

"A LIVE MORMON."

Recently I visited Boston, as a place of historical interest. I stepped up to a gentleman and asked him to kindly direct me to points of the city I desired to visit, as I was a stranger there. After the sought for information had been given and a few incidental remarks passed, he wanted to know from what part of the country I came, and on learning that Utah was my home was of course curious to know if I was a Mormon. Receiving an answer in affirmative, he continued by saying:

"Well, you are the first live Mormon I ever saw, and if you will permit me to ply you with questions about your people and their institutions I will constitute myself your guide to the principal places of note."

"Agreed," was the reply, so away we went about the city, talking of the Mormons as well as sight seeing. The interview lasted till midnight, in the hotel, and I will give it in the main as well as my memory serves.

Mr. S.—"I suppose after polygamy is eliminated Mormonism is essentially the same as other creeds?"

"No; we worship a different God, believe in continuous revelation, our Church is organized after the pattern set forth by Paul, our baptism differs from most sects, we lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, and perform ordinances for the living and the dead of which the rest of the world know nothing."

Mr. S.—"A different God; do you worship an idol?"

"No. Your God has neither body, parts nor passions; ours has all three."

Mr. S.—"The God I worship is no God at all."

"You don't believe in the scriptures, then?"

Mr. S.—"No, if I did I would be obliged to acknowledge your polygamous doctrine."

"Then sir, we will have to shift the base of our argument."

"Mr. S.—"Yes, to a social and scientific point of view. I want to know how you can help but call a polygamous marriage a sin."

"We hold that the sin lies in the purpose, not in the kind of marriage."

Mr. S.—"Explain."

"We believe offspring to be the purpose of marriage, not the gratification of a passion. Among you, those men who are best able to support a large family, and best qualified to transmit intelligence to their children by the laws of heredity, have the fewest children. Statistics say that in Massachusetts, by far the majority of children come from the low Irish and rabble (as it were) part of the community, and statisticians deplore your future social aspect. With us the case is generally the reverse. Why should men be denied offspring from more than one wife, if the wives are recognized as such and their children made the recipients of parental love, care and acknowledgment? You must acknowledge that science condemns the preventives of birth, to which you must necessarily resort, and that a pure social instinct abhors the feticide and the infanticide you commit."

Mr. S.—"But a great many among us raise large families by one wife."

"I speak of society in the aggregate—is it not a fact that very few women, especially among the well-to-do, have more than two or three children? What am I to understand by social statistics?"

Mr. S.—"They are no doubt correct, and what you say of society at large; but is it not better to have only one or two children and educate them well than to have more uncared for?"

"Your proposition implies a contradiction, for at the very time the education of the child should begin with the conduct of the mother, that mother is either attempting the murder of an unborn infant, or her mind is soured with disappointment. Besides, it is not a sound education which the child receives when it is not taught to labor and to be self sustaining. If mothers are not industrious how much industry will they give to their children as an inheritance, if women's minds are stimulated by nervous excitement, the stimulants will be the inheritance of the offspring."

Mr. S.—"When men have more than one wife, the wives must be denied his attentions and love, and consequently suffer untold misery."

"Women learn to devote their feelings and affections and care more to their children."

Mr. S.—"You don't claim that our women love their children less than yours love theirs because they have fewer?"

"Yes, if your women loved their children more they would want and have more."

Mr. S.—"The more then a man loves his wife the more wives he wants, and the more a woman loves her husband the more husbands she wants—is that your logic? Let your women have more husbands than one and see if the shoe will not pinch on the other foot."

"We will weigh your statements with logical syllogisms and see what conclusions we reach. We premise our marriages upon offspring, you upon the gratification of pleasant desires. We say the purpose of marriage is children; two wives will bear more children than one, hence man may desire and have more than one wife. We say too with woman the purpose of marriage is children, then your tenderfooted logic would make us say a woman will bear more children by two men than one, hence should desire and have more husbands. You say the purpose of marriage is the gratification of passion, women can have more pleasure with two men than one,

hence she would want two husbands. It may be that this kind of logic will explain the numerous divorce grants to the women of Massachusetts."

