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The present study analyzes the highest leadership of the LDS ("Mormon") Church as a social elite. To determine the extent to which the Mormon "General Authorities" constituted an elite within the Mormon community, a collective biography is presented of the 124 men who were part of the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932.

The family interrelatedness of the Mormon hierarchy was one prominent aspect of their social elitism. Aside from the fact that more than twenty-two percent of the appointees were sons of other General Authorities, the Mormon hierarchy revered relationships as distant as sixth cousin. The Mormon practice of polygamy enabled men to marry daughters, nieces, cousins, granddaughters, and former wives of other General Authorities. Through these marriages, distant kinship relationships were reinforced and unrelated men were brought into the hierarchical family. Between fifty and 100 percent of the echelons of the hierarchy were interrelated up to 1932.

Economic wealth in the hierarchy tended to be as much as ten times that of non-members of the hierarchy within the Mormon community. Although wealth tended to be a function of ecclesiastical status within the hierarchy, a man's economic growth tended to stagnate during the first few years of his tenure in the hierarchy. Wealth came to Mormon General Authorities by direct and indirect economic benefits that corresponded to length of tenure as well as ecclesiastical position.
The Mormon hierarchy exercised monolithic political control for fifty years, after which its political authority declined as pluralism increased within the Mormon community. During its fifty year ascendency, the General Authorities controlled elections and legislation on the municipal, county, and territorial levels of areas in which Mormon population predominated. Forced by the federal government to surrender political hegemony and theocracy, the Mormon hierarchy became actively involved in partisan politics in 1891, after which its political authority began a slow process of erosion. Although the General Authorities periodically sought to reassert former theocratic prerogatives, the Mormon populace became increasingly less responsive to such political direction.

Despite the religious context, the elitism of the Mormon hierarchy was compatible with social characteristics of widely disparate elite power structures. The Mormon hierarchy at its apex was a reflection of the elitist goals of the American bourgeois power structures, both local and national, that have traditionally sought to replicate the aristocratic power structures of static societies within the more fluid social structure of America.
PREFACE

Perhaps the earliest antecedent for the historical study of groups of individuals is Plutarch's *Lives* (ca. 110 A.D.), wherein Plutarch presented biographies of fifty eminent Greek and Roman leaders, and then paired them for comparison. Plutarch's approach of collecting biographies of eminent persons has been repeated countless times, and is reflected in local histories of counties and cities, and in such larger works as *Dictionary of National Biography*, *Dictionary of American Biography*, and *Who's Who*. By contrast, statistical analysis of total populations according to age grouping, sex, and education was begun by the U.S. Census Bureau in the mid-nineteenth century, but neither the methodology nor the statistical summary distinguished individuals from the mass, or grouped individuals according to family or social status. The mere assembling of biographical sketches provided no analysis of the characteristics of the group of which an individual was a part, and the census abstracts provided limited data about an amorphous population devoid of any social structure aside from the political divisions of states, territories, counties and cities. In the biographical sketch approach the individual obscured the larger group, and in the census abstracts the individual was indistinguishable.

The analytical use of a collection of individual life histories was pioneered by the medical and psychiatric professions. By maintaining case histories for individual patients, the physicians were able to look for shared characteristics in background in order to identify causes and manifestations of disease. Although this medical use of life histories for comparative analysis was commonplace, it was not until the turn of the
twentieth century that historians, political scientists, and economists began to recognize the application of such an approach to the study of groups and institutions.

American political and economic historians were apparently the first to apply collective analysis to individual biographies. Between 1894 and 1896, George H. Haynes presented a series of papers on the statistical characteristics of social origins, occupations, and voting patterns of members of legislative assemblies in Puritan and ante-bellum Massachusetts, and in New England of 1892. By 1900, Haynes had extended this approach to all of the state legislatures, and in 1906 he applied this analytical technique to the U.S. Senate.¹ Haynes' work attracted relatively little attention as a methodological approach for historians, but Charles Beard's 1913 analysis of the collective economic interests of the members of the 1787 Constitutional Convention created considerable controversy. Nevertheless, Beard's admirers and detractors seemed incapable of seeing his study of the U.S. Constitution as a model for collective study of leadership groups.² Therefore, the American historical profession ignored the possibilities of a new methodological approach to the history of leader-


ship groups, institutions and society, due to an apparent mixture of professional inertia and interpretative polemics.³

Despite some additional publications of collective analysis in France, Germany, and the United States,⁴ the English were the first to establish collective biography as a recognized tool for historical analysis. In 1925 and 1929, the London School of Economics published studies of the nineteenth and twentieth century members of Parliament in which the men were collectively analyzed according to occupation or profession, education, status of parents, economic interests, and conditions of peerage.⁵ This was a prelude to the publication in 1929 of Sir Lewis Namier's two-volume study, The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III. Namier used extensive manuscript and published sources to analyze family interconnections, social origins, occupations, geographic coalitions,

³David A. Hollinger's "T.S. Kuhn's Theory of Science and Its Implications for History," American Historical Review, LXXVIII (April, 1973), 370-393, was too eager to praise the openness of the professional historians to new interpretations (esp. p. 382), and therefore missed the opportunity to provide a significant parallel between scientists and historians in the matters of intransigence and resistance to new methodologies of interpretation.


Namier’s work established collective biography as a recognized methodology. Many historians and political scientists have applied collective analysis to members of legislative bodies, as well as to other public office holders and political influentials. In addition to studies of political leaders, collective biography has been used in analyzing men of a particular profession, economic class, or business enterprise. Although the largest proportion of collective studies has involved persons in political, economic, or occupational groupings, there have been collective biographical studies of college graduates, intellectuals, military men, and religious adherents.\footnote{Although a listing of examples in each category would be bibliographically useful, it would consume more space than is practical here.}

The diverse potentials of collective biography (or "prosopography") have resulted in a variety of approaches. The first major issue is that of the size of the group to be studied. The terms "collective biography" and "prosopography" have been applied to studies of as few as seven persons and as many as five thousand.\footnote{Edward Woenknecht, Ambassadors for Christ: Seven American Preachers (N.Y: New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); Richard W. Bulliett, The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972); A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale and J. Morris, The Prosopography of the Latter Roman Empire, Volume I, A.D. 260-395 (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1971).} In fact, one enthusiast has written:
Ideally, a social historian would like to be able to trace all the individuals in a particular society or region during a particular historical period in the same manner as, say, Namter traced one or twenty or one hundred. For a great many historical epochs, perhaps for most, this is obviously impossible since ordinary people in the past tended to leave behind no identifying information about themselves as individuals.  

By the use of computers and of such records as manuscript census rolls, parish registers, and tax lists, recent studies have been published about large numbers of "common" people.  

A corollary to the question of group size is the use of statistical analysis. If a group of individuals is to be analyzed statistically, one must decide how many variables are going to be involved, which statistical models to use, and the balance between statistics and narration. The problem of statistical reductionism is indicated in one biographical study of nine thousand prominent women that totalled five printed pages, including two pages of introduction.  

---


12 Richard Jensen and Barbara Campbell, "How to Handle a Liberated Woman," Historical Methods Newsletter, V (June, 1972), 109-113. No cross tabulation was presented, however.
whether the individuals studied are the exclusive focus of analysis or whether the analysis of the individuals is regarded as part of a larger institutional or social focus. The differing responses to these three issues have resulted in a broad spectrum of approach to prosopography, or collective biography.

The present study analyzes the 124 men who comprised the highest leadership of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1832 to 1932. Known as "General Authorities," these men, with few exceptions, had tenure from the day of their appointment until their death or their rejection for unacceptable conduct. Although traditional histories of the LDS or "Mormon" Church have inevitably mentioned (sometimes at great length) individual General Authorities, the men themselves have most often become ciphers in a chronology of Mormonism as a church or social movement. On the other hand, the biographies of General Authorities, when they exist, have provided little information about the charac-

---

13 The men included in this study are in some respects different from those in traditional LDS histories. Analysis of the development of the Mormon hierarchy (see Chapter I) requires the exclusion of six men previously suggested or asserted in traditional LDS histories as General Authorities (Titus Billings, John Corrill, George Miller, Isaac Morley, Edward Partridge, and Asahel Smith). Historical evidence also requires the addition of the names of eight men (John Banks, Alfred Cordon, Nathaniel H. Felt, Jesse Gause, Vinson Knight, Theodore B. Lewis, Roger Orton, and Joseph A. Young) not generally recognized as having been appointed to the Mormon hierarchy during these years.

teristics of the group of which the individual was a part. In 1951 some of the General Authorities were included in a partial prosopography of early Mormon missionaries, but it was not until 1973 that these men were the exclusive subject of a collective study concerning their social origins.15 Although there is a continuing debate, particularly in the field of sociology, about the definition and implication of "elite" as a group designation, there is a general consensus that an elite group tends to be the focus of prestige, leadership, wealth, and/or political control within a population.16 Therefore, the specific areas of this collective analysis will be the ecclesiastical leadership role, family interrelationships, economic status, and political activities of the men who were advanced to the Mormon hierarchy during the period 1832-1932. The significance of the Mormon hierarchy for such a collective study is indicated by the fact that during the period in question the Mormons constituted the majority population in what was temporarily Illinois' largest city and in the Great Basin of the American West.

The methodology of research for this study began several years ago as an effort to obtain a relatively simple statistical profile of the Mormon hierarchy, but gradually developed into a personal odyssey of discovery and redefinition of Mormonism as an institution. As a result, the present study took on some of the dimensions which have been attributed to Lewis Namier's initial work:


16For a discussion of the various interpretations of elitism, see the chapter in this study titled "The Mormon Hierarchy and American Social Structure."
An institution has a life and personality of its own, transcending those of the individuals who compose it; but to re-create it as a living organism Namier had to go beyond the bare records of its corporate life and study the lives of its Members. His task was, in his own words, "to find out all I could about every single Member who sat in the House between 1761 and 1784"; and he soon realized that he was acquiring information not merely about Members of Parliament but about the social and economic life of the period. 17

Because existing biographies of Mormon leaders have tended to be superficial, the research for this study soon concentrated in the plentiful manuscript sources of Mormonism's ecclesiastical institutions and in the personal diaries and correspondence of Mormonism's leaders. It became apparent that a history of the Mormon hierarchy was larger than the sum of its parts, and that its character and significance could not simply be represented in cross-tabulation charts. At a minimum, the analysis of the hierarchy had to be presented within the context of Mormon religious, ecclesiastical, social, political, and economic history, but the research itself repeatedly required redefinition of conventional surveys of Mormon history. Moreover, the research revealed trends, contrasts, inconsistencies, and transitions that seemed to require frequent illustration from the lives and expressions of the individual men involved. Because this collective biography of the Mormon hierarchy became more concerned with process than with profile, the study tends to be more narrative than quantitative.

Although the data from which this study has been drawn are extensive, they are also limited in certain respects. Diaries and correspondence were not available for several of the men in the study, some of whom have slipped into virtual oblivion in Mormon history due to their short tenure as General Authorities and as Mormons. Tax rolls from Mormon

communities for 1838 and 1844-1850 were either non-existent or inaccessible for the present study. The Salt Lake County Property Tax Assessment Rolls from 1851-1889 provided total assessed valuations for only a part of the years, and no tabulation for the numbers of persons assessed in any one year. Therefore, entries were counted individually to arrive at mean values for each year. Although the assessed valuations of the property of General Authorities can be precisely determined, the actual status of the hierarchy in relation to the rest of the population is only approximated in this study, since between 39% and 24% of the county's adult male population during the period was not assessed. Because companies and other businesses were assessed along with persons (even though some of the residents of the county owned the businesses), companies were counted as separate "persons" in the tabulation of mean assessments. Despite these difficulties with the tax assessment rolls, the evaluation of Edward Pessen seems to be accurate: "Yet for all the deficiencies of the tax data there is nothing better for measuring changes [of individual wealth] within an era."[18]

In presenting a study of this nature, there are many acknowledgments to be made. Sincere appreciation is felt toward literally hundreds of staff members at dozens of libraries, archives, research facilities, and county courthouses that have been visited during the past several years during the research for this project. Special gratitude is extended to the Graduate School of Yale University and to the Mr. Giles Whiting Foundation for the fellowships that made the completion of this project possible. Although the author has benefited from the advice of many pro-

fessors, three historians deserve special mention: Davis Bitton of the
University of Utah, who introduced the author to Mormon diaries and to
collective biography; Leonard J. Arrington of the Historical Department
of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, who offered many sug-
gestions; Howard R. Lamar of Yale University, who extended himself beyond
the duty of a dissertation adviser in giving assistance and direction.
Deep-felt appreciation is extended to a multitude of Mormons, including
the professional community of LDS and RLDS scholars, who have confirmed
the author's own conviction that one can be deeply committed to the
spiritual foundations of Mormonism and also analyze its history with
candor. In the final preparation of the dissertation a great contri-
bution was made by Kathleen L. Darley in the typing and by Robert T.
Kirkham in the preparation of charts. And finally, I wish to express
my gratitude to my wife, Jan, for sacrifices only we can fully appreciate.
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CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE HIERARCHY

Before there was a Mormon hierarchy or even a church, Mormonism was fostered in the experiences of Joseph Smith, Jr. Born to an obscure family of farmers on December 23, 1805, Joseph Smith had resided in Manchester, New York, since he was fourteen. Living in an age of revivalism in western New York State, the "Burned-over District" of frenzied camp meetings, the young man became "convicted of his sins" and sought communion with God.

Thus from the age of twelve years to fifteen I pondered many things in my heart concerning the situation of the world of mankind and the contentions and divisions the wickedness and abominations and the darkness which pervaded the minds of mankind my mind became exceedingly distressed for I became convicted of my Sins and by searching the Scriptures I found that mankind did not come unto the Lord but that they had apostatized from the true and living faith and there was no society or denomination that built upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ as recorded in the new testament and I felt to mourn for my own Sins and for the Sins of the world ... therefore I cried unto the Lord for mercy for there was none else to whom I could go and obtain mercy and the Lord heard my cry in the wilderness and while in the attitude of calling upon the Lord in the 16th year of my age a pillar of light from above the brightness of the sun at noon day come down from above and rested upon me and I was filled with the spirit of God and the Lord opened the heavens upon me and I saw the Lord and he spake unto me saying Joseph my son thy Sins are forgiven thee. go thy way walk in my statutes and keep my commandments behold I am the Lord of glory I was crucified for the world that all those who believe on my name may have Eternal life behold the world lieth in sin at this time and none doeth good no not one they have turned aside
from the Gospel and keep not my commandments they draw near to me with their lips while their hearts are far from me...1

Seeking forgiveness, Joseph Smith instead found a divine call.

