

Lecture II

HOW TO WRITE AN ANTI-MORMON BOOK

DR. HUGH W. NIBLEY

Well, we go literally from the sublime to the ridiculous.

We have all read anti-Mormon books and have been annoyed by them--especially by things we could not quite put our finger on. We sense that something is being slipped over on us, but we do not know exactly what it is. Last year there appeared on the market a typical run-of-the-mill anti-Mormon book which deserves our attention if only because it perfectly summarizes all other anti-Mormon books. The reader who takes the trouble to investigate will soon discover that Mr. Irving Wallace's The Twenty-seventh Wife is nothing but warmed-up leftovers of Analiza Young (Eliza Ann Webb D. Young Dennings), wife number nineteen. There is nothing different from what you will find in Mrs. Stenhouse's book here--her full exposé of Mormonism. And you will find that Mrs. Stenhouse is simply repeating the stories of Mary Burton and "The Beetle," the ghost writer who was also Eliza Ann Young's ghost writer. He was here in Utah awhile and then in Chicago; he was also a ghost writer for Bill Hickman, the author of The Danites. You may notice that this "Beetle" authenticates his Hickman stories by appealing to Judge Harding for a first-hand account of Mormonism, which Judge Harding takes from Pomeroy Tucker, who, in turn, borrowed from J. C. Bennett, E. D. Howell and Bedi Dogberry. We see the ancient and devious brotherhood of Mormon historians busily passing the same stock stories around from book to book.

After eighty-five years of diligent non-Mormon research, Mr. Wallace, in retelling Analiza's story, has not a single significant detail to add. That is rather astonishing. Since Alexander Campbell's first blast 130 years ago, nothing has been learned and nothing has been forgotten. What makes this remarkable is the uniform claim by all anti-Mormon writers that what they are telling is just a mere sampling--just a drop in the bucket--of the terrible things they could tell. But none of those other things ever turn up. Analiza Young herself says in her 1875 book that she could easily write any one of 600 books which would be far worse than her first. In 1908 she tried to do it, and had a lot less to tell than she did in her 1875 book.

Non-Mormon writers draw irresponsibly and uncritically from a single corpus of anti-Mormon lore. The further we get from the original sources, the less able we are to examine their validity; what once was believed only because the public, at the fervent behest of the ministry, was desperately determined to believe it true, now is accepted because nobody will take the trouble to examine it. The result is the truly remarkable uniformity of anti-Mormon literature of any generation. One only has to compare Mr. Wallace's book with those of John Hyde or Pomeroy Tucker to see how little

it has changed. It is unchanging and ancient as a mummy and for the same reason: it was born dead. The air of unreality that haunts this literature is nowhere more apparent than in its latest triumph--Mr. Wallace's book. However, unlike certain of his predecessors, Mr. Wallace is not precisely a myth maker. He is a mythographer, as the Greeks would call him. It is the art of the mythographer which we shall now describe. How does one go about producing a new exposé of Mormonism? We offer ten rules, and will illustrate them from Mr. Wallace and Analiza Young.

Rule one (bearing in mind that we are entering upon a very controversial field): make it clear that at last, after years of groping and speculation based on what Mr. Wallace calls "a mass of lies and contradictions which furnishes the evidence," you have come forth with the plain, unvarnished truth. Declare that you are peculiarly chosen and fitted for your task and are perfectly free from prejudice. Mr. Wallace writes, "I emerge from my researches with my objectivity unblurred." A marvelous man, you must admit. "During close to three years of intensive research on Analiza and on her Church I became neither anti-Mormon nor pro-Mormon." A phenomenon! He neither believes in modern-day revelation nor denies it. Remember what Brother Romney told us the other day: the things of God can be only known by the spirit of God. Can you say that you do not accept modern-day revelation and at the same time do not reject it? It is an absurd proposition--unless you leave revelation strictly alone. But Mr. Wallace does not do that.

