

beings there. Never could a person go to a place under more happy circumstances. Mr. Cabot, to try his experiment, had also the selection in France of whom he pleased. He and his company went to Nauvoo, and what is the result? You have seen the published account in the papers. We were banished from civilized society into the valleys of the Rocky Mountains to seek for that protection among savages which Christian civilization denied us—among the *peau rouges*, or red skins, as they call them. There our people have built houses, enclosed lands, cultivated gardens, built schoolhouses, opened farms, and have organized a government and are prospering in all the blessings and immunities of civilized life. Not only this, but they have sent thousands and thousands of dollars over to Europe to assist the suffering poor to go to America, where they might find an asylum. You, on the other hand, that went to our empty houses and farms—you, I say, went there under most favorable circumstances. Now, what is the result? I read in all of your reports from there, published in your own paper in Paris, a continued cry for help. The cry is to you for money, money: 'We want money to help us to carry out our designs.' The society that I represent comes with the fear of God—the worship of the great Eloheim: they offer the simple plan ordained of God—viz., repentance, baptism for the remission of sins, and the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. Our people have not been seeking the influence of the world, nor the power of government, but they have obtained both; whilst you, with your philosophy independent of God, have been seeking to build up a system of communism and a government which is, according to your own accounts, the way to introduce the millennial reign. Now, which is

the best—our religion, or your philosophy?"

"Well," said he, "I cannot say anything."

He could not, because these were facts that he was familiar with.

What has become of that society? There are very few of them left. They have had dissensions, bickerings, trouble, and desertions, until they are nearly dwindled to nothing.

I might enumerate many societies of a similar nature, commenced in different parts of the world and at various times. The results, however, would be proved to be the same: they commenced in the wisdom of man, and ended as speculative bubbles. Truth, based on eternal principles, alone can stand the test.

If Owen, Fourier, Cabot, and other philosophers have failed—if all the varied schemes of communism have failed—if human philosophy is found to be at fault, and all its plans incompetent, and we have not failed, it shows there is something associated with this people and with "Mormonism" that there is not with them.

Now the question is, What is this principle? Why is there a difference?

The first account I ever heard of this Gospel was simply preaching what are termed the first principles of the Gospel of Christ. There was nothing very ostentatious about it—nothing very grand—no great pomp or parade. The Elders were in many instances uneducated: they had no particular advantages among men; but they had received certain principles, certain doctrines, that were plain and easy to comprehend—things that were childlike and simple, and that recommended themselves to every intelligent, unblessed mind.

What was it we first learned in relation to this Gospel? Was it something very profound and philosophical, that some sage either in this or some other country had dis-