

Number 3

PLURAL MARRIAGE IN AMERICA

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION

BY PRESIDENT JOSEPH SMITH



HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE
Lamoni ❧ ❧ ❧ Iowa

ORIGIN OF AMERICAN POLYGAMY.

THE reply to my article in the *Arena* for August, 1902, by President Joseph F. Smith, of the Utah polygamous church, in the *Arena* for November, 1902, has at least made one thing plain. He states on page 493 of his paper, "that in the earlier days of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints monogamic marriage was advocated and upheld; but no one has disputed that."

On page 494 this writer further states: "Careful reading of the law of God to the church in these latter days, will show that, while its members were then required to practice monogamic marriage, the declaration as quoted by Mr. Smith, that 'one man should have one wife, and one woman *but* one husband,' bears the implication that a man might possibly be permitted at some time to have more than one wife, while a woman was to have '*but* one husband.'"

Here are two direct admissions from the present head of the dominant church in Utah that the law of God regulating the domestic relation in the church at its institution and subsequently was monogamic.

Attention is called to these admissions for the reason that in my article in the August *Arena* the scriptural evidences taken from the books constituting the standard works of the church were clearly and definitely stated; and while Mr. Smith states on page 497 of his article that his "reply to the leader of the 'Reorganized Church' is not intended as an argument in favor of plural marriage," we fail to see how the ordinary reader will hesitate to take his article as being an effort to defend against the attack upon Utah polygamy by a plain statement of facts, made by the son of the man charged with being the one who introduced polygamy into the church.

Mr. Smith, of Utah, wrote in reference to the question whether the dogma and practice of plural marriage are right or wrong, "That is not the question at issue." (See page 497.) The gentleman's pardon is craved; that is the question at issue, and

has been ever since the sons of the Prophet Joseph Smith took the field in advocacy of the religion of their father, and against any and every perversion of it as a consequence.

In order to break the force of the article in the *August Arena*, Mr. Smith, of Utah, attacks the motive of the writer, assuming that the purpose of that article was "to brand with willful falsehood all his, Joseph Smith's, successors in the prophetic and presiding office, and also a large number of men and women of unimpeachable character and high standing in the church," etc.

The contention of the sons of Joseph Smith, the putative founder of the church under consideration in these papers, is and has been this: That, as the laws of God, found in the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the later revelations to the church, were given to constitute the rules of both faith and practice, upon which the church was to be built and perpetuated, as a consequence, God would not give to the church through Joseph Smith any commandment or rule of faith and practice which would conflict with the laws he had already given; or that would require the performance of any act by which those laws would be disregarded or broken.

To make this point clear the following is cited:

"Let no man break the laws of the land, for he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land; wherefore be subject to the powers that be, until He reigns whose right it is to reign, and subdues all enemies under his feet. Behold, the laws which ye have received from my hand are the laws of the church, and in this light ye shall hold them forth. Behold, here is wisdom."—*Doctrine and Covenants* 58: 5.

"Thou shalt take the things which thou hast received, which have been given unto thee in my scriptures for a law, to be my law, to govern my church; and he that doth according to these things, shall be saved, and he that doeth them not shall be damned, if he continues."—*Doctrine and Covenants* 42: 16.

In the legendary teaching of the church the Book

of Mormon was called the "new covenant." As a revelation it was made binding upon the church in the following:

"And this condemnation resteth upon the children of Zion, even all; and they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the new covenant, even the Book of Mormon and the former commandments which I have given them, not only to say, but to do according to that which I have written, that they may bring forth fruit meet for their Father's kingdom," etc.—*Doctrine and Covenants* 83: 8.

This establishes the fact that the laws to the church were understood to have been given for its government until the second coming of Christ, and that in addition thereto no commands would be given which would require the members of the church to disregard or break the laws of the land.

The contention of the sons of Joseph Smith is further; that the laws of the church, given as the people all believed through the principle of revelation, would not be controverted, nor set aside by contradictory revelation. Hence, that Joseph Smith could not have either taught or practiced contrary to the rule of marriage which Mr. Smith, of Utah, now admits was monogamic. To have done this he would have to disregard and disobey the commands of the Lord, as he and his associates, including his brother Hyrum, understood them.

The *Book of Doctrine and Covenants* is a book of church law, rules, and commandments. It was published first in Kirtland (not Kirkland), Ohio, in 1835. It contained the declaration of indorsement of the monogamous marriage system, which is "opposed to polygamy." This declaration was given in the August *Arena*, and the reason that it is cited again is that the President of the Utah church now admits that it was the rule in the earlier days of the church. That article was to show when this rule was abrogated, and the polygamous marriage system introduced into the practice of the church over which President Brigham Young presided, and which the present head of that church, Joseph F.

Smith, declares to be the same church organized in 1830. It is a fact that this section adopting the monogamous system was published continuously in the editions of this book down to the fall of 1876; by John Taylor, in the United States, in 1845 and 1846; by Orson Pratt, in Liverpool, England, in 1852 and 1854; and by Albert Carrington, at Islington, England, in 1869. It was publicly held out as the law from August 29, 1852, the date on which President Brigham Young introduced the so-called revelation on celestial marriage, until ordered out, presumably by President Young in 1876, without any public statement to show that it was by act of the church. Who was to blame for all these years of public affirmation of the monogamic rule after the death of Joseph Smith?

It is for reasons like these that the son of Joseph Smith "prefers to believe" that his father did neither teach nor practice plural marriage, or polygamy. The fact that Joseph Smith had no children born in polygamy, has been affirmed by every writer of note who has written with any knowledge of the situation. If the son is called upon for evidence, he is prepared to cite the public statements of President George Q. Cannon, one of the Presidency with Brigham Young, John Taylor, and Wilford Woodruff, associate with President Joseph F. Smith. President Brigham Young admitted this to William Hepworth Dixon, as stated by that writer in his work "New America," in chapter thirty of that work. If other proof is wanted, it will be forthcoming.

The chief contention of the sons of the Prophet Joseph Smith, however, is not that their father was not a polygamist, but is, that whether he was or was not, the dogma and practice are contrary to scripture, ancient and modern, and are wrong, being contrary to the laws of both God and the United States. That being contrary to the fundamental and organic laws of the church, neither the dogma nor the practice could in any sense become legitimately the faith and practice of the church. No matter who the human author of the doctrine may

have been, it was unlawful in every sense of the word, and is yet.

The decision by the Court of Appeals by which the Reorganized Church was denied possession of the Temple Lot in Independence, Missouri, is not a reversal of the decision of Judge John F. Philips, of the United States Circuit Court, that the Reorganized Church was in legal succession to the church organized in 1830; but is that the said church had slept upon its rights, and did not begin its suit soon enough; technical ground only.

The President of the Utah church states on page 492 of the *Arena*, that the President of the Reorganized Church "and his brothers have visited Salt Lake City, and have met ladies who assured him that they were united in marriage to his father in the city of Nauvoo, but, to use his own language, he 'prefers to believe the contrary.'"

The President of the Reorganized Church and his brother Alexander have been in Utah together but twice, and they both affirm that at no time and at no place, in Salt Lake City, or elsewhere, did they meet "ladies who assured him that they were united in marriage to his father;" or lived with him as such wives. There are neither "living witnesses," "written documents," nor "indisputable circumstances" to sustain such an assertion.