To establish your qualifications under principle number one, refer gently, but firmly, as Mr. Wallace does, to the bias and prejudice of other anti-Mormon books. Mr. Wallace says, "Mrs. Brody's unremitting hysteria on every page mars her prose." It does not disqualify her as a historical source or anything like that. It "mars her prose." The strategy is to take other non-Mormon writers kindly to task for their disturbing tendency toward exaggeration and hysteria thereby making clear to your readers that you are above such things. Protest your love for the Mormon people. Show your tolerant and humane attitude by allowing the Mormons a few human failings--that will make your story more plausible and for that reason far more damning. Be homey and folksy. Always refer to Mrs. Eliza Ann Webb D. Young Denning as Analiza, and to Brigham Young always as Brigham, of course, just as Mrs. Brody always says Joseph, never Joseph Smith. In this way you show that you have an intimate personal and benevolent insight into your subject. No one will dare accuse you of prejudice.

Now our second point: once you have established your lack of prejudice, you must convince the reader of your scholarly qualifications. "Nowadays," writes H. Trevor-Roper, "to carry conviction, a historian must document or appear to document his formal narrative, but his background, his generalization, allusions, comparisons remain happily free from this inconvenience." We shall refer to the background in due time, but first consider the means by which an anti-Mormon writer can "document or appear to document his formal

narrative." Naturally, he needs first-hand material, and this is surprisingly easy to find. Old photographs and engravings, picked up with little trouble, are impressive evidence of research. Here, for example (to show what Wallace has done through research), is a picture of the Lion House, another one of the Beehive House, a cut from Mrs. Young's own book, and the title page of her book. Of course, all these pictures are available in any library of any size at all in the country, but they make it seem as if you, the scholarly author, are in direct contact with your subject. It makes no difference what the picture is of--a portrait of anybody connected in any way with the story, pictures of anything from the time, locomotives, patented machines, famous catastrophes--anything will do to show that you, so to speak, were there.

An imposing appendix, too, is a must. The bulkier it is and the more names you cram into it, the more intimidating it will appear and the less the reader will feel like checking up on anything.

Be sure to wave your credentials. Remind the reader from time to time, as Mr. Wallace does, that your book represents almost three years of intensive research. Be lavish in bestowing thanks and bouquets on the vast army of workers who have assisted you. Mr. Wallace is hard to beat in this department. "Who would not feel obligated to accept this book without further question," says Mr. Wallace, "if only out of a decent respect for that host of skilled researchers who gave so selflessly of their time and energies to collaborate with me in my attempt to preserve a remarkable woman for history." Thank everybody for valuable information, even if the information was only that the party was not at home or that he had none to offer. I have talked to a number of people whose names are mentioned with gratitude and who resent the fact. They did not tell him a thing. One woman in Salt Lake is quite astonished and put out to find her name here, quite prominently mentioned. List all the names you can, whether the people like it or not. Express deep-felt regrets at having to pass by hundreds more in silence for lack of space. Name every library at which you and your assistants have thumbed through a card index as having rendered eager and invaluable assistance. Become dewy-eyed over the ceaseless and altruistic efforts of your devoted and selfless staff. Make it apparent that your book was something of a public crusade, an idealistic enterprise into which an army of citizens--volunteers to the great cause of truth--entered with enthusiasm. Analiza Young did these things; Mr. Wallace has faithfully followed her example.

Furthermore, it will be difficult to challenge your intellectual fairness if you establish your surpassing intellectual magnitude right at the outset of your book. So open it with a mass of random and promiscuous erudition calculated to intimidate any potential critics and beat the opposition flat before they can object to your first serious slip. Anything will do. Tell about the century in which your characters lived, as Mr. Wallace does. This was the time when the stout, stuffy "Little Victory" was bustling with heavy trunks. Have an assistant look up the technical word to describe the

type of trunk between Balmoral and wherever it was. This was the time when the lights were burning late on whatever street it was on which Pasteur had his laboratory. You might mention Pasteur's whiskers. You can look up all the details or have somebody else do it and then toss them all off in a casual, offhand manner that shows how well you know your way around in the field. When you have gathered a nice, fat handful of three-by-fives, throw them cockily in the reader's face before he has got to page twenty. You will have put him in his place, if he is the kind who likes to ask annoying questions.

