman in polyandry conceive or bring forth seventy-two sons and perhaps an equal number of daughters? I do not know but there might be some efficacy in that herb called "mandrake," or in some other miraculous herb that would give power and strength for one woman to bring forth seventy-two sons. Who knows, in a day of wonders like this! But a man has the ability, a man has the power to beget large families and large households. Hence we read of many of the great and notable men who judged Israel, that one man had thirty sons—his name was Jair; you will find it recorded in the Judges of Israel; another had thirty sons and thirty daughters; while another judge of Israel had forty sons. And when we come to the Gideon we have named, he had seventy-two. Now, we have nothing to do with the righteousness of these men, or their unrighteousness, in this connection. That has nothing to do with the marriage institution. God has established it by Divine command. God has given it His own sanction, whether it be the polygamic or the monogamic form. If Gideon afterwards fell into idolatry, as the reverend gentleman may argue, that has nothing to do with the matter. He had the power to beget seventy-two sons, showing he had a superior power to that of the female.

Right here, I may say, God is a consistent Being; a Being, who is perfectly consistent, and who delights in the salvation of the human family. A wicked man may take unto himself a wife, and raise unto himself a posterity. He may set before that wife and her posterity a very wicked example. He may lead those children by his drunkenness, by his blasphemy, by his immoralities, down to destruction. A righteous man may take fifty wives, or ten, as you choose; and he will bring up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; he will instruct them in the great principles of righteousness and truth, and lead them along and bring them up by his example and by his teachings to inherit eternal life at the right hand of God, with those polygamists of ancient times, Abraham and Jacob of old, who are up yonder in the Kingdom of God. Which of the two is the Lord most pleased with? The man who has five, or ten, or twenty wives, bringing up his children, teaching them, instructing them, training them so that they may obtain eternal life with the righteous in the Kingdom of God; or the monogamist that brings up his children in all manner of wickedness, and finally leads them down to hell? Which would you prefer with your limited wisdom when compared with that of the great Creator? Who among you would not prefer to entrust your offspring with your friends instead of your enemies? Would not God, therefore, upon the same principle, do the same? Does God delight in the marriages that exist among the wicked? Go to the antediluvian race. They married and were given in marriage until the day that Noah entered into the ark. They were not righteous men nor righteous women; and their children were taught in the wicked precepts of their fathers, who committed all manner of wickedness until all flesh had corrupted itself before the Lord. Therefore the Lord had to destroy those evil workers of iniquity that had received wives, but did not honor nor regard the Lord. Instead of those marriages consummated before the flood, the marriages and intermarriages among the sons of God and the daughters of men, being acceptable to the Most High, He was obliged to destroy those that were married and their offspring from the face of the earth. How much better it would have been had they been righteous polygamists who would have brought forth a pure offspring that the Lord could have exalted to eternal life. Consequently, when we examine the subject of polygamy in regard to this matter, we must acknowledge from these scriptures, and from various other testimonies, that the marriages of the wicked are not approved by the Heavens. There are many passages of scripture to support me in what I have now said. The Lord in one place commands the destruction of a people, parents and children, "lest they should fill the world with cities," lest all the world should be filled with people who had married contrary to His law. No person can pretend that a marriage consummated between an unrighteous man and an unrighteous woman, is a marriage in which God has joined the parties together. You might as well take the ordinance of baptism, and say that Simon Magus, when he went forward and was bap-

tized had complied with the ordinance of Heaven, while he yet remained in a condition of hardened sinfulness; and that because he had passed through the outward observance of the ordinance it was acceptable in the sight of Heaven. God never had anything to do with the marriages of the wicked only to permit them, perhaps for a wise purpose, as He permitted Joseph to be sold into Egypt by his brethren. He permitted the deed for His own wise purposes, but He did not justify the instruments who did the deed. So He permits these unauthorized marriages between wicked men and wicked women, to perpetuate the human race, because they will not hearken to Him, until the time shall come when He can have a pure people who will obey His laws, educating their posterity to honor and serve Him. He permits, but He does not sanction such marriages.

If we should argue with the reverend gentleman that the census shows an equality of males and females, this argument that I have now advanced will rebut the idea thus sought to be established. The idea is that because there may be made to appear an equality in numbers, therefore, every man must be confined to one wife and every woman must have one husband. Is that the way God dispenses His gifts and blessings to the human family? Does He give the same amount of blessings to the wicked that He does to the righteous? In some respects He does. He sends the rain from heaven upon the just and the unjust. But there are many great and important blessings that are bestowed more abundantly upon the righteous than upon the wicked. God has holy designs to accomplish when he makes a distinction between the righteous and the wicked in dispensing His blessings. Therefore if the wicked take wives without their being joined together by divine authority, those wives have allied themselves to their husbands without the Lord's sanction. Because the Lord permits this it does not prove that He sanctions it; and He would prefer that a people should be like Israel of old, a nation of polygamists as well as monogamists, and the blessings be dispensed between them, rather than have this so-called perfect equality between the males and females and a wicked generation be the result. To prove this I will refer you to the 37th Psalm. God in that psalm has expressly said, and repeated again and again, that the seed of the evil-doers should be rooted out of the earth, that they should not inherit the earth, while the righteous should inherit it and should prosper. He bestows His blessings upon the one and His curses upon the other.