Mr. S.—"Am I to understand you then, that you marry a woman because you desire children?"

"What I said does not imply that. Love as with you is an incentive to and concomitant of marriage. Love is the cause, children the effect or purpose. Whatever men may say of our motive, to enter marriage, they can not affirm that children are not the effects. Children are sometimes called Utah's best crop."

Mr. S.—"Well, then, suppose that young men should tell the women that one or two children were sufficient and the women should agree, what practical effect would it have?"

"It would break up our polygamous marriages and establish the same order of things as exists with you. For the same purpose that men would want other wives, women would want other husbands."

Mr. S.—"Your system seems all one sided—favoring the men."

"It is said that woman's life is made up of the affections, that man seeks for fame, for fortune; for space in the world's thought, and dominion over his fellow men. Evidently then the trials of the two must differ. Men will work night and day, scheme and turn gray before they are forty. Only, that it may gratify their appetites, provide their pleasure, give them rank, and they may hoard up wealth. If you want to cut the heart strings of these men and cut them to the very core, ask them to reasonably provide for ten or twenty children more than they have. Tell them their pleasure must be confined more to the care and attention of their little ones, that they must lose their sleep nights, stay home from the bathing resorts and see if you don't snap their heart strings."

Mr. S.—"But you don't believe in any system that brings so much suffering to effect it."

"You believe in the reformation; you boast of modern discoveries, of the achievements of Galileo, of the works of your Puritan forefathers—these were all begotten in pain. It seems to me all but a universal law of society that every truth is subject to that great command that God gave to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, that life should come forth in pain, and as truth is a living thing, society has brought it forth under equally painful circumstances. With us, marriage means life; with you, death. Besides, we do not concede that your wives average more happiness than ours. Figures will conclusively prove that more men in New York, according to numbers, cohabit with more than one woman, than among us. Again, this miscellaneous intercourse generates disease and death, and future generations must flow into the world through the stagnant pools of disease and corruption."

Mr. S.—"Why we don't endorse the evil institutions any more than you do. It's poor argument to say that because crime exists here you are justified in committing crime out there."

"I understand that we are discussing social systems which belong to monogamic and polygamic marriages. If you ask us to eliminate every evil pertaining to the former, you must grant us the same privilege. In either case we must presume a perfect condition of society, and how will we get sin out of perfection. Fairness demands that you shoulder every evil incident to the monogamic system when you ask others to shoulder the evils of the polygamic system they advocate. Prostitution is and has been a concomitant of monogamy ever since the Greeks and Romans insisted upon its enforcement—varying it is true, but on the whole wonderfully increasing. The oriental nations may be accused of polygamous practices, but you cannot, comparatively speaking, accuse them of prostitution. Their moral life loses nothing by a comparison with the modern civilized nations. Sanger, in his History of Prostitution, tells us that the Turks are growing more and more corrupt, but at the same time he informs us that polygamy is becoming very unpopular with them. It seems to me history warrants us in drawing two conclusions—monogamy with prostitution—polygamy without prostitution."

Mr. S.—"We claim polygamy is prostitution."

All right then, I will draw the conclusions on your own ground. Polygamous prostitution as you term it means life—monogamous prostitution means death; for it can not be shown that there is less fidelity to the marriage relation in polygamy than in monogamy. Will that suit you? If so, it only remains to be proven that there's more pleasure in life than death. Mr. S.—"It looks as though a man must have a purely selfish motive to take more than one wife."