Now that you have established you are an unbiased, highly qualified scholar, you are ready for the third point--"unequal scholarship, the scrupulous straining at small, historical gnats," as Trevor-Roper says, "which diverts attention from the silent digestion of large and inconvenient camels." How choosily scholars nibble when the matter is of no great significance, thus winning tributes to their scholarship from lay reviewers. And yet what enormous gulps they take when no one, they think, is looking. An excellent demonstration of this technique is Mr. Wallace's description of Analiza Young's escape from Utah. In this tale, which is one absurdity after another, he is at pains to remind us no less than three times that the train went exactly twenty-two miles an hour. In the face of such scrupulous attention even to the smallest detail it would be churlish to question the rest of his story. He strains at a gnat, showing how meticulous he has been in his research, while he recounts this fantastic story of Analiza's escape, which she made up.

It is important to one who would make the fullest use of the principle of unequal scholarship to avoid footnotes if at all possible. Instead, include a huge bibliography. It looks impressive and you do not have to be responsible for a thing. The very few anti-Mormon writers who have risked footnotes have got themselves into serious trouble. The main objection to footnotes if you happen, as Mr. Wallace does, to be getting 90 per cent of your information from two or three books, is that they give you away. Without footnotes, on the other hand, not one reader in a thousand suspects that all those hundreds of sources indicated in your appendix are nothing but eye-wash. Since it is your purpose to make your reader believe that you have used all those sources equally and fairly, it is foolish to throw away your advantage by letting him question you too closely.

Point four: in place of evidence, use rhetoric. When one is making grave, criminal charges, as anti-Mormon writers all make, evidence can be very troublesome, so let it alone. The ancients found that any public prefers rhetoric anyway. They also discovered the two basic principles of rhetorical method which will be invaluable to your anti-Mormon book. Number one they called the aggest: build up a case not on facts but on probabilities. It is more interesting and can be subjected to definite rules. Number two is the use of standard responses to standard situations--that is, the use of familiar stock phrases and emotive words of tested reliability. We

can illustrate these two principles in a situation which we will call "The House that Jack Built."

It is common knowledge that Jack built a house. (Notice the little phrases we use: "It is common knowledge" that Jack built a house.) It is that house which we are now discussing. There are rumors that a good deal of malt, very probably stolen, was stored in the house. What lends probability to the report is that Jack chose to build a house. Why a house, if not to store the stolen malt? Further, it is said that the malt was eaten by rats; and in view of the high nutrient content of malt (see Appendix A for references to scholarly and scientific studies proving beyond a doubt that malt is nutritious), there is no good reason for doubting this report. The rats may very probably have been killed by a cat, as some believe, and there is certainly nothing intrinsically improbable in this. On the contrary, a study by the Rodent Institute, of the University of So and So, shows that only one rat . . . (here follows the Rodent Institute's conclusions). Thus, the report that only one rat ate the malt is erroneous; the consumption of such a large quantity of malt would require many years and probably a large number of rats. That the cat was chased by a dog is only to be expected. Only a fanatic would question it. The same applies to the dog being tossed by a cow, although that is admittedly a less common event. At any rate (always use "at any rate" whenever you have listed a lot of improbably things), we can be reasonably certain that the cow was milked by a milkmaid. What other kind of maid could it have been? Also, there is no good reason to doubt that the milkmaid, whose name may have been Bertha, was wooed by a man tattered and torn. There are unmistakable references in the newspapers of the time, or at least of a generation later, of a poorly dressed man roaming about the country. There can, therefore, be little doubt that Bertha was engaged in a passionate and public wooing. The date of Bertha's marriage to her tattered lover is not known exactly (How much better this sounds than simply saying "it is not known." If we do not know at all, we may as well not know it exactly. It sounds as if you had made a more careful research than had ever been made before.), but it could have been late sometime in January, 1858. (It could have been in February, 1942.) Though there is no evidence that Bertha was badly mistreated by the man who wooed her so passionately, there is no good reason for doubting it, especially in view of what has gone before.