The young man's epiphany substantiated his prior conviction that all religious denominations had "apostatised from the true and living faith," and also implied that through him the truth would be revealed to men. In 1823, an angel appeared to Joseph Smith and began that process of new revelation by commissioning him to translate a volume of ancient scripture, The Book of Mormon. While engaged in this work, Joseph Smith claimed to have been visited on May 15, 1829, by John the Baptist, who conferred upon him the ancient authority to baptize. Shortly thereafter, three other heavenly messengers, the ancient apostles Peter, James, and John, allegedly bestowed upon the young man the apostolic authority. Having communed with God and angels, Joseph Smith proceeded to baptize his followers into the new faith.2

Converts to the new faith at first came slowly, being primarily among his family and close associates. The publication of The Book of Mormon in March, 1830, however, gave the new faith its nickname "Mormonism" and provided it with enough publicity to attract many new converts. The numbers of converts inevitably resulted in the official formation of a church by Smith, which occurred on April 6, 1830. Originally called the Church of Christ, the organization in 1834 became known as The Church of the Latter Day Saints, and in 1838 received its final designation as The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.3 At first the government

---

1Dean C. Jessee, "Early Accounts of Joseph Smith's First Vision," Brigham Young University Studies, IX (Spring, 1969), 279-80. This account was written in 1832. A more polished and amplified version, written in 1838, is found in Roberts, History of the Church, I, 3-6.

2Roberts, History of the Church, I, 9-59.

3Ibid., I, 60-80; II, 24, note.
of the church was informal, with Joseph Smith and his former scribe
Oliver Cowdery leading the group, but at the outset Smith claimed that
he was a prophet of God whose words must be heeded.4

Smith's inevitable dominance of the new church eventually had
to be supplemented by expanded leadership at the highest level. Com-
menting on this development in Mormonism, sociologist Thomas F. O'Dea
has written:

The recognition of prophetic leadership implies the
development of a hierarchical church structure, with authority
flowing from top to bottom, at least as soon as the informal
master-disciple relationship among a small group is replaced
by the more formal relationship of leadership and membership
in a large church organization. The process of binding
charisma within organizational forms was one aspect of the
evolution of such a hierarchical structure, and the original
relationship between prophet and his disciples evolved into
a relationship between the prophet and an oligarchy of
leading elders, which merged into and exercised ascendancy
over the rank and file of the membership.5

The process by which the hierarchy developed in Mormonism was evolutionary,
and was preceded by the development of ministerial offices among the
general membership of the church.

From the outset the ministry of the church was democratized so
that virtually every adult male had the opportunity to be ordained to
ecclesiastical authority. At the organization of the church, there were
five grades of office, in ascending order: deacon, teacher, priest,
elder, and apostle. Their respective duties were outlined in a "reve-

4D. Michael Quinn, "The First Months of Mormonism: A Contem-
porary View by Rev. Diedrich Willers," New York History, LIV (July,
1973), 330-1.

5Thomas F. O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago: University of Chicago
lation" dictated by Smith in June, 1830.6 Beginning in 1830, the titles "First Elder" and "Second Elder" were applied respectively to Joseph Smith and his former scribe Oliver Cowdery.7 These were honorific titles conferred upon these men in recognition of the fact that they were the first two men ordained to that office. In 1831 this priesthood was expanded to include the office of bishop and high priest. With the exception of Joseph Smith, up to the year 1832 these offices were restricted to local responsibility rather than having jurisdiction over the entire church.8

While the ministry of the church was being democratized during the years 1830-32, Joseph Smith's own position as leader of the church

6A Book of Commandments, for the Government of the Church of Christ, Organized According to Law, on the 6th of April, 1830 (Zion, 1833), pp. 47-55, hereinafter referred to as Book of Commandments. A current edition of these instructions, indicating that the above revelation was given on April 6, instead of June, 1830, is published as The Doctrine and Covenants of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1971), Section 20, hereinafter referred to as Doctrine and Covenants.

7License to Preach, issued to John Whitmer in June 1830, signed by Joseph Smith as "First Elder" and Oliver Cowdery as "Second Elder," in Western Americana, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, hereinafter referred to as Yale University. In the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants a textual change was made in the previously cited revelation on offices of the ministry. Originally the text in the Book of Commandments identified Smith and Cowdery each as "an elder," but in the 1835 edition this was changed respectively to "first" and "second" elder. For a discussion of this problem of alterations in the printed versions of revelations dictated by Joseph Smith, see Melvin Joseph Peterson, "A Study of the Nature and Significance of the Changes in the Revelations as Found in a Comparison of the Book of Commandments and Subsequent Editions of the Doctrine and Covenants," (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1955) and Richard P. Howard, Restoration Scriptures, A Study of Their Textual Development (Independence, Missouri: Department of Religious Education, Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1969), pp. 196-263. Whenever citations are substantively identical in original and recent editions of the revelations of Joseph Smith, the recent editions will be cited.

8Roberts, History of the Church, I, 40-41, 61, 77-8, 147, 175-6. See discussion below of the development of the office of bishop.
was given more precise definition. At the organization of the church, Smith was designated "a seer, a translator, a prophet, an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder of the church," and in September, 1830, he was identified as the only person to proclaim revelations that were binding upon the church.\footnote{Book of Commandments, pp. 45, 67; Section 21:1, Section 28:2 in recent Utah editions of Doctrine and Covenants.} For nearly two years after the organization of the church, Joseph Smith dictated no revelations or instructions indicating that he would have officially appointed assistants or counselors.\footnote{A revelation dictated in November, 1831, makes reference to "the First Presidency of the church," as this document has been published in recent editions of the revelations, Doctrine and Covenants, Section 68:22-23. These references, however, were substituted in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants for the phrase "a conference of high priests," in the original document as published in the church's first organ, The Evening and the Morning Star, I (October, 1832), [p. 35]. A revised edition was reprinted beginning in 1835 which introduced the changes in the printed revelations. By 1835, the First Presidency had already been formed, and that organization was introduced retroactively into the text of the earlier revelation.}

The traditional history of the church indicates that Joseph Smith did not appoint official assistants until March 18, 1833, following a revelation of March 8 in which Sidney Rigdon and Frederick G. Williams were designated counselors. Moreover, conventional history asserts that the first unit ("quorum") of the hierarchy to be formed was that of the "Presiding Bishopric" in 1831.\footnote{Roberts, History of the Church, I, 334; Smith, Essentials, pp. 127, 595-6.} Newly discovered evidence suggests, however, that Joseph Smith chose official counselors a year before the date given in the official histories and that the Presiding Bishopric was the last unit of the hierarchy to develop rather than the first.
On January 25, 1832, Joseph Smith was sustained by the church as "President of the High Priesthood." Following that event, Smith officially appointed men to act as his counselors, thereby beginning the Mormon hierarchy. On March 8, 1832, Smith made the following statement:

March 8th 1832.
Chose this day and ordained brother Jesse Gause and Broth Sidney [Rigdon] to be my counsellors of the ministry of the presidency of the high Priesthood...  

An unpublished revelation to Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon, dated March 1832, had authorized Joseph Smith to appoint an unspecified number of counselors to assist "the presidency of the high Priesthood." In the Old Testament, Moses was assisted by Aaron and Hur and in the New Testament Peter, James, and John seemed to function as a unit. These biblical precedents may have been the basis on which Smith chose two counselors rather than some other number. In the later presidencies of the church, beginning with the reorganization of the presidency on March 18, 1833, the two counselors were ranked respectively as first and second, with attendant seniority.

12 Roberts, History of the Church, I, 243, note; Reynolds Cahoon diary, January 1832, Archives Division, Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, hereinafter referred to as Church Archives.

13 Kirtland Revelations Book, manuscript, pp. 10-11, Church Archives.

14 Revelation to Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon, manuscript in Newel K. Whitney Family Papers, Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, hereinafter referred to as Brigham Young University. A notation on the back of the document states that the revelation was given in "March 1832." The library catalogue card for the document, however, states that the revelation was given on January 7, 1832. The source of the latter date cannot presently be verified. Since the revelation speaks of the "office of the presidency of the high priesthood" as though it had already been established, the revelation probably was given after January 25, 1832, when Joseph Smith was sustained to that position. Therefore, the March date, although imprecise, seems to be the more likely one.

15 Exodus 17:10-12; 24:13-14; Mark 5:35; Matthew 17:1; 26:37.
In this first organization of the presidency, it is not readily apparent whether Gause or Rigdon was the senior counselor. A little known figure, Jesse Gause had been a Quaker until 1829, when he converted to the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing (the "Shakers"). He converted to Mormonism sometime after October 22, 1831, when he arrived at the Shaker community of North Union, Ohio, from the Shaker community at Hancock, Massachusetts. Matthew Houston, a non-Mormon associate of Gause, wrote a letter concerning Gause in which Houston said Gause "is yet a Mormon--and is second to the Prophet or Seer--Joseph." Moreover, when Smith listed his two counselors, he placed Gause's name before that of Rigdon.

There is other evidence, however, to indicate that Sidney Rigdon has ascendancy over Gause. Like Gause, Rigdon had had experience with more than one religious organization: initially a Baptist pastor, Rigdon had converted to Alexander Campbell's Disciples of Christ in 1824,

---


17 Letter, Matthew Houston to Seth Y. Wells, August 10, 1832, Folder 51, Series IV-A, Shaker Manuscripts, Western Reserve Historical Society, quoted in Mario S. DePillis, "The Development of Mormon Communitarianism, 1826-1846" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1960), p. 184, hereinafter referred to as "Mormon Communitarianism."
and then formed his own schism of Communitarian Campbellites in 1830 until he was converted to Mormonism later the same year. Rigdon was the recipient of at least eight revelations dictated by Smith between 1830 and 1832, and was frequently in Smith's company during this period to transact important business of the church. Gause, on the other hand, was the recipient of only one revelation, dated March 15, 1832, in which his role as counselor was reaffirmed. The only recorded occasions in which Gause acted with Smith in an official capacity were during an important trip to the Missouri settlements of the church from April to May, 1832. Gause attended five meetings in Missouri between April 26 and May 29, 1832. In the minutes of these meetings (in which his name was erroneously spelled "Gauss") Gause and Rigdon were designated as counselors to Joseph Smith Jr.


19Doctrine and Covenants, Sections 35, 37, 40, 44, 49, 71, 73, 76; Roberts, History of the Church, I, passim.

20Kirtland Revelation Book, pp. 17-18. For some reason, the introductory words "my servant Jesse" in this document were altered to read "my servant Frederick G. Williams," and the latter version appears in the published editions of the revelation. There is no question that the revelation was directed to Gause, because the page index to the book reads "17 Revelation to Jesse Gauze [sic] March 15-1832." Since Williams later replaced Gause in the presidency, apparently someone felt justified in substituting the names. This unfortunate alteration has not only violated the context of the original document, but it has further obscured the existence of Gause as one of the General Authorities of the LDS Church and has erroneously indicated that Williams was a counselor in 1832 (see Doctrine and Covenants, Section 81).

21The Conference Minutes and Record Book of Christ's Church of Latter-day Saints, Belonging to the High Council of said church, of their successors in office, Caldwell County, Missouri. FAR WEST: April 6, 1838, typescript, pp. 30-53, Church Archives, hereinafter referred to as Far West Record, as it is the best among researchers of Mormon history; Roberts, History of the Church, I, 265; DePillis, "Mormon Communitarianism," pp. 170-89.
against irregular proceedings of a conference of the church was signed first by Rigdon and second by Gause, implying their relative seniority of authority.\(^{22}\)

There seems to be sufficient circumstantial evidence to assert that in this first organized unit of the Presidency Joseph Smith was president, Sidney Rigdon was first counselor, and Jesse Gause was second counselor. Late in 1832, Jesse Gause "denied the Faith," and Joseph Smith recorded that "Br. Jese" was excommunicated from the church on December 3, 1832. After Gause's disaffection from Mormonism, he faded into obscurity. His replacement, Frederick G. Williams, was functioning as Smith's counselor as early as January 22, 1833.\(^{23}\)

Within a year after the formation of the First Presidency in 1832, revelations announced by Joseph Smith unquestionably established that body as the supreme authority of the church. In the revelation through Joseph Smith to Gause (not Williams, see note 20), in March, 1832, reference was made to "the keys of the kingdom, which belong always unto the Presidency of the High Priesthood." A later revelation, dictated on the anniversary of the organization of the presidency, further stipulated:

\(^{22}\)Sidney Rigdon, Jesse Gause, David Whitmer, Peter Whitmer Jr., Hyrum Smith, Reynolds Cahoon, undated protest against irregularities in a conference of January 28-30, 1832, manuscript, High Council Minutes, 1832-1839, Kirtland, Ohio, Church Archives.

\(^{23}\)Far West Record, April 26, 1832; Joseph Smith journal, December 3, 1832, Church Archives. The Journal History of the Church, a day-by-day compilation of historical data on the LDS Church, states under date of December 31, 1832, that Jesse Gause was still one of the active high priests of the church. Unless Gause was reinstated within four weeks of his excommunication, this statement is in error. His replacement, Frederick G. Williams, was noted as a counselor to Joseph Smith in Kirtland Council Book, p. 6, January 22, 1832.
And this shall be your business and mission in all your lives, to preside in council, and set in order all the affairs of this church and kingdom.  

Subsequent revelations gave the presidency control over the finances of the church. The "affairs of this church and kingdom" would also be expanded to include intricate political activities, but by 1833 the First Presidency was unmistakably recognized in the practice and dogma of the church as the apex of the Mormon ecclesiastical structure.

A revelation dictated in 1835 specified that the First Presidency was to be comprised of three men, the president with his first and second counselors. Nevertheless Joseph Smith had already established the precedent of appointing extra counselors or "Assistant Presidents" in addition to the first and second counselors. He and his successor in office, Brigham Young repeated this policy occasionally during a forty-year period. Irrespective of the numbers of counselors, by 1833 the First Presidency of the "Church of Christ" had established a role that would remain virtually unchanged.

The second unit of the hierarchy to develop was the office of Presiding Patriarch or Patriarch to the Church. Both the function and the name of the office derived from the ancient practice of giving father's blessings, as did the Old Testament prophets Isaac and Jacob.  

---

24 *Doctrine and Covenants*, Sections 81:2, 90:16

25 See Chapter titled "Political Activity," to follow.

26 *Doctrine and Covenants*, Section 107:22.