It looks to me as though he had a selfish motive in taking one. It would be absurd to say a system is wrong because selfish motives prompted men to enter it. Why do men write books, work out inventions, invest capital, all of which prove an immense benefit to mankind. Are they not impelled by selfish motives. You know Johnson said: "No one but a blockhead ever wrote except for money." This may be putting it rather strong, but it will not be unsafe to say that men are generally prompted by money or a personal ambition to become benefactors of their race. Personalities sway men in all ranks of

life, and I have not so much confidence in human nature as to think it is likely to become perfect right away; but when men will accept social conditions which improve the status of society the argument is strongly in favor of personal sacrifice. There are two men; one writing a book the other steals \$10. The shallow school of sophistry so characteristic of the age would make us hold up in defense of thief's act the motive which arise from a craving being, the necessity of shelter and the pressing wants of clothing to keep him warm; while of the author we are want to say: Oh, well, he expects to make money out of it. It seems to me men's motives should be judged more by the purposes for which they serve society at large, than by the immediate results which accrue to the individual, for when men benefit society they correspondingly benefit themselves. Men may serve themselves without serving society. The circumstances of our social life are before the world, and men see both cause and effect; the circumstances of monogamic social life are comparatively hidden—we only see the effects, and ask therefore that effects be compared. The advocate of monogamy draws beautiful pictures of social marital happiness, and the picture appears well in front of the curtain for we can't see the tallow candles behind, yet we know there's a lie out somewhere, else why this prostitution, this destruction and prevention of life, and sin against nature and nature's laws. A woman said to me in Buffalo: "We consider it vulgar for a woman to have more than two or three children at the outside." She was the wife of a representative man and an eminent doctor, too, of the place. But you single out a case here and there to prove it is not all but universal. You make the exception to disprove this rule. What kind of motives do you call those which make men and women pursue so self destructive a course."

Mr. S.—"We denounce the evils of monogamic society as well as the evils of polygamy; but you justify your evils and we don't, ours, that's the difference you open the gates of iniquity when we are striving so hard to close them up."

"It is somewhat difficult to understand how in the world you expect to shut the gates against the stream of corruption while you are in the current of infamy and prostitution yourselves. It seems to me you could talk with infinitely more propriety if you would get out of this current of immorality and stand upon the banks of high social integrity and virtue. If you made monogamous marriage honorable you would have nothing from which to draw the horrible picture you do of polygamic marriages. You know too well the purposes for which marriage serves you and consequently from your point of view think we must be rotten. There are too many among you who constitute themselves social doctors and imagine the head must be banded, or the tooth extracted when all the time the source of the pain was in the stomach. Marriage in general is the social stomach, keep that pure and allment of the social members will take care of themselves. If these professed social reformers would go before the world and declare that the purpose for which men and women entered marriage was wrong and condemn those who either prevented or destroyed life it would be a long, long time before these heralds of glad tidings would need to strike the chords of reform in a Mormon household. Mr. Darwin, for whom you have expressed greater reverence than for the Savior clearly proves that the temperate suffer from a high rate of mortality, and the extremely profligate leave few offspring; and Mr. Vance thinks there is economy in such an order of things, for the more worthy will survive the less worthy. You must conclude that your doctrinaire establishes a theory which cannot but present a gloomy picture of the future of the U. S."

Mr. S.—"But isn't history against you, hasn't the great civilization of modern times been built up by monogamic nations, in contradistinction to those built up by ancient polygamous nations?"

"No, the marriage relations belong more within the domain of the moral than of the intellectual world. Spencer, while visiting America, was interviewed by the press, and when asked if a higher general education would not elevate our government, answered in the negative; affirming that it was a question of high moral character. I believe that whatever the intellectual may come in possession of it is the business of the moral to maintain. What physical and intellectual acquirements did for the ancients their immorality undid: so too the same is not unreasonably to be expected of us. Mr. Spencer thought that we as a race were not of a high enough type to maintain our institutions, and that we would consequently have to go backward before we could go forward. I hope you don't think we are morally in advance of the ancients, and though you may raise your hands in holy horror of the little ones sacrificed to Moloch, there are more lives sacrificed in a day now than were to their gods anciently in a year. I am aware that statistical crime is somewhat on the decrease within the last forty years in England, but the base of villainous operations has entirely changed. Anciently murders were committed comparatively among those who were not without some means of defense; now the murdered ones are not only entirely without

means of defense, but the detection is impossible. We have no means of making a diagnosis of the diseases of the social body, except by the ulcerous places which here and there break out on the surface in the form of prostitution and kindred vices, and if these mean anything at all, they mean that modern society is rotten to the core and must be destroyed."

