

act is stripped of the attributes of murder; it is a religious act. She turns to her bible or *Shasta*, and says, "I am commanded to do this by my bible." What will you do? You will turn away from the *Shasta* and say, "the interests of society demand that you shall not murder that child." So civil government has the right to legislate in regard to marriage, and restrict the number of wives to one, according to God's law. But I am not an advocate of stringent legislation. I agree with my friend, that the law should not incarcerate men, women and children in dungeons! No, my friends, if I can say a word to induce humane and kind legislation towards the people of Utah I shall do it, and do it most gladly. But I assert this principle that civil government has the right to limit religious liberty within due bounds.

There was another point that I desired to touch upon, and that is as to the longevity of nations. We are told repeatedly here, in printed works, that monogamic nations are short-lived, and that polygamic nations are long-lived. I am prepared to go back to the days of Nimrod, come down to the days of Ninus, Sardanapalus, and down to the days of Cyrus the Great, and all through those ancient polygamic nations, and show that they were short-lived; while on the other hand I am prepared to prove that Greece and Rome outlived the longest-lived polygamic nations of the past. Greece from the days of Homer down to the third century of the Christian era; and Rome from seven hundred and fifty years before the coming of Christ down to the dissolution of the old empire. But that old empire finds a resurrection in the Italians under Victor Emanuel and Garibaldi; and England, Germany and France are all proofs of the longevity of monogamic nations. Babylon is a ruin to-day, and Babylon was polygamic. Egypt, to-day, is a ruin! Her massy piles of ruin bespeak her former glory and her pristine beauty. And the last edition of the polygamic nations—Turkey—is passing away. From the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, from the Danube, and the Jordan and the Nile, the power of Mahomedanism is passing away before the advance of the monogamic nations of the Old World. Our own country is just in its youth; but monogamic as it is, it is destined to live on, to outlive the hoary past, to live on in its greatness, in its beneficence, in its power; to live on until it has demonstrated all those great problems committed to our trust for human rights, religion, liberty and the advancement of the race.

My friends, these are the arguments in favor of Monogamy; and when they can be overthrown, then it will be time enough for us to receive the system of Polygamy as it is taught here. But until that great law that we have quoted can be proved to be not a law; until it can be proved that there is no distinction between law and practice; until it can be proved that there is a positive command for polygamy; until it can be proved that Christ did not refer to the original marriage; until it can be proved that Paul does not demand that every man shall have his own wife and every woman her own husband; until it can be proved that polygamy is a prevention of prostitution; until it can be proved that monogamic nations are not as long-lived as polygamic nations; until it can be proved that monogamy is not in harmony with civil liberty; until all these points can be demonstrated beyond a doubt; until then, we can't give up this grand idea that God's law condemns polygamy, and that God's law commends monogamy; that the highest interests of man, that the dearest interests of the rising generation, that all that binds us to earth and points us to heaven are not subserved and promoted under the monogamic system. All these great interests demand the practice of monogamy in marriage,—one man and one wife. Then indeed shall be realized the picture portrayed in the Scriptures of the happy family—the family where the wife is one and the husband one, and the two are equivalent; then, when father and mother, centered in the family, shall bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,—when the husband provides for his family,—and it is said that the man who does not is worse than an infidel,—then indeed monogamy stands forth as a grand Bible doctrine.

THE THREE DAYS' DISCUSSION.

THE discussion of the question "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" between Professor Orson Pratt and Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate, closed yesterday afternoon, according to arrangement. The arguments on the affirmative and the negative appear in our columns, having been reported in full. The audience on Saturday was a much larger one than Friday's; and yesterday there were fully eleven thousand persons present—the people from the surrounding settlements having come from their homes to listen to the discussion. We should have been pleased to have seen Vice-President Colfax present at this discussion. He would have had an opportunity of properly estimating

the act, for which his admirers praised him so much last summer—the making of a few remarks to a few score persons in front of the Townsend House one evening. He had caused, or at least suffered, the impression to prevail that he had performed a wonderfully brave act in making that speech—indeed "bearded the lion in his den;" when the truth was, if he had made his wishes known, instead of selecting a time when nobody excepting a few stragglers, and a few other persons were present to hear him, he might have had the Tabernacle to speak in, and the whole people as listeners.