It is this persistent resort to misstatement and falsehood that has caused the sons of Joseph Smith to refuse to believe those who continue to utter them, and "prefer to believe" those witnesses whom they know were truthful, and the long array of facts which has come within their knowledge. President Smith of the Reorganized Church was in Salt Lake City in November and December, 1876. He spoke in the Liberal Institute there, and then and there challenged the evidences and threw the burden of proof on the advocates of polygamy. He was there again in 1885, and spoke in the Opera House, and again threw down the gage of defense. He was there again in 1887, and in 1889 spent six months in Utah, Montana, and Idaho, and spoke in various places in Utah, from Beaver on the south to Logan

on the north, and in each of the places the same claims to the right of an examination of the evidences inculcating his father in the introduction of Utah polygamy were made by him. In not one instance was there produced in public, any woman, or women, as witnesses who made affirmations to being wives to Joseph Smith; nor was there a man or woman produced for whom it was claimed he or she was a child of Joseph Smith in polygamous marriage. If it was known to so large a number of people, as it is asserted in the November *Arena*, why were not these persons presented and the son of the Prophet Joseph Smith given the benefit of their open testimony and the privilege of cross-questioning them before the public?

In the August *Arena* the question of veracity was not raised; a plain statement of facts was given, and if this threw suspicion upon persons connected with the church in Utah after Joseph Smith's death, it is but the result always following when the truth is told. In the eyes of the sons of Joseph Smith there is no virtue or loveliness in the dogma or practice of polygamy or plural marriage. They have neither fear of nor reverence for the false in religion. They have not in the past, through either fear or favor, stayed their opposition to the doctrine which has brought the name of their father into disrepute and cast reproach and shame upon the faith in which and for which he lived a stormy life and was cruelly murdered. The claim for unimpeachability of witnesses has no weight with these sons when put into the scales with the word of God and the facts known to them; nor does it matter to them what the positions these witnesses may have held or now hold. There is none of them but what at the time of testifying was a polygamist or an apologist therefor,—the men as husbands, the women as wives,—in contravention of the law of God admitted by them to have been the rule of marriage in the church in the lifetime of Joseph Smith. All of them were accomplices in guilt, if guilt it was. All knew, or should have known, that they had broken the laws of Illinois, if

the things stated by them were true. And this is tacitly admitted in the statement that the church in Utah, after a "long contest in the courts," "decided to submit to the laws of the land," and that no more plural marriages were performed now. But those who had been married polygamously have been permitted to "practice plural marriage" by living with their polygamous wives, by reason of the faulty construction of the Enabling Act, the result either of purpose or carelessness in framing it.

It is not true that the persons spoken of in the revelation referred to in the November article "were well known by a large number of trustworthy witnesses to have been wives" to Joseph Smith in Nauvoo, "in every sense of that relationship."

Franklin D. Richards, historian of the Utah church, in an article furnished to Gay Brothers & Company, for their work, "What the World Believes," published by them in New York, in 1888, has this peculiar statement, on page 600:

"Joseph Smith's first wife was Emma Hale, who was married to him January 18, 1827. Of the names or number of his other wives, as also the dates of their marriage to him, we are not informed."

If there was anything of the kind going on it was in secret, and those marrying or being sealed knew that they were criminals before the law, providing that the sealing named carried the idea of living in wedlock as in legal marriage. If it was in vogue at all it bore the stamp of the secret bringing in of heresy, the deceptive character of which is seen in the terms used by Historian Richards, "married or sealed to him." The same shifty parenthesis was introduced in the affidavits to which reference is made on page 491 of the November article in the *Arena*. The parenthetical ("or sealed") showing the unreliable and deceptive mental reservation, by which one thing was made to do duty for another. When Joseph Smith was killed and his body lay in his own house, where thousands viewed it, there were no family mourners gathered by the side of his open coffin except his wife, his only wife, Emma, and her sons, and an adopted daughter. Not one

of these so-called wives was there, or known, or recognized as of right there. The witnesses produced in the suit referred to who gave evidence, all stated that they were not at the funeral as or known to be his wives.

The November *Arena* article states on page 496 that the " 'Reorganized' church came into existence in 1861." This is an error, as the first conference was held June 12, 1852, two months before President Brigham Young introduced the so-called revelation on "the eternity of the marriage covenant," in August of that same year.

It is a well-known principle of law, ecclesiastical as well as secular, that the organic laws and rules of government of a religious body can not be changed by either a small or large number of its membership, to the exclusion of and the taking away of the rights of those who may choose to remain true to the open declarations of faith of the church at its origin. And that if any divergence from the original faith is attempted, either privily or openly, those who remain with the original articles are the church, whether few or many. This law is as old as the Exodus, when Caleb and Joshua were the faithful and the rest perished in the wilderness. The sons of Joseph Smith and their associates are the original church in this contention.

There remain a few features of the "Reply" to my article in the August *Arena* which, from their character, it is a duty to notice.

On page 493 the writer states that the so-called revelation which is the alleged basis of Utah polygamy "bears the impress throughout of the spirit and language of the other and earlier revelations through Joseph Smith, as published in his lifetime in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants."

What a statement this is, following the admission made on the same page, that "monogamic marriage was advocated and upheld," "in the earlier days of the church;" and that "no one has disputed that."

In January, 1831, the following was given: "And that ye might escape the power of the enemy, and be gathered unto me a righteous people, without

spot and blameless: wherefore, for this cause I gave unto you the commandment, that ye should go to the Ohio; and there I will give unto you my law."—Doctrine and Covenants 38: 7.

The law here referred to was given in February, 1831, and contains this direct command to the church: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else; and he that looketh upon a woman to lust after her, shall deny the faith, and shall not have the Spirit; and if he repents not, he shall be cast out. Thou shalt not commit adultery."—Doctrine and Covenants 42: 7.

The "spirit and language" of this revelation are monogamous; the spirit and language of the revelation referred to are polygamous. The language, "love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else," can not be construed to mean, Thou shalt cleave unto thy *wives*. The first requires faithfulness to one wife; the other permits and enjoins the having more than one wife.

In March, 1831, the following was given, and shows conclusively "the spirit and language" of what was given in February: "And again, I say unto you, that whoso forbiddeth to marry, is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God unto man; wherefore it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation; and that it might be filled with the measure of man, according to his creation before the world was made."—Doctrine and Covenants 49: 3.

This "bears the impress of the spirit and language" of Genesis 2: 24; Malachi 2: 15; Matthew 19: 5, 6; Mark 10: 5, 9.

These texts from the earlier revelations and the Scriptures provide for but one companion in wedlock, whereas the revelation to which the President of the Utah church refers as being like them "in spirit and language" provides for a plurality of wives—so understood and urged by him.

There is a wide divergence "in the spirit and lan-

guage" of the revelation to which Mr. Smith of the Utah church refers from the "spirit and language" of these earlier revelations. Those of the earlier days enjoin the observance of the rule, one companion in wedlock for either man or woman; the latter abrogates this rule and establishes polygamy. The one provides for the lawful union with one woman as a wife, the other for an unlawful plurality.

In the article in the November *Arena* President Smith, of Utah, refers to a quotation from the Book of Mormon limiting the men of that time to monogamy, and states of it, "They were limited to one wife each." He states as a reason for this that "they were too wicked and abominable to be permitted to enter into those sacred relations and covenants comprehended in the divine order of celestial or plural marriage." ". . . The Book of Mormon declares that the Nephites of that early period should have but one wife."

In an effort to escape the inevitable conclusion that would follow in the mind of the reader of my article in the August *Arena*, that the Book of Mormon contained positive inhibition of polygamy, this writer in its defense resorts to a clumsy subterfuge by quoting in italics a portion which he states I "carefully left out;" but which he has carelessly put in, upon the plea that had I quoted it, it would have "taken away the entire ground of" my position. He assumes that the command to have but one wife was to that people and to them alone, but that the italicized quotation is "an intimation that a further and different command might be given at another time and to another people, and that the law then declared was but temporary." To further this assumption, while he admits that the members of the church were "required to practice monogamic marriage, the declaration, that 'one man should have one wife, and one woman *but* one husband,' bears the implication that a man might possibly be permitted at some time to have more than one wife, while a woman was to have *but* one husband."