Now, what has been proved? Nothing! Yet we have given the world a suffering Bertha and her brutal spouse without having to prove anything. We have created a fictitious story and now can build up Bertha's biography upon it in a way that will make every fair-minded reader burn with indignation. You must, then, give your anti-Mormon book historical reality, by connecting it up in some way with real historical events. No matter how tenuous, the connection will bring your tale to life. Here is an example from Wallace, the way he works.

Because Chauncey [notice this Chauncey is Mr.

Webb, Analiza Young's father; but he is Chauncey to Mr. Wallace] had written [notice the loaded words] in the community, Brigham Young considered him a valuable Mormon. As such, Chauncey was ordered to serve a tour of duty as a missionary. Tied closer to the Church than ever by polygamy, Chauncey was forced to comply. On his mission Chauncey decided, without too much pain, it may be assumed, that an English girl as a wife might be more decorative than a home-grown product, so he married an English girl.

Take this little paragraph on why Joseph Smith introduced polygamy:

The Prophet had been [we should ring a bell or a buzzer every time we get one of these loaded words or phrases] intrigued by the polygamic practices of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Solomon, and David. There is little doubt that he believed that the plural wife system was the God-favored system of marriage. Beyond this there may have been decisive personal factors that influenced him [notice the vaguery], quite possibly his juiceless and forbidding wife. Evidently Smith had a roving eye. Yet, his stern, puritanical upbringing did not give him the easy conscience of a rake. He could not allow himself a mistress, and so possibly to have his cake and eat it too he allowed himself a plurality of wives. However, Smith realized that he could only make it acceptable for himself if he made it acceptable to his wide following; or perhaps, as the Mormons insist, none of this elaborate intrigue was necessary, for Smith did receive [Mr. Wallace underlines this] an order from on high. At any rate, Smith began to devote himself to premature polygamy.

Every sentence is speculative; every word in italics here is an escape hatch in case one should hold Mr. Wallace to his thesis. This paragraph is the cornerstone of his whole work, and it is loaded. How does he know that Emma, to whom Joseph Smith was devoted all his life, was "juiceless and forbidding," or that Smith in his secret heart realized this or that? Wallace concludes this pivotal paragraph by a supreme rhetorical trick. After presenting conclusions founded upon no evidence whatever, he clinches them by thrusting before the reader an alternative so ridiculous that one has no choice but to reject it: ". . . or perhaps Smith did receive an order from on high." The underlining of "did" is not only superbly ironical, it is triumphant. Suppose there is no evidence to support Mr. Wallace's thesis--so what? Look at the alternative. There is no choice. He must be right after all.

Point five has to do with "background." Recall that the quotation we made from Trevor-Roper had two parts: "Nowadays to carry conviction, a historian must document, or appear to document his formal narrative"--that is the first part. "But his background, his generalizations, his allusions, comparisons remain happily free from this inconvenience. This freedom is very useful. Against it, against this imaginary background, even correctly stated facts can be wonderfully transformed." This is the second element--the background. Once you have it firmly established, facts need not bother you. For example, it can be firmly established in the reader's mind that Lincoln was a mountebank, as certain people have believed. Then anything further that is said about him is colored.

Mr. Wallace exploits this technique. In his book he builds an atmosphere, and once he has succeeded it makes no difference what the facts are. The damage is done. That is what Trevor-Roper means when he says that against the background, once the reader has accepted it, "even correctly stated facts can be wonderfully transformed." What an anti-Mormon book conveys is not a history of this or that person or persons, but an atmosphere. To create one, no trick is more effective than the use of loaded words--atmosphere is the rhetorician's specialty. For example, Brigham Young never asks for anything in Mr. Wallace's book. He always commands. His wives are always called his "harem." The reader never learns how the Mormon Church operated or how it is organized, but hears only of the "hierarchy." The members are always referred to as the "underlings," and so forth. Knowing perfectly well that John Hyde gave a false picture of the temple ordinances, Wallace nevertheless quotes his lurid story at length (taking care to designate him as "Elder" John Hyde even though he was not an elder when he wrote) because Mr. Hyde leaves a very nasty taste in our mouths. That is what you want; that is your atmosphere.

