

SUZANNE M. SINKE

Florida State University

MORAVIANS, MORMONS, MOONIES: THINKING ABOUT RELIGION, MIGRATION, AND MARRIAGE ACROSS U.S. HISTORY

Marriage patterns and migration intertwine in interesting ways.¹ Add religion into the mix and you find doctrine setting visions of matchmaking, nuptial practice, and singlehood. So linking religion, migration and marriage makes it easy to ask questions about gender and sexuality. What consequences did religious migrations have for family formation? How did marriage migrations fit into religious patterns? What sanctioned options existed for adults not in heterosexual relationships? How did religious affiliation interact with national belonging? To answer these questions I turn to some basic information on three religious groups in North America, one each from the 1700s, 1800s, and 1900s: 1) United Brethren, 2) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and 3) Unification Church--or in popular parlance Moravians, Mormons and Moonies. All fell outside the mainstream of religious practice of their day with Utopian visions that related at least somewhat to marriage patterns. All encouraged migration at times. All promoted family formation along religious lines and in so doing downplayed other categories of identity such as ethnicity or nationality. Moreover religious ideals in every case had significant implications for the unmarried. So let us turn to scene one.

The author would like to thank Dorota Przaszłowicz the other participants at the “American Ethnicity: Rethinking Old Issues, Asking New Questions” workshop in Kraków, particularly Hartmut Keil, Wolfgang Helbich and Ursula Lehmkuhl, for their insightful questions and comments. She also wishes to thank Amy Koehlinger for helpful commentary.

¹ S. M. Sinke (1995), *The International Marriage Market: A Theoretical Essay*, in: Hoerder, D.; Nagler, J. (eds.), *People in Transit: German Migrations in Comparative Perspective, 1829-1930*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 227-248.

July 15, 1749, twenty-eight couples took part in a mass wedding ceremony in the Saal of the Gemeinhaus of the Moravian community in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.² Many in this Unitas Fratrum (United Brethren or Moravian Church) group, which had roots in Saxony, had already crossed the Atlantic to the British colony of Georgia in 1735. Subsequently on the advice of George Whitefield, they accompanied him to Pennsylvania. There, the group founded their own community in 1741.³ Other Brethren followed across the Atlantic, a shipload here and there. During the early years the community eschewed private property and lived in groups separated by sex, age, and marital status.⁴ According to the plan articulated in part by August Gottlieb Spangenberg, a leading Moravian figure of the era, the Pennsylvania group would serve as the base for missionary activity in North America and the West Indies.⁵

If this exclusively Moravian community expected to survive, they needed more people. For this they pursued several strategies: 1) immigration of existing members from Europe and beyond, 2) conversion of new members, and 3) procreation. Like some other pietistic groups, the United Brethren prescribed rather specific gender roles as one element of religious practice that governed their lives. Marriage formed a central focus of the theology, with intercourse between married couples elevated to holy status. Women wore certain color ribbons around their bonnets related to their marital station. Brides wore violet until they had intercourse, and then they received blue ribbons in a public ceremony.⁶ Given the strict separation of the sexes and anticipation of celibacy for the unmarried, the ideal for intercourse and procreation involved marriage first, and marriage meant following the guidance of religious leaders in terms of matchmaking. Sometimes this involved the petition of a potential groom, approval of the elders, and agreement of the woman. The elders also sought additional input. According to Moravian practice of the time the Holy Spirit would guide the drawing of lots on important questions, including whether a couple should marry.⁷ Yes or

² P. M. Peucker (2011), In the Blue Cabinet: Moravians, Marriage, and Sex, "Journal of Moravian History", Issue 10, p. 18.

³ Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1741-1844, *Bethlehem Digital History Project [BDHP]*, <http://bdhp.moravian.edu/bethlehem/bethlehem.html> [Accessed 7. 05. 2012].

⁴ K. Carte Engel (2010), Religion and the Economy: New Methods for an Old Problem, "Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal", Vol. 8, Issue 3, p. 483.

⁵ K. M. Faull (1997), *Moravian Women's Memoirs: Their Related Lives, 1750-1820*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, p. XXVI.

⁶ P. M. Peucker, In the Blue..., pp. 10-11, 27-29; see also P. Vogt (2011), Zinzendorf's 'Seventeen Points of Matrimony': A Fundamental Document on the Moravian Understanding of Marriage and Sexuality, "Journal of Moravian History", Issue 10, pp. 39-67.

⁷ For a good description of the lot see J. F. Sensbach (1998), *A Separate Canaan: The Making of an Afro-Moravian World in North Carolina, 1763-1840*, Chapel Hill: University of North Caro-

no—the lot determined the outcome. If the lot said no the two would have to hope for other potential partners. Officially both parties first agreed to any arranged marriage. In practice, the community sometimes exerted pressure on its members to marry as the will of God. At times the Brethren staged multiple weddings, sometimes on short notice, and at other times facilitating a communal celebration. In 1749 the community leaders organized what people later labeled the great wedding, fifty-six people taking vows of matrimony at one time.

Who were these couples?⁸ For one thing, few were from the same location originally. Only one out of twenty-two marriages listed for that year in the Moravian records showed a couple who came from the same birthplace, in this case Zauchtenthal, Moravia, one of the strongholds of the religious movement. Two of the 1749 weddings involved couples with one spouse born in North America and one born in Europe. In those cases the North American was from a local Moravian stronghold (Tulpehocken). Between those extremes were couples who invariably came from different states across the map of central Europe. A rough estimate of the distance between their birthplaces came to 237 miles or 381 kilometers.⁹ In some cases it is possible the two nonetheless shared a basic ethnic identification, however that clearly did not apply to all.

