



Type: Book Chapter

Chapter II

Author(s): Helen Mar Whitney

Source: *Why We Practice Plural Marriage*

Published: Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1884

Pages: 23–54

Abstract: The author discussed a number of her interactions with non-Latter-day Saint visitors to the Utah Territory, and how many of them came away favorably impressed with the Latter-day Saint people and overcame their prejudices towards women engaged in plural marriage. She also quotes at length from a non-Latter-day Saint publication which extolled the merits of polygamy versus traditional monogamy. Towards the end of the chapter the author states, "Though looked down upon by the world we consider ourselves the most highly honored people on the earth and console ourselves with the reflection that we will yet be looked up to and regarded as the founders of a superior system of Christianity."

CHAPTER II.

I WILL now produce another picture from real life, which sets the other quite in the shade:

Among the thousands who pass through our city, we occasionally meet some who seek information from the proper source, and they appear overwhelmed with wonder to find things so very different from what they have been represented by people outside, particularly by lying correspondents, who care for nothing only the sensational. An instance of this kind happened last Fall:

A gentleman and his wife, who came from the States, planned, before they started, to come to Salt Lake and learn all they could of the "Mormons" and their peculiar doctrines. They were on their way to the Warm Springs, and one of our sisters, named Raleigh, being in the car, they made some inquiries of her and finding her to be an old resident, the lady stepped over to where she was sitting. A'ter informing her for what they had come, and that they were anxious to see some one who would tell them the truth about this people, she entered into conversation. The visitor expressing a great desire to see a wife of Joseph Smith, Sister Raleigh accompanied her to Sister E. R. Snow Smith's. They remained two or more days longer than they had intended. Sister Raleigh took the lady to a number of places, and called and spent an hour or more with me. I gave her a cordial welcome and invited her to be free and outspoken. She complied in a modest and unassuming manner, and I took great pleasure in answering her questions and relating some of my experience and that of others in the order of plural marriage.

I did not try to conceal the fact of its having been a trial, but confessed that it had been one of the severest of my life; but that it had also proven one of the greatest of blessings.

I could truly say it had done the most towards making me a Saint and a free woman, in every sense of the word; and I knew many others who could say the same, and to whom it had proven one of the greatest boons—a “blessing in disguise.” As for its being degrading it had proven to be the very opposite. It was exalting in its tendency and calculated to raise mankind from the degraded condition into which they had fallen under the practice of a corrupt and hypocritical system of enforced monogamy. I told her of our future hopes, which I knew we should enjoy, and they would be reward enough for the sacrifice we were making for the great good it would accomplish, not only for ourselves but for generations unborn.

Her looks showed the astonishment she felt, she having heard the statement of the Josephites that the Prophet never introduced or taught such a principle. She could not help seeing and feeling the truth of our testimony. She acknowledged this was a superior religion, and that our mode of plural marriage was the only thing that would ever purify society, though she did not know how she could bear the trial, as she and her husband had always lived so happily together. She drew the contrast between our social system, which is practiced openly and above board, and the loose state of morals where she dwells—even in circles that claim to be genteel and refined and would fain be regarded as very models of propriety. The secret iniquities that were winked at and sanctioned by society had made her think better of the “Mormons,” who were spoken evil of by this very class. She had always said, from a child, that she would, some day, visit this people.

Her husband had been, for many years, the proprietor of a large hotel in one of the western cities, which had been her home from the time they were married. But she had seen enough of the hypocrisy and sin that prevail and are fostered in the midst of society. She related instances where married and unmarried ladies of wealth and influence came there closely veiled to meet clandestinely with men who were fathers and husbands. And this illegal and revolting practice, she said, was carried on day and night, among different classes; and, what was worse, they were mostly church-goers and very dis-

tinguished patterns of propriety, who desired so much to convert and bring the "Mormons" up (?) to their own level. Oftentimes those women, she said, were accompanied by their daughters, and even little children came with their mothers for a blind, and in this way were being led into the same path of vice by coming in contact with it. Being a mother herself and seeing the dangers that beset her own children, they had, long since, moved into a separate house.

When I enquired why they did not come out and expose such iniquities, she informed me that it would be utter folly to undertake it, as the guilty ones were among the most influential people, and it would only break up their establishment, and end in their own financial ruin. She said these things were what had caused them to think more kindly of this people; and the more they saw the more their hearts turned towards Utah. When we parted she assured me that they should come again, with their little family, to spend a season with us in our "lovely garden city." She gave me her address and I have sent her numbers of our papers.

In a letter received from her, by Sister Raleigh, she acknowledged the receipt of the papers, and expressed her appreciation of the same; also their kind remembrance of the few pleasant days spent in Salt Lake, and wishing to be remembered to all whom she had met here. She said she had made it a subject of prayer to bring herself to know the will of God, that they might be enabled to receive the truth from the proper source. Just previous to coming here they had lost their eldest daughter by sudden death, and their deep sorrow had helped to draw their hearts upward and they were thereby made ready to receive the seeds of truth. I am satisfied there are thousands who have the same feelings which she expressed and would receive this gospel had they the moral courage to face a frowning world.

The iniquities she speaks of are not at all new, but are things which have been growing and increasing from year to year, until corruption in high places has become so glaring and frightful that the honest portion will soon be obliged to come out of Sodom and Gomorrah, or be consumed. For the

vengeance of the Almighty is already beginning to be poured out upon them, and it will never cease until this earth is emptied of its corruptions and burned until it has become purified and fitted for the pure in heart to dwell here and enjoy the privilege of serving God according to the dictates of their consciences.

It is no wonder that they of the world have so many domestic broils and law-suits for divorce, etc.; nor that children born of such parents, with the constant example before them, should turn out prostitutes and fit subjects for a life of crime and debauchery. How much more terrible is the sin, when committed by those whose every reasonable want or desire can be gratified! They are of the class who vaunt their "purity," and call it vulgar to "bear the souls of men," or to raise up families, which should be considered the glory of woman. There is far greater safety and happiness in taking the course marked out by the great and all-wise Creator, than to trifle with His laws: and it is the universal testimony of physicians that the amount of suffering and premature old age is vastly greater among those who outrage the laws of God and nature—thinking to avoid trouble and expense in bearing and rearing what they term "a surplus of children." It may be popular to believe that such women will live longer and happier than the patient, toiling mother, who raises up a large family of children; but I feel positive that her life is happier a thousand fold, and that such more generally retain their fresh and youthful looks than those who shirk their duties and become the slaves of passion and dissipation.