This is a bit of sophistry so transparent as to cause a wonder that a man should write it for those who read the English language. First: The quotation from the Book of Mormon which I gave in the *August Arena*, page 162, clearly states what the conduct complained of as wicked and abominable was, to-wit, "This people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures: for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son." This arraignment is but preliminary to the statement of gross iniquity which follows: "Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord."

There is not a sentence in the whole quotation given, nor in the chapter of the book that warrants the statement that the people were "too wicked and abominable" in other directions than in polygamy and concubinage to be allowed to practice plural marriages, etc. Further than this, the "ancient inhibition" has a direct "bearing upon the present age" and "the people of these times," especially those to whom the Book of Mormon came. Note what I have already quoted from the revelations to the church. In one of the revelations given "in the earlier days of the church," the Book of Mormon is called the new covenant, and because that work was treated lightly they were reproached. The cause is as follows: "And this condemnation resteth upon the children of Zion, even all; and they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the new covenant even the Book of Mormon and the former commandments which I have given them, not only to say, but to do according to that which I have written."—*Doctrine and Covenants* 83:8. This was given in September, 1832. The former commandments included the one on marriage:

"And again, the elders, priests, and teachers of this church shall teach the principles of my gospel which are in the Bible and the Book of Mormon, in the which is the fullness of the gospel; and they

shall observe the covenants and church articles to do them, and these shall be their teachings, as they shall be directed by the Spirit."—Doctrine and Covenants 42:5.

The commands to the church place the Bible and the Book of Mormon in juxtaposition in importance for the government of the church. The practice of polygamy and concubinage of David and Solomon were abominable before God in the Nephites, and by reason of the fact that the record of that people has come to the Mormon people and its teaching enforced by restatement and revelation, polygamy is as abominable before him now as it was then.

Corroborative of this note the following:

"Behold, the Lamanites, your brethren, whom ye hate, because of their filthiness and the cursings which have come upon their skins, are more righteous than you: for they have not forgotten the commandment of the Lord, which was given unto our fathers, that they should have, save it were one wife; and concubines they should have none; and there should not be whoredoms committed among them."—Book of Mormon, Jacob 2:9.

The two peoples of the Book of Mormon are placed in contrast here, the Nephites, polygamists; the Lamanites, monogamists. Let the contrast be drawn again, between the two peoples—those who are polygamists and those who are not.

The fact that the teachings of the Book of Mormon are binding on Latter Day Saints, the Utah church as well as all others, shows the folly of supposing that the italicized quotation intimates the giving of a different law. Second: The reason for the exodus of Lehi and family from Jerusalem was:

"Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of my arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old."—Book of Mormon, Jacob 2:6.

A similar reason is given for the monogamic marriage commanded to the church at its beginning:

“And that ye might escape the power of the enemy, and be gathered unto me a righteous people, without spot and blameless: wherefore, for this cause I gave unto you the commandment, that ye should go to the Ohio; and there I will give unto you my law.”—Doctrine and Covenants 38: 7.

Precisely the same reason is assigned by the Prophet Malachi, already cited, which reads:

“And did he not make one? Yet had he the residue of the Spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth.”—Malachi 2: 15.

It is strikingly strange that with all these evidences before him this apologist for Utah polygamy should resort to such shallow evasions as he has done in his article in the November *Arena*. The force of the quotation he has italicized is found in the terms, “I will *command* my people,” “wherefore this people shall keep my commandments.” President Smith, of Utah, is guilty of another subterfuge, which is, to say the least, pitiable if not contemptible. He seems to hold that the sentence, “One man should have one wife, and one woman *but* one husband,” restricts the woman but puts no limitation upon the man. He conveys the implication that the sentence was so worded as to provide that at some time a man might have more than one wife, and a woman *but* one husband. He italicizes the word *but* in both sentences. The rule given the church in 1831 was, “Wherefore, it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.” The word *twain* bars his implication in this sentence, “We declare that we believe that one man should have one wife; and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.” In this case the words, “either is at liberty to marry again,” bars his implication in this sentence. It is lawful for a man to have one wife; it is unlawful for him to have more than one, or to marry a second while the first is living. Mr. Smith’s very next words show that he knew this attempt to destroy the force of the

restriction was not a good one, for he writes, "Be that as it may;" that is, granted that it is a valid restriction (and he already admitted that), a change might be effected.

Why did President Brigham Young have this restrictive clause taken out of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, if the position taken by his successor, Joseph F. Smith, is correct, that the inhibition found in it did not conflict with the revelation he ordered inserted in its place?

This implication so clumsily made, is one of the things objected to by the sons of Joseph Smith in this controversy. It assumes the position that the one who gave the revelations and commandments to the church was guilty of subtlety, deception, and double dealing; that he gave laws to the church that were intended to have one meaning to the world and another to the church; that he condemned polygamy as a crime in one age and lauded it as a virtue in another age; a curse and an abomination in one people, a blessing and commendable in another. That he, Christ, the law-giver, was changeable in character, and gave a rule of conduct to be followed by his people that God might seek a godly seed; a righteous people upon this land, and suddenly changing his established rule of virtue, uprightness, and chastity, gave another and contradictory law directly opposite to the first. Further than this, this assumption that there was in these revelations that I have cited, and in the declaration of belief made by the church in 1835, a cunningly devised scheme for the men engaged in it to hold out to the world the claim for the chastity, virtue, and honor of both men and women in honorable monogamous marriage, according to the command of God and agreeably to the laws and institutions of the land where the church had its birth, and to engage in a system of marriage forbidden in the laws of God and punishable under the laws of the land; which system required lives of secrecy, duplicity, disregard for law, a covert hiding from publicity, the disregard for and breaking of the covenants of marriage solemnity entered into with

companions who are ignorant of the existence of such secret systems, and helpless to redress their injuries;—such implication makes Joseph Smith and his father, mother, brothers, and sisters to have been parties to the living of two-faced lives, one to the world and the great majority of the church, the other to the few, who, like themselves, were enmeshed in their iniquity. The apologist for polygamy may believe such a record of those who may be dear to him, but the sons of the Prophet Joseph Smith will not so believe, unless evidence is presented which is far better and more worthy of credence than has hitherto been submitted to their examination.

Joseph Smith in 1838 denied the right of a man to two or more wives; Parley P. Pratt denied it in 1842; John Taylor, who succeeded Brigham Young, denied it in November, 1844, and in May, 1845; John Taylor denied its existence, July 11, 1850. Orson Pratt preached the first polygamous sermon to the church, August 29, 1852. It was then a new doctrine. George Q. Cannon said June 11, 1871, "Joseph and Hyrum Smith were persecuted to death previous to the church having any knowledge of this doctrine"—plurality of wives.

What means this array of contradictory evidence? It can not mean that the system of polygamy came into the church in an open, clear, and comprehensive declaration of faith, as did all the other provisions of the gospel known to the church between 1830 and the death of Joseph Smith. It can mean only that the dogma and practice were privily introduced and that it was not until through the influence of President Brigham Young, himself a polygamist, he had allied unto himself some of the leading men of the church, by entangling them in the like practice, and *eight years and two months after the death of Joseph Smith, and at Salt Lake City, Utah*, he forced the dogma upon the people under his control, without a discussion of the purported revelation, or the submission of it to the voice of the people; the law of the church requiring that "all things shall be done by common consent;"

“that nothing shall be added contrary to church articles.”

