

that he had disclaimed and declined the discussion? Such a proceeding would excite the ridicule of every man in the country; and yet this is precisely the course which Dr. Newman has taken. Had he in good faith, been desirous to have had a discussion he would, when he saw the *Telegraph* article, have written to President Young or Professor Orson Pratt from Washington, and inquired whether or not that article was authorized, and if it was, stated that it was his intention to accept it and to come here to discuss the question. But this he did not do.

It will be seen by the correspondence, that Dr. Newman was offered either or both of the Tabernacles in which to speak, and no restriction was placed upon him as to what the character of his remarks should be. One of these buildings holds 13,000 persons; the other, 3,000. Had he been desirous of addressing the Latter-day Saints, he could have done so, instead of addressing an audience of a few hundred at an obscure hall, and the most of those not members of our church. It was the evident design to prevent the "Mormon" people from hearing the argument. We had a reporter at the Hall yesterday to take down his remarks, and shall probably publish them—such portions, at least, as are suitable; for we conclude, from what we have heard of his discourse, that Dr. Newman will never complain of others' vulgar talk in the pulpit. We have published his first sermon, delivered at Washington, on the subject of plural marriage, and Professor Pratt's reply. We expect, at an early date, to publish his second, and Elder Pratt's rejoinder to it. We will do for Dr. Newman what he declined to do for this people—let the Latter-day Saints and the public generally know his arguments.

Correspondence.

BETWEEN

REV. DR. NEWMAN

Pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Church, Washington, D. C.,

AND

President BRIGHAM YOUNG.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 6, 1870.

To PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—In acceptance of the challenge given in your journal, *The Salt Lake Daily Telegraph* of the 3d of May last, to discuss the question, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I have hereby to inform you that I am now ready to hold a public debate with you as the head of the Mormon Church upon the above question, under such regulations as may be agreed upon for said discussion; and I suggest for our mutual convenience, that either by yourself or by two gentlemen whom you shall designate, you may meet two gentlemen whom I will select for the purpose of making all necessary arrangements for the debate, with as little delay as possible. May I hope for a reply at your earliest convenience, and at least not later than 3 o'clock to-day.

Respectfully, etc.,
J. P. NEWMAN.

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T.
August 6th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—Yours of even date has just been received, in answer to which I have to inform you that no challenge was ever given by me to any person through the columns of the *'Salt Lake Daily Telegraph,'* and this is the first information I have received that any such challenge ever appeared.

You have been mis-informed with regard to the *'Salt Lake Daily Telegraph,'* it was not my journal, but was owned and edited by Dr. Fuller of Chicago, who was not a member of our church and I was not acquainted with its columns.

Respectfully,
BRIGHAM YOUNG.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 6, 1870.

To PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—I confess my disappointment at the contents of your note in reply to mine of this date. In the far East it is impossible to distinguish the local relations between yourself and those papers which advocate the interests of your Church; and when the copy of the *Telegraph* containing the article of the 3d of May last, reached Washington, the only construction put upon it by my friends was that it was a challenge to me to come to your city and discuss the Bible doctrine of Polygamy.

Had I chosen to put a different construction on that article, and to take no further notice of it, you could then have adopted the *Telegraph* as your organ and the said article as a challenge, which I either could not or dared not accept. That I am justified in this construction is clear, from the following facts:

I. The article in the *Telegraph*, of May 3d contains these expressions, alluding to my sermon as reported in the *N. Y. Herald*, it says: "The discourse was a lengthened argument to prove that the Bible does not sustain Polygamy." * * * * * The sermon should have been delivered in the New Tabernacle in this city, with ten thousand Mormons to listen to it and then Elder Orson Pratt, or some prominent Mormon, should have had a hearing on the other side and the people been allowed to decide. * * * * *

Dr. Newman, by his very sermon, recognizes the religious element of the question. * * * Let us have a fair contest of peaceful argument and let the best side win. * * * We will publish their notices in the *Telegraph*, report their discourses as far as possible, use every influence in our power, if any is needed, to secure them the biggest halls and crowded congregations, and we are satisfied that every opportunity will be given them to conduct a campaign. We base this last remark on a statement made last Sunday week in the Tabernacle by President Geo. A. Smith, that the public halls throughout the Territory have been and would be open for clergymen of other denominations coming to Utah to preach. * * * Come on and convert them by the peaceful influences of the Bible instead of using the means now proposed. Convince them by reason and Scriptural argument and no Cullom Bill will be required."