But to resume. The Rev. T. Dewitt Talmage, of Brooklyn, has given the world the benefit of some midnight explorations, showing what exists in the midst of those righteous (?) souls who are so fearful of contamination from a people afar off that are guilty of the awful crime of marrying all the women they live with and acknowledging them as wives. Says he:

"I could call the names of many of the frequenters of these haunts of sin—judges of courts, distinguished lawyers, officers in churches, political orators that talk on the Republican,

Democratic and greenback platforms about God and good morals, until you might almost take them for evangelists, expecting a thousand converts in one night. I have something to tell you more astonishing than that the houses of iniquity are supported by wealthy people, when I tell you they are supported by the heads of families—fathers and husbands, with the awful perjury upon them of broken marriage vows; and while many of them keep their families on niggardly portions, with hardly enough to sustain life, have spent their thousands for the diamonds, and wardrobe, and equipage of iniquity. In the name of high heaven I cry out against this popular iniquity. Such men must be cast out from social life and from business relations. If they will not reform, overboard with them from all decent circles. I lift one half the burden of malediction from the unpitied head of woman and hurl it upon the blasted pate of offending man. By what law of justice does the burning excoriation of society pursue offending woman down off the precipice, while offending man goes kid-gloved into respectable circles, invited up if he has any means, forwarded into political recognition, and all the doors of high life opening to the rap of his gold-headed cane.”

It might be asked here, why the Rev. Dr. Talmage does not try upon such people his “Christian” method of “thundering into them the seventh commandment” with United States artillery. Such is what he advises for the purification of “Mormonism.”

The plural marriage system practiced in this Church, and the motive which prompted the few who have accepted it, stand high compared with the loathsome vices practiced among the refined and intellectual ladies and gentlemen in the Eastern States, or any other States in the Union. Divorces and foeticide are already more common than marriages among them. Over six thousand women in the United States, it is stated by a clergyman who lectured at New Haven, “die every year from attempts to destroy unborn children.” And even this does not reach the extent to which this crime is practiced among that class who profess Christian sanctity and are so horrified over the “much-married Mormons.”

The following was quoted by Senator Brown, in his late speech, from a lecture delivered in Boston, by Mr. Dike:

"The courts are crowded with unhappy couples, and often the cases are dispatched with unseemly haste. There is a daughter of a prosperous farmer, still a young woman, who has been divorced from three husbands, each of whom is living and married to another wife, while she has been lately married to the fourth husband. Nor is this the only one or the worst case of the kind reported in the State of Connecticut. Two Vermonters deliberately swapped wives by aid of the courts. Young people coolly reckon on divorce in contracting marriage. A Vermont couple married on trial for six months, agreeing to get a divorce if either party did not like."

He quotes the following from what was written a year ago by Professor Phelps, of Andover College:

"We are not half awake to the fact that by our laws of divorce and our toleration of the 'social evil' we are doing more to corrupt the nation's heart than Mormonism, tenfold."

Senator Brown denied the truth of the statement that the "Mormons" were in rebellion against the government of the United States. He said,

"The Mormons are not in rebellion against the United States in any legal acceptation of that term. They are a quiet, peaceable people, who have comfortable homes, work hard and make an honest living, and who worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, and, as a mass, believe they are right. * * * * * * *"

Why, then, should the government pour the vials of its wrath upon the heads of the Mormon offenders and take no steps to punish an infinitely more numerous, and equally wicked, army of offenders living in the States and other Territories? The Mormons may well turn to us and say, 'Physician, heal thyself.' Or, in the language of Him who spake as never man spoke, may turn and look us in the face, and may justly say, 'Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.'"

The author of an interesting work, entitled "Plain Facts," says of the prevailing crime of infanticide:

"That they are increasing with fearful rapidity and have nearly reached such a magnitude as to seriously affect the growth of civilized nations and to threaten their very existence, has become a potent fact to observing physicians."

The following he quotes from another author:

"Of all the sins, physical and moral, against man and God, I know of none so utterly to be condemned. So utterly repugnant is it that I can scarcely express the loathing with which I approach the subject. Murder!—murder in cold blood, without cause, of an unknown child; one's nearest relative; in fact, part of one's very being, actually having not only one's own blood in its being, but that blood momentarily interchanging! Good God! Does it seem possible that such depravity can exist in a parent's breast—in a mother's heart? 'Tis for no wrong that it has committed that its sweet life is so cruelly taken away. Its coming is no disgrace: its creation was not in sin; but its mother don't want to be bothered with any more brats; can hardly take care of what she has got; is going to Europe in the Spring. * * * * *

For the married shirk, who disregards her divinely-ordained duty, we have nothing but contempt, even if she be the lordly woman of fashion, clothed in purple and fine linen. If glittering gems adorn her person, within there is foulness and squalor."

Another writer says:

"From a very large verbal and written correspondence in this and other States, I am satisfied that we have become a *nation of murderers*."

A distinguished clergyman, of Brooklyn, uttered the following:

"Why send missionaries to India when child-murder is here of daily, almost hourly, occurrence; aye, when the hand that puts money into the contribution-box to-day, yesterday, or a month ago, or to-morrow, will murder her own unborn offspring?"

"Many influences," says the author of "Plain Facts," "may combine to cause the mother ruthlessly to destroy her helpless child: as, to conceal the results of sin; to avoid the burdens of maternity; to secure ease and freedom to travel, etc.; or even from a false idea that maternity is vulgar: but it is true, beyond all question, that the primary cause of their sin is far back of all these influences. The most unstinted and scathing invectives are used in characterizing the criminality of a mother who takes the life of her unborn babe; but a word is seldom said of the one who forced upon her the circumstances which gave the unfortunate one existence. Though doctors, ministers and moralists have said much on this subject, and written more, it is reasonable to suppose that they will never accomplish much of anything in the direction of reform until they recognize the part that man acts in all of these sad cases, and begin to demand reform where it is most needed, and where its achievements will effect the most good."

If it was crime they wished to repress, they could, as he implies, find a broad field at home, and save the expense and trouble of sending commissioners to search for iniquity in Utah. But have they really the agents of reform which they claim, and are their effects desirable? Says the author of "Plain Facts:"

"The North American Indians, when first discovered in their native wilds, were free from vices and consequent diseases of civilization. This fact points unmistakably to the conclusion that there must be something in the refinements and perversions of civilized life which is unfavorable to chastity, notwithstanding all the restraints which religion and the conventionalisms of society impose. * * The standard of virtue is trailing in the dust."