Mr. S.—"You don't think there will be an end to the race?"

"Yes, 'tis my religion and 'tis your science, if you believe your doctrinaires. (See Spencer on 'Retrogressive Religion,' *Popular Science Monthly*, Aug., 1884.) Spencer affirms that the beginning and end of the individuals implies the beginning and end of the race."

Mr. S.—"How do you reconcile the fact that there is but little difference in the number of the sexes, every man can't have two wives?"

"We don't argue that every man should, but let polygamy be made honorable and women will not be forced to prostitute themselves or be denied the blessings of offspring. Make polygamy honorable in Massachusetts and the tens of thousands of old maids would have no excuse for not accepting a more praiseworthy calling—motherhood. You must first, however, change the purpose of your marriage with one wife before you could think of making anything but a grosser sin out of polygamy. And here I again affirm that the sins of marriage must be looked for in the purpose, not in the kind."

Mr. S.—"But is not the world overstocked with people now, and does not limiting of the family mean limiting the misery of future generations?"

"In the first place, people don't limit their families because of any benefit they expect to bestow upon unborn generations; it is simply to gratify their lust and pleasures. When your scientists condemn them, they hold up this malthusian doctrine to excuse themselves and pose before their fellow men as benefactors of generations to come. They are too much like Louis XIV of France. When he beheld the miseries of his people he remarked, 'Oh, well, things will last my day.'"

Mr. S.—"Animals prey upon and destroy one another, and every seed that falls to the ground does not germinate."

"These animals and seeds adhere to the laws of nature—why shouldn't the same condition apply to men. Men seem to be the outgrowth of their instinctive aggression. Man, alone, is created an enemy to himself, he alone has power of self-destruction by his own volition and he alone is base enough to use the means of self-destruction; animals and plants have not."

Mr. S.—"How do your people regard the law against polygamy?"

"They think it unjust, but so far as the law is concerned it shifted it from the people to the individual. It is wholly between the man that breaks it and the officers of the law."

Mr. S.—"But don't your people preach it?"

"Yes."

Mr. S.—"And don't you think under such circumstances Congress would be justified in taking every political right away from them?"

"What has Congress to do with anything but men's acts. It reminds me of a conversation I held with a gentleman in Iowa. That State has recently passed prohibition laws, and I was told that nearly every man including most of the city officials in some of the cities was opposed to prohibition."

J. M. TANNER.

BY TELEGRAPH.

BY WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

AMERICAN.

TOLEDO, 10.—Governor Hendricks addressed 4,500 people at the Fair grounds this afternoon, the subject being the importance of agriculture and mechanic arts. In the evening he spoke to a democratic mass meeting in the Fifth Ward, to an audience of 3,000. In the course of his speech Hendricks said: "The democrats declare in their platform at Chicago that the revenue must be reduced to the requirements of the government economically administered. What do you say to that, my fellow citizens? Are you a democrat, are you a granger, or an independent? Whatever may be your party relation, what do you say to that proposition of the Chicago convention, that the revenue shall be reduced to the needs of the government, economically administered. (Applause.) If you do not like that, don't vote with the democracy, for when the democracy comes into power, I undertake to say, that the machinery will be turned for awhile, backward did I say? No, forward, in favor of reform, reducing taxation to the needs of the government economically administered. What are you going to collect any more for (voice, 'stealing') why should we have an extraordinary taxation twenty years after we have passed away from the condition of the war?" Passing from this subject Hendricks said: "The republican party under the leadership of the chieftains who are at its head, have now abandoned substantially their old friends, the Germans, and they are laying hold of my Irish friends with a zeal, that is absolutely beautiful. What have the Germans done, that they should be abandoned by the republican party thus? The only fault I know of the Germans is that he says when he lived in Germany beside the Rhine he thought he