The “Lesser Great Wedding” 16 years later in 1757 demonstrated an even greater diversity of couples. The fourteen pairs married on April 20th of that year included Samuel Johannes, from Ceylon in East India, who wed Magdalena Mingo, a notable woman of African descent from St. Thomas.¹⁰ Converts from the local American Indian groups also took part in the lesser great wedding in Bethlehem. Four of the fourteen couples united men from Europe (Denmark, England, Grafschaft Wittgenstein) with women from New York or Pennsylvania. The other couples at this mass wedding replicated the pattern of the earlier “great wedding,” people from a variety of states in central Europe, though the range

lina Press, pp.131-133; E. Koenig Nitzsche (1956) penned a novel based on this, *Marriage By Lot: A Novel Based on Moravian History*, Allentown, PA: Pennsylvania German Folklore Society, this edition includes a discussion of the use of lot in marriage by Bishop Samuel H. Gapp.

⁸ Data computed from Register – Marriages 1742-1756, *BDHP*, http://bdhp.moravian.edu/community_records/register/marriages/marriages1742to1749.html

⁹ Both average and median for the 19 couples (with the outliers removed) registered at 237 miles. The range was 38 to 560 miles. I calculated these very rough estimates based on the most direct 2012 geographic land route connections.

¹⁰ On Moravian missions to slaves there see J. F. Sensbach (2005), *Rebecca's Revival: Creating Black Christianity in the Atlantic World*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press; Rebecca was one of the signers, along with four other converted slaves, including one Magdalena, of a letter in 1739 to the queen of Denmark. This and other documents by Magdalena appear in *Transatlantic Feminisms in the Age of Revolutions* (2012), Moore, L. L., Brooks, J., Wigginton, C. (eds.), New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 110-112.

increased into Alsace, the Palatinate, and Switzerland. Again, of the fourteen couples only one had birthplaces listed in the same country—in that case both hailed from Pennsylvania.

Speculation about migration rates and typical distances abounds for this period in Central Europe.¹¹ People in certain occupations moved; people at certain ages moved. Clearly individuals moved around despite social structures tied to local identity. Presumptions about the reasons for that migration among social scientists go back at least to E.G. Ravenstein, who focused most on economic opportunities.¹² The United Brethren did have some economic motivations for migration, but religion in this case held precedence. The migration en masse under religious leadership, communal settlement, and emphasis on missions place this population at the extreme on a continuum of religious motivations. Religious connections attracted further migrants from different locations. And religious convictions sent people to other lands, hoping for more conversions.

Doctrine suggested that evangelists should be married. A belief in equality of souls and perhaps the high mortality that left many widowed led a few Moravians in this period to marry across racial as well as national lines.¹³ Intermarriage of this sort often challenged local sensibilities and at times even pushed the limits of equality as Moravians understood it in the mid-1700s.¹⁴ Moravian leader Count Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf had to negotiate personally to gain the release from prison of two of his missionaries in St. Thomas, imprisoned ostensibly because they had not married in the official church, but known for having married across racial lines.¹⁵ In Wachovia, the Moravian congregation eventually segregated along racial lines, which reflected colonial policy. The situation was not much better in the colony of Pennsylvania, where the Assembly passed a statute outlawing marriage across racial lines for African Americans and whites in 1723.¹⁶ However slaves could become members of the Brethren,

¹¹ Cf. J. Lucassen and L. Lucassen (2009), The mobility transition revisited, 1500–1900: what the case of Europe can offer to global history, “Journal of Global History”, Vol. 4, Issue 3, pp. 347–77; and J. Ehmer (2011), Quantifying mobility in early modern Europe: The challenge of concepts and data, “Journal of Global History”, Vol. 6, Issue 2, pp. 327–338.

¹² E. G. Ravenstein (1885), The Laws of Migration, “Journal of the Statistical Society of London”, Vol. 48, Issue 2, pp. 167–235.

¹³ For example see the case of Rachel (Amanariochque) who married missionary Christian Friedrich Post in R. M. Wheeler (2008), *To Live Upon Hope: Mohicans and Missionaries in the Eighteenth-Century Northeast*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 135–136; 140–144.

¹⁴ J. Sensbach (1998), *A Separate Canaan: the making of an Afro-Moravian world in North Carolina, 1763–1840*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

¹⁵ J. Sensbach, *Rebecca’s...*, pp. 126–132.

¹⁶ K. Mumford (1999), After Hugh: Statutory Race Segregation in Colonial America, 1630–1725, “American Journal of Legal History”, Vol. 43, Issue 3, p. 300.

take communion, and serve as missionaries. In other words, people of African descent faced somewhat less racial prejudice in the Moravian stronghold.¹⁷ The widespread evangelical activities of the Brethren resulted in a mixed group of believers, with the potential for marriages that joined co-religionists who were at the same time from different places and backgrounds.

