

Twentieth-Century Polygamy and Fundamentalist Mormons in Southern Utah

Ken Driggs

DESPITE OFFICIAL DENIAL, the Manifesto of 1890 did not bring an end to LDS church-approved plural marriages. It did, however, inaugurate an era of confusion, ambiguity, and equivocation in the Mormon community. After two generations of bitter struggle and the creation of thousands of plural families, one could hardly expect polygamy to simply disappear.

The years 1890–1911 were a period of ambiguity. When the federal government granted Utah statehood in 1896, federal laws regulating families gave way to state laws, and such legislation as the Morrill Act (1862), the Poland Act (1874), the Edmunds Act (1882), and the Edmunds-Tucker Act (1887) no longer applied. Although plural marriage was prohibited by both state constitutional and statutory law as a condition for statehood,¹ official enforcement was relaxed. As a result,

KEN DRIGGS has published extensively on Mormon and legal history topics. He holds an LLM in legal history from the University of Wisconsin law school. A version of this essay was presented as the Juanita Brooks Lecture at Dixie College.

¹ Article 3 of the Utah Constitution provides “First:—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.” Article 1, section 4 provides that “the rights of conscience shall never be infringed” and ensures a complete separation of church and state, but has been held not to protect religiously based plural marriage (*In Re Black*, 283 P.2d 887 [1955]).

Utah Enabling Act, ch. 138, 28 stat. 107 (1894), sec. 3, provides, in part, “First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship: Provided, that polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.”

Mormons once again entered into new officially sanctioned plural marriages, and existing plural families continued to live together. This was especially true during the early presidency of Joseph F. Smith, 1901–18. Plural marriages continued to be solemnized both in Zion and in the Mexican colonies. Moreover, many members of the Quorum of the Twelve during this period were reluctant to grant unqualified support to the 1890 Manifesto, including Apostle Abraham O. Woodruff, a son of the Manifesto's author. This official reluctance lent tacit approval to the hundreds of plural marriages—some two thousand according to the *Salt Lake Tribune*—solemnized between 1890 and 1904. (I suspect their estimate was far too high, but the *Tribune* vigorously promoted it.) Historian Tom Alexander noted that “perhaps as high as 15 percent” of stake and ward leaders had entered plural marriages after 1890, “often at the urging of a Church leader” (1986, 62). D. Michael Quinn has estimated that fifty thousand living descendants remain of these marriages (1985, 104; see also Cannon 1978a, 1978b).

The selection in 1903 of Apostle Reed Smoot as a senator from Utah and the four years of Senate hearings concerning his seating forced Church leaders to again address the polygamy question, a confrontation which resulted in the Second Manifesto of April 1904 (*Proceedings* 1906; Shipps 1977; Jenson 1971, 178–81). President Joseph F. Smith said, in part, “I hereby announce that all such marriages are prohibited, and if any officer or member of the Church shall assume to solemnize or enter into any such marriage he will be deemed in transgression against the Church and will be liable to be dealt with, according to the rules and regulations thereof, and excommunicated therefrom” (in Clark 1970, 4:84–86). This time the Church meant business.

In 1911 Apostle John W. Taylor was excommunicated and Apostle Matthias Cowley was disfellowshipped (Jorgensen and Hardy 1980; Collier and Knutson 1987). However, it was during the administration of Heber J. Grant, beginning in 1918, that Church officials made concerted efforts to purge the Church of the most zealous advocates of plural marriage. Among those excommunicated were John W. Woolley, his son Lorin C. Woolley, Israel Barlow, Jr., his son John Yates Barlow, Joseph W. Musser, and others who would later play significant roles in the fundamentalist movement.