Professing such great sympathy for "these poor females" as to emancipate them "from the slavery of voting," is in keeping with the rest of their hypocrisy. We would be glad if Senator Edmunds and a great many more could hear the real opinion of the "Mormon" women, who are "at liberty to speak for themselves," and are more than willing to give them "the free exercise of those opinions." Possibly they would

return wiser if not better judges of the human heart, and of the superiority of our mode of living "*in the marriage relation*," and they might possibly blush at their own ignorance of the greater and higher laws which are as far above their own as heaven is above hades. "Mormon" women are not so ignorant as some suppose. We know the power we hold to declare polygamy illegal. If there was any necessity, or if we felt our chains to be galling, we could assuredly avail ourselves of it and call upon the U. S. army stationed here, to protect us. The feeling of "Mormon" women has been demonstrated in the cases of Belle Harris and Nellie White.

The means gathered to assist in reforming the "Mormons," in freeing the "poor down-trodden women from their polygamous yoke" is a most ridiculous farce. It will compare with the collecting of money for the poor heathen, who would have been better off a thousand fold had they never seen a "Christian," through whose moral (?) ideas and associations thousands have become like themselves, impure and far more degraded than they would have been had not the waves of civilization passed over them. We have scores of testimonies from the outside world of the falseness and corruption which exist among these sanctified redeemers, especially those in the puritan States who cry out so loudly against a plurality of wives in Utah. We have witnessed enough to make us pity their condition as much as they have professed to deplore ours.

If they have any sympathy to spare why not expend it in relieving the suffering in their own midst? We refer our charitable sisters, who profess so much pity and seem so anxious to improve their kind, to an account given in the *New York Times* by Ex-Mayor Rowderly, of Scranton, who lately visited the Connellsville coke region, of Pennsylvania, where women accompany their husbands and fathers to the ovens early in the morning, "doing tasks that would try the stoutest men." He saw "women half naked drawing the hot coke from the chamber." The first one described "had no covering on her head and very little on her person. Her appearance was that of one whose spirit had been broken by hardship and hard

work. Her attire consisted of a coarse chemise and a pair of cowhide boots." This was not the worst case. At the close he says, "Many more such scenes met my view and some of them were even worse than this."

They might search in every village and hamlet throughout Utah and the adjoining Territories and they could not find a parallel to this. Not even in the hardest days of our experience in pioneering a mountain wilderness, were there any scenes that could compare with this.

And another wretched story we have from West Virginia: Eighteen human beings, white slaves, sold at auction in the town of St. George, the seat of Tucker County, in the heart of the Cheat Mountains overlooking the beautiful Cheat River. Though their hearts were wrung with the deepest anguish, those paupers were jeered at and tormented in the midst of a heartless crowd, who came there to witness the sale of widows and orphans, the aged and the youth. One was a beautiful little girl of ten years, who cried bitterly because she had to leave the family to whom she had been sold the previous year. The purchaser of this child was "a minister of the gospel, a man known as one of God's elect, whose duty it is to minister to the spiritual wants of the people." The story is too pitiful to dwell upon; but they, "under the laws of the State," were placed upon the block and sold to the highest bidders for the term of one year. And while this Christian(?) act was being performed, roars of laughter ascended from the crowd of six hundred people who had gathered before the court house of the little town of St. George in the very heart of "Christian civilization" and boasted piety of some of the most honored and enlightened ministers and law-makers of our land. "The stories of cruelty to these people are numerous and beyond question of doubt. They are worked to the utmost capacity. They are fed on refuse, made to sleep in barns, have to be bare-footed ten months in the year, and are whipped, and whipped savagely, for the slightest pretext. The tales of immorality are frequent and too often true. The children are allowed to grow up without education and, it is said, some do not even know that a God exists. They are in

the most degrading bondage in the world, a bondage which is more absolute, more terrible and more appalling than that of negro slavery."

This and much more is published in the *Elmira Telegram*. And all this transpired among those professing "Christian charity;" and who so long to free us from the tyranny of the "Mormon" Priesthood, and prate about the ignorance and degradation of a people to whom they are trying to deal out the same kind of charity. They would make paupers of "Mormon" wives and their offspring, could they but manage to send them adrift. But God forbid that we should be dependent upon the mercy of men who could stoop to make human chattels of their own flesh and blood.

Another philanthropist from Vermont, L. P. Poland, has introduced a bill into Congress to disfranchise all that are members of the Church of Latter-day Saints who will not solemnly swear that they are not members or adherents of said Church, etc., etc., proving still more forcibly that polygamy has been only a blind, a mere excuse for robbing the people by breaking down the power which is acknowledged to exist in this Latter-day organization. Our union is the simple "problem." The Lord commanded His people to "become one in all things;" but this is a thing which Satan abhors and is trying his best to break down.

The following, from the *Detroit News*, though containing nothing new to the Saints, is gratifying inasmuch as it shows that a few others are beginning to understand some of the true motives of the beam-eyed Pharisees who are hunting for the "Mormon" mote.

"Many senators told him (Mr. Edmunds) when he had his last measure under way that it wouldn't have the slightest effect upon polygamy. He knew it better than anyone of them. He didn't intend it to have any effect upon polygamy. He aims it at the head of the Democratic party. It answered his purpose in that respect perfectly. It gave the party of God and morality—the party of all the virtues, another chance to get up a howl about other people's vices. If it suppressed polygamy the chance would have been gone."

“Edmunds knew perfectly well that no amount of oratory or law-making would extirpate it, and congratulated himself on finding something that would furnish good fighting for a generation or so, and offer a lasting foil for the superfluous moral indignation of the chaste and virtuous Republican masses. The ‘Twin-Relic,’ as they call it, is to remain still as a perpetual and handy ‘red rag’ with which to arouse Republican virtue to an annual frenzy of moral indignation and enthusiasm.”

We can appreciate every kindly feeling and sentiment expressed in our favor. The late speech of Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood was commendable, and we were pleased with the honor paid by Mr. John Gault, president of the Graphic company of New York, to the women of the “Mormon” community. But we have cause to believe that very little kindness is felt for us by the majority of the women of the United States. We remember the incident of Sister Zina Young’s visit east, accompanied by Dr. Ferguson. Both are refined and intelligent women, but when avowing themselves to be Latter-day Saints, were they permitted to represent themselves or their sisters whose cause they were there to plead? No, their privileges did not go that far. It is something on a par with what the North professed for the slaves of the South. They martialled their forces and drenched the land with blood to free the African, and in their enthusiasm lifted some into office—even above the white citizens of the south—but when it came to their claiming the rights and privileges of freemen—to mingle in the same society—to eat at the same tables, etc., that materially changed the color of the coat. Now we do not hear so much of that whining cant about equal rights and the glorious union of the white and black. Apropos to this subject the following is worth reading:

“Fred Douglass has flung a stunning shot at the objectors to his marriage. We are strongly and unalterably opposed to miscegenation and cannot help noticing the justice of the following fling he gets off in a letter: ‘I know of a colored woman here in Washington who is the mother of ten children by one of our late most influential citizens, but no noise was made

over the fact, simply because the woman was his concubine and not his wife.' "