The obvious point I make here is that sometimes religion brought people together across borders and distances.¹⁸ A slightly less obvious point is that religion made migration possible for those who were not married. The United Brethren moved around Europe, across the Atlantic, through the Caribbean and North American lands, and at times into key personal relationships.¹⁹ On the North American side of the ocean, this was not the first, nor the last instance of migration with strong religious overtones. Later commentators could point to Moravians as one part of a diverse population peopling Pennsylvania. Others could stress the importance of religious belief and religious freedom in the foundation of the U.S.²⁰ For me, the Moravians constitute a good colonial example of group migration strongly tied to religious motivations. Moreover this religious movement differed from many of its contemporaries in terms of marriage ideals, and this had significant consequences for family formation. The “Great Wedding” and “Lesser Great Wedding” stood out, not as typical, but as exemplary of the group’s desire to use marriage in its efforts to both proselytize and unite parts of the world. Migration facilitated those intimate contacts of people from very different locations.

Moravian doctrine promoted marriage, particularly for those who would serve as missionaries. The decision to marry, however, needed communal as well as individual support. A man could approach the elders to ask if he might marry a particular woman, but the elders had to approve, and so did she. Elders themselves often organized matches when they considered it appropriate. In that case both parties had to agree. The wedding ceremony also included the approval of the community generally. So the United Brethren literally united their members.²¹ Once married the couple fell under the supervision of the married

¹⁷ J. Catron (2009), *Early Black-Atlantic Christianity in the Middle Colonies: Social Mobility and Race in Moravian Bethlehem*, “*Pennsylvania History*”, Vol. 76, Issue 3, pp. 301-345.

¹⁸ Interconnections across the Atlantic are central in P. Vogt (2006), ‘Everywhere at Home’: The Eighteenth-Century Moravian Movement as a Transatlantic Religious Community, “*Journal of Moravian History*”, Issue 1, pp. 7-29.

¹⁹ This echoes S. S. Rohrer (2001), *Evangelism and Acculturation in the Backcountry: The Case of Wachovia, North Carolina, 1753-1830*, “*Journal of the Early Republic*”, Vol. 21, Issue 2, pp. 199-229; K. M. Faull, *Moravian...*, p. XXIV.

²⁰ See for example S. F. Martin (2011), *A Nation of Immigrants*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

²¹ J. Sensbach, *Rebecca's...*, p. 105.

communal group or choir, though that did not necessarily mean living together. The choir and other church leaders did however approve of intercourse for married couples, at least at certain times and in certain positions. Doctrine also suggested they avoid lust in the process.²²

Though the Brethren organized matches and promoted marriages of members, the structure of separation of the sexes—choirs of single brethren and single sisters—also allowed for single adults to live in a socially acceptable communal setting and to move across borders. Widowed members also had choirs at times in Moravian communities. People resided, worshiped, and received much of their spiritual advice from those within their own choir. This meant religious roles for leaders in every age and marital status category. So the Brethren promoted matches of people from different places (but within their religious tradition), and praised those who remained celibate in terms of theology. They tolerated those who sought to avoid marriage—though they stressed marriage for mission work.

Let us turn next to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (or LDS), better known as the Mormon Church. We are also moving ahead in time about a hundred years. As U.S. immigration policy developed on a federal level in the nineteenth century, it targeted Mormonism through a ban on those who advocated plural marriage, though Congress enacted the legislation around the same time as the LDS at least somewhat officially turned against the practice in 1890.²³ Compared to many of the Europeans or Asians coming to the territory that would make up the western United States, LDS members of mid-century tended

²² See C. D. Atwood (2004), *Community of the Cross: Moravian Piety in Colonial Bethlehem*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, p. 187. One example describing proper marriage attitude is Nicolaus Ludwig, Graf von Zinzendorf “A manual of doctrine: or, a second essay to bring into the form of question and answer as well the fundamental doctrines, as the other scripture-knowledge, of the Protestant congregations who for 300 years past have been call’d the Brethren. (reserving a Liberty to alter and amend again, what at any Time shall be found needful.) Written in High-Dutch, by the author of the first essay; and now translated into English. With an introduction (1742), London : printed for James Hutton, at the Bible and Sun, in Little-Wild-Street, near Lincoln’s-Inn-Fields, pp. 190-192, *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, Gale Group [Accessed 27.06.2012].

²³ The Immigration Act of March 3, 1891 included polygamists among the excludable classes. E. P. Hutchinson (1981), *Legislative History of American Immigration Policy, 1798-1965*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 102; see also W. Mulder (1956), Immigration and the ‘Mormon Question’: An International Episode, “The Western Political Quarterly”, Vol. 9, Issue 2, pp. 416-433; for the Woodruff Manifesto against plural marriage: Official Declaration—1, <http://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/od/1?lang=eng>. For the relationship of LDS belief to policy on migration and marriage generally see N. F. Cott (2000), *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, chapter 5.

to come as families, with relatively balanced sex ratios and many children.²⁴ Polygamy earned the animus of many nineteenth-century reformers outside the group, but other marriage customs of the LDS also diverged from those of most surrounding Christian groups of the time, in particular “sealing,” which was much more common than polygamy among LDS members.²⁵ Mormon founder Joseph Smith’s “Divine Revelation” expounding on the practice of plural wives also included a section proclaiming the ability to “seal” a marriage into eternity, so that the spouses would continue in marriage after death.²⁶ An eternal marriage could also take place after one of the partners died, with someone else standing in as a proxy for the deceased. After Smith’s assassination in 1844 latter-day saints under the leadership of Brigham Young took these marriage practices west, to the Great Salt Lake region in what would become Utah. There, in relative isolation, Mormons openly proclaimed polygamy (more accurately polygyny) and welcomed a stream of immigrants from a variety of countries, England, Wales, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway in particular.²⁷ The new settlement in the Great Salt Lake region gained the name of Deseret.