II. I understand the article containing the above expressions was written by Elder Sloan, of the Mormon Church, and at that time associate editor of the *Telegraph*; and that he was and has since been in constant intercourse with yourself. The expressions of the said article as above cited, were the foundation of the impression throughout the country, that a challenge had thus been given through the columns of the *Telegraph*, and as such, I myself, had no alternative but so to regard and accept it. I may add that I am informed that an impression prevailed here in Utah, that a challenge had been given and accepted. Under this impression I have acted from that day to this, having myself both spoken of and seen allusions to the anticipated discussion in several prominent papers of the country.

III. It was not till after my arrival in your city last evening, in pursuance of this impression, that I learned the fact that the same Elder Sloan, in the issue of the *Salt Lake Herald*, of Aug. 3rd, attempts for the first time to disabuse the public of the idea so generally prevalent. Still acting in good faith and knowing that you had never denied or recalled the challenge of the third of May, I informed you of my presence in your city and of the object of my visit here.

My note this morning with your reply, will serve to put the matter before the public in its true light and dispel the impression of very many in all parts of the country, that such a challenge had been given and that such a discussion would be held.

Feeling that I have now fully discharged my share of the responsibility in the case, it only remains for me to subscribe myself as before,

Respectfully,
J. P. NEWMAN.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 6, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—It will be a pleasure to us, if you will address our congregation to-morrow morning, the 7th inst., in the small Tabernacle at 10 a.m., or, should you prefer it, in the New Tabernacle at 2 p.m., same instant, or both morning and evening.

Respectfully,
BRIGHAM YOUNG.

P. S. I hope to hear from you immediately.
B. Y.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 6, 1870

8 o'clock, P.M.

To PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—In reply to your note just received to preach in the Tabernacle to-morrow, I have to say that after disclaiming and declining as you have done to-day, the discussion which I came here to hold, other arrangements to speak in the city, were accepted by me, which will preclude my compliance with your invitation.

Respectfully,
J. P. NEWMAN.

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T., Aug 6, 1870.
REV. DR. NEWMAN;

Sir: In accordance with our usual custom of tendering clergymen of every denomination passing through our city, the opportunity of preaching in our tabernacles of worship, I sent you, this afternoon, an invitation tendering you the use of the small Tabernacle in the morning, or the New Tabernacle in the afternoon, or both, at your pleasure, which you have seen proper to decline.

You charge me with "disclaiming and declining the discussion" which you came here to hold. I ask you, sir, what right have you to charge me with declining a challenge which I never gave you, or, to assume as a challenge from me, the writing of any unauthorized newspaper editor? Admitting that you could distort the article in question to be a challenge from me, (which I do not believe you conscientiously could) was it not the duty of a gentleman to ascertain whether I was responsible for the so-called challenge before your assumption of such a thing? and certainly, much more so before making your false charges.

Your assertion, that if you had not chosen to construe the article in question as a challenge from me, I "could then have adopted the *Telegraph* as your [my] organ and the said article as a challenge," is an insinuation, in my judgment, very discreditably to yourself and ungentlemanly in the extreme, and forces the conclusion that the author of it would not scruple to make use of such a subterfuge himself.

You say that Mr. Sloan is the author of the article; if so, he is perfectly capable of defending it, and I have no doubt you will find him equally willing to do so; or Professor Orson Pratt, whose name, it appears, is the only one suggested in the article. I am confident he would be willing to meet you, as would hundreds of our elders, whose fitness and respectability I would consider beyond question.

In conclusion, I will ask, what must be the opinion of every candid, reflecting mind, who views the facts as they appear? Will they not conclude that this distortion of the truth in accusing me of disclaiming and declining a challenge, which I never even contemplated, is unfair and ungentlemanly in the extreme and must have been invented with some sinister motive? Will they not consider it a paltry and insignificant attempt, on your part, to gain notoriety, regardless of the truth? This you may succeed in obtaining; but I am free to confess, as my opinion, that you will find such notoriety more unenviable than profitable, and as disgraceful, too, as it is unworthy of your profession.

If you think you are capable of proving the doctrine of "Plurality of Wives" unscriptural, tarry here as a missionary; we will furnish you the suitable place, the congregation, and plenty of our elders, any of whom will discuss with you on that or any other scriptural doctrine.

Respectfully,
BRIGHAM YOUNG.

DR. NEWMAN AT FAUST'S HALL.