I could relate many incidents to show how the bars of prejudice give way when one becomes acquainted with the "terrible Mormons." In the year 1871 a gentleman and his family came to Salt Lake and rented a house within a few rods of mine. He came here as a miner in search of gold. He had formerly served in the Mexican war and the war of the Rebellion, as an officer, and during the latter conflict was severely wounded and left on the ground among the dead and dying. His wife left her friends and the ease of a southern home, to follow her husband. He commanded the troops on the Platte route in 1865, and afterwards took charge, for Wells, Fargo and Co., of the armed escort for the protection of passengers and mail coaches during the Indian troubles of 1866. During this time, H. B. Clawson and a party passed over the route going east, and on their safe arrival at Riverside they passed a vote of thanks to Major T. and highly complimented him in a dispatch to President Brigham Young. These were the first Mormons he had ever seen, and he was very favorably impressed. But his wife had made up her mind that she would have nothing to do with them and more especially with polygamous wives. Knowing nothing of her feelings my mother-in-law and myself gave her a friendly call and were cordially received. She returned the call and soon after we invited her to tea. She subsequently confessed how peculiar were her feelings, as she sat and looked at Mr. Whitney's two wives and thought, "Is it possible I am sitting in the house of a polygamist and these two women are the wives of one man, living together agreeably?" She found it impossible to hold her early prejudice. They left the city for a season and on their return rented a portion of my house. And no warmer friendship could exist than has grown up between their family and ours, taking in both branches. If our children had been their own they could not have treated them better. This lady has many times declared that she could not feel contended anywhere but in Salt Lake City, though she occasionally went with her husband and sons to the mines. Once when they were

leaving, she said to me that if she did not live to return, she desired me to adopt her youngest child, then a babe, whom they had named for my husband.

She lived and returned however, and when I visited them at their hotel the following incident occurred: A young married woman whom they had met there came in, and after being introduced, supposing me to be an outsider or Gentile, like herself, commenced about the "horrid and degraded Mormons," who, she thought, were "too low for anything." She said she knew of one polygamous wife in Provo, where she had lived, who had to go out to wash, and just as I was about to have an interesting time listening to her tirade, Mr. and Mrs. T. spoiled it all by informing her that Mrs. Whitney was a "Mormon." This placed her in such a dilemma that I really pitied her. But she soon recovered herself and turned to praising some of the Provo people. She knew some who were "very nice," and among them were "two such fine young ladies—two Misses Kimball." "Yes," said I, "they are my half-sisters," and I informed her that my father had other fine daughters as well as sons that would be an honor to any man, and that I was proud to acknowledge them.

As for "Mormon" women who had to go out to earn their own living, that, I said, was no more than women had to do in other places, and it was far better than to sell themselves body and soul, as thousands were left to do in Christian communities—a thing which seldom occurred among the "Mormons." We had considerable to say, and I treated her as if nothing unpleasant had happened. I treated her all the more kindly, knowing how indignant Mr. and Mrs. T. felt towards her, which they afterwards expressed to me.

Another incident I will mention, which occurred a few years ago. My father's niece, who paid us a visit, had thought a great deal of him from her childhood. I introduced her to several of my half-brothers, who called at different times, and she afterwards made the remark that "Uncle Heber must have felt very proud of such noble sons," and she wished that she could see more of them. I told her I wished so too, for I felt proud of those who were following in his worthy footsteps.

A traveler and newspaper correspondent came here not long since with a letter of introduction to my husband from a relative who had previously spent a little time in Salt Lake City. This man professed no religion, but was interested in the welfare of all, and believed in allowing everybody their rights. He said he had gained the ill-will of people among other religious sects because he refused to join them. He was seeking information that he could depend upon. He remained two or more hours and the interview was a most agreeable one. The topic of conversation was the "Mormon" question and the theories of those who were planning to wipe out the "foul blot" in Utah. I told him some of our expectations, and that at no distant day we should claim our rights and the lands we had been driven from.

I spoke about the great work the Lord was doing among the gentiles and also the Lamanites, and of the course we were taking in marital matters which was calculated to purify and elevate society. He said he believed we would be rewarded for teaching the Indians to be self-supporting as well as Christian-like. As for the present state of society in the east he believed there was more jealousy, family-jars and divorces in the community where he dwelt than among this people, put them all together. But for all that he claimed the world was growing better. He thought women were much better treated than they used to be, and many things had improved. I told him I acknowledged it in this sense, that the good were growing better and the bad worse, which he admitted to be true. He expressed himself as highly gratified with all he had seen and heard, and said he should never forget the pleasure he had had during his brief stay in Salt Lake City. He has since sent me a paper containing his travels west which I acknowledged and received a card in return, saying: "Your kind and acceptable message of the 30th inst., is received. I was pleased to learn that I was kindly remembered by those whose friendship I highly prize; and I can assure you that my brief sojourn in your beautiful city, and especially the pleasant hours I passed in the quietude of your own seemingly happy home, will ever be noted events in the history of my lone and wear-

some journey to western lands. I have presented two of my friends with copies of your little book on 'Plural Marriage' and they perused the pages with great interest. When I write of Salt Lake City and my enjoyable visit there I will try and procure a copy for you. I often think, shall we meet again and hope for the dawning of that auspicious day. It is true, as you say, this life is not a bad one—sometimes I am led to conclude from scientific investigation, it is all the one there is, and hence the necessity of making it a pure and honorable one."

True to his word he has sent me a copy of the *Knightstown* (Ind.) *Banner*, containing his "unprejudiced view of Zion and the Latter-day Saints." It is as follows:

"I had often read of the famed city of 'Zion,' of the strange peculiarity of its people, of the verdant plains that surround it, and the hoary old mountains that overshadow its charming environments, of its churches, and palaces, and temple, and tithing house, and grandly decorated assembly halls; but never until I stood on an eminence one bright April morning and viewed the lovely landscape o'er, had I any conception of the inspiring grandeur of the glorious scene. The sun was just arising from his rosy couch, and ascending a cloudless sky, and the mellow splendor of its golden beams were gilding the mountain tops and sending a warm bright light far over the jeweled desert. Stretching away on the one hand are the vast plains covered with thrifty homes nestling in the shade of beautiful groves cooled by the dancing waters of crystal streams; and on the other the vast unbroken chain of the Wasatch mountains towering loftily in the distance, imparting a degree of silent grandeur which the enthusiastic poet might properly accept as a 'fount of joy.' Hills, mountains, valleys, silvery waters and showy dwellings scattered over the scene, make up a picture, and a grand and beauteous one it is.