Translations of books and tracts, including Parley Pratt, *Marriage and Morals in Utah*; Orson Spencer, *Patriarchal Order or Plural Marriage*; and Orson Pratt, *Celestial Marriage*, went through various editions.²⁸ The works provided theological principles regarding marriage in brief form. Pratt’s *Marriage and Morals in Utah*, which he presented in front of the legislature in Utah in 1855, illustrated the close relationship LDS leaders made between social order and appropriate marriages: “moral and social affections and institutions are the very

²⁴ See for example P. A. M. Taylor (1966), *Expectations Westward: The Mormons and the Emigration of their British Converts in the Nineteenth Century*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, p. 147; D. L. May (1998), *Fleeing Babylon: The English Mormon Migration to Alpine, Utah*, in: *European Immigrants in the American West: Community Histories*, Luebke F. (ed.), Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, p. 36.

²⁵ B. Burgett (2005), *On the Mormon Question: Race, Sex, and Polygamy in the 1850s and the 1990s*, “*American Quarterly*”, Vol. 57, Issue 1, pp. 75-102.

²⁶ J. Smith, 12 July 1843, Issue 19, in: *Section 132; Doctrines and Covenants*, under Scriptures, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, <http://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/132?lang=eng> [Accessed 16.05. 2012]; G. J. Bergera (2002), *The Earliest Eternal Sealings for Civilly Married Couples Living and Dead*, “*Dialogue: A Journal Of Mormon Thought*”, Vol. 35, Issue 3, pp. 41-66; G. M. Bishop (1990), *Eternal marriage in early Mormon marital beliefs*, “*Historian*”, Vol. 53, Issue 1, pp. 76-88.

²⁷ D. J. Whittaker (1987), *The Bone in the Throat: Orson Pratt and the Public Announcement of Plural Marriage*, “*The Western Historical Quarterly*”, Vol. 8, Issue 3, pp. 293-314. On nationalities see for example ‘Latter Day Saints’ From Afar, “*New York Times*”, 16 Sep 1874, p. 4.

²⁸ P. A. M. Taylor, *Expectations...*, pp. 18-21; W. Mulder (2000), *Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [reprint of 1957]), pp. 77, 94.

foundation of all government. . . .”²⁹ After setting out the Biblical precedent for plural marriage, Pratt railed against the evils of monogamy:

Let the monogamic law, restricting a man to one wife, with all the attendant train of whoredoms, intrigues, seductions, wretched and lonely single life, hatred, envy, jealousy, infanticide, illegitimacy, disease and death like the millstone cast into the depths of the sea—sink with Great Babylon to rise no more.³⁰

Even in written form the fire and brimstone glow.

Proselytizing among both the British and Scandinavians began by targeting immigrant populations already in the U.S., but then expanded rapidly as missionaries (sometimes members of the previous migrant group) made their way through the European homelands. Practice dictated that converts tithe, and the money could then be used to spread LDS messages. Church leaders at the General Assembly of Deseret established a “Perpetual Emigrating Fund” in 1849 for gathering believers to Zion in the Great Salt Lake region.³¹ According to the plan, poor converts could receive funds to cover migration to the area. Once in Deseret the migrants would repay the cost, thus replenishing the fund. As Brigham Young and two others explained it:

The few thousands we send out by our agent, at this time is like a grain of mustard seed in the earth: we send it forth into the world, and among the Saints, a good soil, and we expect it will grow and flourish, and spread abroad in a few weeks to that it will cover England, cast its shadow on Europe, and in the process of time compass the whole earth. . . .³²

In 1850 LDS leaders incorporated the fund under the laws of the “Provisional State of Deseret.” The fund became an enticement for some to convert. Church leaders sought to weed out (to keep with the planting metaphor) those whose desire for emigration or other monetary assistance sparked less than sincere

²⁹ P. P. Pratt (1856), *Marriage and Morals in Utah: an address written by Parley P. Pratt, read in joint session of the legislature in the Representatives' Hall, Fillmore City, Dec. 31, 1855, by Mr. Thomas Bullock, Chief Clerk of the House*, Liverpool: F.D. Richards, p. 1; on the anti-Catholicism tied to the speech see T. L. Givens and M. J. Grow (2011), *Parley P. Pratt: The Apostle Paul of Mormonism*, New York: Oxford University Press, p. 367.

³⁰ P. P. Pratt, *Marriage...*, p. 8.

³¹ D. L. May (2003), Rites of Passage: The Gathering as Cultural Credo, “Journal of Mormon History”, Vol. 29, Issue 1, pp. 1-41.