27 Oliver Cowdery was appointed an Assistant President on December 5, 1834, and Joseph Smith Sr. and Hyrum Smith were appointed Assistant Presidents on December 6, 1834, Manuscript History of the Church, Book A-1, manuscript. p. 11, December 5-6, 1834; Church Archives. Pagination of this entry is different from that of the rest of the volume.

Smith transformed this ancient custom into a function of the ecclesiastical organization.

Although hardly a patriarch in the sense of age, the twenty-seven year old Joseph gave special blessings to members of his family and to one of his associates on December 18, 1833.29 On that occasion, the blessing given to his father Joseph Smith Sr. designated the elderly gentleman as Patriarch to the Church, as though he were the spiritual father of the members of the church.

So shall it be with my father: he shall be called a prince over his posterity, holding the keys of the patriarchal Priesthood over the kingdom of God on earth, even the Church of the Latter-day Saints . . . 30

The day he received this blessing, Joseph Smith Sr. was ordained "Patriarch and president of the High Priesthood" by the First Presidency.31 Joseph Smith Sr. began giving patriarchal blessings to individuals in which they were counseled, told of their potentials and future activities, and designated as descendants of one of the twelve tribes of Israel, thereby setting the pattern for all patriarchal blessings given by later patriarchs in the church.

Although a Presiding Patriarch had been established in 1833 as an ecclesiastical authority for the entire church, it was an office of limited hierarchical power. Joseph Smith Sr.'s jurisdiction in giving blessings extended throughout the church, but over whom did he "preside?"


30Joseph Fielding Smith, ed., Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith; Taken from his sermons and writings as they are found in the Documentary History and other publications of the Church and written or published in the days of the Prophet's ministry (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 1938), p. 39.

If he was the first man to be ordained to the office of patriarch, then there was no person besides himself over whom his jurisdiction extended. Brigham Young maintained that his own father, John Young, was the first man ordained a patriarch and that Joseph Smith Sr., the second ordained, was given the special designation "presiding." It was perhaps to elevate Joseph Smith Sr.'s sense of hierarchical importance that he was made an assistant president in the First Presidency on December 6, 1834. This gave him a jurisdictional authority which his primary office in the hierarchy lacked. Moreover, it may have been because of the small number of patriarchs in the church over which the Presiding Patriarch could actually preside, that this office was not voted on with other members of the hierarchy in official conferences of the church until April 6, 1843. Although it was nearly a decade before the office of Presiding Patriarch was given the ultimate status of the other units of the hierarchy, the function of that position had been clearly established in 1833.

The third unit of the hierarchy to be formed was the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. As early as 1830, Joseph Smith and his former scribe

---

32 Journal History, June 21, 1874, p.3. Brigham Young's statement seems to be inaccurate, however, since he indicates his father became a patriarch in 1834, which would be subsequent to the ordination of Joseph Smith Sr.

33 Manuscript History of the Church, Book A-1, p. 20, December 6, 1834. Pagination of this entry different from rest of volume. The standard histories imply he first became an Assistant President on September 3, 1837 (see Smith, Essentials, p. 571).

34 Roberts, History of the Church, V, 329. That this was the first time the Presiding Patriarch was sustained with the other members of the General Authorities is confirmed by a review of the actions of the various conferences of the church from 1833 to 1843 (see General Conferences, List of General Authorities and Officers, a typed record at Church Archives).
Oliver Cowdery were designated as apostles, this deriving from their allegedly having received the authority from Peter, James and John the previous year. The establishment of a governing body of twelve men had been alluded to in a revelation announced by Joseph Smith in June, 1829. These men were to preach to Jew and Gentile, to baptize, and to ordain men to the ministry. The establishment of such a body of men was an obvious response to the New Testament precedent of the twelve apostles chosen by Jesus. These modern twelve apostles were to be sought out and chosen by Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer, two men who had given public testimony that an angel had showed them the plates from which The Book of Mormon had been translated. It was not until 1835 that twelve men were chosen to comprise this special presiding quorum. On February 14, 1835, men were ordained apostles and named the Quorum of Twelve Apostles. Although any number of living men could be ordained to the

---

35 Book of Commandments, p. 48; Doctrine and Covenants, Section 20: 2-3.

36 Book of Commandments, pp. 37-8; Doctrine and Covenants, Section 1; 8-39.


38 It is generally recognized that prior to 1835 Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, and David Whitmer were ordained apostles. See Doctrine and Covenants, Sections 18:9, 20:2-3. There may also have been others. An early defector from Mormonism, Ezra Booth wrote in 1831 that Ziba Peterson, "one of the twelve apostles," had been rejected. See his letter in Ohio Star (Ravenna, Ohio), November 24, 1831. Booth's reference to the Twelve Apostles may indicate that nine other men besides Smith, Cowdery, and Whitmer had been ordained apostles in 1831. Nevertheless, those apostles never functioned as a unified group or quorum, and when such a quorum was organized in 1835, new apostles were ordained to comprise it.

office of apostle, by definition the Quorum of Twelve Apostles was comprised of twelve such ordained men.\textsuperscript{40}

As with the other units of the hierarchy, Joseph Smith gave early definition to the responsibility of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. On February 27, 1835, he proposed to answer the question, "What importance is there attached to the calling of these twelve Apostles different from the other callings or offices of the Church?" To that query, he responded:

They are the Twelve Apostles, who are called to the office of traveling high council, who are to preside over all the churches of the Saints among the Gentiles, where there is no presidency established, and they are to travel and preach among the Gentiles, until the Lord shall command them to go to the Jews. They are to hold the keys of this ministry to unlock the door of the kingdom of heaven unto all nations and to preach the Gospel to every creature. This is the power, authority and virtue of their Apostleship.\textsuperscript{41}

The "presidency" referred to in this quote is not the presidency of the church but is instead the organized presidency and high council of a stake (a geographic area comprising a thousand or more members). At the

\textsuperscript{40}Qualifications of this statement are necessary. First, during the period of the present study, three men were given the official designation as Counselor to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles: Amasa M. Lyman (1844-45), Daniel H. Wells (1877-91), and John H. Young (1877-91). Moreover, after 1847, when members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles served as counselors to the president of the church, new apostles were called to replace them in the Quorum of the Twelve. In 1887, the death of the president of the church created a situation in which his two counselors returned to their former positions in the Quorum of the Twelve, resulting in the presence of thirteen members of the Quorum of the Twelve in addition to the two counselors to that quorum. The presence of more than twelve men in the Quorum of the Twelve was thereafter relieved by organizing another First Presidency from among members of the Quorum of Twelve. The temporary abundance of men in the Quorum of the Twelve subsequently occurred with the death of each president of the church. See Reed C. Durham, Jr. and Steven H. Heath, Succession in the Church (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 1970), pp. 95ff.

\textsuperscript{41}Kirtland Council Minute Book, manuscript, p. 83, Church Archives. The published version of this passage has omitted the word "no" prior to the word "presidency," a variation significant enough to warrant quoting the original source (see Roberts, History of the Church, II, 200).
time the Quorum of Twelve Apostles was organized, there were two stakes of the church, one at Kirtland, Ohio, and one in Missouri. Each one of these stakes had a local presidency and high council. The high council's responsibilities were to govern the members of the stake, arbitrate disputes, investigate misconduct, and generally oversee the ecclesiastical and religious life of the stake.

The significance of the "standing high council" of the stake is that according to the instructions of Joseph Smith on May 2, 1835, the jurisdiction of the Twelve Apostles ended where the stakes began.

The twelve apostles have no right to go into Zion or any of its stakes where there is a regular high council established, to regulate any matter pertaining thereto: But it is their duty to go abroad and regulate and set in order all matters relative to the different branches of the church of the Latter Day Saints.

No standing high council has authority to go into the churches abroad and regulate the matters thereof, for this belongs to the Twelve. 42

Combining this instruction with that of February 27, it is evident that the Quorum of the Twelve was originally intended to operate only in those areas of the church where there was no regularly organized stake.

Throughout Joseph Smith's lifetime the stakes of the church were the centers of the ecclesiastical mainstream. The hinterland of the church was comprised of comparatively small, isolated "branches" of members. According to the definitions established by Smith in 1835, the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles was a traveling high council to function officially only in those areas where there were no permanent stake high

42Minutes of a Grand Council at Kirtland, Ohio, May 2, 1835, manuscript, included in Patriarchal Blessing Book 2, Church Archives. A rephrased version of these minutes is found in Roberts, History of the Church, II, 220.
councils. In pursuance of this limited jurisdiction, Joseph Smith sent the Twelve Apostles to regulate affairs in scattered branches of the church in New York, eastern Canada, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine from May to October of 1835. After similar activities during the next year, he sent two of the Twelve Apostles to the British Isles in 1837 to begin the work of proselyting there. From 1839 to 1841 all but two of the Quorum of Twelve were in foreign lands.43 Thus, during the first five years of existence of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles, it seemed that the primary role of this body would be performed away from the headquarters and central activities of the church.

Unlike any other unit of the hierarchy, however, the functions and jurisdiction of the Quorum of the Twelve were significantly expanded by Joseph Smith several years after the formation of the body.44 This development began in 1841, and apparently resulted from two factors: first, the remarkable successes the Twelve Apostles had had in converting thousands of Britons to the church, organizing them into branches, and preparing them to emigrate to the headquarters of the church at Nauvoo, Illinois; second, a record of constant devotion to Joseph Smith by several of the Twelve Apostles during periods of persecution, apostasy, and turmoil.45

In a revelation dictated by Joseph Smith on January 19, 1841, the

43Roberts, History of the Church, II, 209; Smith, Essentials, pp. 227-36.


45Roberts, History of the Church, IV, 403.
Quorum of the Twelve was designated to "hold the keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth, and after that to send my word to every creature." On August 16, 1841, at a special conference the Quorum of Twelve was authorized to select men to go on missions, and then Joseph Smith stated:

that the time had come when the Twelve should be called upon to stand in their place next to the First Presidency, and attend to the settling of emigrants and the business of the Church at the stakes, and assist to bear off the kingdom victoriously to the nations . . . 47

In pursuance of these instructions, the Twelve Apostles were also appointed to assist Joseph Smith in his duties as Trustee-in-Trust for the finances of the Church.

Following the return of seven of the Twelve Apostles from England on July 1, 1841; their ascendancy began. During 1841 seven of the Quorum of the Twelve became members of the city council of Nauvoo. By April 1844 four more of the Twelve had been called to serve on the city council. 48 On January 28, 1842, Smith announced a revelation giving the Twelve control over the church organ the Times and Seasons, and also the

46 Doctrine and Covenants, Section 124:128. On March 28, 1835, it is true that the Quorum of the Twelve were designated as being equal in authority to the First Presidency, but in the same revelation it was stated that the other body of the hierarchy, the First Quorum of Seventy, also was equal in authority with the Twelve, and that the combined stake high councils (in 1835, there were only two) were also equal in authority to the Quorum of Twelve (see Doctrine and Covenants, Section 107:23-6, 36). Although this 1835 revelation ranked the Quorum of Twelve next to the First Presidency, its functions were still limited as above stated, and its decisions could be negated by the vote of two lesser bodies. Therefore, 1835 is not the period in which the Quorum of Twelve gained its ascendancy.

47 Roberts, History of the Church, IV, 403.

48 Nauvoo City Council Minutes, 1841-1844, manuscript, Nauvoo, Illinois, Collection, Church Archives. The only member of the Quorum of the Twelve who did not serve on the city council during this period was John E. Page. See Chapter, "Political Activities."
printing of all church publications. Moreover, Smith commissioned the Twelve Apostles on June 18, 1842 "to organize the Church more according to the law of God" and to supervise the settlement of immigrants in Nauvoo. This was a crucial development in the gradual ascendency of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. Now, for the first time, they were authorized to regulate affairs within the jurisdiction of a stake high council, specifically the Nauvoo High Council. Thus, within a year following the return of the Twelve Apostles from Europe, this body was directing the political, economic, and ecclesiastical affairs of the church at home and abroad.

Having given the Quorum of Twelve Apostles increasing authority in the public ministry of the church by 1842, Joseph Smith also commissioned that body to direct other lesser-known developments within the church. On May 4, 1842, Joseph Smith met with three of the Quorum of Twelve and several other church leaders

instructing them in the principles and order of the Priesthood, attending to washings, anointings, endowments and the communication of keys pertaining to the Aaronic Priesthood, and so on to the highest order of the Melchisedek Priesthood...

This was the introduction of the endowment ceremony within the church, a sacerdotal ritualization of theology, covenants, and instructions. After its introduction this rite was administered under the direction of Joseph Smith and members of the Quorum of the Twelve, and constituted an

---

49 Journal of Wilford Woodruff, holograph, February 8, 1842, Church Archives; Roberts, History of the Church, IV, 503.

50 Journal of Wilford Woodruff, June 18, 1842; Roberts, History of the Church, V, 35.

ordinance of the LDS Temple. Following this development, Joseph Smith revealed to the Quorum of Twelve a doctrine which required the practice of plural marriage. Under Smith's own direction, members of the Quorum of Twelve married plural wives and began solemnizing such marriages for others.

Opposition to the Mormons generally and to these practices in particular caused Joseph Smith to consider moving the body of the church into the unsettled West. As recorded by Apostle Wilford Woodruff, Smith delegated the responsibility of organizing that westward movement to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles on February 21, 1844:

I met with the quorum of the Twelve at Josephs Store & according to Joseph Council we selected a company to go on an exploring expedition to California & pitch upon a spot to build a City.

Despite the intended move west, the Quorum of the Twelve had already voted in private council with Smith that he be a candidate for election as president of the United States. In pursuance of the expanding political role of Mormonism, Joseph Smith and the Quorum of Twelve on March 10, 1844, secretly organized a governing body (the "Council of Fifty") to take charge of the political affairs of the Mormon kingdom.


53Ibid., pp. 267-72, 274-77; Andrew Jenson, "Plural Marriage," The Historical Record, VI (May, 1887), 219-40 (see also Chapter II below.)

54Journal of Wilford Woodruff, February 21, 1844; Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 223. Later this responsibility was transferred to the Council of Fifty of which the Apostles were the most prominent members.

55Journal of Joseph Smith Jr., recorded by Willard Richards, holograph, January 29, 1844, Church Archives; Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 187-8
throughout the world. Thus, by the spring of 1844, the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles had attained formidable power in Mormonism, far more than indicated by its jurisdiction as defined in 1835. When Joseph Smith's death caused a temporary succession crisis, it was the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles that successfully repudiated other contenders, and became the presiding authority of the church.