THE PURPORTED REVELATION ON PLURAL
MARRIAGE.

It is affirmed “That the revelation on Celestial Marriage, including the plurality of wives, given as explained on July 12th, 1843, bears the impress throughout of the spirit and language of the other and earlier revelations through Joseph Smith, as published in his lifetime in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. It bears no literary resemblance to the revelation contained in the same volume given through President Brigham Young.”

Careful comparison of the document with the revelations of Joseph Smith, published and sanctioned by him during his lifetime, fails to disclose a single feature of marked identity. Of the hundred and eighty revelations claimed to have been received by Joseph Smith, and published with his sanction, every one bears his plain unassuming manner of statement, simply naming the document and date given; i. e., “Revelation given March, 1829;” “Revelation given April, 1829.” When the revelation contained instruction to himself or some other person, the statement is, “Revelation to Joseph Smith, Jr., given December, 1830;” “Revelation to Thomas B. Marsh, given September, 1830;” etc. This simple style uniformly follows in his work to the date of his last important revelation to the church, which is introduced as follows: “Revelation given to Joseph Smith, January 19, 1841.”

The document referred to by Joseph F. Smith as containing such marks of identity, reads as follows:

“Revelation on the Eternity of the Marriage Covenant, including Plurality of wives. Given through Joseph, the Seer, in Nauvoo, Hancock County, Illinois, July 12th, 1843.”

How does it come that the man who had invariably avoided the use of special appellations in references to himself, changed all at once and wrote, “Given through Joseph, the Seer?”

To begin with, the brand of forgery is written

across the face of the document. Joseph Smith's name is not attached as the receiver of this document except in this statement, which is written without his consent and after his death. The author of the purported revelation is readily disclosed by a few literary comparisons. After the death of Joseph Smith, the factional claimants to leadership in the church put forth every conceivable statement of Joseph Smith, whether uttered in conversation or simple address, that they could distort in their favor to strengthen their hold upon the people. Brigham Young caused the publication of a number of these. (See Utah Doctrine and Covenants, sections 126, 131, 136, etc.) Here we find, "Revelation given through Joseph, the Seer, in the house of Elder Brigham Young, Nauvoo, Illinois, July 9th, 1841."

This was printed after Joseph Smith's death. It seems to be the beginning of the new order. It further reads:

"Dear and well-beloved brother Brigham Young, verily thus saith the Lord unto you, my servant Brigham, it is no more required at your hand to leave your family as in times past, for your offering is acceptable to me; I have seen your labor and toil in journeyings for my name. I therefore command you to send my word abroad, and take special care of your family from this time, henceforth, and for ever. Amen."

Again we read: "The Word and Will of the Lord, given through President Brigham Young, at the Winter Quarters of the Camp of Israel, Omaha Nation, West Bank of the Missouri River, near Council Bluffs, January 14th, 1847."

Here is the titled revelator; and every sentence discloses the character of the man.

The same marked contrast in teaching and doctrine is prominent all through the body of the polygamous document.

Paragraph 1 places Joseph Smith in the position of holding that the Lord justified Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and David and Solomon in having many wives and concubines.

Joseph Smith, on the contrary, held and taught that God did not justify these men in having many wives and concubines. Of Abraham he wrote, "God does not acknowledge Hagar as Abram's wife." (Genesis, chapter 16, Inspired Translation of Scriptures.) Of David and Solomon he taught: "Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord."—Book of Mormon, Jacob, chapter 2. Neither did he teach nor believe that Isaac and Moses were polygamists in any sense. The paragraph is a gross fraud when compared with the writings of Joseph Smith.

Paragraph 3 of the document, represents the Lord as saying: "All these who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same."

The fair inference is that this was either more important than other laws God had given, or else that it was not necessary to obey other laws. Joseph Smith taught that God's ways were equal and all his laws spiritual and alike unto him:

"Wherefore, verily I say unto you, that all things unto me are spiritual, and not at any time have I given unto you a law which was temporal, neither any man, nor the children of men; neither Adam your father, whom I created; behold, I gave unto him that he should be an agent unto himself; and I gave unto him commandment, but no temporal commandment gave I unto him; for my commandments are spiritual; they are not natural; nor temporal, neither carnal nor sensual."—Doctrine and Covenants 28: 9.

Paragraph 4 states: "For behold! I reveal unto you a new and everlasting covenant."

Joseph Smith taught one everlasting covenant, and that this was already revealed in 1831. (Sections 45 and 49, Book of Doctrine and Covenants, 1835 edition.)

Paragraphs 15 to 19 teach that unless men and women are joined in wedlock by special appointed authority, it is not by the decree of God.

Joseph Smith taught that God's decree touching marriage was from the beginning, and that not only

Adam and Eve were bound under this, but their posterity, and that no particular minister or formula was necessary to the sanctity of this God-given and holy order of matrimony:

"She shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."—Genesis 2: 29, 30, Inspired Translation.

"We believe, that all marriages in this Church of Christ of Latter Day Saints, should be solemnized in a public meeting, or feast, prepared for that purpose: and that the solemnization should be performed by a presiding high priest, high priest, bishop, elder, or priest, not even prohibiting those persons who are desirous to get married, of being married by other authority."—Doctrine and Covenants 101, section on marriage, 1835 edition.

Paragraphs 19 and 20 of this document teach that men may become gods.

Joseph Smith taught that Christ would give power to those who received him "to become the sons of God;" but never that either Adam or any other man was God.

Paragraph 24 states: "This is eternal lives, to know the only wise and true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent."

Joseph Smith wrote: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."—John 17: 3, Inspired Translation.

Paragraph 39 states: "David's wives and concubines were given unto him, of me, by the hand of Nathan, my servant, and others of the prophets who had the keys of this power; and in none of these things did he sin against me, save in the case of Uriah and his wife."

Joseph Smith wrote of David: "But repented of the evil all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite, wherein the Lord cursed him."—1 Kings 15: 5, Inspired Translation.

Paragraphs 52 to 66 inclusive are in word, doctrine, and spirit wholly at variance with any and all

the known teachings and social life of Joseph Smith, and contradictory to any writing or publication of his extant.

President Wilford Woodruff, of the Utah church, before the Commissioner of the United States Circuit Court, Salt Lake City, March 16, 1892, testified: "I do not know where the original of the revelation called the polygamous revelation is. I do not know that I ever saw it. I do not believe I ever did see it. I never saw a copy of it or the original during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. I do not think I saw the one that came here to Utah and purported to be a copy of the original. I do not know whether the church of which I am the president has the purported copy or not. The church papers are in the possession of various parties,—the historian of the church has them more or less. The original manuscripts or copies of the original manuscripts are in various places. . . . I was present here in Salt Lake City in August, 1852, at the conference. It is altogether probable that it was at the time when this revelation on polygamy was given to the church by Brigham Young. I do not recollect that fact, but I presume I was present. I have read the sermons Brigham Young published in the *Journal of Discourses*,—some of them,—they are in my library, and I presume are considered correct as published. They are published by the church of which I am president. . . . Some of my own sermons are published there, and they are correct."

Q.—"Then on the 15th day of November, 1844, there was no marriage ceremony that governed the church as a church, except the one published in the 1835 edition of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants? Is not that a fact, Mr. Woodruff?"

A.—"None that I know of. That was all the law on the question of marriage that was given to the body of the people."