³² B. Young, H. C. Kimball, W. Richards (1962), Letter to Orson Hyde, Great Salt Lake City, October 16, 1849, in J. Linforth, F. H. Piercy (1962), *Route from Liverpool to Great Salt Lake Valley*, Brodie, F. M. (ed.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 23.

conversion. Hence those who did not conform to Mormon standards faced excommunication. In an era of industrialization and concomitant economic dislocation (and poverty) in England in the early 1850s, that included many thousands. As with many migrant groups, however, it was not the most destitute, but rather those of moderate means who tended to form the bulk of the migration.³³ LDS State officials on both sides of the Atlantic scrutinized the movement, and enacted laws concerning ships' passage and then concerning the emigration fund specifically.³⁴

Reporting on this process for 1854-55, an LDS agent noted that under his watch that year fourteen chartered ships departed across the Atlantic with converts headed for Utah, sending 4,647 LDS adherents, of whom 972 came from Scandinavian Missions and over 3,000 from the United Kingdom. Mormons from several other countries took part in smaller numbers. Of the 4,647 total emigrants, 1161 fell under the auspices of the Perpetual Emigration fund.³⁵ By the 1860s they added an Emigration Deposit Fund for people to save for the journey. Polygamy made migration possible for some women to migrate, as men already in Utah sometimes paid the passage from Europe of women who agreed to wed them in plural marriages. In the mid-1800s conversion implied eventual migration. Whether coming from the Eastern United States or Europe, migrants at mid-century typically gathered in Missouri before travelling the Mormon trail west.

One of the statistics on the LDS records for 1855 was Patience Loader, who crossed the Atlantic on the *John J. Boyd*, sailing mid-winter from Liverpool to New York. Loader provided a detailed account of her life. Born in Oxfordshire, England in 1827, at age seventeen she went into domestic service. During the years she resided and worked for others her family converted to LDS faith. When Patience returned home to visit, she too converted, and hence when the family headed for America, she joined them. In Utah she met and married (within two years) another converted LDS member, John Eugene Rozsa, from Hungary. Because he was in the army and his commanding officer disapproved of LDS marriages, the couple had a second wedding celebration to make the union acceptable outside their faith. Four children and a Civil War later, he died. Patience turned to cooking at a mining camp. Later, in her fifties, she married John Archer, another Mormon, and in this case a man she had known many years before in England. She was his third wife. Again, the pattern: conversion

³³ F. M. Szasz (2000), *Scots in the North American West, 1790-1917*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, p. 155.

³⁴ G. O. Larson (1931), *The Story of the Perpetual Emigration Fund*, "The Mississippi Valley Historical Review", Vol. 18, Issue 2, pp. 189, 190, 194.

³⁵ J. Linforth (1962), *Emigration Appendix*, in: J. Linforth, F. H. Piercy, *Route...*, pp. 134-135.

on one side of the Atlantic, migration to the other, marriage to another believer, in this case one from another European land. A second marriage after the first spouse died, this time to another believer who had made a similar trans-oceanic journey.³⁶

Now I turn to a second LDS example. Roughly 30,000 Scandinavian Mormons arrived between 1850 and 1905.³⁷ One of those migrants who eventually entered an “eternal marriage” was Kerstina Nilsson, who married Edmond Harris. Nilsson came from the Skåne region—the “cradle of Mormonism”—in Sweden in the mid-1800s. Nilsson took her savings in hand and headed with other LDS converts to the Salt Lake settlement, arriving in the United States just after the outbreak of the Civil War. Meanwhile, Harris, originally from England, spent time with his first wife and children in Australia. A shipwreck cut short the journey to America and ended the lives of his spouse and child, who previously expected to precede him to Utah. Harris, now a widower, made his way to California for a time, and then travelled on to Utah. Within a few months of her arrival Nilsson married Harris, despite the linguistic difference and the twenty years of age that separated them. In terms of number of children and longevity it would prove a fruitful marriage for both.³⁸

Sometimes family ties brought people into the Mormon faith, as with Patience Loader. At other times religious conversion meant a break from previous kinship ties.³⁹ Marriage in either case helped cement a convert into LDS religious networks, and set the stage for a new nuclear and then extended family. Migration often split extended family ties and led to greater reliance on religious groups to take the place of extended family, at least in the first generation.⁴⁰ As in the case of Nilsson, marriage could unite those of different backgrounds into a religious community. In other words, here we see cases where religion promoted migration, and migration in turn helped promote religion. Moreover, marriage, at least at times, fostered both migration and greater emphasis on religion in the new community.

³⁶ *Recollections of Past Days: The Autobiography of Patience Loader Rozsa Archer* (2006), Petree, S. A. (ed.), Logan: Utah State University Press, pp. 11-13, 159.

³⁷ W. Mulder, *Homeward...*, pp. VII, 150.

³⁸ L. A. Huber (2005), Kerstina Nilsson: A Story of the Swedish Saints, “*Journal of Mormon History*”, Vol. 31, Issue 3, pp. 241-263.

³⁹ D. L. May (1998), *Fleeing Babylon: The English Mormon Migration to Alpine, Utah*, in: *European Immigrants in the American West*, Luebke, F. C. (ed.), Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, pp. 42-43.

⁴⁰ S. M. Sinke (2002), *Dutch Immigrant Women in the United States, 1880-1920*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, chapter 1.

For both the United Brethren of the mid-1700s and Latter-Day Saints of the mid-1800s, at least part of the population made more than one move based on religious persecution in their original homelands. Laws, ostracism, physical attacks, murder or execution: alternative religious movements in both eras faced threats. In both cases the groups sought out areas of refuge. For the Moravians, many went to the estate of Count Zinzendorf in Saxony. From there, Brethren might set out for other lands, such as the relatively tolerant colony of Pennsylvania. For the Mormons, Nauvoo, Illinois served as a major point of departure, not to mention the site of the assassination of LDS founder Joseph Smith. In this case, fewer remained behind. Shared migration, one could argue, helped foster group cohesion. Those who took up the mantle of missionary work might associate migration with religious belief. These migrations also included a significant proportion of families.