The fourth hierarchical body to be formed was that of the First Council of Seventy, a group of seven men often called the First Seven Presidents of the Seventy. On February 28, 1835, two weeks after organizing the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, Joseph Smith began choosing seventy men to fill the office of "Seventy," stating: "The Seventies are to constitute traveling quorums, to go into all the earth, withersoever the Twelve Apostles shall call them." Although the traditional history indicates that Smith established this office in response to visions and revelations he had received, there apparently are no extant revelations authorizing the office of seventy prior to Smith's introduction of that office on February 28, 1835. Undoubtedly the biblical precedents of Moses and Christ appointing seventy men for ecclesiastical purposes influenced Joseph Smith's thinking on this matter.

The earliest known revelation of Joseph Smith concerning the role of the seventies in the church was dictated on March 28, 1835, a month

---


following the establishment of this group.

The Seventy are also called to preach the gospel, and to be especial witnesses unto the Gentiles in all the world—thus differing from other offices of the church in the duties of their calling. And they form a quorum equal in authority to that of the Twelve special witnesses or Apostles just named.\textsuperscript{59}

At the outset, therefore, the specific role of the Seventies was defined: to be proselyting missionaries to all the world. Although the revelation stated that the Seventy were equal in authority with the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, Joseph Smith had already affirmed that the Seventy were to act under the direction and jurisdiction of the Twelve Apostles and he subsequently reinforced this subordinate role in a written revelation.\textsuperscript{60}

Considering that the Seventy were to proselyte outside the headquarters of the church where there were no organized stake high councils, this relationship with the Quorum of Twelve was entirely consistent with the role of that latter body in 1835 as the Traveling High Council.

There is no indication that Joseph Smith intended this body of seventy men to comprise in their full number a unit of the hierarchy of the church. Perhaps remembering the New Testament precedent of the appointment of seven men\textsuperscript{61} he specified:

\begin{quote}
And it is according to the vision showing the order of the Seventy, that they should have seven presidents to preside over them, chosen out of the number of the seventy; and the seventh president of these presidents is to preside over the six; and these seven presidents are to choose other seventy besides the first seventy to whom they belong, and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{59}\textit{ Doctrine and Covenants,} Section 107:25-6.

\textsuperscript{60}\textit{Ibid.,} Section 124:138-40; \textit{Roberts, History of the Church, II,} 202, 227.

\textsuperscript{61}\textit{Acts 6:3-6}
seven times seventy, if the labor in the vineyard of necessity requires it.62

Beginning August 17, 1835, this group of seven presidents over the Seventy was sustained with the other General Authorities of the church.63 The fact that their status was clearly subordinate to members of the other presiding councils of the church is indicated by the fact that Joseph Young, one of the most senior members of the First Council of Seventy, did not even realize he was a President of the Seventy until he was so informed by one of the apostles four years after having been

62 Doctrine and Covenants, Section 107:93-6.

63 A practice observed at this meeting and some subsequent meetings of the First Council of Seventy requires explanation. At the conference of August 17, 1835, among those men listed as "the seven Presidents of the Seventy Elders" were men who have never been recognized as holding that position (Harpin Riggs, Joseph Hancock, and Almon Babbitt), whereas three of the original members of the First Council of Seventy (Hazen Aldrich, Joseph Young, and Zebedee Coltrin) are not listed with the other members of that body (see Kirtland Council Minute Book, p. 99). This fact could lead to the conclusion that the latter three were not actually part of the First Seven Presidents of Seventy designated on February 28. However, the record of the ordination prayers on that occasion indicates that Joseph Young, whose name was not listed at the August 17 meeting, was set apart on February 28 "to be one of the 70 and also to be one of the Presidency of that Mission to preside with thy brethren." (see Kirtland Council Minute Book, p. 185). The reason for the confusion is that Riggs, J. Hancock, and Babbitt acted as substitutes for the actual members of the First Council of Seventy who were absent at the time of this meeting. This was apparently the last time this practice occurred in a public meeting of the First Council of Seventy, but in the private council meetings of that body beginning May 10, 1879, "alternate" members of the First Council of Seventy were appointed in the place of absent members. These alternates functioned only during the deliberative council meetings of that group and were never voted upon by the general membership so as to give them official status in the hierarchy. The practice of using men to substitute in council meetings for absent members of the First Council of Seventy was discontinued on May 27, 1883. (see First Council of Seventy Minutes, manuscript, May 10, 1879 and May 27, 1883, Church Archives).
given that responsibility. Nevertheless, the basic function and jurisdiction of the First Council of Seventy had been clearly outlined in 1835.

The fifth and final quorum of the hierarchy to be established was that of the Presiding Bishopric. Of all the units of the LDS hierarchy, the historical development of this office has been the most complex and the least understood. Traditional histories of the church assert that the first Presiding Bishop was Edward Partridge, who was called as a bishop in 1831; his successor in office has been thought to be Newel K. Whitney, who attained that office sometime about 1844. One difficulty with this traditional view is that in 1841 a contemporary of Whitney, George Miller, was "appointed, by revelation, Bishop, in place of Edward Partridge, deceased." If Partridge was succeeded as Presiding Bishop by Whitney, as traditional histories assert, then he was succeeded in office by two men at the same time. The confusion about the history of the Presiding Bishopric, which is still evident in the 1973 official history of the LDS General Authorities, derives from a misunderstanding of the development of the office of bishop in LDS history.

At the time Edward Partridge was appointed bishop on February 4, 1831, he was the first bishop and only man in the church to hold that

---

64 In 1878, Joseph Young told a group of seventies: "Speaking of his own experience he said that he never knew that he was President of the Seventies until he came to Nauvoo [in 1839] and Br Brigham told him that that was his place and he took it." (See First Council of Seventy Minutes, January 16, 1878).

65 Andrew Jenson, "Church Encyclopedia." The Historical Record, VIII (December, 1889), s.v. "Partridge, Edward" and "Whitney, Newel K."

66 Times and Seasons, II (February 1, 1841), 310; Roberts, History of the Church, IV, 286.
position. When Newel K. Whitney was appointed the following December to be bishop, only these two men held that office in the church. During 1831, Smith gave these two men little information about their duties or the extent of their powers. The few references in Smith's dictated revelations indicated that the bishop was to receive donations for the benefit of the poor, to be present at investigations of misconduct by members, and to watch over the church.67 A later Presiding Bishop of the church, Edward Hunter, commented on the disturbing limbo in which these two bishops functioned:

Spoke of the Temple and the power of the priesthood and the knowledge we had now as compared with even leading men at the commencement of this dispensation. As for example when Bro. Whitney was first told he was to be Bishop fumbled and said not so unless it be the will of God. He did not know at the time nor Joseph either what the position of a Bishop was.68

In the two 1831 revelations which designated Partridge and Whitney as bishops it had been specifically promised that further instruction would be given as to their duties.69 Aside from an 1832 revelation concerning the economic duties of the bishopric, explicit details concerning the duties and limitations of the role of the office of bishop did not come

---

67Doctrine and Covenants, Sections 42:31, 82, 46:27; substantive additions were made to the text of the revelation contained in Section 42 compared to the published version in Book of Commandments, p. 92. Retroactive additions to the 1831 revelations concerning the role of bishop were made concerning their role as judges, the question of descendants of Aaron functioning as bishops, and the fact that bishops are subject to trial by the First Presidency, a body not formed in 1831. These additions first appeared in the 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants. Compare present Doctrine and Covenants, Section 64:37-43 with Book of Commandments, p. 160; compare Section 68:15-23 with Evening and Morning Star, I (October, 1832), [p. 35].

68Aaronic Priesthood Minutes, 1857-1877, manuscript, March 3, 1877, Church Archives.

69Book of Commandments, p. 39; Evening and Morning Star, I, (December, 1832), [p. 53]; Doctrine and Covenants, Sections 41:10, 72:7.
until 1835. At that time, it was made clear that the bishops were subject to the jurisdiction of the First Presidency, were to preside over the lesser offices of deacon, teacher, and priest, and were exclusively concerned with the "temporal" (financial and economic) welfare of the church. 70

Concerning the extent of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of these first two bishops, it is necessary to remember that from 1831 to 1838 there were two headquarters of Mormonism: one at Kirtland, Ohio, and one in Missouri. Whitney was bishop in Ohio and Partridge was bishop in Missouri. Each had control over the temporal affairs of his respective region; neither had jurisdiction over the entire church. Their ecclesiastical authority was described in 1880 by Apostle Orson Pratt, then the church historian:

Here were two Bishops, then, one having jurisdiction in the West, a thousand miles from the other; the other having jurisdiction in the East. Their duties were pointed out, but neither of them was a Presiding Bishop [over the entire church]. But what were they? As was clearly shown by President Taylor at the Priesthood meeting on last evening, they were general Bishops. 71

In ecclesiastical authority, these two men were performing regional functions rather than operating, according to the definition of LDS General Authorities, as officers who presided over the entire church.

Not until the church established its headquarters at Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1839, was the office of bishop further clarified. Beginning in 1839, two other bishops besides Partridge and Whitney were ordained, and these four men were appointed to preside over four ecclesiastical

70 Doctrine and Covenants, Section 107:15-17, 68-76, 88; see also note 67 above.

"wards." Within a year several more bishops were chosen to preside over wards. (Mormon usage of the word "ward" was derived from the term for political subdivisions within cities of nineteenth century America.) The appointment of bishops to preside over such geographical subdivisions gave a congregational or parochial responsibility to the office of bishop. This was a delimitation of the broad regional authority previously exercised by Bishops Partridge and Whitney. In Utah, the wards became independent ecclesiastical units with a separate schedule of meetings for residents of the geographical boundaries of the ward. In Nauvoo, however, the wards were apparently a pre-congregational development, since devotional meetings were held on Sundays for the entire population of Nauvoo, rather than by individual wards. Nevertheless, giving the bishops responsibility for Mormons living in a narrowly defined locality was an important step in the evolution of the bishopric.

For a time, along with the local ward bishops in Nauvoo, the previous regional bishops (General Bishops) continued. The opportunity to unify their role into a single presiding bishop was by-passed when, at the death of Edward Partridge in 1840, George Miller was appointed by revelation on January 19, 1841, to succeed him. But the need for a single authority over these various classes of bishops was recognized in the same revelation:

And again, I say unto you, I give unto you Vinson Knight, Samuel H. Smith, and Shadrach Roundy, if he will receive it, to preside over the bishopric . . . 72

---

72 Doctrine and Covenants, Section 124:20-21, 141. Verse 141, which contained the appointment of Knight, was in a lengthy organizational section at the conclusion of this document, that was not published when the document first appeared in the church organ at Nauvoo, Times and Seasons, II (June 1, 1841), 424-9. The omitted section first appeared in the 1844 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants.
Vinson Knight was therefore the first man appointed to be a Presiding Bishop of the LDS Church. He was so regarded by three church historians and by LDS President John Taylor.

Despite the revelation designating Vinson Knight to preside over all other bishops, Knight apparently never functioned as the supreme Presiding Bishop over the church. Although information about Knight from 1841 to his death in 1842 is sketchy, it appears that Knight was not allowed to function as the supreme bishop in the church due to an act of ecclesiastical presumption on his part. In the *Times and Seasons* of January 15, 1841, Knight announced that the Aaronic Priesthood (a division of the ministry encompassing the office of deacon, teacher, priest, and bishop) would be organized at his home on January 24, 1841. This announcement was published by Knight four days before Joseph Smith dictated the revelation appointing Knight to "preside over the bishopric." Obviously Knight was anticipating the appointment which later appeared in the dictated revelation. Presumably Joseph Smith had given Knight some intimation that he would be called to be a bishop to preside over all other bishops, and Knight became overly anxious to exercise that authority.

---

73 *Journal of Discourses*, XXI, 361-2 (discourse by John Taylor on August 8, 1880), XXII, 34 (discourse by Orson Pratt on October 10, 1880), XXII, 200 (discourse by John Taylor on July 18, 1880); Orson F. Whitney, "The Aaronic Priesthood," *Contributor*, VI (August, 1885), 405. In 1904 Anthon H. Lund, the Church Historian, wrote: "Bro. Penrose came in and discussion on Keeler's book was had. It was thought best not to say the Presiding Bishop had the fulness of the Aaronic Priesthood. It was also decided to avoid saying there are several classes of Bishops such as Presiding, not presiding but extensive district as Whitney and Partridge, Traveling Bishops and ward bishops. It is better to reckon the two: Pres. Bishopric and ward Bishop and explain the position of the others." Journal of Anthon H. Lund, June 30, 1904, Church Archives; emphasis added.

74 *Times and Seasons*, II (January 15, 1841), 287.
In 1839, Joseph Smith had written a letter in which he discussed the situation of men in the church exceeding the bounds of their authority, using the words "many are called, but few are chosen." That decree apparently applied to Vinson Knight's appointment as Presiding Bishop. When announcement was made in *Times and Seasons* on February 1, 1841, of the most important new appointments in the recent revelation, there was no mention of Knight's appointment, even though George Miller's lesser appointment to succeed Partridge was announced. Knight's January announcement indicated he planned to organize the Aaronic or Lesser Priesthood himself on January 24, 1841. The meeting was not held as he announced, presumably because it was not allowed. When the Aaronic Priesthood was finally organized in Nauvoo, it was two months after the date Knight designated. Instead of being under his single direction, as implied by his announcement, the Aaronic Priesthood was organized under the joint direction of Bishops Miller, Whitney, Knight, and one other bishop of Nauvoo. To his death, Vinson Knight was denied the opportunity to receive the office of Presiding Bishop, and the official announcement of his death referred to him as "one of the bishops of this church." Although excluded from the supreme position to which he had been authorized by revelation, Knight was advanced above the position of ward bishop he had previously held. He became a General Bishop and acted in concert with

---

75 *Doctrine and Covenants*, Section 121:34-40.

76 *Times and Seasons*, II (February 1, 1841), 310.

77 *Aaronic Priesthood Record and Minutes*, Nauvoo, Illinois, 1841-1846, manuscript, March 21, 1841, p. 1, Church Archives.

78 *Times and Seasons*, III (August 15, 1842), 894.
with the two other General Bishops, Whitney and Miller.  

For nearly five years following the death of Knight in July 1842, no man was appointed to the position of Presiding Bishop of the Church. Whitney and Miller continued their joint function as General Bishops. Miller was the presiding officer of the high priests in the church, and Whitney presided over the Aaronic Priesthood officers. In October 1844, they were jointly appointed as Trustee-in-Trust for the church, following the death of the former trustee, Joseph Smith. At that same conference, Whitney was sustained as "first bishop" and Miller as "second bishop."