I shall expect this afternoon to hear some arguments to refute those passages brought forward to sustain polygamy as well as monogamy; and if the gentleman can find no proof to limit the passages I have quoted to monogamic households, if there is no such evidence contained in the passages, and there is nothing in the original Hebrew as it now exists to invalidate them, then polygamy as a divine institution stands as firm as the throne of the Almighty. And if he can find that this form of marriage is repealed in the New Testament; if he can find that God has in any age of the world done away with the principle and form of plural marriage, perhaps the argument will rest with the other side. I shall wait with great patience to have some arguments brought forth on this subject. We are happy, here in this Territory, to have the learned come among us to teach us. We have embraced the Bible as a rule of faith; and if we misunderstand it, if we are acting contrary to its precepts, how very happy we should be to have the learned come from abroad—people who are acquainted with the original languages—to correct us and set us right. I think this is generous on the part of those gentlemen; much more so than it would be to enact laws and incarcerate in dungeons those who practice a form of marriage laid down in this book; to send them for three, or four, or five years to prison, tearing them from their poor wives and children, while their families would suffer hardship and hunger, being robbed of their natural protectors. We thank Mr. Newman and those who have come with him with their hearts full of philanthropy to enlighten us here in this mountain Territory, and if possible convince us of our errors. How much time is left me? ("Seven minutes.")

I have many arguments that I have not drawn upon, not only to reason upon, but testimonies as well in favor of polygamy; but I am informed that only seven minutes of the time is granted to me. I cannot, therefore, pretend on this occasion to enter into these ar-

guments and examine them with that justice that should be expected before the people. Mr. Newman has said he would like nine hours to bring forth his arguments and his reasonings for the benefit of the poor people of Utah. I wish he would not only take nine hours, but nine weeks and nine months, and be indeed a philanthropist and missionary in our midst; and try and reclaim this poor people from being the "awful beastly" people they are represented abroad. We are very fond of the Scriptures. We do not feel free to comply with a great many customs and characteristics of a great many of those who call themselves Christians. Much may be said upon this subject; much, too, that ought to crimson the faces of those who call themselves civilized, when they reflect upon the enormities, the great social evils that exist in their midst. Look at the great city of New York, the great metropolis of commerce. That is a city where we might expect some of the most powerful and learned theologians to hold forth, teaching and inculcating principles and lessons of Christianity. What exists in the midst of that city? Females by the tens of thousands, females who are debauched by day and by night; females who are in open day parading the streets of that great city! Why, they are monogamists there? It is a portion of the civilization of New York to be very pious over polygamy; yet harlots and mistresses by the thousands and tens of thousands walk the streets by open day, as well as by night. There is sin enough committed there in one twenty-four hours to sink the city down like Sodom and Gomorrah.

We read that there was once a case of prostitution among the children of Benjamin in ancient days. Some men came and took another man's wife, or concubine, which ever you please to call her; some men took her and abused her all night; and for that ones in they were called to account. They were called upon to deliver up the offenders but they would not do it, and they were viewed as confederates. And what was the result of that one little crime—not a little crime, —a great one; that one crime instead of thousands? The Lord God said to the rest of the tribes of Israel, Go forth and fight against the tribe of Benjamin. They fought against Benjamin; and the next day they were again commanded to go forth and fight against Benjamin. They obeyed; and the next day they were again so commanded; and they fought until they cut off the entire tribe except six hundred men. The destruction of nearly the whole tribe of Benjamin was the punishment for one act of prostitution.

Compare the strictness that existed in ancient Israel with the whoredoms, the prostitution and even the infanticide practiced in all the cities of this great nation; and then because a few individuals in this mountain Territory are practicing Bible marriage a law must be threatened to inflict heavy penalties upon us; our families must be torn from us and be driven to misery, because of the piety of a civilization in which the enormities I have pointed at exist.

How much more time Gentlemen? ("One minute.")

I cannot say much in that time. To close this argument I now call upon the reverend gentleman, whom I highly respect for his learning, his eloquence and ability; to bring forth proof to rebut the passages laid down in yesterday's argument in support of the position that the Bible sanctions polygamy. I ask him to prove that those laws were limited. If they were limited— (Here the umpires announced the time was up.)

DR. NEWMAN Rose and Said:
MESSRS. UMPIRES AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I understand the gentleman to complain against me that I did not answer his Scriptural arguments adduced yesterday. If I did not the responsibility is upon him. He, being in the affirmative, should have analyzed and defined the question under debate; but he failed to do that. It therefore fell to me, not by right, but by his neglecting to do his duty; and I did it to the best of my ability. It was of the utmost importance that this audience, so attentive and so respectable, should have a clear and definite understanding of the terms of the question; and I desire now to inform the gentleman, that I had the answers before me to the passages which he adduced and, had I had another hour, I would have produced them then. I will do it to-day. Now my learned friend will take out his pencil, for he will have something to do this afternoon.

A passing remark,—a word in regard to the original manuscripts, written by Moses, or Joshua, or Samuel, or the prophets. You sit down to write a letter to a friend; you take it into your head to copy that letter;