EARLY FUNDAMENTALIST LEADERS

It would be a mistake to dismiss early fundamentalist leaders and sympathizers as a group of crackpots. Certainly LDS apostles John

W. Taylor and Matthias Cowley were educated, well-spoken, and thoughtful men. Taylor and Cowley are much respected and embraced by fundamentalists, but both refused to openly join the movement. They remained in the mainline Mormon community, and both were eventually restored to full membership, Taylor some years after his death (see Taylor 1974, 273–79). Other plural marriage holdouts served as stake presidents, bishops, and frequently patriarchs. Often they were from prominent Church families such as the Taylors, Barlows, Musers, Johnsons, Woolleys, and others.

The family of Leroy S. Johnson, who presided in more modern times over a large community of fundamentalists based in Colorado City, Arizona, was fairly typical. He was a son of one of the plural wives of Warren Johnson, called on a mission by Brigham Young to replace John D. Lee as ferrymaster at Lee's Ferry in 1874 (Driggs 1990; Measeles 1981). His brother Price Johnson was convicted of polygamy in Arizona in 1935, one of the first fundamentalists prosecuted in the twentieth century ("Prison" 1935). Within Latter-day Saint society, these men were powerful, respected, relatively well educated (especially in religious matters) and could often claim extensive pedigrees dating back to the time of Joseph Smith.

HEBER J. GRANT'S RESPONSE

In 1918 President Joseph F. Smith died, and Heber J. Grant became seventh president of the Church, serving longer than any other president except Brigham Young. During his administration, Church membership nearly doubled. At the same time, Church leaders sought to mollify public hostility and garner good will by actively and publicly distancing the Church from polygamy holdouts. Although Grant had been convicted of a polygamy-related offense in 1899 ("Heber" 1899), he was determined to eradicate plural marriage within the Church community. He delivered stern messages denouncing the practice in 1925, 1926, and 1931 (in Clark 1970, 5:242, 249, 292–303). In 1933 his counselor J. Reuben Clark, a relative of the Woolleys, prepared a detailed, legalistic, sixteen-page "Final Manifesto" (Quinn 1983, 179–81; Clark 1970, 5:315–30). The statement, which was read aloud in every congregation in the Church, responded to and denounced fundamentalists, who continued to distribute literature at Temple Square during general conference.

Shortly thereafter Clark advocated a kind of ecclesiastical "loyalty oath" that suspected fundamentalist sympathizers were required to sign. Those who refused faced excommunication. Individuals had to pledge that they were not themselves practicing or advocating polygamy, or

spreading rumors that General Authorities secretly condoned plural marriage in their private circles. Musser published a version of the oath in the March 1936 issue of *Truth*, a monthly magazine published by fundamentalists beginning in 1935:

I, the undersigned member of the Millville Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, solemnly declare and affirm that I, without any mental reservation whatever, support the Presidency and Apostles of the church; that I repudiate any intimation that any one of the Presidency or Apostles of the Church is living a double life; that I repudiate those who are falsely accusing them; that I denounce the practice and advocacy of plural marriage as being out of harmony with the declared principles of the Church at the present time; and that I myself am not living in such alleged marriage relationship.

In 1935 the majority of the small dependent ward at Short Creek in southern Utah was excommunicated for refusing to sign the oath. Leroy Johnson and other future fundamentalist leaders were among them.² The loyalty oath apparently backfired. Instead of eradicating fundamentalism, the excommunications only created a core membership around which its leaders could build a more permanent organization. President Clark himself would come to reconsider this approach later in life (Quinn 1983, 184–86).

FUNDAMENTALISTS ORGANIZE

In the 1920s many fundamentalists associated themselves with Utah inventor Nathaniel Baldwin. Among those working in his Salt Lake City radio factory or serving as officers in his business was defrocked apostle Cowley. Until the business foundered, Baldwin was fundamentalism's most important financial patron (Singer 1979; Bronson 1989). Throughout the 1920s, fundamentalists existed as a loose association of friends and sympathizers from both within and without the official Church. At first they recognized John W. Woolley, an excommunicated Salt Lake Stake patriarch and temple worker, as their spiritual leader. With his death in 1928, his son, Lorin C. Woolley, assumed leadership and in 1929 organized the first priesthood council. He was succeeded in 1934 by J. Leslie Broadbent and in 1935 by John Y.