They did not, however, form the unified quorum alluded to in the 1841 revelation, since each of them was semi-autonomous, Whitney having one counselor, and Miller having no counselors as bishop. Referred to as the "presiding bishops" of the church, these two men continued their semi-autonomous relationship to each other as General Bishops, even though Whitney was designated First Bishop in 1844, honoring him as the

---

79 On May 11, 1842, an official declaration was signed by the First Presidency, the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, and by Whitney, Knight, and Miller, as "Bishops of the above mentioned Church." (Journal History, May 11, 1842.) These men were certainly not the only bishops of the church, nor were they the Presiding Bishopric designated in the 1841 revelation, but they were functioning in the special capacity of General Bishops.

80 It might be suggested that Samuel H. Smith became Presiding Bishop following the death of Vinson Knight, since the Nauvoo high council resolved on August 20, 1842, that "Samuel H. Smith be appointed bishop in the place of Vinson Knight, deceased" (see Roberts, History of the Church, V, 119). This appointment was made in the reorganization of the wards of Nauvoo on that date, one of which Knight had continued to serve as a local bishop despite his other appointment. Moreover, the Nauvoo high council had no authority to designate anyone to a position of presiding over the entire church or over any segment of it beyond the jurisdiction of the stake. Therefore Samuel H. Smith had not been appointed Presiding Bishop of the Church. Samuel H. Smith declined the offer to preside over a local ward as Knight's successor, and another local bishop was appointed by the high council instead (see Nauvoo High Council Minutes, manuscript, August 21, 1842, Church Archives).
bishop of longest tenure in the church. Following the exodus of the Mormons from Nauvoo in February 1846, Whitney gained increasing eminence and ultimately became the Presiding Bishop of the church. Miller began demonstrating resistance to the leadership of Brigham Young, and rapidly fell out of favor with his administration. Miller was specifically invited to attend the general conference of the church to be held on April 6, 1847. Failing to attend, Miller’s name was omitted from the list of officers, and Whitney was sustained as Presiding Bishop of the church. Although the office had been authorized by the 1841 revelation, Whitney was the first man actually to function in that position. By 1847, the duties of the bishops to preside over the Aaronic priesthood and administer the finances of the church had been so well developed that the duties of the Presiding Bishop of the church were obvious.

With respect to the hierarchical organization of the Presiding Bishopric, however, additional evolution was necessary. At first Whitney served without counselors. Then, on September 6, 1850, Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball were sustained as his counselors, a curious situation since by then Young was the president of the church and Kimball was his first counselor. This situation ended with Whitney’s death two weeks later.

During the tenure of the next Presiding Bishop, Edward Hunter,

---

81 Journal of Willard Richards, August 9, 1844, Church Archives; Journal History, October 7, 1844, pp. 2-3, April 7, 1845, p. 5, 7. Miller had counselors in his role as president of the high priest quorum, but not in his role as bishop.

82 Journal of Willard Richards, April 4, 1847, Journal History, April 16, 1847.

83 Orson F. Whitney, "The Aaronic Priesthood," The Contributor, VI (September, 1885), 441.
there was additional evidence of organizational evolution. From his appointment on April 7, 1851, until September 8, 1851, Hunter served without assistants or counselors. On the latter date, Nathaniel H. Felt and John Banks were sustained, at the instance of Brigham Young, as "travelling Presiding Bishops, under Bishop Edward Hunter."\(^{84}\) On October 9, 1851, Alfred Cordon was also sustained a travelling bishop "to preside over other Bishops."\(^{85}\) Although none of these three men have to date been recognized as General Authorities in official LDS histories, they were all presented at the general conference of the church on April 7 and October 7, 1852, and April 7, 1853 in the following manner:

Edward Hunter was sustained as the Presiding Bishop to the Church; also Nathaniel H. Felt, John Banks, and Alfred Cordon, as Assistant Presiding, and Travelling Bishops among the people.\(^{86}\)

Despite the fact that from 1851 to 1853 Hunter had officially appointed "assistants," on April 11, 1852, Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball were appointed as his counselors.\(^{87}\) Apparently, however, Young and Kimball were never presented to general conferences as Hunter's counselors, and from October 7, 1853 until April 6, 1856, Hunter had no

\(^{84}\) Journal History, September 8, 1851, p. 1.

\(^{85}\) Journal of Wilford Woodruff, October 9, 1851.

\(^{86}\) Journal History, April 7, 1852, p. 1; October 7, 1852, p. 1; April 7, 1853, p. 1.

\(^{87}\) Journal of Wilford Woodruff, April 11, 1852. In commenting on this event the Seventh General Epistle from the First Presidency, dated April 18, 1852, indicates that Seth Taft, David Pettegrew, Abraham Hoagland, David Fullner, and Daniel Spencer, were chosen "assistant Presiding Bishops." See James R. Clark, ed., Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1833-1964 (5 vols.; Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft Inc., 1965-71), II, 97. These men, however, were apparently never presented with the other General Authorities of the church, and therefore occupied a position inferior to that of Felt, Banks, and Cordon.
counselors or assistants sustained with him at general conferences. At the latter date, he finally received regularly appointed first and second counselors, and from 1856 onward the organization of the Presiding Bishopric was stable. The uneven attempts at stabilizing the organization of the Presiding Bishopric are further evidence that this unit of the hierarchy was the last, rather than the first, to develop.

During the lifetime of Joseph Smith, the basic foundations for the functions and organization of the hierarchy had been established. With the First Presidency, its role as the supreme body was inherent in its proximity to the president of the church. Organizationally, it did not really matter how many assistants or counselors the president chose. Both the function and organization (one man) of the Presiding Patriarch's office had been established initially. The Quorum of the Twelve Apostles had both a clear organizational form and ecclesiastical jurisdiction at the inception of that body; but unlike any other unit of the hierarchy, the jurisdiction and function of the Twelve were greatly amplified during Smith's lifetime. Similar to the Patriarch, the organization and function of the First Council of Seventy was also clearly defined almost at its establishment. Although the Presiding Bishopric did not develop organizationally until after the death of Smith, its role was defined in the functions of lesser bishops and its existence had been authorized in a revelation dictated by Joseph Smith. All things considered, Smith had successfully created a hierarchy which was sufficient for the ecclesiastical needs of the church during the period 1832-1932.
CHAPTER II

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS IN THE HIERARCHY

Of the social characteristics of the men who comprised the Mormon Hierarchy, 1832-1932, the most complex, and perhaps the most significant, were the family relationships these men sustained to each other. At a primary level, there were ties of kinship that bound the LDS General Authorities together. Secondarily, but no less significant, were the marriage connections that aligned these men to each other. Family connections fundamentally reinforced the affinity already shared by these men as adherents and proponents of a religious faith. Convoluted interrelationships made the Mormon hierarchy, in effect, an extended family.¹

Kinship

To evaluate the influence of kinship upon appointments to the Mormon hierarchy, recognition must be given to the theological importance of kinship in Mormonism. One sociologist has commented: "Society in both the Book of Mormon and the Old Testament is conceived as an extended kinship group. All members thought of themselves as descended from a common ancestor."² Very early in Mormonism this emphasis on the family

¹The data for this chapter has been collated from family histories and other genealogical sources indicated in the bibliography.

was translated into a concern for the spiritual welfare of deceased ancestors. As early as 1835, Assistant President Oliver Cowdery indicated this concern in a published letter: "Do our fathers, who have waded through affliction and adversity . . . [have] an inheritance in those mansions? If so, can they without us be made perfect?" The implication of Cowdery's words was that the Mormons had some active role, as yet undefined, in securing the spiritual welfare of their deceased ancestors. Speaking further upon this question, Joseph Smith announced in 1838:

All those who have not had an opportunity of hearing the gospel, and being administered to by an inspired man in the flesh, must have it hereafter, before they can be finally judged.

Although the details were not specified, Joseph Smith reinforced Cowdery's former position that the Mormons would have to do something actively to save their departed kin. On January 19, 1841, Joseph Smith dictated the revelation which indicated the nature of that role: baptism by proxy on behalf of the dead. The Mormons immediately began implementing this ordinance by proxy for deceased relatives and friends, a practice that was extended to other ordinances of the church such as ordination to the priesthood, the endowments, and temple marriage. These practices resulted in the Mormon emphasis upon gathering genealogical data about one's ancestors so that these vicarious ordinances might be done in their behalf.

More important with reference to the Mormon hierarchy, there was

---

3Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate, I (July, 1835), 156.
4Elders' Journal, I (July, 1838), 43.
5Doctrine and Covenants, Section 124:29-42.
a theological concept that men had the right to preside in the church by virtue of their lineage. As implied by some of these revelatory statements, this right of presiding due to lineage was not restricted to the single office of patrilineal appointment in the church, the Presiding Patriarch. For example, in 1847 Brigham Young spoke on this principle as it affected membership in the Mormon hierarchy: "I am entitled to the Keys of the Priesthood according to lineage and Blood, so is Brother H.C. Kimball & many others." Moreover, on several occasions, revelations dictated by Joseph Smith indicated that the sons and other descendants of current leaders of the church would also be a blessing to the church. These theological premises provided an authority for the appointment of men who were related by kinship to members of the hierarchy.

Joseph Smith clearly established such kinship appointments as an accepted practice. During his presidency of the church, Joseph Smith gave General Authority positions to his father, his uncle, two of his brothers, and his first cousin. Moreover, in the Quorum of the Twelve that was established in 1835 it was intended to have three sets of brothers, Orson and Parley P. Pratt, Luke S. and Lyman E. Johnson, and Brigham and Phineas H. Young. This original plan appears to have been a conscious effort to duplicate the kinship relations in the twelve.

8Doctrine and Covenants, Sections 86:10, 110:12, 124:58.
apostles Christ originally chose in which there were also three sets of brothers.9 Joseph Smith, however, decided to drop Phineas H. Young from the proposed membership of the latter-day Quorum of the Twelve, substituting his own brother, William Smith.10 In so doing, Joseph Smith was perhaps also following a biblical precedent, for one of the brothers of Jesus Christ was appointed ancienly as an apostle.11

Having established, as president of the church, the policy of appointing members of one's immediate family to the hierarchy, Joseph Smith had set a precedent that later presidents of the church applied to their own sons. In 1864, two months after secretly ordaining three of his sons apostles and making them special counselors in the First Presidency, President Brigham Young (1844-1877) explained this action to two of the apostles:

President Young said I am going to tell you something that I have never before mentioned to any other Person I have ordained my sons Joseph A. Brigham & John W. Apostles and My Counsellors. Have you any objections? J. Taylor G.A. Smith said they had not, that it was his own affair & they considered it under his own direction. He further stated In ordaining my sons I have done no more than I am perfectly willing that you should do with yours. And I am now determined to put my sons into active service in the Spiritual Affairs of the Kingdom and keep them there just as long as possible you have the same privilege.12

Subsequent presidents of the church followed Brigham Young's example, but sometimes advanced them to positions in the hierarchy besides that of

---
10Letter, Oliver Cowdery to Brigham Young, February 27, 1848, quoted in Stanley R. Gunn, Oliver Cowdery, Second Elder and Scribe (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, Inc., 1962), p. 268, hereinafter referred to as Oliver Cowdery.
11Galatians 1:19.
12Wilford Woodruff, Historian's Private Journal, April 17, 1864, Church Historian's Office Collection, Church Archives.
apostle. President John Taylor (1877-1887) appointed two of his sons to the hierarchy, President Wilford Woodruff (1887-1898) appointed three of his sons, and President Joseph F. Smith (1901-1918) appointed three of his sons. Only two presidents of the church down to 1932 did not appoint members of their immediate family to the hierarchy: President Lorenzo Snow (1898-1901), who made only two appointments during his brief presidency, and President Heber J. Grant (1918-1945), who had no living sons. The practice of appointing sons to the hierarchy was not restricted to the sons of the presidents of the church. In all, 29 sons of General Authorities were appointed to the Mormon hierarchy, accounting for 23.6% of the appointments, 1832-1932.

This appointment of sons to the Mormon hierarchy must, however, be put into a statistical perspective. After the 1840's, the General Authorities married plural wives, and therefore had more children than would otherwise be expected. Brigham Young, for example, had fifty-six children. Of those children, there were nine sons who had reached the age of twenty-five during their father's presidency; only three were advanced to the hierarchy. Even that proportion of appointments, if applied to eligible sons of all the General Authorities, was many times more than there were vacancies in the hierarchy. With the limited number of vacancies and the large number of children born to the General Authorities, relatively few of the sons could statistically be advanced to the hierarchy. Even though twenty-nine sons of General Authorities were so advanced, that number must be weighed against the numbers of children born to the men of the hierarchy (see Table 1).

Were the kinship relations of the Mormon hierarchy merely a matter of patrilineal appointments, it would be a straightforward matter to analyze. Men appointed to the hierarchy, however, sustained kinship
TABLE 1

NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN TO MEN OF THE 1832-1932* HIERARCHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Monogamist Men</th>
<th>Polygamist Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data is sufficiently complete for only 114 men.

relations as son, brother, nephew, uncle, first cousin, and distant cousin to other General Authorities. Moreover, where brothers or cousins served in the hierarchy, oftentimes their sons were also appointed, establishing a complex series of connections involving distant cousin relationships to numerous other General Authorities. In the resulting maze of cousin relationships, one might doubt whether it was particularly significant or even recognized by a General Authority that his third, fourth, or more distant cousin had joined him in the hierarchy.

Some have assumed that the Mormon leaders did not know the details of their distant relations until after genealogical research had become an officially established practice in the church.\textsuperscript{13} Joseph Smith Jr., however, had extensive knowledge of his ancestry. Two years prior to

\textsuperscript{13}Larsen, "Familism," p. 146.
the revelation on baptism for the dead, his uncle John Smith recorded his own patrilineal ancestry back to his great-great-grandfather.\textsuperscript{14} Thus, during the 1830's, Joseph Smith Jr. had personal knowledge of five generations of his own family. Moreover, he also indicated an early awareness of the distant cousin relationships he sustained to the men he advanced to the hierarchy. He told Apostles Orson and Parley P. Pratt that by vision he had learned that their "fathers and his all sprang from the same man a few generations ago."\textsuperscript{15} Joseph Smith and the Pratt brothers were sixth cousins. From whatever source, the first president of the church knew he was related to men he advanced to the hierarchy.