Q.—"Now I will ask you, Mr. Woodruff, why the church of which you are president, in the publication of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants in the edition of 1876, eliminated from that edition the section on marriage as found in the 1835 edition,

and in all the editions of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants published up to 1876, and inserted in lieu of that section on marriage, the revelation on polygamy, dated July 12, 1843?"

A.—“I do not know why it was done. It was done by the authority of whoever presided over the church, I suppose. Brigham Young was the president then.”

Q.—“Now, can you tell why the section on marriage that has always been in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants up to that time was eliminated from it and the other inserted in lieu of it?”

A.—“I can not tell. It was done I suppose under the direction of Brigham Young or under his administration. I can not state why it was done.”

Q.—“Was it not because one was in conflict with the other?”

A.—“I do not know that I can state why it was done.”—Abstract of Evidence U. S. Circuit Court, pp. 308, 309.

This testimony of the associate, and second successor in the presidency of Brigham Young, discloses the character of the man who attempted to succeed Joseph Smith. In defiance to the revelations to the church and the rights of the people, he stretched forth his hand against the holy order of marriage that was approved and made binding upon the entire church in a solemn assembly held in the Temple at Kirtland, Ohio, A. D., 1835, under the immediate supervision of Joseph Smith and tore it from its place in one of the sacred books of the church.

The revelations in that same book direct the manner of transacting the business of the church. They state:

“Neither shall anything be appointed unto any of this church contrary to the church covenants, for all things must be done in order and by common consent in the church, by the prayer of faith.”—Revelation September, 1830, Doctrine and Covenants 27: 4.

This also was fully violated in the act, in word and spirit. It is the Utah witness upon the stand,

not a witness called by the sons of Joseph Smith. Mr. Woodruff was one of the original twelve apostles under Joseph Smith. Was at Nauvoo and had full opportunity to know. Was a free man until the new order of things under Brigham Young and then he could know nothing.

It is asserted by Joseph F. Smith, that this polygamous document was taught to the apostles in Nauvoo. Here is one of the Nauvoo apostles on the stand; a witness at his own volition. He testifies. "I never saw a copy of it or the original during the lifetime of Joseph Smith." It could not have been taught to him if he never saw it, or a copy.

Lorenzo Snow, a president of the Seventy under Joseph Smith, and living in Nauvoo in 1843 and president of the Apostles in Utah at the time of his testimony, states of this document:

"I could not say whether it was after it was presented here by Brigham Young to the church that I saw it. I was nothere when it was presented. I was in Italy, I believe, in Italy or in France. I had not seen it up to that time of course. I do not remember where nor when I saw it; it was printed, however. I never saw the original, if that is what you want to know. I never saw it in any other form except in printed form."—Abstract of Evidence, page 319.

The statement of William B. Smith and John E. Page, apostles at Nauvoo, the former a brother of Joseph Smith, denounced the document in positive terms and maintained that it was a heresy brought in after the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith.

Elder James Whitehead, the private secretary of Joseph Smith, testified:

"I landed in Nauvoo, the 13th day of April, 1842. I lived there till the fall of 1847; I was engaged while there in church work. I was the private secretary of Joseph Smith from early in June, 1842, until he was killed in 1844. I was there when he was killed; I knew the officers in the old church; I was a member of the church when I went to Nauvoo. . . . The doctrine of polygamy was never taught by the elders, or high priests, or by any

other person or persons of authority in the church, so far as I know or ever heard between the years 1830 and 1844."—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 27-29.

The proofs, then, are not "overwhelming and beyond honest controversy" that this thing was "plainly taught to the apostles and other prominent church ministers in Nauvoo" during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. It is, on the contrary, clear that it was never presented by Joseph Smith in public or private, and was never seen by these men. The assertions so freely made are absolutely false. We are aware that there have been attempts to manufacture history among certain classes and make this doctrine reach back to 1841 and 1842, in order to force the sanction of polygamy upon Joseph Smith. This was made apparent in the outstart of the testimony of President Wilford Woodruff when he said: "I undoubtedly knew of its being taught to certain individuals at Nauvoo in 1841 and 1842, but I can not say as to time from memory."

But upon cross-examination, he was compelled to deny the statement. The testimony upon this is clear:

"Now you have said that the doctrine of plural marriage was taught at Nauvoo in 1841 and 1842, and I want to read this article or letter found on page 939, [of *Times and Seasons*,] dated October 1, 1842:

"We the undersigned members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and residents of the city of Nauvoo, persons of families, do hereby certify and declare that we know of no other rule or system of marriage than the one published from the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and we give this certificate to show that Doctor J. C. Bennett's "secret wife system" is a creature of his own make, as we know of no such society in this place, nor never did."

"That is signed by S. Bennett, George Miller, Alpheus Cutler, Reynolds Cahoon, Wilson Law, W. Woodruff, N. K. Whitney, Albert Pettey, Elias Higbee, John Taylor, E. Robinson, and Aaron Johnson. Now what do you say to that?"

A.—"Well, sir, that is correct, for we never did

acknowledge it up to that time. No, sir, and at no other time, up to the death of the Prophet.

"I signed the letter you have just read. There was no other rule of marriage acknowledged by the church except what is found in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, the 1835 edition. I did not know of any other rule at the time, and if I did, I do not now recollect it."

Q.—"Now here is another certificate that I want to call your attention to, following the one I have just read you on the same page and in the same column, it is as follows:

"We the undersigned members of the Ladies' Relief Society, and married females do certify and declare that we know of no system of marriage being practiced in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints save the one contained in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and we give this certificate to the public to show that J. C. Bennett's "secret wife system" is a disclosure of his own make."

"That is signed by the following persons: Emma Smith, president; Elizabeth Ann Whitney, counselor; Sarah M. Cleveland, counselor; Eliza R. Snow, secretary; Mary C. Miller, Lois Cutler, Thirza Cahoon, Ann Hunter, Jane Law, Sophia R. Marks, Polly Z. Johnson, Abigail Works, Catharine Pettey, Sarah Higbee, Phebe Woodruff, Lenora Taylor, Sarah Hillman, Rosanna Marks, and Angelina Robinson.

"Now I observe amongst the names I have read to you, the name of Phebe Woodruff,—she was your wife, was she not?"

A.—"Yes, sir."

Q.—"And the name of Sr. Emma, also?"

A.—"Yes, sir, she was the wife of Joseph Smith, the President of the Church, and she was also president of the Ladies' Relief Society. Elizabeth Ann Whitney was the wife of Bishop N. K. Whitney. Sarah M. Cleveland was counselor to Emma Smith as president of the Ladies' Relief Society, and Eliza R. Snow was the secretary of this society.

"I know all those ladies whose names appear to

that certificate. There could not have been any rule of marriage or any order of marriage in existence at that time, except that prescribed by the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, to their knowledge. They would certainly have known it, and up to the first day of October, 1842, there was no such system taught or practiced openly or secretly to my knowledge."—Abstract of Evidence, 303, 304.

Here is a positive date fixed by the highest authority of the Utah church and one of the apostles at Nauvoo, Illinois, under a solemn oath: he is also at the time the chief party in interest on the polygamous side. Beyond this no man who is disposed to be truthful will attempt to go. This disposes of all the tales and stories conjured up by Brigham Young and his immediate followers after the death of Joseph Smith, to make up history to suit their purposes. The Reorganized Church has been fully aware of the effort made at this kind of work, hence its open questioning of any published account by these men after the death of Joseph Smith purporting to represent his views. The contention among the dozen or more factions which arose after his death was such as to compel men and women who wanted the truth, to take nothing for facts which had a basis in the tales of the times. The Apostle's advice was heeded by the sons of Joseph Smith: "But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness."—1 Timothy 4: 7.