² Those excommunicated in 1935 for refusing to sign the oath included Henry E. Covington, Viva Jones Covington, Leroy S. Johnson, Josephine Ford Johnson, Leonard Black, Vera Colvin Black, J. Warren Black, Ruth Walker Black, Millard W. Black, Eda Johnson Black, Charles C. Cox, Retta Stocks Cox, Karl J. Olds, Charlotte Colvin, Elva E. Walker Carling, Elizabeth Johnson Colvin, Melvin E. Johnson, and Lola Johnson. (See microfilm records of Rockville Ward, Zion Park Stake, Transcript Ward Record, 1935, also called Form E. Originals in LDS Archives.)

Barlow. Each lived in Salt Lake City but ministered to a following all over the old Mormon Zion.

Following mass excommunications at Short Creek in 1934 and 1935, Barlow and Joseph W. Musser visited the community. A few years earlier, members of Leroy Johnson's family had moved there from Lee's Ferry, where their polygamous practices had attracted the attention of local authorities (Stegner 1970, 209–26). Gradually Short Creek became both a center of fundamentalism and an experiment in United Order communalism, although other centers continued in Salt Lake City and at other outposts in Canada, Mexico, and throughout the Great Basin.

In spite of this growth, fundamentalism still lacked the structured hierarchy familiar to most Latter-day Saints. While many fundamentalists looked to the priesthood council for leadership, other "independents" opposed any structure. *Truth*, edited by Joseph W. Musser (and later his son Guy Musser), served as a unifying force among fundamentalists until it expired in 1956.

In 1949 John Y. Barlow, the man most fundamentalists recognized as the leader of the priesthood council, died. Joseph W. Musser became the leader of the council even though he had suffered a series of debilitating strokes and was now under the medical care of Rulon Allred, a naturopath and practicing fundamentalist. Musser's advocacy of Allred as his successor and other religious and policy disputes created a rift in the council (Bronson 1989, 202–43; Solomon 1984, 15–30) before Musser died in 1954. Allred emerged as the leader of a Salt Lake City group, which still exists under the leadership of Rulon's brother Owen Allred. Leroy Johnson assumed the leadership of the more traditional United Effort Trust group in Short Creek, now known as Colorado City, on the Utah-Arizona border. When Johnson died in 1986, Rulon Jeffs, a Sandy accountant, succeeded him.

CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS

In 1935 the Utah legislature made unlawful cohabitation, a polygamy-related crime, a felony for the first time. Even in the darkest days of the 1880s, Congress had left the offense a misdemeanor (Driggs 1988a, 1988b, 1990; Firmage and Mangrum 1988; Linford 1965). That same year, Arizona prosecuted a half dozen Short Creek residents, aided by the LDS Church, which had earlier excommunicated them. In a 4 April 1931 conference address, President Heber J. Grant had stated the Church's position concerning prosecution:

We have been and we are willing to give such legal assistance as we legitimately can in the criminal prosecution of such cases [new polygamy]. We are willing to

go to such limits not only because we regard it as our duty as citizens of the country to assist in the enforcement of the law and the suppression of pretended 'plural marriages,' but also because we wish to make our attitude toward this matter so clear, definite, and unequivocal as to leave no possible doubt of it in the mind of any person. (in Clark 1970, 5:292-93)

Fundamentalists were convinced the 1935 Short Creek trials were engineered by local LDS leaders after the excommunications ("Heber" 1936). In the first twentieth-century convictions of fundamentalist Mormons, two men were sentenced to eighteen to twenty-four months in the Arizona state prison.