Cousin relationships that would be considered obscure and inconsequential by many people were recognized and honored by the General Authorities. The feeling of kinship and camaraderie the Mormon leaders felt toward their distant cousins is best shown in a "family meeting" held in Nauvoo on January 8, 1845. Assembled at this meeting were men and women who were as closely related as brother, sister, or first cousin, and as distantly related as fourth, fifth, and sixth cousins. The remarks of John Haven set the tone for the meeting:

Brothers and Sisters, Cousins, Nephews and Nieces and all who are before me as such. I rejoice that I am connected with you as there are three branches here, descendants of Father Phinehas, and Mother Susannah Goddard Howe.

\textsuperscript{14}Journal of John Smith, photocopy of holograph, July 20, 1839, George A. Smith Family Collection, Western Americana, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, herein-after referred to as University of Utah.

\textsuperscript{15}Letter, Orson Pratt to Parley P. Pratt, October 11, 1853, quoted in Archibald F. Bennett, Saviors on Mount Zion (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Sunday School Union Board, 1950), p. 86.
At this meeting were four members of the Quorum of the Twelve, a member of the First Council of Seventy, the mother of Joseph Smith Jr., and two future General Authorities. Brigham Young's remarks indicated that he, as the most prominent General Authority at this meeting, regarded distant cousin relationships between the authorities as being quite close.

When we come to the connections we discover that we all sprung back to the settlement of New England about 200 years ago. It is but a little more than that time when Father Smith, the Goddards, Richards, Youngs and Kimballs were all in one family—as it were. We are all relations. It is only three generations back that Brother Joseph Smith's family were related to this family.10

Throughout the history of the Mormon hierarchy into the twentieth century, the General Authorities recognized these relationships, often referring to distant cousins as "kinsman," "uncle," or merely "cousin."17

The extent to which kinship allied the General Authorities can best be illustrated through a diagram (PLATE I) showing the General Authorities who were appointed within one extended family group. This extended family included three of the families which assembled at the 1845 meeting (the Smiths, Youngs, and Richards) and also included the Lyman family. The names of General Authorities are written in bold face type.

To simplify understanding of PLATE I, it is perhaps easier to focus first on each of the four families that comprised this extended family. The Young family, descended from John Young, provided seven


17 For example, Brigham Young referred to his fourth cousin, Albert P. Rockwood, simply as "cousin A.P. Rockwood." See "History of Brigham Young," Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star, XXV (August 8, 1863), 504.
PLATE I

PATRILINEAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE MORMON HIERARCHY, 1832-1932
FROM ONE EXTENDED FAMILY (YOUNG, RICHARDS, SMITH, AND LYMAN)
patrilineal appointments to the hierarchy between 1835 and 1909. The Richards family, descended from Joseph Richards, provided four appointments between 1840 and 1917. The Smith family, descended from Asahel Smith, provided fourteen patrilineal appointments between 1830 and 1912. The Lyman family, descended from Roswell Lyman, provided three appointments between 1842 and 1918.

Each of these families was, in turn, related to the other families on the genealogical diagram centering on the Smith family. Apostle Willard Richards was the fourth cousin of President Joseph Smith and also the first cousin of Apostle Brigham Young. Apostle Amasa M. Lyman was the first cousin, once removed, of Counselor John Smith's wife, and the second cousin of Apostle George A. Smith. The Smith family interrelationships are closer and more easily recognized. To avoid added complexity, the chart fails to indicate that Brigham Young was also a sixth cousin of President Joseph Smith. The mutually acknowledged cousin relationships existing between the General Authorities of these four families continued through five generations of appointments to the Mormon hierarchy. In all, twenty-eight men of this extended family became General Authorities, accounting for 22.6% of the members of the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932.

One means of putting this maze of kinship relations into perspective is by analyzing the kinship relations to living General Authorities that existed at the time men were appointed to the hierarchy (see Table 2). Of the 123 men appointed to the hierarchy between 1832 and 1932, 53 (43.1%) sustained a kinship relation to one or more living General Authorities. Several of these kinship ties were distant cousin relationships but of the 123 men appointed, 37 (30.1%) were connected to living General Authorities in a kinship relation of second cousin or closer. During four of the statistical time divisions the percentage of such appointments was higher
### TABLE 2

CLOSEST KINSHIP RELATIONS TO CURRENT GENERAL AUTHORITIES OF APPOINTEE AT THEIR ADVANCEMENT TO THE HIERARCHY, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Brother</th>
<th>Nephew</th>
<th>Uncle</th>
<th>1st Cousin</th>
<th>Grandnephew</th>
<th>1st cousin</th>
<th>2nd cousin</th>
<th>More distant cousin</th>
<th>Total kinship</th>
<th>No known kinship</th>
<th>Total men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* When an appointee sustained more than one kinship relation to living General Authorities, only the closest degree of kinship is tabulated. When an appointee sustained equally close ties of kinship to two or more General Authorities, only the kinship relation to the man in the highest echelon of the hierarchy is tabulated (e.g., William Smith, who was the son of the Presiding Patriarch and also the brother of the president of the church, is tabulated as a brother).

*b* Joseph Smith Jr. is not included in the tabulation, since he was president of the church before there was a hierarchy.

than the percentage for the entire century period: in 1878-88 it was 43.8%, in 1856-66 it was 60.0%, in 1900-10 it was 64.3%, and in 1922-32 it was 50.0% of the appointees who had some kinship relation to living members of the hierarchy.

As previously discussed, however, Mormon emphasis on the family included both the living and the dead. This was also reflected in appointments within the LDS hierarchy. At their appointment, the following members of the Quorum of the Twelve were sons or grandsons of deceased
members of that quorum or of the First Presidency; Apostles Joseph F.
Smith, Heber J. Grant, Francis M. Lyman, John Henry Smith, George F.
Richards, Orson F. Whitney, Stephen L. Richards, Richard R. Lyman, and
Joseph F. Merrill. That such appointments were oftentimes a conscious
effort to honor deceased General Authorities is indicated in the journal
of Apostle John Henry Smith. When the Quorum of the Twelve discussed
filling a vacancy in the quorum in 1901, John Henry Smith recorded: "I
presented for the consideration the names of the sons of the dead apos-
tles."\(^{18}\) This policy of representing and honoring deceased members of
the hierarchy inevitably magnified the kinship relationships within the
hierarchy (see Table 3).

Analyzing the relationships that existed to both living and deceased
General Authorities alters some of the trends observable in Table 2. Us-
ing Table 3, the percentage of appointees, 1832-1932, who were related to
other General Authorities, living or dead, is 46.3%, an increase of
slightly more than three percent over the percentage of those related
only to living General Authorities. Of greater interest is the fact that
38.2% of the appointees were related to other General Authorities, living
and dead, in a degree of second cousin or closer. This is an increase of
more than eight percent over the relationships to living men alone. In
other words, including deceased General Authorities in the analysis did
not appreciably increase the total numbers of men who sustained some kind
of kinship at their advancement, but it did noticeably increase the num-
bers of close family ties and decreased the numbers of distant cousin re-
relationships as the closest bond. This coalescing of kinship in the two
comparatives is best shown in the numbers of men who at their appointment

\(^{18}\)Journal of John Henry Smith, October 24, 1901, George A. Smith
Family Collection, University of Utah.
TABLE 3
CLOSEST KINSHIP TO CURRENT AND FORMER GENERAL AUTHORITIES
OF APPOINTEES AT THEIR ADVANCEMENT
TO THE HIERARCHY, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Brother</th>
<th>Nephew</th>
<th>Uncle</th>
<th>1st Cousin</th>
<th>Grandnephew</th>
<th>1st cousin, 1 rvd</th>
<th>2nd cousin</th>
<th>More distant cousin</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Known Kinship</th>
<th>Total Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When an appointee sustained more than one kinship relation to General Authorities, living or dead, only the closest degree of kinship is tabulated. When an appointee sustained equally close ties of kinship to two or more General Authorities, living or dead, only the kinship relation to the men in the highest echelon of the hierarchy is tabulated (e.g., Joseph F. Smith, who was the son of deceased Assistant President Hyrum Smith and also the brother of living Presiding Patriarch John Smith, is tabulated as a son).

Joseph Smith Jr. is not included in the tabulation, since he was president of the church before there was a hierarchy.

to the hierarchy had the relation of father, son, brother, nephew, uncle, or first cousin to another member of the hierarchy. Thirty-three men (26.8%) sustained such close kinship to living General Authorities, whereas forty-two (34.1%) were thus related to living or dead General Authorities. For the Mormon hierarchy, the significance of kinship spans the generations and the eternities.

Another approach toward understanding the intricate kinship relations
within the Mormon hierarchy is to tabulate the statistical incidence of
the various kinship relations (see Table 4). This approach avoids the
statistical arbitrariness implicit in Tables 2 and 3. One man at his
advancement to the hierarchy might be a son, a brother, and nephew to
other members of the hierarchy. In order to obtain statistical correla-
tions with the total number of men appointed, each man could be counted
in only one kinship category in Tables 2 and 3. By contrast, Table 4
provides the total number of sons, nephews, etc. who were appointed to
the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932.

Although the categories of kinship in Table 4 are not mutually
exclusive with reference to the appointees, the data for the categories
provide further insight into the kinship structure of the Mormon
hierarchy. Predictably, the highest incidence is within the closest
levels of kinship: 29 sons, 16 brothers, 14 nephews, and 12 grandsons.
As the correlations in Tables 2 and 3 suggested, the hierarchy was inter-
connected most densely at this level. In terms of incidence, distant
relationships are only slightly removed from those of the closest kinship:
12 fifth cousins, 12 sixth cousins, 10 fifth cousins, once removed, and
9 sixth cousins, once removed. On a superficial level this only attests
to the conventional wisdom that within a few generations a large segment
of any geographical population is related. With the Mormon hierarchy,
however, this high statistical incidence of distant cousin relationships
reflected the appointments of men whose distant cousin relationships to
current General Authorities were known and honored. The other statistical
incidences of kinship are such as would be expected to connect the two
poles of the kinship spectrum.

A final statistical approach in assessing the significance of kinship
within the Mormon hierarchy involves the total impact of kinship appoint-
### TABLE 4

INCIDENCE OF KINSHIP RELATIONS TO LIVING AND DEAD GENERAL AUTHORITIES
BY APPOINTEES AT THE TIME OF THEIR ADVANCEMENT TO THE HIERARCHY, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Brother</th>
<th>Nephew</th>
<th>Uncle</th>
<th>1st Cousin</th>
<th>Grandson</th>
<th>Grandnephew</th>
<th>Great-grandson</th>
<th>Great-grandnephew</th>
<th>1st Cousin</th>
<th>2nd Cousin</th>
<th>3rd Cousin</th>
<th>4th Cousin</th>
<th>5th Cousin</th>
<th>6th Cousin</th>
<th>7th Cousin</th>
<th>8th Cousin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aOftentimes an individual member of the hierarchy at his appointment sustained several of these relationships to other General Authorities, living and dead. Each of these separate relationships will be tabulated as one incidence of a kinship relation. When a man had an identical relationship (e.g., brother) to more than one General Authority, that will be tabulated as only one incidence of that particular relation. When related men were advanced to the hierarchy simultaneously (e.g., Luke and Lyman Johnson) their separate relationships to each other are counted separately, i.e., the advancement of the Johnson brothers to the hierarchy in 1835 is tabulated as two incidences in the brother column, whereas the advancement of Joseph F. Smith to the hierarchy in 1866 is tabulated as only one in the brother column, since his brother had been made a General Authority previously. Joseph Smith Jr. is excluded from these tabulations, since he was president of the church before a hierarchy was formed.*
ments upon the structure of the hierarchy. Many of the appointees served for less than five years, while others had tenure of more than thirty years. By analyzing the kinship relations of the hierarchy at given points of time throughout its history, it is possible to assess the extent to which kinship affected the composition of the hierarchy. Reducing the fluctuations of hierarchy membership to eleven year intervals allows analysis of the trend of kinship penetration of the Mormon hierarchy. For this analysis, only kinship of a closer degree, second cousin to the nuclear family, is considered (see Table 5).

TABLE 5
PERCENTAGE OF HIERARCHY RELATED AS SECOND COUSIN OR CLOSER TO CURRENT OR FORMER GENERAL AUTHORITIES, 1833-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>First Presidency</th>
<th>Quorum of Twelve</th>
<th>Presiding Patriarch</th>
<th>Council of Seventy</th>
<th>Presiding Bishopric</th>
<th>Total Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1833</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>. . b</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1844</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1855</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1866</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1877</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1888</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1889</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1910</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1921</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1932</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMen holding two positions in the hierarchy at one time (e.g., Hyrum Smith in April 1844, as Assistant President and also Presiding Patriarch) are included in the tabulation for each unit, but counted only once in the total.

bThis symbol indicates that the hierarchical unit was not in existence at the time.
A trend that is immediately apparent and administratively significant in Table 5 is the comparative percentages observable among the several units of the hierarchy. Eliminating the Presiding Patriarch, which was a patrilineal office, the percentages almost exactly reflect the ecclesiastical status of the several quorums. With the exception of 1855 and 1910, the organized First Presidency had the highest percentage of kinship penetration in relation to the other quorums, varying between 33.3% and 100%. Standing next to the First Presidency, both administratively and in percentage of kinship, was the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, with kinship penetration varying between 41.7% and 75.0%. Consistently behind the Quorum of the Twelve in kinship penetration was its ecclesiastical subordinate, the First Council of Seventy, with kinship varying between 14.3% and 57.2%. With the exception of the 1932 period, the Presiding Bishopric consistently had the least percentage of kinship penetration. Allowing for fluctuations within the eleven year intervals, it appears that the degree of kinship penetration in the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932, was a function of ecclesiastical status. In other words, there was an apparently conscious effort to proliferate the hierarchy with kinship appointments at the highest levels of ecclesiastical power, whereas there was generally less concern with making kinship appointments in the lower echelons of the hierarchy.

Another trend demonstrated in Table 5 relates to the chronological progression of kinship within the Mormon hierarchy. From 1844 until the turn of the twentieth century, the mean percentage of kinship penetration was 43.3%, with no observable tendency to increase. By the 1899 period, however, the percentage of kinship stood at 50.0% During the twentieth century down to 1932 the mean percentage had climbed to 62.4%. Since kinship only within the second degree of consanguinity is considered in
Table 5, this increase of 20.0% in the hierarchy's kinship patterns cannot be accounted for by the geometric increase of distant cousin relationships. The only apparent explanation for the increase of the mean percentage is that in the twentieth century, during the presidencies of Joseph F. Smith and Heber J. Grant, the emphasis upon kinship appointments was greater than at any previous time in the history of the Mormon hierarchy.