The fact demonstrated by this discussion, and which we view as being of far higher importance than the discussion itself, is one that has always existed, but which has been repeatedly denied, namely, that free speech on certain topics, especially polygamy, did not exist in Utah. The spectacle witnessed at this discussion was thoroughly unique. We do not state it too strongly when we say that we do not believe it can be paralleled in any part of Christendom. In what other place, or among what other people would a church, chapel or hall be gratuitously furnished to any opponent, and the people suspend business and labor, at a very busy season of the year, and assemble from the surrounding settlements to listen patiently to an assailant of a doctrine which they hold sacred? In what other place could eleven thousand people be gathered together, who would listen as quietly as the audience did yesterday to the condemnation by an opponent of a religious doctrine as firmly believed in and as widely understood as the doctrine of patriarchal marriage is by the Latter-day Saints? We mentally drew the contrast yesterday between the treatment the elders of this church had received in so-called Christian and free cities and commonwealths, not for denouncing existing institutions and doctrines, but for advocating the pure principles of the gospel—the first principles—and we thanked God that a day had, at last, come when the Latter-day Saints could set the world an example in this as in other respects.

There are a few points in Dr. Newman's argument yesterday to which we wish to make reference, because we think that it would be doing Professor Pratt and the cause he advocated great injustice to suffer them to pass in silence. Dr. Newman said, yesterday, "I plead for more time; my friends plead for more time; but time was denied us, I am therefore restricted to an hour." A hearer, or a reader of this remark would imagine that Dr. Newman did not have all the time he wanted to discuss this question; which would be simply untrue. Professor Pratt's propositions, as we have already published, were for each disputant to occupy half an hour alternately, or an hour alternately. Dr. Newman chose the latter. But Professor Pratt placed no limit upon the length of time that should be occupied in the discussion. This Dr. Newman did himself. He proposed that the discussion should hold three days—commence on Friday, end on Sunday. Now, we listened to his remarks yesterday, which we have quoted, and we viewed them as designed to create a false impression.

Another point that created a painful sensation throughout the audience was the light, burlesque style in which he alluded to the words of Jesus. The Doctor said: "Why, they somewhere quote a passage that if a man forsake his wife, he shall have a hundred. Well he ought to go on forsaking. * * * Such a man would keep the Almighty busy creating women for him."

The passage thus ridiculed is found in Mathew 19th chapter, 27—30, also Luke 28th chapter, 28—30, and reads:

"Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee: what shall we have therefore?"

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

"And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundred-fold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

"But many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first."

He labored hard to show that Midian and Ethiopia were the same country, and therefore, that Moses' Ethiopian and Midianitish wives were one and the same person, and that Moses was a monogamist. The Doctor thinks Josephus good authority; yet that historian informs us that Moses married a daughter of the king of Ethiopia, and that, too, before he fled to Midian and took Jethro's daughter. He plainly shows that, in the days of Moses, Midian and Ethiopia were distinct lands, as separate as the United States and Mexico now are.

This brings us to another point that he endeavored to make respecting bastards. He said: "The only child recognized as a bastard by Jewish law is a child born of a Jew and a Pagan woman."

This he bases on the law of Athens, that those children were bastards who were not born of native Athenians. What, then, according to this definition, were the children of Moses and the Ethiopian and the Midianitish women and those of Boaz and Ruth? Were they kept out of the congregation for ten generations?"

Respecting Abraham he wished his hearers to understand that Hagar was the only woman whom Abraham had children by, excepting Sarah and Keturah. He would have us believe that it was Sarah's anxiety to help the Lord to keep his promise that led Sarah to give him her maid as a wife, and that poor Abraham took the maid because it was Sarah's arrangement; but that he afterwards sent her away by divine command, and then conformed to Dr. Newman's idea of piety and had no more wives; in other words, experienced a change of heart. But, unfortunately for the symmetry of this theory, the Bible says, Genesis 25th chapter, 6th verse:

"But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, (while he yet lived) eastward unto the east country."

Was Sarah still anxious to help the Lord to keep His promise, and not satisfied with giving him Hagar, gave him these other concubines? or was this an anxiety of Keturah on the same point? Strange that the ladies in those days should be so anxious to give their husbands wives and concubines. The wives among the Latter-day Saints resemble them marvelously in this respect. But Dr. Newman denies that Abraham was a polygamist, and Dr. Newman ought to be authority; we suppose he is in some places. And this brings us to another point.