Washington County, Utah, attempted more prosecutions in the late 1930s (*State v. Jessop* 1940). The 8 March 1944 *Salt Lake Tribune* reported a major multi-state and federal government raid that led to the arrests of almost fifty people, the eventual imprisonment of twenty-two of them, and publicity in such national publications as *Time*, *Look*, *Newsweek*, and most major newspapers. Again, the Church publicly applauded the raid. The following official statement appeared in the 8 March *Salt Lake Tribune*:

Since the manifesto by President Wilford Woodruff was adopted by the church (on October 6, 1890), the first presidency and other general authorities have repeatedly issued warnings against an apostate group that persisted in the practice of polygamous marriage, illegal both as to the church and the state. Members of the church who have let this warning go unheeded and have violated the rule and doctrines of the church by entering into these illicit relationships have been formally dealt with and excommunicated as rapidly as they could be found out. This is the extreme punishment which the church can inflict.

Notwithstanding excommunication, some of these persons have persisted in propagating their false ideas regarding the doctrine of plural marriage. Their attitude is one of rebellion against the church. Their activities are unauthorized, illegal and void.

We commend and uphold the federal government in the efforts through the office of the United States district attorney and assisting agencies to bring before the bar of justice those who have violated the law.

Church members also assisted in the prosecutions. The 2 October *Ogden Standard Examiner* reported that Bishop Kasper Fetzer testified at one of the trials that Church officials "sent me on a special mission to try and save young people's souls from the clutches of the cult." Three appeals from these prosecuted cases reached the United States Supreme Court—*Chatwin v. United States* (1946), *Cleveland v. United States* (1946), and *Musser et al v. Utah* (1948)—the first time religiously based polygamy had been considered there in this century.

Finally, in the big Arizona raid of 26 July 1953, almost three hundred people were taken into custody, and national publicity was extensive. Page one articles appeared in the *Atlanta Constitution*, the *Dallas*

Morning News, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and others. Reports in the *Arizona Republic* and *Deseret News* noted that as a result of the raid, twenty-seven Arizona men were placed on a short probation and over 160 children and their mothers remained in Arizona foster homes for almost two years ("147 Receive" 1955; "Short Creek" 1955; Bradley 1990). A United States Senate subcommittee came to Arizona in 1955 for largely unproductive investigative hearings, and the Utah Supreme Court decided the legally notorious *In Re Black* (1955) denying parental rights to fundamentalists who practice or advocate polygamy.

The last organized polygamy hunt came in 1955 when five men, all of them "independents," were arrested ("Two Utah" 1955).

A TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY

Today fundamentalist Mormons can be found all over the old Mormon Zion, with substantial congregations outside Mexico City and in western Canada. There is even a small western European following. They are not a monolithic group. There are several organized priesthood groups and perhaps an equal number of unaffiliated independents. A few remain active members of the LDS Church, keeping a low profile about their fundamentalist sympathies. The two largest organized groups are that based in Colorado City, which has a meeting house with seating for five thousand and which is presided over by Rulon Jeffs, successor to Leroy Johnson. The other, presided over by the grandfatherly Owen Allred, has its administrative base in Bluffdale, Utah, but has a congregation numbering in the hundreds outside Mexico City and a united order community at Pinesdale, Montana.

The fundamentalist Mormon community in Southern Utah today is primarily the United Effort Trust group at old Short Creek, now known as Hildale, Utah, and Colorado City, Arizona. A smaller community near Cedar City affiliates with the Allred group. In the interest of full disclosure, I should say that as an outside observer who has visited several fundamentalist communities and been a guest in both worship services and a number of homes, I am sympathetic to these people, though I have reservations about some aspects of their community life. Let me offer a few personal observations.

Most Latter-day Saints have a difficult time being clear-headed when it comes to fundamentalism. Years of hard feelings and emotional biases based on internal doctrinal differences and, to be honest, embarrassment over polygamy, make objectivity difficult. A small minority who call themselves fundamentalists have been violent, resulting in distorted stereotypes in the news of all fundamentalists. Main-

stream fundamentalism has no tradition of violence and no tolerance for it. Perhaps we should put polygamy entirely aside for a moment and consider the similarities of the fundamentalist Mormon community with other very traditional, socially conservative, and sincere religious communities. I find striking parallels with Old and New Order Amish, Mennonites, Hutterites, and others in the Anabaptist tradition (Hostetler 1974).