One key difference between Latter-Day Saints and Moravians was theology regarding singleness. Both promoted marriage for those who would evangelize, but the Brethren literally made space for those who did not marry. If the United Brethren allowed all singles to live in communal quarters, the LDS tended to house a single person with an older married couple, a more exacting form of ongoing parental control. In addition, LDS leaders tended to bestow religious endowments on those who were about to marry and to view those who were single as less worthy than married ones—perhaps even less acceptable to God.⁴¹

The stress on marriage had demographic consequences. Kathryn Daynes's quantitative study of the Mormon town of Manti, Utah, showed less than one percent of women listed as never married by age 28 in the late nineteenth century. Women in this community also married significantly younger than the national averages. Most female migrants married within a year of arrival. About a third of the female early arrivals in Utah would take part in plural marriages as their first marriage.⁴² Likewise a U.S. Census sample showed that for those aged 35-44 born in Scandinavia and living in Utah in 1880, only one percent of women and five percent of men appeared as never married. In the 45-55 age group, the numbers were 2.5 percent women and three percent of men reporting never having married.⁴³ Given that this included the entire

⁴¹ M. Raynes, E. Parsons (1983), *Single Cursedness: An Overview of LDS Authorities' Statements about Unmarried People*, "Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought", Vol. 16, Issue 3, pp. 35-45.

⁴² K. M. Daynes (2001), *More Wives Than One: Transformation of the Mormon Marriage System, 1840-1910*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 95-97.

⁴³ Data calculated using 1880 10 percent IPUMS sample. S. Ruggles, J. T. Alexander, K. Genadek, R. Goeken, M. B. Schroeder, and M. Sobek (2010), *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0* [Machine-readable database], Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

territory of Utah, not all were Mormon. But nearby Wyoming, another territory traversed by the transcontinental railroad, but without as strong an LDS presence, had never married rates between 20-23 percent for men in the same year and a much more imbalanced sex ratio. Utah stood out among western territories for attracting slightly more women migrants than men from Scandinavia—and that at a time when men predominated in the national migration statistics.⁴⁴ Between families and a slight surplus of young women coming as servants who generally expected to be wives soon, Mormon migration to Utah went against the national pattern.

Move ahead a little over a hundred years. Our third example springs from the Cold War and moves into the turn of the twenty-first century: the Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, or in short the Unification Church of Rev. Sun Myung Moon. The common moniker in the U.S. for church adherents was “moonies,” which increasingly took on a derogatory connotation for outsiders, though sometimes insiders would embrace it as well. Unification beliefs mixed elements of evangelical Protestantism with Korean Confucianism among other influences.⁴⁵ The group formed in South Korea in 1954, but soon expanded internationally. Moon moved to the United States in the 1970s, and established a seminary in New York.⁴⁶ The skeptical argued that availability of student visas had something to do with that. When the U.S. enacted restrictive quotas in the 1920s, lawmakers wrote a special exemption for students and ministers and their families, categories that continued through the twentieth century.⁴⁷ Angry parents, who charged the Unification church with brainwashing, pursued various means to bring down both Moon and the denomination. Moon faced possible deportation after conviction for tax fraud in the early 1980s, but six U.S.-born children not to mention many U.S. adherents, weighed in his favor.⁴⁸ The Immigration and Naturalization Service did deport a number

⁴⁴ W. Mulder, *Homeward...*, pp. 108-109.

⁴⁵ K. S. Lowney (1992), *Passport to Heaven: Gender Roles in the Unification Church*, New York: Garland, pp. 140-141.

⁴⁶ M. D. Bryant (2010), Unification Church, in: *Encyclopedia of Religion in America*, Lippy, Ch. H.; Williams, P. W. (eds.), Vol. 4., Washington, DC: CQ Press, pp. 2220-2222.

⁴⁷ E. P. Hutchinson, *Legislative...*, pp. 188, 259, 327, 339.

⁴⁸ E. R. Shipp, Judge Bars Deporting Rev. Moon on Tax Conviction, “New York Times”, 11 August 1982, Section A, p.20, <http://search.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktimes/docview/122029541/136A23D37A761E97E04/6?accountid=4840> [Accessed 11.05.2012]; D. G. Bromley, A. D. Shupe, Jr. and J. C. Ventimiglia (1979), Atrocity Tales, the Unification Church, and the Social Construction of Evil, “Journal of Communication”, Vol. 29, Issue 3, pp. 42-53.

of his followers, who had sought permanent residency based on their status as missionary trainees.⁴⁹

In 1992 Moon confirmed that he and his spouse were the “true parents,” i.e. he was god, a belief long held by many of his followers. According to church theology, marriage, specifically arranged marriage by the “true parents,” helped restore the world to a state of purity.⁵⁰ Rev. Moon described marriage in *Blessing and Ideal Family* at length, noting how within the church people termed the marriage ceremony “to receive the blessing.” Moon explained:

“According to the Principle, if Adam and Eve had not fallen and had become perfected, they would have stood in the position to receive the Blessing.”⁵¹

Marriage loomed central in this theology: “Marriage is what tries to find people who can create a new nation and new world.”⁵²

In printed speeches, Moon described his methods and philosophy of matchmaking: first he would ask single believers if they wanted to be matched. He would then ask who wanted to be matched across different kinds of barriers. Moon made it clear through descriptions full of admiration that he particularly approved of matches with couples from different countries, even ones who did not share a common language. Moreover, Moon noted how irritated he would become with those who tried to make choices about partners based on their own interests. In *Who Is God and Who Am I (1-25-81)* for example, Moon explained:

A Western-centered person would say, “Since I have blue eyes, I want a wife with blue eyes, too.” But the world-centered person would say, “Since I have blue eyes, I need a wife with brown eyes -- in fact, a wife who is black.” Blue eyes are like daylight and black eyes nighttime. Together they represent a complete day. People develop this sort of attitude within the Unification Church. Members ask for a spouse of a different race or color in order to become world-level people.