Acknowledging that kinship relations were a theologically reinforced characteristic of the Mormon hierarchy, there still remains the question of the extent to which the appointment of relatives to the hierarchy created tensions. As previously mentioned, there were not enough vacancies in the hierarchy to allow every General Authority the opportunity of seeing a close relation join him in the presiding councils of the church. It must be assumed, therefore, that a portion of the hierarchy were disappointed that their sons, brothers, or other relations failed to receive such appointments.

Moreover, on one occasion the desire to appoint a near relation disrupted the process by which appointments were made to the hierarchy. In June, 1829, a revelation was announced by Joseph Smith which commanded Oliver Cowdery and David Whitmer, witnesses to the Book of Mormon, to select the men who would comprise the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.¹⁹

The selection they made included no close relation of Joseph Smith, and he countermanded their decision, removing one of the prospective apostles and substituting his brother, William Smith. In a letter to Brigham Young in 1848, Cowdery referred to this incident:

¹⁹*Doctrine and Covenants*, Section 18:26-43, esp. vs. 37.
At the time the Twelve were chosen in Kirtland, and I may say before [this time] it had been manifested that Brother Phineas [H. Young] was entitled to occupy the station as one of the number; but owing to Brother Joseph's urgent request at the time, Brother David and myself yielded to his wish, and consented for William to be selected, contrary to our feelings and judgment, and to our deep mortification ever since.²⁰

Although the incident may be an isolated one, it indicates the extent to which the desire to appoint a relative could cause internal tensions.

Even men who had followed their fathers into the hierarchy sometimes opposed the appointment by other General Authorities of their sons. Apostle Brigham Young, Jr. had been appointed to the hierarchy by his father, the president of the church, and Apostle Heber J. Grant's father had been a counselor to Brigham Young. Nevertheless, in 1897 they both voiced opposition to the possibility that Counselor George Q. Cannon of the First Presidency might appoint one of his sons to the Quorum of the Twelve. Apostle Young recorded their feelings:

Called on Bro. H.J. Grant who seems to be better Bp Empey came in we administered to him [Grant]. He is cheerful but when I touched upon one of Bro Geo Q. C. sons being called to fill vacancy in our quorum he manifested stormy opposition. It is proposed to fill the 2 vacancies in the Twelve at this Conference. I can't see the wisdom of it yet I pray earnestly that I may be one with Prest. C. but I have much to contend with.

Instead of sons of George Q. Cannon, the two vacancies were filled by a son of President Wilford Woodruff and a grandnephew of Wilford Woodruff, by marriage. When he first learned of these appointments by the First Presidency, Apostle Young remarked: "I was much disappointed but prayed God would reconcile me which he did altho' I felt almost rebellious for

²⁰Letter, Oliver Cowdery to Brigham Young, February 27, 1848, quoted in Gunn, Oliver Cowdery, pp. 262-9. Despite this letter, Phineas Young was never appointed to the Quorum of the Twelve.
a few minutes, but Thank God he gave me grace." Notwithstanding theological premises that allowed the appointment of sons and despite personal experience with such appointment, General Authorities could feel disappointment and resentment when somebody else's near relation was appointed to the hierarchy.

It is also important to recognize that the General Authorities themselves felt a certain amount of hesitancy in advancing their sons or other near relatives to the hierarchy. Oliver Cowdery, for example, did not protest against Joseph Smith substituting his brother for Phineas Young in the Quorum of the Twelve, because "Brother Phineas occupied at that time a relation [brother-in-law] to myself that caused me to feel delicate about urging his name." When a vacancy occurred in the Quorum of the Twelve in 1867 due to the rejection of Apostle Amasa Mason Lyman, Brigham Young wanted to replace Lyman with his own son Brigham Jr., but instead he installed Joseph F. Smith as the replacement, waiting until the next vacancy to install Brigham Jr. in the Quorum. Apostle Young explained why his father did this:

Bro. Geo. A. Smith suggested that it might raise a question & comment if B.Y. Jr. was put in, in place of Bro A.M. Lyman apostatized; and if Jos. F.S. was now put in to the Quorum it could make no difference as I B.Y. Jr was ordained an apostle and would take my his place in the Quorum according to that ordination.

This same discomfort about appointing one's sons was also indicated in 1889 when George Q. Cannon assured his son Abraham H. that he had not

---

21Journal of Brigham Young Jr., September 28, 30, October 5, 1897, Church Archives.

22Letter, Cowdery to Young, quoted in Gunn, Oliver Cowdery, p. 268.

23Journal of Brigham Young Jr., April 5, 1900.
suggested that Abraham be appointed to the Quorum of the Twelve. Such hesitancy was more forcibly asserted by Apostle John Henry Smith in his opposition to the appointment of Hyrum M. Smith and George Albert Smith to the Quorum of the Twelve in 1901 and 1903. As late as the 1920's and 1930's President Heber J. Grant had hesitated naming any of his sons-in-law as Presiding Bishop, Apostle, or Presiding Patriarch, and he ultimately decided against so doing, despite strong recommendations from others. These expressions by the General Authorities reflect a recognition that the practice of appointing near relatives to the hierarchy could invite a certain amount of criticism.

The censure which the General Authorities hesitated to invite was the charge of nepotism. The accepted definition of nepotism is: "Favoritism shown to nephews and other relatives (as by giving them positions because of the relationship rather than on their merits)." Even though Mormon theology encouraged the appointment of relatives of General Authorities to the hierarchy, the men themselves felt distinctly uncomfortable about such appointments. When Hyrum M. Smith was voted on by the Quorum of the Twelve as the first apostle to be appointed by his father, President Joseph F. Smith, Apostle John Henry Smith remarked: "... I called attention to the charge that was likely to be made of Nepotism and said I would bear my share of the responsibility and said

24 Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, October 7, 1889, Brigham Young University.
25 Journal of John Henry Smith, October 24, 1901, October 6, 1903.
26 Journal sheets of Heber J. Grant, March 30, April 1, 1932, March 23, 1933, Church Archives.
27 Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, s.v. "nepotism."
I endorsed the selection."²⁸ That nearly half of the appointees to the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932, were closely related to other General Authorities is an established fact (see Table 10), and thus fulfills one essential of the definition of nepotism. Nevertheless, it is by no means certain that familial relationship was the primary basis on which such appointments were made, nor can it be demonstrated, as implied by the accepted definition of nepotism, that such appointees to the Mormon hierarchy were otherwise unqualified for the positions they received.

The first objection to the use of the term "nepotism" to describe the appointments to the Mormon hierarchy involves the motivation of the men who made the appointments. Motivation is an elusive problem which has confounded jurists no less than historians. Although kinship connections might have been a consideration in the appointment of some men, the Mormon leadership sought divine guidance as a means of making appointments to the hierarchy. The response of Apostle John Henry Smith to such a kinship appointment is instructive:

President Jos F Smith said to me tonight that the mind of the spirit was that my son George Albert should fill the vacancy in the Apostles. I told him was it a political office I would advise against it but I could not stand in the way of the suggestions of the spirit to him.²⁹

Although it is impossible to assert, in view of the evidence, that kinship was not a factor in choosing appointees to the Mormon hierarchy, it may not have been the deciding factor.

The second objection to the use of the word "nepotism" with

²⁸Journal of John Henry Smith, October 24, 1901.
²⁹Ibid., October 4, 1903.
reference to the Mormon hierarchy is the implication of the term that, aside from kinship connections, these men were unqualified to have positions in the hierarchy. One fact might seem to support such a conclusion: of the twenty-five men who were under thirty years of age at their appointment to the hierarchy, 1832-1932, nineteen of them (76.0%) were sons, brothers, or nephews of General Authorities. The significance of this statistic, however, is not a function of the age of the appointees, but rather of what constitutes qualification for membership in the Mormon hierarchy. The question was perhaps best answered in a dialogue in 1859 between Apostle Orson Pratt and President Brigham Young concerning men to be ordained apostles:

0. Pratt—"I would like to know on what principle men are to be selected: whether we are to suggest men of experience who have been tried and proven in many responsible positions, or those who are young, & have not been called to important trusts in the church, or if any qualifications are necessary needed."

Pres. Y.—"I will answer your question Bro. Pratt to my own satisfaction. If a man was suggested to me of good natural judgment, possessing no higher qualifications than faithfulness and humility enough to seek to the Lord for all his knowledge and who would trust in him for his strength I would prefer him in preference to the learned and talented."

The instructions given by Oliver Cowdery to the apostles in 1835 also indicated that serving in the highest echelons of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was independent of age, experience, or training, but inextricably involved one's personal experiences with God.31

The term "nepotism" seems fundamentally inappropriate, both in its usage and in its negative connotations, as a description of the family-oriented appointments of the Mormon hierarchy. A genealogist came closer

---


to describing the situation in its proper context by referring to the LDS General Authorities as a "Race of Religious Leaders."\textsuperscript{32} A term that seems to accurately describe the significance of kinship connections within the hierarchy is "Mormon dynasticism." Among the conventional definitions of dynasty are the following:

\textit{a group or class of individuals having power or authority in some sphere of activity and able to choose their successors. . . a family that establishes and maintains predominance in a particular field of endeavor for generations.}\textsuperscript{33}

Such a definition applies to the Mormon hierarchy with the following qualifications: no single, nuclear family controlled hierarchy, but instead a family involving nuclear and extended kinship connections; the dynasticism of the Mormon hierarchy did not prevent the appointment of men who had no kinship connections with other General Authorities. A further characteristic of Mormon dynasticism with respect to the hierarchy is that marriage connections reinforced the kinship relationships and also allied to the hierarchial dynasty General Authorities who had no kinship connections with the hierarchy.

\textbf{Marriage}

The emphasis on the significance of kinship inevitably influenced Mormon thinking on marriage. During the 1830's, when Mormons began considering the eternal importance and responsibilities of kinship, they also considered the possibility that marriage as an institution might also have significance in the eternal worlds. The possibility of marriage relationships existing in heaven was suggested as early as 1835 by William W.

\textsuperscript{32}Bennett, Saviors on Mount Zion, p. 85.

\textsuperscript{33}Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, s.v. "dynasty."
Phelps, prominent Mormon editor and church officer in Missouri:

We shall by and by learn that we were with God in another world, and had our agency: that we came into this world and have our agency, in order that we may prepare ourselves for a kingdom of glory; become archangels, even the sons of God where the man is neither without the woman, nor the woman without the man in the Lord... 34

More than five years later, Joseph Smith in Nauvoo began teaching that the divine form of marriage "sealed" couples together for eternity, and that following death such sealed couples continued the marriage relation. In this regard, at Nauvoo the practice began of sealing couples "for time and eternity." 35

Implicit within the doctrine of eternal marriage, however, was a concept far more revolutionary. If a man was sealed to a woman who later died, and later he was similarly sealed for time and eternity to another woman, theologically these ordinances of sealing would give him two wives with whom he would share the eternities. Moreover, the earthly counterpart of this other-worldly polygyny was supported by numerous biblical precedents. 36 Given the LDS penchant for regarding Mormonism as the restoration of all ancient truths and practices of God's people, it is not too surprising that polygyny (or more simply, polygamy) became a part of the latter-day restoration.

Although some people question whether Joseph Smith was in fact

34Latter Day Saints' Messenger and Advocate, I (June, 1835), 130. Emphasis added.

35Testimony of Jason W. Briggs, Complainant's Abstract of Pleading and Evidence, In the Circuit Court of the United States, Western District of Missouri, Western Division at Kansas City. The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, Complainant, vs. the Church of Christ at Independence, Missouri... (Lamoni, Iowa: Herald Publishing House, 1893), p. 399; Flanders, Nauvoo, pp. 267-268.

36Genesis 16:1-3; Genesis 29:23-8; Genesis 30:3-4, 9-10; Exodus 21:10; Deuteronomy 21:15; Judges 8:30; II Samuel 12:7-8.
responsible for the introduction of polygamy in Mormonism, there is evidence that plural marriage in theory was one of the earliest developments of Mormonism. In 1830, The Book of Mormon had contained many injunctions against polygamy. Nevertheless, this book of new scripture provided the theological basis for even a latter-day resumption of polygamy: "For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise, they shall hearken unto these things."37 Within the year Joseph Smith apparently dictated a revelation which encompassed the possibility of men marrying more wives than one. An early defector from Mormonism, Ezra Booth, wrote in 1831 that this revelation commanded married men who were sent as missionaries to the American Indians to take Indian women as wives.38 One of these missionaries, William W. Phelps, subsequently confirmed that Smith had given such a revelation in 1830.39 Orson Pratt also said he learned of the revelation on polygamy in 1832.40 Since polygamy existed as a theoretical possibility from the very inception of the church, it is not surprising that the theory was later translated into practice.

Although there is evidence that both Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery married plural wives during the 1830's in Ohio,41 polygamy as a

---


38 Letter of Ezra Booth in Ohio Star, December 8, 1831.

39 Letter of William W. Phelps to Brigham Young, August 10, 1861, Church Archives.

40 Journal of Discourses, XIII, 192 (discourse delivered on October 7, 1869).

practice among the Mormon membership began in the 1840's at Nauvoo, Illinois. On April 5, 1841, Joseph Smith was formally, albeit secretly, married to Louisa Beaman. This is traditionally regarded as the first plural marriage ceremony ever performed in the Mormon church. The total number of plural wives Joseph married polygamously is not immediately evident, but a semi-official list provided by an LDS historian included the names of twenty-seven women. That list apparently is not complete, and other researchers have provided lists of additional women who may have been sealed to Joseph Smith as wives prior to his death in 1844.

The protective secrecy that surrounded the practice of polygamy in Nauvoo has continued to obscure, even today, many of the details of this early departure of Mormonism from western norms of marriage. Not only are the numbers of Smith's wives an unanswered question, but the number and identity of children born to these polygamous unions has remained in obscurity. One of the women who was sealed to Joseph Smith during his lifetime stated that three children were born to Joseph Smith of these polygamous marriages. Joseph Smith dictated a revelation on polygamy in 1843, and began urging his close associates in the hierarchy to marry plural wives. Once the Mormons were established securely in Utah,
polygamy was publicly acknowledged in 1852 and was an integral facet of Mormon society of the West until a federal campaign against polygamy resulted in a public abandonment of polygamy in 1890.

With reference to the role of polygamy in the family structure of the hierarchy, it is necessary to recognize that not all General Authorities were polygamists. During the latter years of Joseph Smith's life, the Quorum of the Twelve began secretly promoting plural marriage under the direction of Joseph Smith, but the practice did not begin to proliferate to the general membership of the church until after 1844. Even following the increase of polygamy within the church, monogamists continued to be advanced to the hierarchy throughout the history of the Mormon Church (see Table 6).