Fundamentalist Mormons are very traditional. Families and children are extremely important, indeed are the primary focus of community life. Divorce or, in the case of plural families, a "cancellation of sealings," is frowned upon, though it does occur. Community sexual mores are very restrictive, beginning with extreme modesty in dress and appearance.

For instance, accepted dress for women in Colorado City requires plain dresses to the wrists, ankles, and neck to cover garments. Make-up and jewelry are frowned upon. Hair is worn long and in old-fashioned styles. Men wear shirts to the wrists and buttoned to the neck, no matter what the season. I once attended Sunday worship services in Colorado City and counted only four men and boys out of about two thousand in attendance not wearing plain white shirts. Men wear their hair short and are always clean shaven. I'm told this style is not doctrinal, but is social custom advocated by the late Leroy Johnson.

Even the discussion of sexual topics is considered inappropriate. Men's and women's roles are very traditional and gender based, though many women work competently outside of the home. Hard, honest work, especially physical labor, is expected of everyone. Children are taught to respect their parents and adopt the community's shared values. As with any socially conservative community, fundamentalists have their portion of teenaged rebellion, and I expect they always will have.

With some reservations about subjects and their application, education is admired and encouraged. A college education in what are thought to be appropriate areas, usually practical fields such as business, education, or nursing, is thought to be a good thing. Many parents have proudly told me of their childrens' college study. Fundamentalist men and women seem to be no more or less educated than the residents of other rural, modest-sized communities in the Great Basin.

Fundamentalists are aware of the "world" around them and carry on a running debate about the problem of being in the world but not of it. Crime, divorce, a perceived erosion of respect for authority and patriotism, deviant sexuality, and declining honesty in our society are the great threats they see for the nation as well as for their community. They want no part of these evils and make conscious efforts to isolate themselves from what they believe to be moral cancers.

Two examples may illustrate. Television has only recently found its way into some homes in Colorado City. The few households with TVs tend to draw neighbors who also want to watch. Many are less than thrilled about this encroachment from the outside world. I suspect they fear less the electronic portrayal of monogamous households than the sex, violence, disrespect, and rampant materialism that they see there.

As a second example, the community has recently been involved in considerable litigation over parental rights and other issues connected with their practice of religiously based polygamy.³ They have retained very able lawyers outside the community to represent them, most of them LDS bishops or stake officers. (I work with these lawyers as a consultant and expert witness. I am sixth generation LDS with a history of polygamy in my family.) Some of the leading cases that will support arguments on behalf of the fundamentalists involve the rights of homosexuals, lesbians, and other individuals whose conduct fundamentalists object to very strongly. While lawyers see no reason not to utilize these cases, the fundamentalists are most reluctant because they so totally reject the conduct involved.

If all this sounds like what you might encounter in an outlying, extremely conservative LDS stake, it should come as no surprise. We are all part of the same religious tradition with the same root values. We have much more in common than we have differences.

So how do fundamentalists differ from “regular” Latter-day Saints? “They’re the ones who practice polygamy, and they’re not really Mormons anyway” is far too simple a response.

A 1963 master’s thesis by John Day characterizes fundamentalist Mormonism as a protest against adaptation. I think that’s pretty much on the mark. The LDS Church we know today is so different from nineteenth-century Mormonism that Brigham Young and John Taylor would be hard-pressed to recognize it. The stress of legal and social pressure from the rest of the nation, coupled with economic and demographic pressures that resulted from great missionary success, made it virtually impossible for the nineteenth-century Church to survive unchanged. Adaptations to these new realities were unavoidable, and Wilford Woodruff’s 1890 Manifesto was only one of those

³ Those cases are: *In the Matter of W.A.T. et al*, 808 P.2d 1083 (Utah 1991) concerning the Fischer adoption; *Williams et al v. United Effort Plan* (No. 87-C-1022J, D. Utah, United States District Court) concerning the partition of the UEP trust; and *Barlow et al v. ALEOAC* (No. CIV 91-838 PHX RCB, D. Arizona, United States District Court) concerning the decertification of a polygamous law enforcement officer.

adaptations. It was neither the first nor the last, and it was not even the greatest (Alexander 1986; Shipps 1984).