⁴⁹ L. Williams, Immigration Service Begins Deportation Proceedings Against 178 Members of the Moon Church: Explanation Given for Delay, “New York Times”, 24 April 1977, p. 25, <http://search.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktimes/docview/123164523/abstract/136A23D37A761E97E04/1?accountid=4840> [Accessed 11.05.2012].

⁵⁰ Ch. Austin, Marriage Seen as Godly Duty, “New York Times”, 2 July 1982, Section B, p. 1, http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/docum...lzV&_md5=c1270c08217e68529e771d3522e3fe65 [Accessed 16.04.2001].

⁵¹ S. M. Moon, *Blessing and Ideal Family* online at Unification Church website <http://www.unification.net/bif/bif-1-3.html> [Accessed 4.09.2012]

⁵² S. M. Moon, *Blessing...*

Their relatives back home sense that something momentous is happening within their family.⁵³

Perhaps we should call this yin-yang matchmaking? In any case once people volunteered, Moon would decide on an appropriate partner.

Moon hosted various wedding celebrations, including rededications for people of all faiths held in conjunction with blessings of couples matched by Rev. Moon. One such celebration in 1997 included around 40,000 people in Robert F. Kennedy Stadium in Washington, D.C. Of those Rev. Moon *only* matched about 2,500 couples in that ceremony; the remaining 25,000 plus couples, from various religious backgrounds, renewed their vows. Spokespersons for the church suggested another 3.9 million couples around the world took part via broadcast. Legally, the newlyweds still needed to file for civil licenses, and religiously they had to wait until church leaders approved consummation of the marriage.⁵⁴

For the couples, the ceremonies culminated a long process of preparing for marriage. Moon's teachings demanded premarital chastity, and before someone could anticipate marriage, the person would need to spend at least three celibate years while working together with other converts to fund-raise (as well as eating and worshipping) in a mixed-sex group.⁵⁵ Often this meant living communally with church "brothers and sisters"--and sometimes ignoring biological family. Marriage, however, remained a key goal, and Moon wrote and spoke (if somewhat obliquely at times) against homosexuality.⁵⁶ Thus the religion emphasized marriage and left little room-- except temporarily--for single life.

The rather ubiquitous fund-raising tended to lend a negative public image, an image tarnished even more by less-than-honest tactics in some cases.⁵⁷ Mass weddings served as a more positive counterweight. Publicity came sporadically and frequently focused on mass wedding celebrations for this group in the United States. A partial list of the US ceremonies included:

⁵³ *True Love, Vol. 1, The Restoration of True Love by Reverend Sun Myung Moon*, <http://www.unification.net/truelove/t11-05.html> [Accessed 4.09.2012].

⁵⁴ P. Richter, Moon Seeks to be Wedded to American Life, "Los Angeles Times", 30 November 1997, Part A, page 1, <http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/docum...lzVmd5=e1938f8a-0c77992239a2602e> [Accessed 16.04.2001].

⁵⁵ J. H. Grace (1985), *Sex and Marriage in the Unification Movement: A Sociological Study* New York: Edwin Mellen Press, p. 61.

⁵⁶ For example see *The True Pattern of Family Life*, a speech by Sun Myung Moon from 1975, <http://www.tparents.org/moon-talks/sunmyungmoon75/SunMyungMoon-750307.htm> [Accessed 4.09.2012; see also J. H. Grace, *Sex...*, chapter 3.

⁵⁷ D. G. Bromley, A. D. Shupe, Jr. (1980), Financing the New Religions: A Resource Mobilization Approach, "Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion", Vol. 19, Issue 3, p. 238.

Date	No. of Couples ⁵⁸
1 July 1982	~ 2,075
29 November 1997	~ 2,500 (plus 28,000 renewing vows)
14 October 2009	~10,000
24 March 2012	~ 2,500

Additional ceremonies in South Korea could be larger. In the U.S. case these weddings actually were blessing ceremonies, meaning they did not have legal weight. The official version (though with less religious implications) would occur at another time and place.