"And, think, a third of a century ago, all was desolation and solitude. No towns or cities lit up the desert with the fires of civilization—no railroads traversed these lands freighted with the richest gems of the world's commerce; no electric wires were stretched through the dark gorges of snow-clad

mountains by which messages could go to the busy marts of the industrial world; no machinery to awaken the echoes of Nature's wild solitudes, no sound of human life. There all was silence, and Nature spread her charms in sublime excellence before no cultured gaze.

"To whom are we indebted for all the culture and ornamental splendor of these barren and uninhabited wilds? To the hated and persecuted Mormons, whose faith is as sacred as life, and whose religion is tainted with the stain of plural marriage, belongs the glory. Yes, all these palatial dwellings, all these towering churches, all these numerous factories that we see sending up their clouds of black smoke to the heavens, all these busy towns and villages that teem with industry and wealth, are the outgrowth of Mormon enterprise, and the products of Mormon brains—and, yet, men who claim to be leading lights in the religious world, and proclaim the gospel of peace, love and mental liberty are crying 'down with polygamy,' which they know to be a cherished element of the Mormons' faith, and a sacred duty incorporated into their religious system. Some prominent theologians, who preach the gospel of Christ, in which peace is the most distinctive principle, recommend that cannon be planted on the hills these hardy sons of toil have beautified, to blow them into the unexplored regions of the 'life to come.' It is true that part of their creed embracing plural marriage seems demoralizing in its tendency, and detrimental to the propagation of domestic happiness, and the peace, and love and harmony that should always characterize every home, but it should be remembered that it is a feature of their religion, and should be tolerated until time, coupled with years of education, refinement and proper association, buries it beneath the limitless sea of the eventful past. Mormonism is perhaps what it was in its early desert history, but time has wrought a wonderful change in the character of its people. It is no longer a life of persecution, tyranny and endless superstition enshrouded in the garments of ignorance and faith, but it is in a limited degree keeping step to the progress of a scientific age.

“Utah is coming forward with her representative women who are asserting their rights as free and independent citizens. Schools and colleges are found in all the towns and villages, and in many nooks and corners of the billowy desert, and the light of science is fast dispelling the clouds of suffering and sorrow that once darkened the pathway of these honest but deluded followers of a selfish faith. Newspapers are being established in many of the strongholds of the territories where Mormonism exists, that are fighting the system on a moral basis, and the tide of immigration here is continuous, and most of the late importations are strenuously opposed to the ‘power of the Church,’ and sooner or later it must go to the shades of the past. Let it die a natural death, be buried quietly in its native soil, and never, no, never, disturb its slumbers with the rattle of musketry, the thunder of cannon, or the solemn tread of steel-clad armies marching under a banner emblematic of human liberty—all for the glory of wading through a sea of human blood.”

I will now present, for the benefit of those whose souls sicken at what they consider the immoral practices of the “Mormons” and who are unwilling to give them credit for any motives but the basest, some of the views of a Christian philanthropist, whose interesting work entitled *The History and Philosophy of Marriage*, was published at Boston in 1869. He speaks from what he learned by observation and long experience among missionaries and the natives of India. He was not aware at the time, of the doctrine of plural marriage being taught or practiced in America, and supposed himself to be the first who had attempted to advocate it among Christians:

“The marriage system is a proper subject of philosophical inquiry, involving an examination and analysis of both polygamy and monogamy. Of the latter form of marriage the Christian world has known too much, and of the former too little to have felt, hitherto, the need of any analysis of either. We have inherited our monogamy, or the marriage system which restricts each man to one wife only, and have practiced it as a matter of course, without any special examination or inquiry: so that we really know little concerning its origin or its early history; while we know still less of the system of poly-

gamy, * * * and it cannot be denied that what we know of it has come to us in such a form as to prejudice our minds against it. This prejudice is unfavorable to a just and candid philosophical inquiry; and while pursuing this inquiry, let us hold this prejudice in abeyance. Let us not forget that what we have seen of this system is in its most unfavorable aspects. Most travelers carry their native prejudices abroad, and look upon the customs of distant countries with less astonishment than contempt, and they remember, when writing up their accounts of those countries, that their books are to be sold at home, and they must not institute comparisons unfavorable to their own land, but must flatter the conceit of their fellow-countrymen by assuring them that their own social and political institutions are vastly better than those of other lands."

No one can rationally deny the truth of these words. They come home to us because we have been and are the sufferers from just such misrepresentations, with others having far worse motives, from those who will not allow themselves to be convinced of anything in our favor. He continues: "No one has given to the subject the time and research necessary to its fair elucidation. But as a venerable institution the social system of polygamy does not deserve such supercilious treatment. Such treatment, besides being unjust, is unphilosophical, and unworthy a liberal and enlightened age. Its great antiquity alone should entitle it to sufficient respect to be heard, at least, in its own defense. It constitutes an important part of human history. It is a great fact that cannot be ignored; and as such, it must be studied and known. To insist upon the condemnation of this system, without hearing its defense, is oppression. It is even the worst kind of oppression; for, in such case, it must be allied with ignorance and bigotry.

"If the advocates of polygamy are in the minority in the Christian world, let the common rights of the minority be granted them—freedom of debate and the privilege of protest; and let their solemn protest be listened to with respect, and be spread upon the current records of the day. And, on the other hand, if those who practice this ancient system do constitute

the majority of mankind, it cannot be either uninteresting or unimportant to inquire what has made it so nearly universal, and caused it to be adopted by so many different nations, and even different races of men, among whom there are, no doubt, some persons who are justly distinguished for their wisdom, their piety and their humanity."

This writer, it should be borne in mind, was a native of New England, and was brought up a strict Puritan, the same as was Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball and the majority of the leading men and women who first undertook to establish this order of marriage in this country, in obedience to a revelation and command from the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

"Having seen all the continents of the globe, and many islands of the sea, and having observed human society in every climate and in every social condition, I have at length returned to my native land, an older and I hope a wiser man. * * * As I had been educated a strict monogamist, in New England, I had never once dreamed that any other social system than monogamy could be possible among Christian people, anywhere; and I remonstrated with the missionaries for permitting polygamy among their converts, under any circumstances whatever. * * * I was answered by them that the Bible has not forbidden it, but, on the contrary, has recognized it as sometimes lawful and proper; and although they themselves did not encourage it, they could not positively prohibit it. I then endeavored to recollect some prohibition in the Bible, but could neither recollect nor find one there. On the contrary, to my own astonishment, after a careful examination of the sacred scriptures, I did find therein many things to favor it. The missionaries also said that their experience had taught them that the converting grace of God was granted to those living in polygamy as often as to others. * * * 'And,' said the missionaries, 'if such persons give evidence of genuine conversion, 'Can any man forbid water, that they should not be baptized, who have received the grace of God as well as we?' * * * 'Shall we compel them to put away all their wives, but those first married, and then receive them into the church?