While many Church members had pushed for these changes, a significant minority found them very unsettling. The vast majority of men and women on both sides of the debate were principled and sincere. Fundamentalism as we know it today has its roots among the conservatives who resisted both these changes in the Mormon community and changes in the nation at large as it became more urban and industrialized.

DOCTRINAL DIFFERENCES

Change and division brought with it new theological constructs (see Musser 1980; Kraut 1989; Richardson 1988). Fundamentalists consider themselves part of the LDS Church, living within special priesthood organizations set apart to continue and preserve sacred ordinances. In 1991 the Colorado City community incorporated itself in Utah as the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, for the first time announcing its break with the Church through a legal creation. Outside of these priesthood groups, independent polygamists, not surprisingly, are much less concerned with direct lines of priesthood authority.

The priesthood councils believe that the temporal Church—the popularly accepted Church—is not the head of the priesthood. To them the leadership of the priesthood and the leadership of the Church are not one in the same but were divided sometime after the death of President John Taylor. According to this model, Ezra Taft Benson is the head of the corporate body, but Rulon Jeffs or Owen Allred, depending on the fundamentalist affiliation, is the head of the priesthood. The head of the priesthood is usually the senior member of the seven-member Priesthood Council and as such enjoys the direct counsel and guidance of God for his people.

As a consequence of this perception, fundamentalists do not always view changes that come through the Church as proper and binding. They do not recognize either the first or second manifesto or the suspension of plural marriage. They also feel the Church is “out of order,” to use their phrase, in other significant ways. They do not accept changes made since the administration of President Joseph F. Smith in the temple ceremony or in the garment design. They refer to “priesthood garments” rather than “temple garments,” as most Mormons call them. This is more a concern of the Allred group. (Many have stressed that they do not need to “sneak” into LDS

temples to perform their ordinances: they are concerned about proper priesthood authority, rather than ordinances performed in a specific place.)

Fundamentalists disagree with the Church's turn-of-the-century suspension of a literal, physical gathering of Zion and with temple-building outside of the old Zion. (The first temple opened outside the Great Basin was the Hawaiian Temple, dedicated in 1919 by President Heber J. Grant.) They also reject the discontinuation of religious communalism, such as the United Order efforts. All of the priesthood groups attempt to continue some form of communalism, including the United Effort Plan in Colorado City. In addition they reject the ordinations of blacks to the priesthood, what they refer to as the "Canaanite Revelation."

Other disagreements include the present more worldly role of apostles in the Church; the discontinuation of the Adam/God theory; the decision to stop sending missionaries out without purse or script; the infallibility of the prophet, especially when he appears to modify doctrines introduced by Joseph Smith; and the Word of Wisdom as a law rather than advisory counsel, a somewhat less tolerant position than they embrace.



Seemingly small points can be especially telling. In both of the large priesthood groups, prayers in worship services are often delivered by men with the right arm raised to the square. In the Allred group worship services, only priests and Melchizedek priesthood holders bless and administer the sacrament. Water is passed in large glasses or goblets, as in the last century. A Melchizedek priesthood holder hands the bread or water to the member, who partakes and hands it back to the priesthood holder, who in turn hands it to the next member. This is in contrast to the usual administration of the sacrament in LDS sacrament meetings by the Aaronic priesthood, and the passing of sacrament trays down aisles from member to member. I have never seen a woman speak in a worship service of the Colorado City group.