Point six: use women. The most successful anti-Mormon writing has been done by women, which is to be expected since, as Mr. Wallace reminds us, under polygamy it was the women who suffered while the men had all the fun. His authority for that statement was a woman, Mrs. Analiza Young. He hides behind her skirts so that she will be responsible for any libelous or impossible statement he chooses to make. He says, "Don't blame me--that was Analiza." A woman's license to gossip is universally recognized; it is the obligation of the reading public not to question a lady's word too closely. Then, too, it adds pathos and punch to be able to remind one's readers constantly, as Mr. Wallace does, of the fragile and helpless nature of a woman subjected to male tyranny. A woman's franchise to gossip includes unlimited freedom to invent conversation. Mr. Wallace uses Analiza Young's invented conversations to touch up his own, to make them appear both more convincing and more sinister. In case he is taken to task, he can of course blame Mrs. Young.

Even more important than outright lies are the absolute immunities which

the claims of modesty bestow on the fair sex. A woman knows some simply terrible stories about the Mormons but she is too much of a lady to repeat them. She hints about them but she does not have to tell them. This does the Mormons more damage than if she told the stories, and it places the lady beyond question. It is amusing to see Victorian ladies wallowing in sensationalism while protesting themselves oh, so proper. And it does no great credit to a supposed civilized man like Mr. Wallace when he protests his factitious reluctance to report a thing which he goes out of his way to dig up. We blush more than he does when with downcast eyes and maidenly protestations he expresses his shock at a passage which he then proceeds to quote at length.

Mrs. Stenhouse says she regrets that "though I have endeavored to tell it all in the conduct and publicly expressed opinion of Brigham Young and many of the leaders, there have been such disgusting atrocities and such unpure statements that for the sake of decency and propriety I dared not even mention them." Mention what? Naturally she will not have to prove what she will not even mention. That is the trick. She tells of a Mormon catechism so obscene that she dared not repeat it. There is no evidence for this, she explains, because it has been bought up so successfully by Brigham that it is doubtful if there is copy of it in existence. Analiza Young takes the story up there. A sheltered child living alone with her mother, she not only remembers the catechism but also exactly how obscene it was. What a precocious child she must have been to recognize such dirty stuff! The stories always get better as they are handed down (see point nine). Analiza says another volume as large as her first would not contain all that she could write against Mormonism. "I am compelled to silence on points that would make what I have already said seem tame in comparison. There are events of daily occurrence which decency and womanly modesty forbid me even hinting at." (Well, what is she doing if not hinting at them?) Yet her first book is entitled, A Full Expose of Mormonism. Thirty-five years later she produced another book at the urging of the publishers. It was just the same old stuff.

The seventh rule to follow: remember that what gives anti-Mormon literature its sales appeal is its combination of mystery and exciting probability. As mere novels it would fall flat for the simple reason that even fairy tales cannot be totally preposterous if they are to be listened to. So it is important to insist on the historicity of your tales. Start out by excusing yourself for telling a tale that to any rational reader can only be the purest poppycock. Explain that it is the subject that is to blame--not you. Mr. Wallace does this with a quotation from Richard Burton. "I am conscious that my narrative savors of incredibility. The fault is in the subject; not in the narrator." Burton, of course, was the narrator. Wallace is not narrating anything but rehashing Analiza Young's story. Here is the way she says it:

The real is so vivid and strange that I need have no recourse to the imaginary. I have added nothing, but

I have left much untold. I am accused sometimes of exaggeration. In reply to that accusation I would say that it is simply impossible. I could not exaggerate. Not a word of all my story is exaggerated or embellished. The difficulty has been rather to suppress and tone down.

Henceforth both Analiza and her faithful follower are immune to criticism or doubt. You do not exaggerate for the simple reason that you cannot exaggerate. Therefore, anything you say is an understatement. Now what can be safer ground than that? Analiza says about Joseph Smith, "Well, there is no evidence that he practiced polygamy, but at least, if he wasn't a polygamist, he was something infinitely worse." (So it would be charity to believe these polygamy stories about him.)