But in many cases this would be impracticable, in others unjust; in all, cruel. For the chastity of the women, hitherto irreproachable, would be tarnished by their repudiation: they would often be left without a home and without support; and like other disgraced or destitute women of all lands, they would be thrust upon a life of infamy and vice.'

"'Who shall dare assume the responsibility of separating wife from husband, and children from parents? since the Bible expressly forbids a man to divorce his wife, for any cause, except unfaithfulness to her marriage vow: God is not said in the Bible to hate polygamy, but it says there that *He hateth putting away.*'

"I need not say that I was completely disarmed and silenced by this array of 'the law and the testimony;' and was compelled, by their arguments, to admit that their course was one of equal justice and mercy."

He soon learned, however, that the rules of the missionaries were by no means uniform upon this question, many reasoned rather from the "traditions of the elders," than from the laws of Nature or of God, which is the case, as a rule, at the present time. He gives an account of the conversion of an old and influential chief among the North American Indians, which was received by one of the missionaries in India and published in a Boston religious journal. The chief was living with two wives at the time of his conversion to Christianity:

"The first was now aged, blind and childless. The other was young, attractive, healthful and the mother of one fine boy. One of these wives he was required to put away 'as an indispensable requisite to baptism and church membership.' The old chief, after careful deliberation, could not decide which to repudiate. The first he was bound by every honorable motive to 'love and to cherish,' especially on account of her age and infirmity; while the other was devotedly attached to him, and was the mother of his only child and heir, which he could not give up and from which he could not separate the mother. He, therefore, submitted the case to the missionaries

to decide. * * * They decided against the younger one. And as he was old himself and his other wife was barren, that she must also give up her child. This mandate was obeyed with martyr-like fortitude, which nothing but the strongest religious motives could have inspired; opposed as it was to every natural sentiment of love and honor. And thus in one hour, was that young wife and mother deprived of her husband, her child, her character and her home; and sent away a bereaved and lonely outcast into the wide world. The report which the missionaries themselves gave of this affair closed by saying that the repudiated wife and bereaved mother soon died inconsolable and broken-hearted.

“On reading this report I could not forbear contrasting their mode of treating polygamy with that of the missionaries in the east, which had come under my own observation there, and which I had at first so severely criticised. I now began to blush at my own late ignorance and bigotry. And the more I thought of the ecclesiastical tyranny of the North American missionaries, the higher rose my indignation against it. I could not fail to see that their narrow attachment to their own social system had made them judicially blind to the merits of any other; and that they were more ignorant of the true spirit of Christianity as well as of the natural rights of man concerning the laws of marriage, than even the poor savages themselves. Yet they undoubtedly supposed they were doing God essential service by this act of inhumanity; just as our fathers did when they hanged and burned honest men because they worshipped God in a different manner, and entertained different views of divine truth, from themselves. Their mistake is one which has always been too common, and from which no one, perhaps, is altogether free. It consists in assuming that because we are honest in our belief, and mean to be right, others who essentially differ from us are dishonest and wrong; and in presuming to judge the conduct of others by what we *feel to be right* i. e., by our own standard of morality, instead of judging them by what we *know to be right*, according to the infallible standard of divine truth.

“These reflections led me to give the whole subject of marriage, in respect to its divine and natural laws, as thorough and as critical an investigation as my abilities and advantages enabled me to do; and to inquire into the origin and the moral tendencies of the two social systems, monogamy and polygamy.”

This investigation he pursued many years and was unwilling to leave the world without giving it the benefit of his reflections. He says: “All truth is important. If these views are true, they ought to be known; if they are not true let them be refuted. If the prejudices of modern Christians are opposed to the social system which their ancient brethren, the earliest saints and patriarchs practiced in the good old days of Bible truth and pastoral simplicity, I believe that these prejudices are neither natural nor inveterate, but that they have been induced by the corrupted Christianity of the mediæval priesthood, and that they will be removed when Christian people become better informed; and if it be necessary for me to sacrifice my own ease and my own credit, in attempting to remove them, I shall only suffer the common lot of all reformers before me. * * * It is a melancholy and humiliating fact that the opinions of most people are determined more by what others around them think and say than what they believe themselves. They are not accustomed to the proper exercise of their own reason, and do not follow the convictions of their own minds. Yet there are some who dare to think and act for themselves; and into the hands of a few such I doubt not these pages will fall: and to all such I most heartily commend them. I make no apology for calling the attention of an intelligent age to a new examination of an old institution. Truth dreads no scrutiny; shields herself behind no breastwork of established custom or of respectable authority, but proudly stands upon her own merits. I will not despair, therefore, of gaining the attention of every lover of truth while I attempt to develop and demonstrate the laws of God and of nature. * * * Truth rises superior to every consideration of fastidiousness, and it is high time that these truths should be demonstrated.”

He goes on to show how the "social evil" is to be prevented, and though he has "great confidence in genuine piety and religious instructions and believes it is the best antidote to all ills that flesh is heir to, that alone will not secure them from this vice."

"The people have already had line upon line and precept upon precept for many successive generations. They know that licentiousness is a sin; and they know that when they fall into it, they become liable to the most fearful punishments both in this life and in the world to come; but the tyranny of monogamy has left them no alternative. * * * Marriage is impossible to half the women. Society has wronged them; and with their own peculiar, intuitive instinct they feel it, though they cannot tell exactly how. Society somehow has made war upon them, most unjustly. * * * Now, let this warfare cease. Let the women have their rights. Let every woman have a husband and a home; and let every man have as many women as he can love, and as can love him, and as he is able to support, until all the women are provided for: then, and not till then, will prostitution cease. * * * Prevention is better than cure and it is now clear to all that a large part of human suffering is preventible by improved social arrangements.

"As the word of God has declared marriage to be honorable in all, so we must infer that His laws have made provision for the honorable marriage of all, and that every person of each sex is equally entitled to its rights and benefits. * * * If love be refining and ennobling, if it be the spontaneous, instinctive birthright of all, and if our Creator has restricted its indulgence to the marriage relation, then marriage must be the right of all, or else God is not a benevolent being. But all nature and all revelation have demonstrated that He is a benevolent being, and it is both impious and absurd to believe that His laws have made no adequate provision for everyone to be married who wishes to be. * * * The fault is not in nature nor in the laws of God but it is in the tyrannical laws and fashions of the artificial system of social life which now obtains among us. This system must be at fault, for it

does not and it cannot provide for the marriage of all; and many who desire to marry are forever deprived of husbands and homes; while the system of polygamy does provide for all, and is, therefore, the only system which is in harmony with divine and natural law. This proposition is further demonstrated by the simple fact that the number of marriageable women always exceeds the number of marriageable men.