An example of the class of subterfuges referred to is found in the little booklet issued from the press of "George Q. Cannon & Sons Co.," Salt Lake City, entitled "Pictures and Biographies of Brigham Young and His Wives." Special pains is taken all through the work to state incidentally that such a one was married in 1842 or 1843, Joseph Smith officiating, or that such a one was the wife of Joseph Smith in 1841 or 1842. But notwithstanding the cunning trick to sow to the world the heresy of polygamy in this covert way, the truth crops out when the births of the children are set out, and in every instance the first polygamous children, born to Brigham Young, or any one else of the Nauvoo contingent, occurred

the following year after the death of Joseph Smith, and no pretension by any one that any such issue belonged to him. This and other attempted slanders against the character of Joseph Smith fail by reason of inconsistencies.

THE "NAUVOO EXPOSITOR."

Later, polygamists, Hedrickites, and the Anti-Mormon League, all, after having been driven from every position which they have taken in their efforts to lay the charge of polygamy at the feet of Joseph Smith, have resurrected the old issues of the *Nauvoo Expositor*, and taken a last refuge under this conspiracy of lies. If it was an imposition against Joseph Smith, and false, malicious, and vilely slanderous then, it is now.

Emma Smith, the wife of Joseph Smith, William Marks, president of the Stake of Nauvoo and member of the High Council, James Whitehead, the private secretary of Joseph Smith, all standing in such relationship that the things charged could not have been true without their knowledge, ever maintained that the claim made by Brigham Young and his associates touching this document was absolutely false. All three continued residents of the state of Illinois from twenty to forty years after the death of Joseph Smith. Mr. Marks lived in Northern Illinois; Emma Smith (subsequently Emma Smith Bidamon) lived in Nauvoo; and James Whitehead in Alton, Illinois. All were respected and honored where they lived as persons of the highest integrity and veracity. Their residences were far apart, and they were not under bonds to each other in any degree by relationship or correspondence; and their testimony is ever the same. On the other hand, we have the unsupported testimony of Brigham Young; he brought out a paper more than eight years after the death of Joseph Smith and said to his followers:

"This revelation has been in my possession many years; and who has known it? None but those who should know it. I keep a patent lock on my desk, and there does not anything leak out that should not."—*Millennial Star*, vol. 15, Supplement, p. 31.

Mr. Young, however, does not bring forward a single one of those persons "who should know it," to whom he refers, to support him in the statement. One of the apostles and a president of Seventy who were with him in Nauvoo and Salt Lake City, have given their sworn testimony, and neither was among those "who should know it."

But Mr. Young also stated in presenting this:

"The original copy of this revelation was burnt up; William Clayton was the man who wrote it from the mouth of the Prophet. In the meantime it was in Bishop Whitney's possession. He wished the privilege to copy it, which Bro. Joseph granted. Sr. Emma burnt the original."—*Millennial Star* Supplement, p. 30.

William Clayton is introduced in this; but for what? to prove the document? The document Brigham Young had is admitted not to be the one that he claimed Clayton to have written. It was to further excuse the absence of any reliable evidence showing the paper he had was the work of Joseph Smith, that he uses this. He further states: "Sr. Emma burnt the original."

The connection to the slightest degree then, of Joseph Smith with this purported revelation depends upon the bare assertion of Brigham Young.

Upon the publication of this statement of Young's, Mrs. Emma Smith Bidamon was interviewed at her home in Illinois, and her testimony published during her lifetime. It is as follows:

Q.—"Mrs. Bidamon, have you seen the revelation on polygamy, published by Orson Pratt, in the *Seer*, in 1852?"

A.—"I have."

Q.—"Have you read it?"

A.—"I have read it, and have heard it read."

Q.—"Did you ever see that document in manuscript, previous to its publication, by Pratt?"

A.—"I never did."

Q.—"Did you ever see any document of that

kind, purporting to be a revelation, to authorize polygamy?"

A.—“No; I never did.”

Q.—“Did Joseph Smith ever teach you the principles of polygamy, as being revealed to him, or as a correct and righteous principle?”

A.—“He never did.”

Q.—“What about that statement of Brigham Young, that you burnt the original manuscript of that revelation?”

A.—“It is false in all its parts, *made out of whole cloth*, without any foundation in truth.”—Church History, L. D. S., vol. 3, p. 352.

In February, 1879, Mrs. Emma Smith Bidamon gave her statement for publication touching Joseph Smith's attitude toward polygamy. She said:

“No such thing as polygamy, or spiritual wifery, was taught, publicly or privately, before my husband's death, that I have now, or ever had any knowledge of.”

Q.—“Did he not have other wives than yourself?”

A.—“He had no other wife but me; nor did he to my knowledge ever have.”

Q.—“Did he not hold marital relation with other women than yourself?”

A.—“He did not have improper relations with any woman that ever came to my knowledge.”—Ibid., pp. 355, 356.

According to the terms of the purported revelation on polygamy, Joseph Smith could not have married a second wife without the knowledge and consent of his then living wife, Emma. This settles that question then.

The frequent reference to Joseph Smith and Emma Smith in the document is against its being genuine, rather than in favor. Why should Joseph Smith's wife, Emma, be named and commanded to give other women to her husband? Why not mention the wife of Sidney Rigdon, B. Young, William Marks, or Parley Pratt? The purpose is too apparent on its face. The document was fixed to deceive those who had accepted Joseph Smith as a true prophet. The frequent use of the names “Joseph”

and "Emma" is but another witness showing its fraudulent character.

It has already been shown that this man Brigham Young, who never trusted anybody but himself, in order to carry out his purposes deliberately took from one of the sacred books of the church in violation of the law of common consent in the church, the section on marriage, and forced instead thereof, without consent of the church, this document providing for plural marriages. Is it out of reason to say that a man who would deliberately do these acts would not hesitate to prepare the documents to suit his notions that he was to have inserted? Since the document so forced upon the people is found to be after the style and ideas of Brigham Young, who had been for years practicing the evils contrary to the laws of the church, according to his own confession, is it not a fair presumption that he was the author, rather than Joseph Smith, whose entire life and teaching, outside of this purported paper, were wholly adverse to it?

Again, is it unreasonable, or illogical to conclude that a man who is engaged in such evil practices, and who does not hesitate to set aside the plain word of God when it stands in his way to the accomplishment of his purposes, would deliberately form a system to suit himself.

If the evidence after having been carefully weighed, forces the sons of Joseph Smith to these conclusions, is it not honorable for them to express them to the public? Rules of evidence in this case demand that the original paper be presented, and original records of the claimed marriages, if such thing ever took place, be produced; but we have for years given opportunity to our Utah friends to present us with an authenticated duplicate, and not a scrap that bears the shadow of evidence have they so far brought forward. If the mother of these sons, Emma Smith, has not testified truthfully, where is the record bearing her signature showing that she consented to such unholy liaisons on the part of her husband as mentioned in this document? President Woodruff was careful to state that they had the

records. We have asked for the records in court, and out of court, and demanded the evidence which was always coming, and never came, until we have been compelled to question the honor, integrity, and truthfulness of Brigham Young and his leading associates, touching the introduction of polygamy, and polygamous practices. Before accepting as truth the accusation that Joseph Smith received this purported revelation and was a polygamist, we are entitled to evidence showing that he was guilty beyond any reasonable doubt. But in the contention upon the matter, the preponderance of the testimony is in his favor; indeed, there has not come under our inspection anything tending to implicate him that would bear a fair examination.