Even with these and other differences, fundamentalist meetings have a distinctly Mormon flavor. The congregation sings Mormon hymns from LDS hymnals. Pictures of Joseph Smith and Jesus Christ are in evidence. Speakers quote from the four standard works but use just as frequently the *Journal of Discourses* and the *Millennial Star*. Ezra Taft Benson might be quoted approvingly on some point, and the *Ensign* might be used in a meeting hall or home. Everywhere there is the comfortable sort of atmosphere we find when a lay clergy presides over meetings and delivers sermons. The language used will be peculiarly Mormon.

PLURAL MARRIAGE

Then there is the issue of polygamy, or plural marriage as the fundamentalists prefer to call it. For them polygamy is a pejorative term that implies no priesthood authority. Though probably what fundamentalists are best known for, plural marriage certainly is not practiced by all fundamentalists and probably not even by a majority.

While romantic love is not necessarily the model for selection of spouses in Colorado City, I am told the feelings of the parties involved are taken into account. Marriages are most often arranged by parents and the community's religious leaders, who believe they are guided by divine inspiration. Sometimes this amounts to being sure that everyone in need of care is the responsibility of some priesthood holder. Not all such marriages work, and when they don't, a cancellation of sealings, a kind of divorce, is granted. Sometimes, with their parents' permission, young people marry before they reach majority. Large age gaps between husbands and wives are not uncommon. The Allred group, in contrast, uses romance as a model, but always with the prior approval of priesthood authorities.

Children and large families are the norm, as they are considered the primary reasons for marriage. It is my understanding that sexual relationships between spouses are not considered proper unless children are possible (Bradley 1990).

Stereotypes about fundamentalist lifestyles are sometimes accurate but frequently downright untrue. My experience with friends in Colorado City suggests that women are often reserved when they first encounter strangers, going through a stage of sizing the newcomer up. I have women friends there who are outspoken and obviously strong willed. Among them is Vera Black, the subject of *In Re Black* (1955), who is personable, yet a strong presence. Even young women under twenty, once they accept a newcomer in the community as a friend, are not shy. The stereotype of the meek and submissive Colorado City plural wife is simply off the mark in my experience. Most of their young people today seem to understand that there are other lives to be lived if they wish.

Polygamy in Colorado City may also serve as a distinct group identification practice, just as it did for nineteenth-century Mormons. It clearly identifies individuals as members of a distinct religious community; leaving the group and blending into the world become psychologically and socially difficult. Some religious historians believe this was on Joseph Smith's mind when he introduced the doctrine (Moore 1982, 1986). When a group practice also draws persecution from the world, group solidarity increases.

CONCLUSION

We can all benefit from religious tolerance. Because of our own experiences of a century ago, Latter-day Saints should be prepared to set the standard for tolerating the sincere religious views and practices of others, even when we strongly disagree with them. We need not accept practices without question, particularly those that may actually injure unwilling participants. But we should never be eager to condemn practices that are a valid reflection of religious faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Thomas. *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890-1930*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Barlow, Daniel. Interview with the author, May 1989, Colorado City, Arizona. Audio tape in the author's possession.
- Bradley, Martha S. "The Women of Fundamentalism: Short Creek, 1953." *DIALOGUE* 23 (Summer 1990): 15-37.