Some of our citizens were doubtless disappointed, yesterday, in not hearing the Rev. Dr. Newman, in the New Tabernacle. What was the matter? It will be seen by the correspondence in another column, that the Doctor was invited to speak in both Tabernacles, thus giving him the entire day to deliver his budget on the anti-Polygamy question. Hearing by accident that the Doctor would speak at 3 p.m., in Faust's Hall, our reporter went down. He says the great sermon that was to have been delivered before "ten thousand 'Mormons'" was preached to a congregation of not over four hundred persons, two-thirds of whom were transients—ladies and gentlemen, Government officials, resident Gentiles and Jews, and apostate "Mormons." So much for the audience. Now for the sermon: there can be but one conclusion—one verdict respecting it, that it was a masterly attempt to distort the Scriptures and make them mean something foreign to the text, to prove the negative of a great truth, to misapply and pervert history, and to abuse and malign the characters of the Old Patriarchs.

Our readers will doubtless feel complimented when they learn that all polygamists are called 'bulls,' not of the Wall Street specie, but the real big necked, bellowing kind and all those noble women who have dared to face the traditions of many generations, and have been, and are willing to suffer the reproach and contumely of a self-righteous Christian world, and become the wives of polygamic husbands called

'slaves' and 'serfs' and their children 'brats,' and that they may be turned out of doors at any time by her who is fortunate enough to be married first.

But this last clause is in bad taste when coupled with the assertion that "the last wife is always most loved."

What think you, Bible readers, of the roll of honor, as called over by the Rev. gentleman? "Lamech, the murderer;" "Abraham, the coward and equivocator;" "Jacob, the swindler, liar and thief;" "Gideon, the bastard and idolator;" "David, the adulterer and murderer;" and "Solomon the man who built altars to worship the God Moloch."

The speaker delivered a very beautiful eulogy on the framers of our glorious Constitution, and the flag of our country, to which every loyal heart responded. But immediately following this eulogy, he makes the assertion that Congress has the right to prescribe limits to man's religious faith, whenever that faith is contrary to the laws of God and common decency, the Doctor constituting himself the judge as to the law of God and decency.

The sermon concluded with the sweeping declaration that polygamy must be put down. The strong arm of government will be brought to bear upon it; but he hoped the laws would be mercifully executed; and he believed that wise legislation would so control the extinguishing process, that the women and children would not suffer. For the men he could not say so much.

We are of the opinion that the mountain has labored and groaned tremendously, but that the mouse is a small affair!

DISCOURSE

By President BRIGHAM YOUNG,
delivered in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, July 24th, 1870.

REPORTED BY DAVID W. EVANS.

Short sermons are very frequently interesting, if the speaker can say what he wishes to say from the time he commences to speak until the end. But most of us who are public speakers labor under timidity, and experience that lack of the governing and controlling principle which prevents our doing this. I notice this in almost every public speaker I hear. It is seldom that a speaker can arise and deliver his thoughts and reflections readily, unless his speech and subject have been studied and fixed previously. For my part, as far as my public speaking is concerned, I do not know that I ever troubled myself to take thought beforehand of what I should say. There have been times in my life that I have been led to lecture on certain principles, and on such occasions my mind would be confined to those principles alone, consequently my subject would be before me more immediately. But upon rising to address the people I trust in Him from whom we all derive the power of thought and reflection, and I strive to express my reflections acceptably to God and to my hearers.

The gospel, whose principles we have been hearing about this morning, is the gospel that every Christian professes to believe in. I do not know of a Christian but what will admit that the Bible is true; then where is the difference between the Latter-day Saints and the various Christian sects that dwell on the earth? The difference is that we believe just enough to obey; while they believe just enough to acknowledge but not to obey.

If there be one principle in this gospel that we preach that is not perfectly true we would like some divine to make us acquainted with the fact; and prove by principles of true philosophy wherein it is not true, or wherein it is injurious to those who believe it. We believe that every principle that God has revealed to the children of men is strictly true, and absolutely beneficial to the life of every intelligent being that dwells upon the whole earth. We have come to this conclusion, for we have tried to learn and understand and to carry out in our lives the principles of the gospel that we believe in, and if we sum them up, in a few words, we might, with the strictest propriety, use the words of one anciently, and say that the gospel "is peace on earth and good will to men." We can also say truly that this is eternal life to know the only wise God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent. But when we examine the faith and acknowledgements of the Christian world we find that, with all their professions, they are involved in midnight darkness concerning the true nature and character of God. Is there a divine on the face of the whole earth who can give you or me any description of the Being that the whole Christian world worship as God? There is not. Where is the proof of this assertion? I am a witness; their writings are witnesses; their sermons are witnesses; their declarations are witnesses. Yet this book, the Bible, portrays the character of God, the Father of our spirits, and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, just as clearly as any work ever written by man portrays the shape, nature, construction