The statistical impression of Table 6 needs to be qualified, however. Although 69.1% of the total appointments to the hierarchy were monogamists at the time of their appointment, it is the nineteenth century context that is most relevant to the question. The men appointed by Joseph Smith prior to 1843 joined the hierarchy at a time that polygamy was just being introduced, and those appointed in the twentieth century were living in a period in which polygamy was no longer an official practice of Mormonism. Therefore, the appointments between 1845 and 1899 reflect more accurately the distribution of monogamists and polygamists advanced to the hierarchy at a time when Mormon society was polygamous. During the nineteenth century after 1844, only 19 appointees (35.2%) were monogamists at the time of their advancement to the Mormon hierarchy. That a preference was obviously made for choosing polygamists is clear from the fact that the percentage of monogamists in Mormon society of the nineteenth century has
TABLE 6
INCIDENCE OF MONOGAMISTS AND POLYGAMISTS
APPOINTED TO THE HIERARCHY, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Monogamist Appointees</th>
<th>Polygamist Appointees</th>
<th>Total Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

been estimated to have been between 80% and 90%. Despite their statistical minority, polygamists were far more likely to be advanced to the hierarchy during the nineteenth century.

This trend was encouraged by the president of the church putting pressure upon the monogamist leadership of the church to enter polygamy. At the inception of the practice of plural marriage among the Mormons, Joseph Smith told the apostles that they must enter the practice or the Kingdom of God could not advance. When the membership of the church seemed slack in their general religious devotion, the First Presidency launched a reformation in 1855-7, during which much emphasis was placed upon entering into polygamy. When the federal government threatened to suppress polygamy by punitive legislation, LDS President John Taylor launched a religious counter-attack: in 1882 he dictated a revelation

---


46 Journal of Discourses, XI, 221 (discourse by John Taylor on April 7, 1866).
stating that all officers in the priesthood must enter into polygamy, and in 1884 he urged monogamists to resign their ecclesiastical offices in the church.47

Although ten of the monogamists who were advanced to the hierarchy, 1845-1899, married plural wives eventually, several General Authorities took years to do so despite the social and ecclesiastical pressure. Prominent among the early appointees who procrastinated their entry into polygamy were the Presiding Patriarch John Smith (b. 1832), who waited exactly two years after his ordination to marry a plural wife, and President of Seventy Jedediah M. Grant, who delayed more than three years. Even more interesting was the fact that despite President John Taylor's public demands for presiding officers to be polygamists, he advanced five monogamists to the hierarchy (Heber J. Grant, Seymour B. Young, John Q. Cannon, John W. Taylor, and William W. Taylor), one of whom, John W. Taylor, waited four years to enter polygamy. The last monogamist appointee to enter polygamy was Abraham Owen Woodruff, who became an apostle in 1897 and married a plural wife in 1901. With the exception of Apostle Anthon H. Lund, all of the pre-1890 appointees who remained monogamists had relatively short tenure in the hierarchy after polygamy became a practice in the 1840's (see Table 7). Lund was an exception that proved the rule, because as a monogamist he was appointed to the hierarchy only a year before the LDS Church publicly abandoned polygamy.

Although the practice of polygamy by the General Authorities multiplied the possibility of in-law relationships within the hierarchy, a phenomenon developed that has tended to obscure familial interrelation-

TABLE 7
LENGTH OF TIME BEFORE MONOGAMIST GENERAL AUTHORITIES ENTERED POLYGAMY 1845-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Appointment</th>
<th>0-1 Year</th>
<th>1-2 Years</th>
<th>2-3 Years</th>
<th>3-4 Years</th>
<th>Never during Tenure</th>
<th>Total Monogamists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Appointments prior to 1845 are not included since they antedated the establishment of polygamy as an institution in Mormonism.

ships created by polygamous marriages. Not all of the wives who were married or sealed to General Authorities are presently recognized as being wives of these men, even though the data of their sealings/marriages seem to be conclusive. More than twenty of the General Authorities were married to such lesser known wives. To analyze the marriage interrelationships within the hierarchy without including these lesser known wives is to ignore in-law and other marriage connections that were significant.

In relation to these lesser known wives, it has been suggested that the ordinance of sealing a living man and woman did not always involve the physical union of marriage, but instead was regarded as solemnizing a spiritual union that had reference only to life after death.48 Such an interpretation can be supported by several evidences. For example,

it was common practice in the nineteenth century Mormon Church for men to be sealed to deceased women. Obviously in these sealings to living men, there was no possibility of marriage in a literal sense, but only in a spiritual sense. Moreover, even when the sealing involved a living man and woman, literal marriage was not always regarded as incumbent upon the participants in the ceremony. On one occasion, Heber C. Kimball is reported to have remarked that he had not seen some of the women who were sealed to him since the day the ordinance had occurred. 49
Moreover, at least one of the plural wives of Joseph Smith specified that she had been sealed to him "for Eternity," thus precluding the actuality of a marriage relation during his life. Thus, the sealing of living couples in the Mormon Church may not always have been synonymous with marriage in its conventional form. 50

Although these lesser-known wives may not have been wives in the strict understanding of that term, there is sufficient evidence that these sealings were significant in the familial relationships of those who entered them. Brigham Young, for example, is credited officially (and by his descendants) with twenty-seven wives, ten of whom are classed as wives "for eternity only" or "in name only." This classification is applied to his wives who bore him no children, apparently based upon the questionable assumption that childlessness necessarily presupposes a lack of physical union. 51 Nevertheless, since ten of the twenty-seven recognized wives of Brigham Young are classed as wives "in name only,"


50Lightner, Remarks, Addendum, p. 7.

51Mabel Young Sanborn, Brigham Young's Wives, Children and Grandchildren (Salt Lake City, Utah: By the Author, 1940).
it would therefore seem consistent to regard as his wives all the fifty-five women who have been conclusively identified as married and/or sealed to Brigham Young.52 That these lesser known wives of Brigham Young sustained a relationship to him that was considered significant within the family structure is apparent by the fact that the families of some of these lesser known wives regarded Brigham Young as the husband of these women. Some of these lesser known wives took steps to obtain formal divorces from Brigham Young.53

What is true of the lesser known wives of Brigham Young is no less true of the lesser known wives of other General Authorities. Therefore, in establishing the family interrelationships within the Mormon hierarchy, no effort will be made to distinguish between those women who were wives in fact and those who were merely sealed. The fact that an ordinance connected a living man and woman in a special matrimonial way will be regarded as sufficient evidence of an interrelationship between the families of the two individuals.

A non-kinship characteristic of Mormon family structure has yet to be discussed. Called the Law of Adoption, it involved adopting persons into one's spiritual family. Although not a literal process by which fatherless children were adopted into other families, in a symbolic

52 John J. Stewart, Brigham Young and His Wives and the True Story of Plural Marriage (Salt Lake City, Utah: Mercury Publishing Co., 1961), pp. 84-96. Stewart's information is based upon records of the LDS Genealogical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah. In addition, I have verified two more sealing marriages of Brigham Young and have obtained complete information of parents' identity, duration of sealings/marriages, etc. about these and other lesser known wives of General Authorities.

53 See the following Family Group Sheets at LDS Genealogical Society: Joshua S. Holman for daughter Rebecca Greenleaf Holman, and Theodore Turley, for daughter Mary Ann Turley. Family Group Sheets contain vital statistics for specific nuclear families, comprised of husband, wife, and children.
and spiritual sense that is exactly what happened. In order to complete the chain of family interconnections back to God the Father, grown men were spiritually adopted in a special ordinance to prominent church leaders. If the adopted man was a head of a family of wife and children, the entire family was considered adopted to the spiritual parent, often an apostle. In 1894 President Wilford Woodruff described the operation of the Law of Adoption up to that date:

In the commencement of adopting men and women in the Temple at Nauvoo, a great many persons were adopted to different man who were not of the lineage of their fathers... When I went before the Lord to know who I should be adopted to (we were then being adopted to prophets and apostles) the Spirit of God said to me, "Have you not a father, who begot you?" "Yes, I have." I was adopted to my father, and should have had my father sealed to his father, and so on back; and the duty that I want every man who presides over a Temple to see performed from this day henceforth and forever, unless the Lord Almighty commands otherwise, is, let every man be adopted to his father. When a man receives the endowments, adopt him to his father; not to Wilford Woodruff, nor to any other man outside the lineage of his fathers. 54

For fifty years prior to this announcement men were adopted to the apostles and other prominent men. These adoptions were not regarded lightly by the persons involved, and adopted sons and families considered themselves under the dominion and protection of their adopted father. Oftentimes such spiritually adopted sons assumed the surname of their adopted father as their own even though they themselves were grown men with large families. 55

54 Deseret Evening News, April 14, 1894, p. 9 (discourse delivered April 8, 1894).

Although adoptions unquestionably extended the family relationships for individual General Authorities, the law of adoption had a negligible effect upon the family interrelationships within the hierarchy. The apostles were considered as the temporal apex of the system of adoption, so they were not adopted to each other. When adoptions occurred between current General Authorities, they occurred between, rather than within, the echelons of the hierarchy, and merely served to reinforce pre-existing kinship connections. For example, Albert P. Rockwood, a President of Seventy, became Apostle Brigham Young's adopted son, but was also his fourth cousin.

Unlike kinship and marriage connections, adoptions had no observable influence upon appointments to the hierarchy. Apparently the only adopted son of a living General Authority to be advanced to the hierarchy was Apostle George Q. Cannon, who had been adopted to Apostle John Taylor in Nauvoo. Cannon was already, however, the nephew of Taylor's first wife, making his status as adopted son a reinforcement of his position as Taylor's nephew by marriage. Two other apostles were adopted sons of the deceased Prophet Joseph Smith: George Teasdale, through an adoption ordinance, and Heber J. Grant who considered himself an adopted son of Joseph Smith because his mother had been sealed by proxy to the deceased prophet. The practice of adoption in Mormonism has importance in the social structure of the Mormon community, but has little demonstrable significance in the family relationships between LDS General Authorities.

Having discussed the characteristics of non-kinship family structure in Mormonism, the task remains to analyze the impact of marriage relationships within the hierarchy. As convoluted as were the kinship relationships, the interrelationships in the hierarchy resulting from marriage are far more complex. With the practice of
polygamy, the total number of fathers-in-law, mothers-in-saw, sisters-in-law, and brothers-in-law of a General Authority frequently exceeded one hundred persons. Some General Authorities (e.g. Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball) had literally several hundred in-laws. The large numbers of children born to the General Authorities (see Table 1) also provided a source for scores of additional marriage ties as the children married, often to kin of other General Authorities. Whereas the geometric increase of kinship relations attained sizeable proportions only with the passage of several generations, Mormon marriage patterns allowed a man within his lifetime to become aligned to an entire community. The resulting labyrinth of marriage ties almost defies analysis, but a starting point is the marriage alliances General Authorities sustained at their entry into the hierarchy (see Table 8).

A comparison of Table 8 with Table 2 indicates that the influence of marriage ties upon new appointees was similar to the kinship relations new appointees sustained to current General Authorities. More important in comparing these two charts is the fact that they do not represent mutually exclusive data. Those who had kinship relations were often-times also connected by marriage to current General Authorities, therefore the figures in the two charts cannot simply be added together to determine the total number of men who were connected by marriage or kinship to current General Authorities. To assess the independent influence of marriage ties upon new appointees, it is necessary to discuss the appointment of men who had no family connection with the hierarchy aside from marriage ties (see Table 9).

Comparing the data of Tables 8 and 9 with that of Table 3 demonstrates that the kinship relations of the newly appointed General Authorities, 1832-1932, were far more significant than the marriage
TABLE 8
MARRIAGE TIES TO CURRENT GENERAL AUTHORITIES
BY APPOINTEE AT APPOINTMENT, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father-in-law</th>
<th>Son-in-law</th>
<th>Brother-in-law</th>
<th>Married to a Sister-in-law</th>
<th>Stepson</th>
<th>Stepbrother</th>
<th>Nephew by Marriage</th>
<th>Grandnephew by Marriage</th>
<th>Cousin Relation to Wife of a General Authority</th>
<th>Other Marriage Ties</th>
<th>Total Marriage Ties</th>
<th>Living General Authorities</th>
<th>Total Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶When an appointee sustained more than one marriage tie to General Authorities, only the closest degree will be tabulated, e.g., George Q. Cannon at his appointment was a nephew of Apostle John Taylor, and was also married to a relative of Apostle Franklin D. Richards, but is tabulated as a nephew.

Joseph Smith Jr. is not included in this tabulation.

relations. The total number of men with kinship connections to former or current General Authorities was more than two times that of those with marriage connections alone. Moreover, the kinship relations existing at the time of advancement were of a proportionally closer degree than those of marriage. Forty-five (78.9%) of the kinship relations at the time of advancement were within the second degree of consanguinity, whereas in Table 8 only twenty-three (40.4%) of the marriage ties at the time of advancement were within that level of affinity. Although marriage ties were less significant than kinship, the combined effect of marriage and kinship relationships gave a tremendous familial character to the
TABLE 9
MARRIAGE TIES TO CURRENT OR FORMER GENERAL AUTHORITIES
BY MEN WHO HAD NO CLOSE KINSHIP TIES
AT APPOINTMENT, 1832-1932a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Father-in-law</th>
<th>Son-in-law</th>
<th>Brother-in-law</th>
<th>Married to a Sister-in-Law of a General Authority</th>
<th>Stepson</th>
<th>Stepbrother</th>
<th>Nephew by Marriage</th>
<th>Grandnephew by Marriage</th>
<th>Cousin in relation to Wife of a General Authority</th>
<th>Other Marriage Ties to General Authorities</th>
<th>Total Marriage Ties to General Authorities, Former and Current</th>
<th>Total Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44b</td>
<td>44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>416</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThis eliminates Lorenzo Snow and Erastus Snow who were 5th cousins, once removed, besides having a brother-in-law relation to other General Authorities.

bJoseph Smith Jr. is not included in this tabulation.

appointments, 1832-1932 (see Table 10).

Table 10 provides an index for the extent to which family associations permeated appointments to the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932. As was discussed with reference to the significance of kinship relations, the extent of preexisting family relationships for the newly appointed General Authorities should not be construed into a post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy of logic. Merely because a large percentage of the appointees were related to other General Authorities does not warrant the conclusion that the appointments derived from the family associations. