

## Correspondence.

BETWEEN

REV. DR. NEWMAN

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

AND

President BRIGHAM YOUNG.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 8, 1870.

To PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG,

Sir:—Your last note, delivered to me on Sunday morning, and to which, of course, I would not on that day reply, does not at all surprise me.

It will be, however, impossible for you to conceal from the public the truth, that with the full knowledge of my being present in your city for the purpose of debating with you or your representative the question of Polygamy, you declined to enter into any arrangements for such a discussion; and after this fact was ascertained, I felt at liberty to comply with a subsequent request from other parties, which had been fully arranged before the reception of your note of invitation to preach in your Tabernacles.

I must frankly say that I regard your professed courtesy, extended under the circumstances, as it was, a mere device to cover, if possible, your unwillingness to have a fair discussion of the matter in question in the hearing of your people.

Your comments upon "disclaiming and declining the discussion" are simply a reiteration of the disclaimer; while, in regard to your notice of my construction of the article in the *Telegraph* of May last, I have only to leave the representations you have seen fit to make to the judgment of a candid public sure to discover who it is that has been resorting to "subterfuge" in this affair. Your intimation that Elder Sloan, Prof. Pratt, or hundreds of other Mormon elders, would be willing to discuss the question of Polygamy with me from a Bible standpoint, and your impertinent suggestion that I tarry here as a missionary for that purpose, I am compelled to regard as cheap and safe attempts to avoid the appearance of shrinking from such discussion by seeming to invite it after it had, by your own action, been rendered impossible. As to the elders you speak of, including yourself, being ready to meet me in public debate, I have to say that I came here with that understanding and expectation, but it was rudely dispelled, on being definitely tested. Were it possible to reduce these vague suggestions of yours to something like a distinct proposition for a debate, there is still nothing in your action, so far, to assure me of your sincerity, but, on the contrary, everything to cause me to distrust it.

I have one more point of remark. You have insinuated that my motive is a thirst for "notoriety." I can assure you that if I had been animated by such a motive you give me small credit for good sense by supposing that I would employ such means. Neither you, nor the system of which you are the head, could afford me any "notoriety" to be desired.

But, to show how far I have been governed by merely personal aspirations, let the simple history of the case be recalled.

You send your Delegate to Congress who, in the House of Representatives and in sight and hearing of the whole Nation, throws down the gauntlet upon the subject of Polygamy as treated in the Bible. Being Chaplain of the American Senate, and having been consulted by several public men, I deemed it my duty to preach upon the subject. The discourse was published in the *New York Herald*, and on this reaching your city one of your Elders published an article which is generally construed as a challenge to me to debate the question with you, or some one whom you should appoint, here in your Tabernacle. Acting upon this presumption, I visit your city, taking the earliest opportunity to inform you, as the head of the Mormon Church, of my purpose and suggesting the steps usual in such cases. You then reply, ignoring the whole subject, but without a hint of your "pleasure" about my preaching in the Tabernacle.

Subsequently other arrangements were made which precluded my accepting any invitation to speak in your places of worship. The day passed away, and after sunset I received your note of invitation, my reply to which will answer for itself. And this you intimate is an attempt on my part to obtain an "unenviable notoriety."

Sir, I have done with you—make what representation of the matter you think proper, you will not succeed in mislead-

ing the discriminating people either of this Territory or of the country generally by any amount of verbiage you may choose to employ.

Respectfully, &amp;c.,

J. P. NEWMAN.

[The communication referred to in the letter below was addressed to Dr. Newman by five persons, who asked him whether it was a fact that he was unwilling to debate the question of polygamy now and here, as that was the impression, they say, the *DESERET EVENING NEWS* and *Salt Lake Herald* conveyed.]

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 9, 1870.

To MR. BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—In view of the enclosed communications, received from several citizens of this place, asking whether I am ready now and here to debate the question "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" with you, as the Chief of the Church of Latter-day Saints, and in view of the defiant tone of your Church journals of last evening and this morning; and in view of the fact that I have been here now four days waiting to have you inform me of your willingness to meet me in public discussion on the above question, but having received no such intimation up to this time of writing, therefore, I do now and here challenge you to meet me in personal and public debate, on the aforesaid question. I respectfully suggest that you appoint two gentlemen to meet Rev. Dr. Sunderland and Dr. J. P. Taggart, who represent me, to make all necessary arrangements for the discussion.