* * * It has been a plausible objection to polygamy, that if some men have a plurality of wives, some other men must thereby be deprived of any, and the system must be unequal and unjust. * * * One has only to count up the persons of each sex of marriageable age in all the families of his own acquaintance to satisfy himself that the females will outnumber the males.

“We have always accustomed ourselves to believe that polygamy originated in barbarism; that it is perpetuated by barbarians only, and that it panders to the basest and most depraved of human passions. But let us now think for ourselves.

* * * If European monogamists have hitherto surpassed all other men in civilization and social happiness, it is not on account of their monogamy, but, no doubt, on account of their Christianity, even a perverted Christianity, a corrupted Christianity, a Roman Christianity, is better than idolatry or Mohammedanism. What, then, may we not hope when Christianity shall become free and pure, and restored to its pristine simplicity and glory? An idolatrous nation practicing monogamy has never been able to long exist. History does not furnish one example. Such nations soon become so incurably corrupt as to incur the wrath of God, and are swept away from the face of the earth. * * * And such was the faith of the many scores or perhaps hundreds of petty States of all Europe before the establishment of Christianity. They rose, they flourished, they became licentious, they fell. Wave after wave of the purer races of polygamists of Asia rolled over them, and assumed their places, and as these, in turn, fell into their social habits, and adopted their monogamy, and became corrupt, they also became extinct, and were succeeded by newer and purer immigrations. On the other hand the polygamists

of Asia have preserved their social purity. * * *
 An intelligent Christian nation practising polygamy has never yet existed, simply because the two institutions have hitherto been falsely deemed incompatible and irreconcilable. The Gnostic heresy had so soon corrupted the springs of Christian learning, and the Grecian and Roman hierarchies had so soon usurped the seats of Christian authority, that the freedom and simplicity of the pristine faith were perverted, even before such an experiment could be made. * * * And now it is most probable that if such an experiment shall ever be made, it will be somewhere upon the continent of free America.

“Polygamy is not barbarism, for it has been maintained and supported by such men as Abraham, Moses and Solomon; whose superiors in all that constitute the highest civilization—knowledge, piety, wisdom and refinement of mind and manners—the world has never known, either in ancient or modern times. Yet polygamy though it be not barbarism, has almost always and everywhere prevailed, where a simple, natural and inartificial state of society subsists. Its origin is coeval with that of the human race. It is mentioned before the flood. It is mentioned soon after the flood. As soon as mankind were multiplied upon the earth, it was discovered that the number of women exceeded the men. * * * If it be objected that God created but one woman for Adam, it is a sufficient answer to reply, that both the man and the woman were also created perfect. They were perfect in health and perfect in morals. But we are now imperfect in both respects, and we now need a social system adapted to men and women as they are.”

Referring to the argument of Christians that Christ fulfilled the ritual and emblematical ordinances of the law and set them aside, and their assumption that the ancient marriage laws were set aside among the rest, and superseded by the “purer system of monogamy,” he says:

“It cannot be supported either by sufficient testimony or by valid reasoning. Marriage laws cannot be regarded as merely ritual and emblematical: they are moral and fundamental, guarding the dearest rights and punishing the deepest wrongs

of mankind. They are therefore equally permanent with those laws protecting life and property, those inculcating obedience to parents and rulers, and those maintaining the sanctity of oaths. All these, together with the marriage laws, existed before the time of Moses, and have survived the time of Christ. They are among those 'laws' that Jesus came not to *subvert* but to ratify. * * * Christ himself was altogether silent in respect to polygamy, not once alluding to it; yet it was practised at the time of His advent throughout Judea and Galilee, and in all the countries of Asia and Africa, and, without doubt, by some of His own disciples. The book of the Acts is equally silent as the four gospels are. * * * It was not because Jesus or the apostles durst not condemn it, had they considered it sinful, that they did not speak of it, for Jesus hesitated not to denounce the sins of hypocrisy, covetousness and adultery, and even to alter and amend, apparently the ancient laws respecting divorce and retaliation; but He never rebuked them for their polygamy, nor instituted any change in that system. And this uniform silence, so far as it implies anything, implies approval."

He next takes up monogamy, of which he says: "In order that monogamists may clearly see the justice or the injustice of the boasted claims of their system to superior purity and virtue, it is very proper that they look to the rock whence they were hewn and to the hole of the pit whence they were digged." After recounting some of the dissolute practices which obtained place in Greece and Rome, where monogamy was in vogue in the licentious times of the Cæsars, he continues:

"Monogamy is Romanism still. Most of us in these countries are accustomed to congratulate ourselves upon our happy escape from the bondage and bigotry of the papal church. But we are mistaken. We have not escaped. Rome binds us in stronger shackles than the iron chains of the holy Inquisition. Her shackles are upon our consciences: they are intertwined with every fibre of our social life. Much of her intolerant spirit, many of her questionable doctrines and practices, and her traditional forms and ceremonies, are still common to

the nominally Christian world. In respect to a few of them, we have discovered that they are unscriptural and unsupported by divine authority, and are therefore of no binding obligation; but, by many other traditional doctrines and practices of that hierarchy, we are unconsciously and therefore so much more securely fettered. We boast of our Christian freedom, while we are, in fact, but little better than slaves; for if we are nominally free, yet we are bound by an apprenticeship to Rome more degrading than our former slavery itself: and our boasted emancipation is but a miserable farce. We are too servile and timid in our interpretation of the Bible, and in our examination of the divine and natural laws. We hesitate to follow the simple truth to its legitimate and logical conclusions. We stand aghast at the radical changes which severe truth requires in our religious and social systems. We shrink from exploring the profound labyrinths to which truth attempts in vain to lead us; while we look anxiously around us for clues and leading-strings by which to trace our way. We dare not go forward without example and authority, and authority and example are reconducting us to Rome.

“I have stood by the gates of the cotton-mill and have seen the multitudes of female operatives stream out of an evening, and I marked their lonesome appearance as they repaired to their respective homes. Homes, did I say? Ah! anything but homes—their boarding-houses. There I have seen them sit down, by scores, to the dinner-table, and eat their dinners in the utmost silence, as if each one was entirely isolated from all social and agreeable companionship. Oh, what loneliness! how hard! how bitter! Yet many of them were radiant with the charms of womanhood, and each one capable of adorning and blessing a home, but which few of them will ever enjoy; for they are not only the unwilling victims of poverty and toil, but the willing votaries of fashion, and the unconscious slaves of monogamy.