The only persons put forward by Joseph F. Smith and his associates as witnesses to identify the polygamous revelation, corroborate the position that the document is a forgery, if the testimony is worth anything at all. One is Joseph C. Kingsbury, a patron of polygamy in Utah, and the other Mercy Rachel Thompson, aunt of Joseph F. Smith in Salt Lake City, who claimed when upon the witness stand to have been the possessor of four husbands, but very reluctantly admitted that two of them existed at the same time. Neither witness could give a single word from memory of what the original paper they were called to identify contained, but both agreed that the document which they saw was written upon only one or two sheets of foolscap paper. Of this they were positive enough.

Mr. Kingsbury testified:

"The paper I copied, I presume was copied in an hour, but I could not tell exactly, of course. Yes, I said I copied the revelation on one sheet of paper,—foolscap."

Q.—"Now, don't you know that you could not copy that revelation, section 132 of Exhibit A, on one sheet of paper, and that you could not copy it on twenty sheets of paper, foolscap or any other kind of ordinary paper?"

A.—"No, sir, I do not know anything about it."
—Abstract of Evidence, p. 342.

Mrs. Mercy Rachel Thompson:

"I saw that revelation on polygamy, and had it in my hands, saw what kind of paper it was written on. It was written on foolscap paper. I do not know exactly how many pages there were of it, think there was not more than one whole sheet, and I am as certain of that as I am of anything I have testified to, that there was not more than one whole sheet of foolscap, that would be four pages. If there had been more than one full sheet, I should have known it. It did not require any pins in the paper to pin it together, because when it was opened it was all one sheet. No, sir, I can not mention anything that was in it. I would not try to do that. I do not recollect the first word nor the last word. I think the last word would be *amen*, likely, but I do not remember it. I do not know that the name of Joseph Smith was signed to it."—Abstract of Evidence, 347.

The document given by Brigham Young to his people consists of sixty-six paragraphs, besides the heading, covering eleven pages 8mo. printed matter, and would require hours, if not a day, to carefully copy by a fair penman and to properly paragraph and verify. It is beyond question that if the witnesses produced to prove the existence of this purported revelation, testified to the truth, it is a fraud. The witnesses described a different document altogether.

The sequel is much like the effort made in the time of Brigham Young to form a collection of affidavits, shaped up to suit the purpose, and successfully contradict Mrs. Emma Smith in her denial of ever consenting to or having any knowledge of her husband marrying a second wife. The affidavits of Emily D. P. Young, and Eliza R. Snow Young, wives of Brigham Young, Eliza M. Lyman, Lucy W. Kimball, Lovina Walker, William Clayton, et al., all polygamists, are set out under the head of "*Plural Marriage*," *Historical Record* (Utah), pages 219 to 234, and the day fixed, 11th May, 1843, when Mrs. Emma Smith faithfully handed over, two in one day, to her husband; and but for the fact that Joseph Smith during his lifetime had kept a

private journal, recording the transactions of each day, Mrs. Smith would seemingly have been at the mercy of these conspirators.

To say the least, it was remarkable that Joseph Smith should again be able to record himself in condemnation of polygamy through his writings upon an issue made twenty-five years after his death.

His private journal was consulted and contained the following:

"Thursday, the 11th day of May, 1843. At six o'clock in the morning baptized Louisa Beeman, Sarah Alley and others. At eight o'clock in the morning went to see a new carriage made by Thomas Moore, which was ready for travel. Emma went to Quincy in new carriage. I rode out as far as Prairie. At ten o'clock in the forenoon B. Young, H. C. Kimball, P. P. Pratt, O. Pratt, O. Hyde, W. Woodruff, George A. Smith, John Taylor, and W. Richards assembled in council and voted that Addison Pratt, Noah Rogers, Benjamin F. Grouard and Knowlton F. Hanks go on a mission to the Pacific Isles. Captain Dan Jones prepared himself to take a mission to Wales; James Sloan to go to Ireland; Reuben Headlock, John Cairns, and Samuel James to England, and that Reuben Headlock preside over the church, etc., be assisted by Elders Hiram Clark and Thomas Ward. That the brothers Cairns go to Scotland. Lucius M. Scoville go to England under the direction of Bro. Headlock, and that Amos Fielding go immediately to Nauvoo, or be cut off from the church. Also that this quorum recommend George Walker to President Joseph Smith as clerk of the Nauvoo House. B. Young stated that Woodworth had offered the use of his draft for the Nauvoo House if any one would copy it, but he had not time to comply with the request of the quorum for a full draft." The journal also states that Emma Smith "returned from Quincy the 15th of May."

This shows beyond a doubt that Emma Smith, the first and only wife, as she claimed, of Joseph Smith,

was correct in her testimony touching this contested event of May 11, 1843.

Joseph Smith dead testified as he spoke while living. Had he been permitted to live, it may reasonably be concluded, that polygamy would never have triumphed as it did. The fault for the existence of polygamy then, does not rest with him or his sons, but with those who in violation of the laws of our country put him to death.

Cyrus H. Whelock, a witness called by President Woodruff, testified:

"Anybody was liable to be excommunicated or disfellowshipped from the church who attempted to teach the doctrine of plural marriage at that time, up to the death of Joseph Smith. I know that if I had taught it I would be liable to be excommunicated mighty quick."

"I never heard of the ceremony of plural marriage performed in Nauvoo before the death of Joseph Smith." . . .

"Joseph Smith said in 1844, when he was denouncing the John C. Bennett secret wife system, that there was no such a system, as that introduced or practiced by John C. Bennett, taught or practiced in the church, and that the teaching and practicing of it would take people who practiced it *to hell*. He said a good many things, but I can not recollect everything now."—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 386, 387.

Mrs. Bathsheba, wife of George A. Smith, counselor to Brigham Young, also testified upon this. She said, referring to Emma, Joseph Smith's wife:

"There was nobody else held out as his wife while I was living in Nauvoo, nor down to the time of his death. I was in Nauvoo at the time of his death; did not attend the funeral. I do not know of any member of the church having more wives than one at Nauvoo, during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. I heard some little talk not much before their death. I lived there from 1840 up to the time he died. I never heard of any such a thing.

"I belonged to the Ladies' Relief Society in Nauvoo. Sr. Emma, Joseph's wife, never taught the Ladies' Society polygamy.

"I heard of the John C. Bennett secret wife doctrine; the church authorities denounced that at the time, and they denounced Bennett for that doctrine, and cut him off from the church, and preached against it,—preached against it publicly right there in the city of Nauvoo, at the time, Joseph Smith and the rest of them,—and particularly Joseph Smith,—he denounced him."—Abstract of Evidence, p. 361.

This shows the positive attitude of Joseph Smith to be uncompromisingly against polygamy up to the time of his death, by polygamists themselves. That polygamy may have been practiced in Nauvoo by John C. Bennett and his following, is admitted by all parties, and it was making inroads upon the flock despite the efforts of Joseph Smith, which seem to have been made energetically against it, both in public and private.

William Marks, president of the stake, and also of the High Council in Nauvoo, in a letter over his signature, dated Shabbona, DeKalb County, Illinois, October 23, 1859, gives the attitude of Joseph Smith toward polygamy, just a few days before his death. He says:

"I will give his words verbatim, for they are indelibly stamped upon my mind. He said he had desired for a long time to have a talk with me on the subject of polygamy. He said it eventually would prove the overthrow of the church, and we should soon be obliged to leave the United States, unless it could be speedily put down. He was satisfied that it was a cursed doctrine, and that there must be every exertion made to put it down. He said that he would go before the congregation and proclaim against it, and I must go into the High Council, and he would prefer charges against those in transgression, and I must sever them from the church, unless they made ample satisfaction. There was much more said, but this was the substance. The mob commenced to gather about Carthage in a few days after, therefore there was nothing done concerning it."—*Saints' Herald*, 1860, vol. 1, p. 26.