Be kind enough to favor me with an immediate reply.

Respectfully,

J. P. NEWMAN.

Residence of Rev. Mr. Pierce.

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T.

August 9th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—Your communication of to-day's date, with accompanying enclosure, was handed to me a few moments since by Mr. Black.

In reply, I will say that I accept the challenge to debate the question "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" Professor Orson Pratt or Hon. John Taylor acting as my representative, and in my stead in the discussion. I will furnish the place of holding the meetings, and appoint two gentlemen to meet Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart, to whom you refer as your representatives, to make the necessary arrangements.

I wish the discussion to be conducted in a mild, peaceable, quiet spirit, that the people may receive light and intelligence and all be benefited; and then let the congregation decide for themselves.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

CITY, Aug. 9th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—I have appointed Messrs. A. Carrington and Jos. W. Young to meet with Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart, to arrange preliminaries for the discussion.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 9, 1870

To MR. BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—I challenged you to a discussion and not Orson Pratt or John Taylor. You have declined to debate personally with me. Let the public distinctly understand this fact, whatever may have been your reasons for so declining. Here I think I might reasonably rest the case. However, if Orson Pratt is prepared to take the affirmative of the question, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I am prepared to take the negative, and Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart will meet Messrs. Carrington and Young to-night at 8 o'clock at the office of Mr. Taggart to make the necessary arrangements.

Respectfully, &amp;c.,

J. P. NEWMAN.

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T.,

August 10th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—I am informed by Messrs. Carrington and Young that at their meeting last evening with Drs. Sunderland

and Taggart they were unable to come to a decision with regard to the wording of the subject of debate.

Bearing in mind the following facts: Firstly, That you are the challenging party. Secondly, That in a sermon delivered by you in the city of Washington, before President Grant and his Cabinet, Members of Congress and many other prominent gentlemen, you assumed to prove that "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," it certainly seems strange that your representatives should persistently refuse to have any other question discussed than the one, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" It appears to the representatives of Mr. Pratt that if Dr. Newman could undertake to prove in Washington that "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," he ought not to refuse to make the same affirmation in Salt Lake City. Mr. Pratt, I discover, entertains the same opinion, but rather than permit the discussion to fall, he will not press for your original proposition, but will accept the question as you now state it, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?"

I sincerely trust that none of the gentlemen forming the committee will encumber the discussion with unnecessary regulations, which will be irksome to both parties and unproductive of good, and that no obstacles will be thrown in the way of having a free and fair discussion.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

By the courtesy of President George A. Smith, we are enabled to lay before our readers the following interesting letter from Australia:

SIDNEY, N.S.W., 26th June, '70.

To PREST. GEO. A. SMITH:

Dear Brother:—I write by the direction of our dearly beloved father in Israel, Elder Robert Beauchamp, to tell you that he is confined to his bed with very severe illness, or nervous prostration, which I think is measurably the result of the hardships he has endured while on this mission. Br. Beauchamp arrived here in December last, via Melbourne, and on the 2d of Jan., in this year, organized a branch of ten members, which has since increased to sixteen, not counting children. Br. Beauchamp was sorely tried in forming this little branch, contending with vile apostasy, for he found several Elders (or persons who claimed to be such) here, who professed the faith, but did not manifest the same in their works. Br. Beauchamp called them to give an account of their stewardship, and a wretched account it was. No meetings had been held for some eight years, and numbers of books and thousands of O. Pratt's tracts shut up in boxes all that time. Well, all that repented were rebaptized and some were cut off for disobedience of counsel, though Br. B. declared that none, or no branch, should be cut off while a single green spot remained.

Having set things in order in Sidney, on the 3d day of March, Elder Beauchamp left Sydney for New Zealand, going via Melbourne, and on the 18th of June, he again arrived in Sydney, having organized a branch at a place named Karori, near Wellington, consisting of some forty members, chiefly whole families. Br. Beauchamp left these in the care of Br. H. Allington, of the above address. A few days after his arrival in Sydney, he received letters to the effect that several more had been added to the branch at Karori since his departure. While in New Zealand, Elder Beauchamp got roughly handled, being pelted with various missiles of a most vulgar character, and otherwise abused. Talk of philanthropy! the efforts of Gentiles are thrown in the shade beside such magnanimous efforts as these for the salvation of the human race! What heroism can be compared to this? Coming without purse or script, and while crossing the Pacific, sleeping among ropes, and then, single handed, declaring doctrines the most unpopular in the land! Bravely has Brother B. endured this tribulation! When he went to Karori, the only ministration they had there was the visit of a Church of England Clergyman once a week, grinding over the old, old tunes.