- Bronson, Lorraine A. *Winnie*. Privately published typescript book, 1989.
- Cannon, Kenneth L., II. "After the Manifesto: Mormon Polygamy 1890-1906." *Sunstone* 8 (Jan.-April 1978a): 27-35.
- . "Beyond the Manifesto: Polygamous Cohabitation Among LDS General Authorities after 1890." *The Utah Historical Quarterly* 46 (Winter 1978b): 24-36.
- Clark, James R. *Messages of the First Presidency*. 6 vols. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft Inc., 1970.
- Collier, Fred, and Knut Knutson, eds. *The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley*. Salt Lake City: Collier's Publishing Co., 1987.
- Day, John Marshall. "A Study of Protest to Adaptation." Unpublished thesis, University of Utah, 1963.
- Driggs, Ken. "The Mormon Church-State Confrontation in Nineteenth Century America." *Journal of Church and State* 30 (Spring 1988a): 273-89.
- . "The Prosecutions Begin: Defining Cohabitation in 1885." *DIALOGUE* 21 (Spring 1988b): 109-26.
- . "Fundamentalist Attitudes Toward the Church as Reflected in the Sermons of the Late Leroy S. Johnson." *DIALOGUE* 23 (Summer 1990a): 39-60.
- . "Lorenzo Snow's Appellate Court Victory." *Utah Historical Quarterly* 58 (Winter 1990b): 81-93.
- Firmage, Edwin Brown, and Richard Collin Mangrum. *Zion in the Courts: A Legal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 1830-1900*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- "Heber J. Grant Appears in Court." *Deseret News*, 8 September 1899, 2.
- "Heber J. Grant Given Cause to Rejoice." *Truth*, January 1936, 101-4.
- Hostetler, John A. *Hutterite Society*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- In Re Black*. 283 P.2d 887 (Utah 1955). U.S. certiorari denied. 350 U.S. 923, 76 S. Ct. 211, 100 L. Ed. 807 (1955).
- Jenson, Andrew. *Latter-Day Saint Biographical Encyclopedia*. 4 vols. Reprint. Salt Lake City: Western Epics, 1971.
- Jorgensen, Victor W., and B. Carmon Hardy. "The Taylor-Cowley Affair and the Watershed of Mormon History." *The Utah Historical Quarterly* 48 (Winter 1980): 4-36.
- Kraut, Ogden. "The Fundamentalist Mormon: A History and Doctrinal Review." Paper delivered at the 1989 Sunstone Symposium in Salt Lake City. Available on tape from Sunstone.
- Linford, Orma. "The Mormons and the Law: The Polygamy Cases." *Utah Law Review* 9 (1965): 308-70, 543-91.
- Measeles, Evelyn Brack. *A Crossing on the Colorado: Lee's Ferry*. Boulder, Colo.: Pruett Publishing, 1981.
- Moore, R. Laurence. "Insiders and Outsiders in American Historical Narrative and American History." *American Historical Review* 87 (April 1982): 390-423.
- . *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

- Musser, Joseph W. *Celestial or Plural Marriage: The Mormon Marriage System*. Reprint. Salt Lake City: Truth Publishing Co., 1980.
- "147 Receive Short Creek Restoration." *Arizona Republic*, 22 March 1955, 12.
- Proceedings Before the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the United States Senate in the Matter of the Protests Against the Right of Hon. Reed Smoot, a Senator from the State of Utah, to Hold His Seat. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1906.
- Quinn, D. Michael. "LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904." *DIALOGUE* 18 (Spring 1985): 9-105.
- Shapps, Jan. "The Public Image of Sen. Reed Smoot, 1902-32." *The Utah Historical Quarterly* 45 (Fall 1977): 380-400.
- . "The Principle Revoked: A Closer Look at the Demise of Plural Marriage." *Journal of Mormon History* 11 (1984): 65-77.
- "Short Creek Finale." *Arizona Republic*, 22 March 1955, 6.
- Singer, Merrill. "Nathaniel Baldwin, Utah Inventor and Patron of the Fundamental-ist Movement." *Utah Historical Quarterly* 47 (Winter 1979): 42-53.
- Solomon, Dorothy Allred. *In My Father's House*. New York and Toronto: Franklin Watts, 1984.
- State v. Jessop*, 100 P.2d 969 (Utah 1940).
- Stegner, Wallace. *Mormon Country*. Reprint. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.
- Taylor, Samuel Woolley. *Family Kingdom*. Reprint. Salt Lake City: Western Epics, 1974.
- "Two Utah Men Arrested on Cohabitation Charge." *Deseret News*, 27 October 1955, 1B.
- Utah State Legislature. An Act Amending Section 103-51-2, Revised Statutes of Utah, 1933, Making Unlawful Cohabitation a Felony, and Providing That All Persons Except the Defendant Must Testify in Proceedings Therefore. *Laws of Utah* 1935, ch. 112, 220.