had a right to decide for himself what he would eat and drink, and where-withal he should be clothed. What say you, my German friends. Is prohibition right or wrong? (a voice "wrong.") Wrong! Of course it is. In my State our democracy have fought this battle well upon the idea that whether a man shall take a drink of beer or of whisky it belongs to himself." The Governor then recited at length the case in the Administration of Marcy, and the McSweeney case in 1881, when Blaine was Secretary of State, as a tending to show which party was the true friend of foreign born citizens. Concerning the latter, he said: "In the month of June, 1881, shortly before Mr. Garfield received the deadly wound, McSweeney, an Irishman born child, having six or seven American born children, however, and having lived in San Francisco in pursuit of legitimate trade for 21 years, having been completely naturalized, and bearing all the honors upon his permit of American citizenship, thought he would return for his health to Ireland. He did so, and in the month of June he was arrested in Ireland by British constables and landed in a British jail. No charge was preferred against him, no violation of laws was assigned against the seized freeman. Until then, without fault, without crime, without violation of any English law whatever, he was seized and thrown into a hideous dungeon. His wife wrote a letter to the State Department at Washington, informing the Secretary of State that her husband was then under arrest and imprisonment without fault, without crime and without charge. The letter was received at the State Department in Washington on the 16th day of August. James G. Blaine was then Secretary of State, and then acting as President of the United States. Mr. Garfield then languishing upon his bed of pain. That letter was unopened, so far as we know, at least unanswered. It never was answered so long as Blaine continued in the State Department, and he remained in that department until the month of December, that letter being received in the August before. For four months he neglected to give attention to an appeal made by a woman in a distant land applying to him for the honor of his country, for the justice of her laws, for the dignity of her citizenship, that her husband should be relieved. It was not a question of express written law. The statutes of the country, then in force, made it the duty of the President, whenever any person from this country should be held in unlawful imprisonment, that he should demand the cause of the imprisonment, and if the answer did not justify the imprisonment he should demand the release of the man. That was the law, and yet James G. Blaine the dashing, as they say, [Laughter and applause,] neglected to answer it, and during the whole of the four months that he held that high office, and controlled the seal of our country, no answer was made and no instructions to our Minister at London, and McSweeney did not come out of jail until the spring following another administration. I am not speaking on this subject to Irishmen. I am speaking to my fellow-citizens; to every man who feels prouder and stronger when the flag of his country floats over him. To all such I say will you endorse the conduct of Blaine, or will you rally under the banner which Marcy, under Pierce's administration, did erect over us all?"

Gov. Hendricks closed with an allusion to the manner of his nomination, and with a strong appeal to the democrats to carry Ohio in October, as that would decide the contest in November.

NEW YORK, 10.—Henry N. Hadley, of Morey letter fame, was examined today in the Superior Court, special term, in supplementary proceedings in the suit brought by Frank P. Marsh, in which a judgment was recovered some time ago upon a note for \$930. The object of the examination was to find out whether the Democratic National Committee owe Hadley anything, and to secure the amount of the judgment. Hadley had no doubt he was authorized to use whatever was necessary in connection with the authenticity of the Morey letter. He could not remember distinctly, but from receipts which had been published from Wm. H. Price for \$300, he thought he was authorized by Dickeson, the stenographer of the committee. The details of the matter were not clearly impressed on his memory.

"Ask me at once," he said, "whether I wrote the letter or not, so that I can go to dinner. You dare not."

Continuing he said he might have received one from Chairman Barnum. On being sworn, a letter dated October 30, 1880, purporting to be from Barnum, he said the letter was in Dickeson's handwriting. He did not believe it was authorized by Barnum. He thought he had no conversation with, nor instructions from Barnum before he went to Cumberland, Md. He had an interview with Barnum, however, before going to Massachusetts. He was uncertain whether he had a legal claim against the committee, but believed he had an equitable claim. He put no price on his services, but would have accepted, say \$1,000. Legally he supposed he had been paid in full for his services in connection with the investigation of the Morey letter, as he made no contract with the committee.

Ex-United States Senator Wm. H. Barnum, chairman of the Democratic National committee, was examined. He said that about two weeks before