

POLYGAMY DEFENDED AGAIN.

To the Editor of the Bolton Weekly Guardian.

Sir,—Will you please to permit me to reply, through the columns of your paper, to "Equality's" letter of the 27th ult. I did not expect to again have troubled you, but as "Equality" appears to be so excited upon the subject of polygamy, and so extravagant in his remarks and assertions, I again beg the privilege.

"Equality" has to me a strange way of expressing his ideas, and uses words calculated to lead the reader to misunderstand the subject upon which we are writing. He complains of me having turned his meaning, in inferring that he called women men's masters. What am I to understand, when, writing on the subject of polygamy, he quotes from the Bible "No man can serve two masters?" He now wishes to explain himself by stating, that the Scripture says it is impossible to serve God and the world. If this be the meaning, I would ask what have such remarks to do with the subject of polygamy?

"Equality" says there is no passage in the Bible bearing out the belief that Cain was married when he slew Abel. I would repeat, that it is a matter of little importance in the premises whether he was married, or was not. If, however, he was not married, where did he get his wife? For he "went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod, east of Eden, and knew his wife;" not took him a wife, but knew the one he already had, and she bare him a son, and he built a city to his name.

Polygamy, he says, is of man's invention, and was commenced by Lamech, which is a mere assertion of his without reference. He also says, "We read of Abraham's wife Sarah, who gave her handmaiden Hagar to Abraham to be his wife, and the result was that Sarah was despised in the eyes of Hagar." He also refers to Jacob having trouble in his family in consequence of polygamy. On the same principle of argument, a man should not marry at all, for thousands of cases might be cited in which a man does not agree with his one wife; or that a father should not be the father of more than one child because there is often trouble in large families; or have more than one servant because servants often disagree. I wish to state that the envy and trouble in the families of Abraham and Jacob were not the result of polygamy. The principle of polygamy was no more responsible for the grievances in the families of Abraham and Jacob than Jesus was for the complaining of Martha against Mary's attention to him. The result of Sarah giving Abraham Hagar to wife was that Sarah became the mother of Isaac; and the result of Leah giving her handmaiden to Jacob to wife was that she had a son, using her own words, "Now I know God hath given me my hire, because I gave my handmaid to my husband to wife." If "Equality" is right in stating that polygamy is an ungodly thing, then the Lord must have made some mistake in stating, when visiting Abraham on the Plains of Mamre, "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which He hath spoken of him," Genesis xviii., 19. Now, if polygamy be such an ungodly thing, it may be that "Equality" does not refer to the God of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Gideon, Adam, Elkanah, Ashur, Shalahaim, Rehoboam, Jehoida, Abijah, Jair, Jerubael, David, and Solomon, all of whom were polygamists, and all of whom God blessed. And in no one instance did ever the prophets, the apostles, Jesus, or God himself say one word against them for being polygamists; but, strange to say, "Equality" finds fault with the whole of them. "Equality" says that Solomon repented of being a polygamist, and eulogized monogamy, and in proof of which he refers me to the following passages, Ecclesiastes vii., 29, which reads: "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions;" also Ecclesiastes viii., 9, "All this I have seen, and applied my heart to every work that is done under the sun; there is a time wherein one man ruleth over another to his own hurt." What

bearing have these quotations on the subject of polygamy? "Equality" admits that Solomon was a God-fearing man in the early part of his life, and that God loved him; but afterwards, he states, that he took unto himself many strange women, which turned his heart away from the Lord; all of which is true according to the Bible. "Equality" will do well to take into consideration that it was not while Solomon took unto himself wives of the house of Israel that the Lord was displeased with him, but it was when he took unto himself wives who did not believe in the God of Israel. What about this saying of the Lord to David, through the prophet Nathan, "And I gave thee thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would moreover have given thee such and such things."

"Equality" asks, that if the Latter-day Saints advocate that every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, why do I advocate polygamy? I do not understand what this has to do with the principle of polygamy. David took another man's wife, and the Lord condemned him for it, and yet he was a husband to each one of his wives.

"Equality" mis-quotes my remarks in stating that I said polygamy is a necessity because of the excess of marriageable women over that of men. My words were "men eligible to marry," which to me has a very different bearing. "Equality" lays a great stress on the words, "Adam and Eve being one flesh in the beginning." I do not understand why "Equality" remains so long in the Garden of Eden, seeing that Adam and Eve have left it themselves. Why does he not leave it, and follow creation as it goes along, and observe how the Lord arranges matters for the redemption of man. Man is not as he was first made, as I have before explained; had he remained as he was, there would have been no need of polygamy. So far as relating to Adam and Eve being one flesh is concerned, I am aware the Bible states that Eve was made of part of Adam's own body, but my wife was not made that way, neither have I heard of any other wife having been made as Eve was. The saying, therefore, which refers to man and his wife being one can only mean one in purpose and in all things, which can also be the case with two, three, or more, as is frequently expressed in the Bible—"Be ye one in Me." &c. According to "Equality's" reasoning, a man cannot be one with his wives, children, servants, friends, or brethren, and would be like a house divided against itself.

He says I did not answer his question wherein he asked me to refer him to a place in the New Testament in favor of polygamy. I did show that there was not a place in the New Testament that spoke one word against polygamy; also, that polygamy had been a custom among the Jews from the days of Abraham, and was looked upon as sacred as any of the laws of Moses. Now, if "Equality" was a pleader-at-law, and could establish the fact that a law did exist pertaining to a subject, and that it had been acted upon for hundreds of years without opposition, and that nothing could be found on the statutes that the said law had been repealed, he would at once gain his point. The same applies to the law of polygamy amongst the Jews in the days of the Apostles. Jesus and the Apostles made it a special part of their mission to speak against the abominations of the Jews, amongst which they named whoredom, fornication, adultery, and lust, but not polygamy. Had polygamy been such an ungodly thing they certainly would have said something about it.

Does "Equality" expect a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah v chap., 1 v., speaking of the last days, in which he says, "In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." It is to be hoped for the sake of "Equality's" feelings that he will not be one of those men.

If "Equality's" views be a fair representation of those who are promoting the Bible as a standard for morals, and polygamy be an ungodly thing, then I blush for their standard of religion; and better would it be for them to burn their Bibles if such be the case as stated

by "Equality," and live a moral life, and save their money to educate the rising generation, and thereby cease offering the Bible as a standard of virtue.

The Latter-day Saints, believe, as the ancients did, in the blessings of wives and children, and in raising children in the fear of the Lord. The better the man, the more worthy he is to be entrusted with them. No greater blessing did the Lord ever make to man than that his children should be so numerous that they could not be numbered. They further believe that a man who is not capable to take care of himself is not fit to marry one wife, and has no business to raise children like unto himself. They encourage and permit women to have their choice, and they make laws whereby women are made honorable in marrying men who will love and take care of them and their children, and they hold every man responsible for his wife or wives. In the next place, they do not look upon marriage as a necessity to gratify man's passions, for Nature has made that provision independent of marriage. For example, look at the social condition of this great nation. Lastly, they look upon marriage as an institution ordained of God, that men may be responsible for their children and wives; that children may be raised by good and honorable parents. Violation of chastity amongst the Latter-day Saints is looked upon as one of the greatest of crimes. The result was that before the Latter-day Saints had introduced into their midst corrupt judges, broken-down politicians and lawyers, and other professing Christian monogamists who sought lust and worldly pleasure, instead of the improvement of the human race, there was not a prostitute in all Utah, nor a gaming-house, drinking saloon, or tipping shop; neither had they any of the loathsome "blessings" of this so-called Christian monogamic country, nor a child disowned by his father, nor women with children born out of wedlock. And, to-day, in places where the Latter-day Saints are left to themselves, these evils are unknown.

I have been connected with the Latter-day Saints since the year 1838, and am well acquainted with them and their leaders. I have been with them in their public and private councils, and in their general labors of life, and can testify before all men that their greatest object is to bless and exalt the human race.—Yours very respectfully, J. BIRCH.

—Bolton (England) Guardian, Nov. 8.

No Cause for War with Spain.

GEN. PRYOR'S PROTEST AGAINST HASTY ACTION—LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE CASE—WAR ENOUGH FOR ONE GENERATION.

It is evident that a war with Spain is imminent; and it is equally certain, though probably not so evident to the multitude, that the United States are ill-prepared for war, and that war, even with Spain, will involve this country in very serious commercial and industrial disasters. The writer, while indignant at the butchery of the *Virginian*'s passengers, and as sensitive as any to the honor of the American flag, thinks, nevertheless, we have no *casus belli* with Spain; and that it is the duty of every citizen in the interest of peace to check the headlong passions of the people.

These propositions are submitted as enunciating indisputable principles of international law:

1. That a neutral vessel may be searched on the high seas; and, if found carrying contraband of war, may be seized and confiscated by adjudication of the Court of Admiralty.
2. Much more may a neutral vessel be seized on the high seas and condemned, if it carry soldiers to the assistance of the belligerent.
3. The right to search, seize, and condemn the neutral vessel is not affected by the fact that the party for whom the contraband and troops are intended is an unrecognized community of rebels. The case of the *Trent* is not inconsistent, since she was transporting hostile individuals to a neutral country.
4. The legitimate government has the right to exact the forfeit of life of such of its own subjects as rise in armed revolt against its authority, and has the right to punish with death subjects of a neutral power engaged in the revolt.

5. The high sea is the property of no nation, or rather is the property of all nations equally; and a neutral subject taken on the high seas with arms, and in the act of going to the aid of the revolt, forfeits his life to the captor.

6. It is the duty of a neutral nation to prevent the issue from its ports of a hostile expedition in aid of the revolt, and if it be incompetent to the fulfillment of the obligation, the injured power may enforce the correlative right. Hence, Spain might have as much right to oblige the United States to observe their neutral obligations as the United States have to restrain or punish by force the excesses of the Cuban people on the pretext that their government was incompetent to do the duty.

The first fault was committed by the United States in allowing the departure of the *Virginian* on its illicit and criminal errand, and they are in no position to complain of consequences. It is notorious that the *Virginian* was fitted out in our ports for the express purpose of carrying men and munitions to the aid of the Cuban revolt; that she was caught in the act of carrying reinforcements to rebels; and the consequence is that she is forfeit, and the belligerent individuals on board were subject to execution under the laws of war. They were outlaws, and had no claim to the protection either of public law, nor of the laws of the United States.

If these propositions be correct, then, however execrable the conduct of the Cuban volunteers, and however our blood may boil with indignation at their barbarity, the United States have no legitimate cause of war with Spain. Surely we have had war enough for one generation, and our forbearance will rather challenge admiration for the self-poise of a great people than expose them to the suspicion of pusillanimity. ROGER A. PRYOR.

—N. Y. Tribune.

MENNONITE MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned, belonging to the Christian denomination called MENNONITES OF SOUTH RUSSIA AND PRUSSIA, in our own behalf, and that of our brethren, respectfully address the following to you:

For three generations our denomination has lived in Russia under their own control, free to enjoy, as a separate colony, our own religion, language, lands and customs, the Russian Government only interfering to punish crimes and to collect its revenues. Now, by a recent edict of the Russian Government, passed 4th (16th) June, 1871, we are deprived of all those rights, liberties and privileges, which had been granted to us forever, and the choice is presented to us of leaving Russia within ten years from the above-mentioned date, or after that time become Russianized in language and religion. In Prussia, where we lived for more than 200 years in the liberty of conscience, the Government acted the same.

We have determined to emigrate to some country where we can enjoy civil, social and religious liberty.

By examining your Constitution and country, we find the full assurance that, under your Constitution and laws, we shall find the liberty we so earnestly desire, and the sentiment expressed by President Grant, in his message of March 3, 1873, gives us great encouragement.

Desirous of settling in your country in colonies, there is, however, one obstacle in the way. The unimproved lands, which we would be likely to select for our future homes, being owned, in alternate sections, by railroads and the Government; if we should purchase from the railroad companies, some of the sections belonging to the Government would be taken up by persons who do not belong to our colony, and who are not in sympathy with us. Besides this, our mode of farming is for fifteen or twenty families to join together on a large tract of land, and to have portions of it set aside for common pasture, where all the horses and cattle may graze together, kept by one herder. This saves much expense in fencing.

It will require time, no doubt the eight years yet open for emigration, before all property in Russia can be disposed of, business finally settled,

and the last of our brethren brought to their new home.

In behalf, therefore, of our brethren, numbering between forty and fifty thousand, we would respectfully ask:

1. That if we select portions of railroad lands in different places, suitable to our different wants, as cattle raisers, agriculturists, &c., that we be allowed to take up and secure the sections of Government lands lying adjacent thereto, either by purchase or under the homestead laws, and to reserve the same until the year 1881.

2. If we find unoccupied bodies of land belonging to the Government, suited to our purpose, that we be allowed the same privilege of taking up and securing a sufficient quantity of land protected from the interference of outside parties.

The Canadian Government has offered to present us as much land as we would occupy, within the before-mentioned time, but a party of us would prefer to settle in the United States, if the opportunity is given us to locate in colonies.

Our only object being to care for those in distress, should there be anything in our petition looking like speculation, we beg you will prevent it.

"Justice exalts a nation," says the word of God, and if you will use your great influence to promote this mission, and assist the emigration of those who are persecuted for conscience' sake, you will have the deepest thanks of the sorrow-stricken Mennonites of Russia and Prussia, and what is much more, the blessings of Him who says, that even a drink of cold water shall not be without its reward.

We are, with high estimation, SOME OF THE EMIGRANTS FROM RUSSIA AND PRUSSIA, CALLED MENNONITES.

P. S.—Our residence being transitory, if any reference should be required, we beg to address to our brethren, Rev. Amos Herr, Lancaster county, Pa., and John F. Funk, Elkhart, Indiana, who are in sympathy with us and conversant with our movements.

Love, Honor and Obey.—On the whole, married women, that is, real women, prefer being ruled to ruling. It is natural to a woman to seek advice. It is scarcely in her nature to go speechlessly on doing what she has to do without aid or counsel. Almost any one of our sex is happier if she can "talk things over" with some man upon whose discretion she relies; and in married life most wives do, even in the smallest things, what "he" likes, and fancy that they like it themselves. Since independence has become the fashion, and strong-minded women have sneered at their more gentle sisters, there is a great affliction of despising the opinion of the gentlemen, but it is all sheer pretense. Almost every wife chooses her gloves and her ribbons of the tint her husband admires, and the man she loves almost inevitably gives her her political opinions, and biases even her religious views. Her speech, her dress, her manner, changes under his influence. What he desires her to do she does in nine cases out of ten, the tenth case we find in the divorce courts. You may rule your wife as you please, good married reader, if you love and pet her enough. Haughtiness and fault-finding alone will make her restive. And, you, dear girls, remember that it will be well to choose a husband good and noble and upright, so that you may obey him to your heart's content without losing your own self-respect; for you will obey him if you love him; and if he be low and mean, you will sink to his level slowly but surely in the course of years.

MARY KYLE DALLAS.

—It is all very well to talk economy, and practice it, too. But those who have plenty of means should spend more freely than usual in a time of financial stringency, in order to prevent a stagnation of business and keep labor in demand. Were everybody to reduce expenses to a minimum at once, all business would be at a stand still and society would become a vast pauper establishment in three months. One-third of our people are just as well off to-day as ever, and when a man who has grown richer by the crisis that has impoverished so many, reduces the expenditures of his family to panic necessities, and tries to make his servants and clerks work for half pay, he becomes a public enemy. And we are sorry to say there are not a few just such mean men and contemptible.—N. Y. Graphic.