Here in private he calls it a "cursed doctrine,"

agreeing with the public statements testified to by Cyrus H. Whelock and Bathsheba Smith.

This is also a fair refutation in itself of the charge that Joseph Smith was in polygamy. How could he prefer charges against those in transgression "and have them severed from the church," if he was himself guilty? Let us be reasonable despite our prejudices.

Occasionally parties misrepresent the position of the Reorganized Church by using a letter written by Isaac Sheen and published in volume 1, page 27, of *Saints' Herald*, and claiming from this that the church has changed positions upon the question since the year 1860. If these men are looking for the truth, why do they not examine the testimony of William Marks, found right on the opposite page? William Marks is a witness stating what he knows. Isaac Sheen was not a witness in any sense. He knew nothing about the facts personally, and simply wrote a letter arguing the matter, taking the statement made by Brigham Young in 1852, "that the revelation was burnt," as one basis. The letter was written to the *Saturday Evening Post*, October 9, 1852, and published before Isaac Sheen was a member of the Reorganized Church. It was afterwards published as a clipping in the *Saints' Herald*, but shows in no way whatever the attitude of the church upon the question, nor of any of its leading officers.

The enemies of Joseph Smith in Nauvoo and elsewhere had an effectual remedy at hand if they knew Joseph Smith had in any way violated the laws of the State that was in reality as ineffectual to Joseph Smith as a like procedure would have been to Paul, had he brought a suit for slander in the courts of Judea or Rome, notwithstanding the fact that he was pressed daily with the most slanderous lies.

The enemies of Joseph Smith were also willing to use not only voluntary witnesses who knew anything, but actually suborned witnesses to try to convict him upon false accusations. If the Laws, Higbees, Bennetts, Fosters, etc., whom Joseph Smith had severed from the church, knew anything, they had ample means of redress through the

courts. The general prejudice against Joseph Smith and the "sect everywhere spoken against" was such as to close up any redress to him through the courts, as it did to the friends of Colonel Owen Lovejoy, the Abolitionist, who was shot down in the streets of Alton, Illinois. The very fact that this was not done by those who claimed to have so much proof in the attack by the *Nauvoo Expositor*, places the matter beyond controversy, that the *Expositor's* attack was by those who were angry because they had been severed from the church, and they determined to ruin, right or wrong, the man who had been prominent in accomplishing this.

The *Expositor* was issued June 7, 1844. Complaints had been filed at the May term of court against Joseph Smith; he appeared in court upon these complaints and demanded trial; the prosecution was not ready and the causes were deferred till the October term. Twenty days from the issue of the *Expositor* Joseph Smith was killed. What opportunity did this period of twenty days' time afford him to prosecute for slander those who made allegations of wrong-doing on his part in that paper, when no names are signed to the articles, nor specific items of identification in the paper itself showing who were responsible for the slanderous assertions? Those who now assert that Joseph Smith should have appealed to the courts for redress if he was slandered, show much ignorance of the facts and the conditions existing at the time.

It is claimed by some parties that whether or not the doctrines of polygamy, plurality of gods, blood atonement, etc., are traceable to Joseph Smith, it makes very little difference, for the doctrine he taught was such as to lead up to these things and that these are the fruits to be expected.

This was the position taken by the heathen nations of the first century against the doctrine taught by Jesus and presented by such great and good men as Paul and Peter.

Have those so claiming forgotten the many stories and subterfuges circulated by pagan Rome against the early saints or Christians in order to bring down

the wrath of the people and the condemnation of the government upon them? The martyrs of the world are the results of pious men and women failing to examine for themselves the divine truths that God's servants were the bearers of to self-righteous and satisfied peoples, who failing to examine, were moved with choler against these worthy men and women, and under rules of warfare approved only by evil-minded men, and Satan, of bigotry, superstition, and slanderous stories, persecuted unto death. Well may good and true men blush for their fellows in turning over the pages of history.

If Joseph Smith's teachings were bad, true Christian policy demands that we stand up like men and point out the errors contained therein. We have the standard by which to try men—the Bible. Joseph Smith was a devoted believer in the Bible, and was willing to have his teachings measured by it. But instead of meeting him with the "armor of God," "having on the breastplate of righteousness," "the loins gird about with truth," "the feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," "with a shield and helmet of salvation," "with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," men who for years have professed to be bearing this holy armor, have cast it away all at once, and instead, armed themselves with the weapons of villainous falsehood and slander, expecting good and upright men and women to approve them in such work.

With such kind of opposition as this, is it any wonder that the general reports of the time represent the work begun under the teachings of Joseph Smith to be rapidly gathering strength in the world?

It is not gathering strength by reason of the work of the Utah church, however, notwithstanding the circulation of reports; neither of the Hedrickite movement, which shows to be weaker to-day than ten years ago; and herein is found the cause of a combined attack upon the Reorganized Church, which is the only body of people standing for and

representing the principles of truth and righteousness taught by Joseph Smith.

To hold that it is right and proper to judge the principles taught by Joseph Smith by the acts of others who broke off from his teaching, and yet claim to believe in him, would establish a rule that would condemn Jesus of Nazareth, and destroy the Christian religion. We are hardly ready to take such an erroneous step as that. It may do for the infidel to use against the Latter Day Saints, and Catholics and Protestants who profess adherence to the Scriptures; but ministers of Christ can not descend to using it against one another.

When Jesus was the preacher it was easy for the Jews to claim that they were Moses' disciples; but the true test came when it was shown that "Had ye believed in Moses, ye would have believed in me; for he wrote of me."

Men are to be judged by their teachings, not by what life some other party may live, or act he may perform.

The Apostle writing to saints at Corinth, states:

"It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not as much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife."—1 Corinthians 5: 1.

Will any person contend that this was the legitimate result of the principles Paul taught at Corinth? Hardly; men are to be judged by their fruits, but the true fruit of a teacher is not what some one else does, but the principles taught.

The betrayal of the Master by Judas was not the result of the legitimate teaching of the Christ. Peter cursed and swore and denied the Lord, but Jesus had taught, "Swear not at all." What men and women may do in their weakness has nothing to do in attesting the truth or falsity of the principles they may have been taught, only as it may be shown that in the performance of the act they carried out and conscientiously adhered to such teaching.

What is the proper fruit is beautifully explained by Jesus, Luke 6: 45: "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which

is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh."

It is from the principles taught, then, that we are to judge; and it was from this standpoint that He could say to the Jews: "If I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words."—John 8: 46, 47. What men may have done who have professed to believe in Joseph Smith no more involves him, or the faith that he taught, than the work of professed Christians on Saint Bartholomew's Day, or in the persecutions of Scotland, involved Peter and Paul and the doctrine they freely gave their lives for as a witness to its truth.

For the religious enemies of Mormonism to read into its declarations of faith parenthetical explanations, and suppositious statements as assumed facts, and to interweave into the citations from its articles of faith and its sacred books misstatements and mischievous allusions foreign to the text, is a work unchristian in motive and false in argument; and yet this is the method employed by the sectaries opposed to the church in Utah and the Reorganized Church alike, on the ground that having common origin, both are bad. It is an unworthy method, and can not succeed; its animus defeats itself.

To condemn Joseph Smith upon the testimony of those who do not know, but who assume that what is said of him is true, without absolute proof, is false in theory and in fact.

JOSEPH SMITH.

LAMONI, Iowa, March 9, 1903.