“A woman’s instincts revolt against the thought of a plurality of husbands, and judging his feelings by her own, she cannot see how a man can want, or at least can truly love a plurality of wives. But, as this point involves a constitutional difference of

sex, it is one in which we must be aware that our feelings cannot guide us. A man can never know the infinite tenderness, and the infinite patience of a mother's love, except imperfectly, by reason and observation. His experience does not teach him. His paternal love does not exactly resemble it. So a woman can never know the purity and sincerity of a man's conjugal love for a plurality of wives, except by similar observation and reason. Her conjugal love is unlike it. Her love for one man exhausts and absorbs her whole conjugal nature: there is no room for more. And if she receives the truth that his nature is capable of a plural love, she must attain it by the use of her reason, or admit it upon the testimony of honest men."

This is correct reasoning, but I confess that it has been a very great puzzle to me; and only by using my reasoning faculties and by the testimony of my husband and other honest men could I bring myself to admit it. But if my life depended upon my giving a true testimony concerning my belief and practice in the order of plural marriage, I could not now contradict these statements, but must still acknowledge the truth of them.

"Great men are always polygamists, * * * no
 matter under what social system they may live, * * *
 even though they transgress the laws of ordinary social life,
 * * * and it is a shame and a pity that our social
 laws cannot be so amended, and brought into harmony with those
 of God and nature, that our noblest men would yield them the
 most prompt obedience. And is it not a sad pity, a burning
 shame, and a fearful wrong that our laws are such, that men
 cannot acknowledge their mistresses, and avow their children?
 The wrongs of these women and children are crying to God
 from the ground, and he will hear and judge. These great
 men are brave; but they are not brave enough. They have no
 just right to practice their polygamy in the dark. Let us
 either have an honest monogamy or an avowed polygamy.
 Hence it is that I am called by the justice of God and the suf-
 ferings of humanity to appeal to every honorable sentiment in
 mankind in behalf of a greater freedom to marry, and a greater
 purity of the marriage relation. Let us have such marriage

laws, that whatever relations any honorable man shall determine to form with the other sex can be honorably formed and honorably maintained."

"Wherever monogamy prevails it is a system of hypocrisy. It is a veil of abstemiousness assumed to conceal a mass of hidden corruption. Its direct tendency is to stimulate the contemptible vices of intrigue and lying, as well as the equally detestable ones of prostitution and adultery. * * *

And thus the laws of chastity are violated on every hand, and truthfulness, integrity, purity and honor are becoming but unmeaning terms. * * *

Which manifests more base and selfish passion—the man who espouses the partners of his love, and takes them to his home and his heart, and provides for them and his children, or the man who steals away from his house in the dark, and indulges in dishonorable and degrading passion in secret places, and then abandons the partners of his guilty pleasures to a life of wretchedness, shame and want?

"It is a notorious fact, that, where the system of monogamy prevails, the most common cause of murder is unhappy marriages. Husbands murder their wives, and wives murder their husbands or incite others to do it, almost every week.

"Napoleon Bonaparte would never have divorced his Josephine, had polygamy been deemed lawful and proper. * * *

His desire for an heir was most intense, most natural and most commendable. It seemed to be all that was wanting to secure the stability of his throne, the good of his people, and the peace of the world. Yet according to the system of monogamy, the only manner in which these very desirable ends could be attained was by divorce of Josephine, by whose alliance he had been brought to more public notice, and been greatly assisted in his successful career, and who was one of the loveliest and noblest women that ever wore a crown. * * *

Before this, all his history is bright; after it, all is dark. One cannot, even now, after so long a time, contemplate the tears of Josephine and the subsequent disasters of Napoleon, without cursing the narrow bigotry of monogamy, and wishing

that the golden age of polygamy had returned before his days."

My only apology for making such copious extracts from this author's excellent and convincing work, is that his writings express so much more clearly than I am able to do, what all who read them in the right spirit will feel to be the result of intelligent observation, profound thought and a sincere desire to benefit society and aid in lifting it from its present degradation.

What I have copied expresses a great deal of what we Latter-day Saints believe and also our experience in grappling with the fierce prejudice and old, stereotyped opinions of those who are either too narrow-minded to receive any more or afraid to follow even their honest convictions for fear of the public lash. It has required courage, and a great amount of it, too, to stand and contend against the prejudices and customs of the age. And this is one of the strongest proofs of the courageous and daring spirit that possesses those who will take upon themselves this cross, and endure all that is put upon them, to be numbered with the ones who are so highly honored by the Almighty. We are the advance guard to meet and break through these trammels of prejudice, and "dare to follow *truth* wherever it may lead." From these mountains is to roll the little stone that will bring to pass the purposes of the Almighty and settle this social question by a practical reform in the marriage system. Though looked down upon by the world we consider ourselves the most highly honored people on the earth and console ourselves with the reflection that we will yet be looked up to and regarded as the founders of a superior system of Christianity. This fact the Lord revealed to His prophet, Joseph Smith, as early as the year 1831. And yet, had it not been for the fear of His displeasure, Joseph would have shrunk from the undertaking and would have continued silent, as he did for years, until an angel of the Lord threatened to slay him if he did not reveal and establish this celestial principle.

Every person who reads and reflects upon these statements, even if he has but little capacity for thinking, must admit that

they contain a great amount of truth and common sense. What I have written and compiled gives but a meagre description of the evils that exist among the wicked. It is the fear of these evils being overturned by the "Mormon" reformers, who preach and practice the system that is jeopardizing, and will eventually break up their pet institutions, which makes them desperate and determined to crush it out of existence. But all their weapons are weak and powerless, because they have no regard for virtue and righteousness, and therefore no foundation to work upon. But we have that which the holy Bible sustains. We have proven it to be a promoter of virtue, and know that if strictly obeyed, it will produce a higher and nobler type of humanity, alike in physical, mental and moral growth. It is an old saying that "every generation grows weaker and wiser." The human race has certainly been weakened and it has been in consequence of their own wicked and disobedient acts.

CHAPTER III.

WOMEN, I willingly admit, are the weaker sex, and that men should lead, but how many of them are really capable of leading or governing? How many of them have caused the wife of his bosom to hide her face in very shame—the woman whom he had promised to love and to cherish till death did them part, but was too utterly selfish to make any sacrifice to insure her comfort or happiness, or that of his offspring. Such will indulge their appetites, and every pernicious and unhallowed lust must be gratified at the risk of her poor heart's breaking. Though this may be a slow process, it is murder nevertheless, and their offspring are receiving the legacy—handed down by a profligate father with the certainty of transmitting the same to the coming generations, who have been sinned against in having to take up with feeble and