We have heard of the wickedness and bagnios of Washington, how that many men occupying high places debase themselves and corruption reigns too widely, but after hearing the arguments of this popular preacher from there, we cease to wonder at this debauchery. He asserts that Abraham, despite his commerce with more than one living wife at a time, was not a polygamist—that he did not have wives by God's command and permission; but had wives and concubines in violation of God's law. Jacob, also, had his wives contrary to the same law. Caleb, also, the mighty prince, pre-eminent in Israel for his fidelity; the only one, besides Joshua, who left Egypt a man and lived to enter Canaan, was equally a transgressor; besides numbers of others whose names we need not mention. Yet, in praying, the Doctor offers his petitions to the God of Abraham and Jacob,—to the God who called Abraham his friend and whose highest

promise to mankind is that they shall go, if faithful to Him, to Abraham's bosom! Now if Abraham and Jacob could thus have commerce with women, outside of divine and lawful wedlock, as Dr. Newman says they had, and still be called the friend of God and have their names associated with His who rules eternity, is it any wonder that where ministers labor who teach such monstrous doctrine men have mistresses, frequent houses of ill-fame, and commit every other species of villainy? "Oh! Yes, follow Abraham and Jacob's examples as I teach them—take mistresses, keep them as long as you please, only take care that when you get old and the fires of life burn low—as Jacob did, eight years before you die—do not have connexion with them, and repent and say you wish you had not done it, and all will be right. Abraham and Jacob have got to heaven, and why not you?"

Are we too severe in drawing these conclusions? We think not. We think the premises warrant them. At any rate we are thankful that such doctrine is so rarely taught in the hearing of the youth of this land.

Another point: Is it fair to call every man a monogamist whose marriage is not mentioned? Why should it not, with equal propriety, be asserted that they were polygamists? If the founders of the nation were polygamists, the heads of the tribes sons of polygamists, would not the nation follow their example? and if because polygamous marriages are not frequently mentioned, neither are any kind of marriages, shall it be concluded, therefore, that there were no marriages?

Space precludes, to-day, the further notice of points that are open to criticism, and we must forbear.

[SPECIAL TO THE DESERET NEWS.]

By Telegraph.

Per WESTERN UNION Telegraph Line.

The Prussians are penetrating France in three grand divisions, by way of Forbach or Metz, by Weissenbourg, and by Mullhouse.

The French are furious at the lack of army organization. For four days after the battle of the 6th inst., the soldiers lived on potatoes gathered in the neighboring fields.

On Friday night the French army was west of the Moselle, and still retreating.

Holland has sent 12,000 volunteers to serve in the Papal army.

It is reported that Strasbourg capitulated on Saturday morning, after a short bombardment.

A large reconnoitering party of Prussians advanced to the environs of Metz, on Friday, when some sharp fighting took place and they were forced to retire.

Reinforcements both of men and stores are rapidly arriving for the French.

Seven hundred and fifty thousand Prussians are between Cologne and Rastadt, and two hundred and fifty thousand in Alsace and Lorraine.

Gen. Changarnier has been appointed commandant of the fortress of Metz.

Two hundred Italians and Irish had a severe fight at Mamaranoc on Saturday afternoon. A number were badly injured.

Disturbances have taken place at Tulu, Marseilles, Limoges and Lyons. Marshall law has been declared in the department of Bouches du Rhone.

The French army has been withdrawn to the west bank of the Moselle. The evacuation of Metz is considered certain.

Napoleon's retreat from Metz is fully confirmed.

The Prussians now occupy Nancy which they entered on Friday night, also Frouard, on the Paris and Strasbourg railroad.

The Prussians attacked Pont-a-Mousous, drove out the French but subsequently fell back.

Large quantities of concealed arms have been seized in Paris.

King William has issued a proclamation declaring military conscription abolished in all French Territory occupied by the Prussian troops.

Pfalsburg the key of the Voges has surrendered to the Prussians.

Chang, one of the Siamese twins, has been attacked with paralysis of the left side. Eng is not as yet affected.

Admiral Farragut died at Portsmouth N. H. yesterday.

Seven thousand, five hundred workmen are employed cutting off the streets leading into Paris.

A battle took place at Metz yesterday (Sunday). Both sides claim the victory.