Your best hope of keeping the reader convinced that such things might be so after all is to exploit the gap (and this is very important) between the reader and the subject. Do not hesitate at a place where the normal reader might boggle at the sheer excess of melodrama and depravity to remind him that he knows nothing at all about it--that he is in no position to question or criticize because all this happened far away at the ends of the earth. Analiza Young says, "No one outside of Utah and Mormonism can understand it in the least because nowhere else is there a possibility of such wretchedness to exist." But when experienced observers and hardened reporters came and lived in Utah and liked what they saw, then she shrieked that they did not have the vaguest inkling of what was really going on because they had never lived inside the Church as she had. According to Mrs. Stenhouse, nobody but a polygamist wife who has left Mormonism has any right to write a syllable about any phase of Mormonism. When large numbers of people came to Salt Lake City, Mrs. Webb (Analiza), who had not been in Utah herself for thirty-five years, shifted her ground again: "The trouble is that the Gentiles do not go into the country places. They only visit Salt Lake. Now if they would go to the outside places, they would find what really goes on." And so she falls back from one line of defense to the next, always to preserve that unbridgeable gap that makes it impossible for anyone but her to make a reliable statement about the Mormons.

The gap is the secret of all successful anti-Mormon writing. For years an almost complete geographical gap made it possible for atrocity stories to be invented with complete immunity. There was no way for the people back East to check up. Whenever the gap has been closed, the atrocity stories have disappeared, so that we can follow the retreat of the old-style "blood and thunder" Mormon classic first to Sanpete, then Panguitch, then Shortcreek and the Four Corners. Finally the gap disappeared completely. After a lull of some years, however, the successes of the Mormon Church called for a reactivation of the market and a new gap was developed--only now it is a "time" gap. Once it had been possible to say with Mrs. Analiza Young, "All this happened far away. You must trust me. I was born in the Church.

I know." It is now possible for Mrs. Brody to remind us that all this happened so long ago that only she, born and raised in the Church, has been able to discover what really happened.

Eighth rule: don't attack anything specific--attack an image. Never attack the thing itself, but only your interpretation of it, which is how the reader, since you have established the atmosphere, now identifies it. Forget the facts. Focus on ideas.

In every age it has been a favorite trick of religious polemic to attack not what the opposition practices or preaches but our impression of what it practices and preaches. This was developed into a fine art by the ancient rhetoricians and their apt students, the Church Fathers of the fourth century. We find it also in full use in the earliest anti-Christian writings. The early enemies of the Christian church used to charge that the Christians practiced incest. Didn't they call each other brother and sister? And did not these brothers and sisters intermarry? If a man marries his cousin that is frowned upon in certain societies. If he marries his wife's cousin, that is a different matter. It may be polygamy. It may be against the law of the land. It is not the same thing as marrying his own cousin. Analiza looks upon such a marriage as incest, though she admits it is stretching the point. But not Wallace. Taking up from there, he announces without reservation, "Brigham Young believed in the practice of incest." Well, it is just Analiza's interpretation of marrying close relatives. But they are not your close relatives. They are each others. That is a different thing. So that is your eighth point. Attack the image. Attack your idea of Mormonism and you can get some marvelous results.

The ninth point: be flexible. Be willing to change. Feel the public's pulse. Each new anti-Mormon book should keep the great tradition alive by plugging up old loopholes where they appear. Treat the Mormon story as Mr. Wallace does--as a communal and a perennial project. Erase the mistakes of your predecessors. Quietly remove the contradictory material. Build up the story as you go along. You can do this without losing the slightest spice or flavor. Indeed you can enhance it, if you do your share. You can make the Mormons look worse without adding one new iota of information. See how Mrs. Analiza Young does it herself:

The oldest wife, Mary Angel, of Brigham Young went to live in the big white house up the hill in back of the Lion House and then she went to live in the Gardo House with Amelia, the favorite wife, which was a great privilege. She was very well taken care of, and so forth. Now Brigham Young used to have a school for his children and they used to meet for instruction to be tutored in the big white house on the hill. And so this is the way . . . And Analiza comes along and says it was "as big as a barn"--a common expression for a house. "This barn of a house," she said. In the hands of Mr. Wallace it ends up this way: "The oldest wife of Brigham Young, who had served him most, ended up sharing a deserted schoolhouse with a cow."