After Brother B. had baptized eight or nine persons, nearly every room that could be obtained was nightly occupied by various preachers. The place seemed alive with them. The parson aforesaid, Mr. Toomuth, by name, challenged Bro. B. to a public discussion, which was accepted, and resulted in the baptism of three persons, who attended. The parson abused Bro. B. on the sub-

ject of polygamy, and Bro. B. asked him if ever he expected to sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of our Father; for the Parson had called Jacob a "besotted old beast," and the wives of polygamists "female she-beasts." This for an educated man, college bred, you may guess how he lost his temper.

But to return, Bro. Beauchamp is really very ill in bed; he has had the ordinance for the healing of the sick administered to him several times during the week, and he has faith that he will recover. The field is very large, and Bro. B. has traveled a good deal, sometimes very uncomfortably. He desires me to ask you to communicate with Mrs. Beauchamp, his wife, and tell her that he was too sick to write to her this mail.

The Saints of this mission desire to convey to you their unbounded admiration of their sisters in Utah, or Zion, upon reading their speeches at the various indignation meetings lately held there. The Saints here are very anxious to come to Zion with songs, and share in her blessings and tribulations,

"With her to stand and fight or flee,  
As the command of God shall be."

We hope to be numbered among the thousands John saw, the multitude out of every kindom, or kindred, nation, tongue and people, who had come up out of great tribulation. The Latter-day Saints are the only people that have ever been gathered as above.

I am, and pray that I ever shall be,  
Your brother in the gospel,

ALBERT W. ASPINALL,

Teacher in the Sydney Branch of  
the Church of Jesus Christ of  
Latter-day Saints.

THE *Alta California* says the main hope of the farmers of California is to escape from the necessity of producing wheat for exportation, and to substitute for it other products which command a higher and steadier price, have less competition, require less labor in proportion to price, and are more regular in their yield. It takes pride in the fact that California has within a few years, risen to be one of the great wheat-exporting countries of the world; but it would have much more cause for pride if they had manufacturers to consume all their wheat, and could export dried fruit, wines and similar articles to the value of \$10,000,000 annually, instead of cereals. It thinks wheat must certainly give up its supremacy as an export, but there is doubt as yet as to the article that is to supersede it first. It is confident that within half a century their wine, silk, and orchard products will each take a greater place in their export lists, than their wheat, but the time may be much nearer at hand. If assured of a good profit on wine, it believes that California could send 8,000,000 gallons of wine to New York in 1871. Cashmere wool and combing wool, olive oil, almonds, raisins, dried figs and other fruits all promise well, and will, it thinks, contribute to supply exports, which will be worth from five to ten times as much per pound as the freight to Liverpool, while their wheat is usually not worth twice as much.

One of the most severe criticisms of a book that we have lately seen is one that appears in *The Citizen and Round Table*, on a book called "Life in Utah," which an ambitious penny-a-liner has lately issued. The critic thus describes it:

"This is a 'subscription book,' and like most subscription books it has a title so long as to be equivalent to a table of contents—a title that, we need hardly say, we have greatly abridged. It has also many of the usual features of books published by mysterious publishing companies, and intended to be sold to subscribers only. The cover is gaudy and tasteless, the paper is thin, coarse and gray, and the type large and sprawling. The illustrations are, of course, ludicrous—it being well established that the people who buy subscription books have a mad infatuation for execrable woodcuts. It might be urged with perfect truth that so many books have already been written on the subject of the Mormons, that no one can now tell us anything new about them. Still the fact remains that this book does distinctly inform us that Joseph Smith founded the Mormon Church, that Brigham Young is now its visible head, and that the Saints practice polygamy, is quite unprecedented. We can, therefore, confidently recommend 'Life in Utah' as a work nearly as interesting as the Reports so kindly issued by the philanthropic managers of the Patent Office."

The development of the Illinois coal fields is claimed to be due to a farmer near Springfield, who thought that such a country could not be destined by Providence to be without fuel. "The wood is nearly gone," said he to himself; "ergo there must be coal," in this almost whimsical faith he sunk a shaft 160 feet, and then struck a vein of excellent bituminous coal, of which he is now mining to the amount of \$2,700 per week.