What made the mass weddings particularly interesting in terms of migration was the matching of people from different countries. Renee Watabe, a Chinese American, volunteered for an international match, which turned out to be a man from Japan. She explained: “As we saw it, the path to world peace was through a coupling of the historically polarized: black and white, East and West, Jewish and Muslim . . . to help create world harmony through family harmony.”⁵⁹ Mark Palmer, a British citizen who ended up taking part in the Madison Square Garden blessing ceremony with his Moon-matched U.S. bride, echoed this vision: “I liked the idea of families being at the centre of a new world, where people loved each other regardless of race, colour or class.”⁶⁰

Under U.S. law, once married to U.S. citizens, those from other nationalities could enter the U.S. outside of quotas. Moreover, those who went through Moon’s blessing ceremony entered marriage with the ideal of missionary work as central, a strong parallel to Mormons who underwent the sealing of their marriages in the

⁵⁸ C. Murphy, L. Wheeler, At RFK, Moon Presides Over Mass Wedding, “Washington Post”, 30 November 1997, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/longterm/cult/unification/wedd97.htm>; M. Henneberger, A Look at Life After Mass Marriage; For 2,075 Couples (Give or Take 200), 10 Years Together, Thanks to Sun Myung Moon, “New York Times”, 22 December 1992 <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/12/22/nyregion/look-life-after-mass-marriage-for-2075-couples-give-take-200-10-years-together.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm> ; J. Kim, Unification Church head marries 20,000 in mass wedding, *Reuters, Edition U.S.*, 14 October 2009. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/10/14/us-korea-church-idUSTRE59D1H720091014>; D. Gayle, 2,500 Marriages made in Moonie heaven: Couples from more than 50 countries tie the knot in mass South Korea ceremony, “Mail Online”, 24 March 2012, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2119753/Unification-Church-South-Korea-mass-wedding-2-500-marriages.html> [Accessed 10.05.2012].

⁵⁹ R. Watabe, A Leap of Faith, “New York Times”, 3 July 2005, <https://login.proxy.lib.fsu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/92976119?accountid=4840>, [Accessed 11 May 2012].

⁶⁰ M. Palmer, I got married in a Moonie mass wedding: He was a public schoolboy from a wealthy family. So what made Mark Palmer spend seven years as a disciple of the cult?, 5 September 2012, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2198444/I-got-married-Moonie-mass-wedding-He-public-schoolboy-wealthy-family-So-Mark-Palmer-spend-seven-years-disciple-cult.html?ITO=1490> [Accessed 5.09.2012].

temple. But to an even greater degree than LDS members, the Unification church sought to match every member, and Rev. Moon promoted international marriages in the process. The model of an ideal church member included marriage, with little room for single individuals beyond an initial period of celibate service (when the members tended to be particularly active in fund-raising). Rev. Moon continued to promote weddings as a way to foster world peace. He officially turned over leadership of the church to one of his sons in 2009. Three years later, in September 2012, the founder died at age 92.⁶¹

Recent attention to racial and ethnic biases in the creation of immigration law has transformed our understanding of the history of migration in important ways. Attention to religious minorities (and dependent populations) could shift that argument somewhat. As Pietistic Protestants, Moravians fit one of the models of acceptable newcomers, yet their communal tendencies and radical ideas of equality of people (including across racial and ethnic lines), made them suspect to many of their neighbors in North America. As the Latter-Day Saints gained converts in Europe, they recruited from areas such as England and Scandinavia. Though these areas fit the racial and ethnic ideals for those in charge of immigration policy-making later in the century, Mormon religious and social practice marked them as questionable. Hence the laws that went into place against those who even believed in polygamy (not just those who practiced it). Mixing nationalities on purpose and mass weddings take on a skeptical tone in reporting about the Unification church.

Scholars of religion and migration often demonstrate how religious groups relate to ethnicity.⁶² In the three groups here, the relationship varied somewhat. Still, all three sought to recruit others of different backgrounds and to wed them (literally) into the membership. Shared belief reigned. All three, at least in the time period under consideration, placed emphasis on marriage and on appropriate marital relations as key to religious belief and practice, and each related marital status and to one's ability to minister to others.

So what do these examples-- a foray into the inter-relationship of religion, migration, and marriage patterns—tell us? What may they suggest? Apart from alliteration, Moravians, Mormons, and Moonies were all slightly outside the

⁶¹ E. Ramstad, S. Miller, false Unification Church Founder Rev. Moon Dies, "Wall Street Journal" (Online) [New York, N.Y.], 02 Sep 2012, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10000872396390443847404577627683756376536> [Accessed 4.09.2012].

⁶² S. Scott Rohrer argued for the importance of religion in studies of migration, and in U.S. history generally based on studies of eight religious groups, including Moravians and Mormons.

dominant Protestant Christianity of much of North America--not too far outside, but “alternative” as religious scholars term it. One part of what made them alternative was marriage patterns. Those differences had implications. First, the communal nature of linking couples set the newlyweds on a path of (continued) belief and community without necessarily linking them to a geographic location. In situations where marriage either determines nationality for one partner or offers benefits of residency, political entities had reason to take interest. Second, couples tend to marry within one religion, often more so than nationality, so examining ethnic background without regard to religion (which unfortunately many quantitative sources omit) only tells part of the story. Third, it pays to consider religious intolerance in discussions of immigration policy. Scholars of migration have paid attention to the role of anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism in U.S. immigration policy and practice. More recently the attention to Islam makes that foregrounding—and a discussion of the historical interaction of religion with migration policy—important. Should a state embrace those persecuted elsewhere for their religious beliefs or bar their entrance? Defining the acceptable in terms of religion remains a dilemma for immigration authorities because it also reflects religious boundaries for the nation as a whole. Fourth, throughout U.S. history some religious groups have used marriage as a strategy to attract people, to bind them into their communities, and to spread religious visions across borders. The close relationship of marriage to missionary work illustrates how transnational movements grow upon and translate into individual-level relationships. Finally, if we assume that NOT all people sought heterosexual matches, then examining cultural practices and sanctions of religious groups around marital status provides hints at the silences surrounding what scholars now refer to as queer life.