You have a grim picture here of the first wife, who had been so loyal, being put out in an old, beat-up abandoned schoolhouse, which was "as big as a barn." What lives in barns? Cows. If you write an anti-Mormon book, you operate this way.

Another example: Mrs. Stenhouse mentions a number of cases when people were killed by Indians, and some people said the Mormons did it. Then along comes Analiza Young and said, "Well, everybody knew it was really the Mormons who did it." And then Wallace follows along and it is always "Indians" who do the killing. It is always the Mormons, in other words, that do the killing. Well, this is the way you can improve the story as you go. Whatever happens, never lose sight of your main object, which is not to depict the life or character of this or that person, but to smear a particular institution. Make little concessions, as Mr. Wallace does, to the virtues of individual Mormons--it makes you appear objective--but be sure the Mormon people look either vicious or ridiculous.

Rule ten is difficult. Study the technique by which Mr. Wallace, writing a history of Brigham Young, manages to avoid mentioning any of the man's real accomplishments. This may appear a harsh rule, but if you carefully observe it, it will pay off. It is not Analiza, but Irving Wallace himself who inserts the irrelevant and perfectly false statements that the passing of the Fifteenth Amendment still did not open the Mormon Church to Negroes, and that the archive room of the genealogical society is open only to Mormons. It is he also who insists on working the word "harem" to death and referring constantly and mysteriously to the Mormon "hierarchy" without ever indicating of whom it might consist. Wallace opens his book with a keynote quotation not from Analiza or from Brigham Young but from Joseph Smith. The fact that those words were never uttered by the Prophet but are first found in a violently anti-Mormon book published in 1897 only underlines Mr. Wallace's determination to pin something on the Mormons at any cost.

Here is a good example of that. Analiza recounts the vivid terror of her first night at the Walker House after she had run away. She was, so she says, expecting to be murdered in her bed any moment by the Gentiles because she was a Mormon. Since she had been living and conniving with the most rabid Gentiles in Utah for some months, such naiveté was, of course, impossible. She was simply making up a wild story. So Wallace changes it. In his version she starts out fearing the Gentiles, but sometime during the night she sees the point and shifts her ground to the fancied strangulation at the hands of one of Brigham's fanatical Danites. Analiza herself has nothing whatever to say about this. This is Wallace's own invention to correct Analiza's obvious bungling.

We would like to talk about the portrait of Brigham Young here--the real history of Analiza. You go through her book and pick out the things she really experienced--every one of them. You cannot find a more tame or safe existence.

It is really quite amusing because there are various ways of checking this story.

Here you have ten points you must observe to write a good anti-Mormon book. There is a solid nucleus of anti-Mormon interest you can always count on. With them anything goes. As Houseman wrote,

The reader often shares the writer's prejudice [of course in this case you have studied your reader's prejudice and you know what they are to begin with] and is far too well pleased with the conclusion to examine either his premises or his reasoning. People want to believe this, and the book will sell.

So you cannot lose. It is like selling whiskey to the Indians. You have canvassed the market and you know what will sell, and that is what you write.

An inquiry came into the Deseret Book Company: "Has this book been suppressed in Salt Lake?" They got curious and investigated and found out where it came from. It came from Wallace himself. He wanted the book to be suppressed in Salt Lake so he would have a sensation. "Suppressed in Salt Lake" would have been its biggest selling point. He has been using desperate devices to get the thing sold.

This book could not stand up for a minute without the basic thesis that the Mormons are mortally afraid of Gentiles and apostates. They must be liquidated in one way or another. These women always insist on that all the time. Analiza Young had to make this phenomenal escape from Salt Lake. Of course, it is a scream. It is strictly comic opera. She engineered it herself. There is no trace of anyone ever having chased her. Brigham Young had offered her publicly, just before that, \$15,000 to leave Utah. But how does this man write it! He is writing for Hollywood. He has been working very hard in Hollywood. He has had other books published in Hollywood, and he is a sensation writer. He says, "Ahead of her lay Wyoming and Freedom." (They had been trying to get her to go to Wyoming.) But doesn't that fairly sear the screen? Don't you see the epic sweep of it? They are going to make it into a movie now, so you might as well be prepared.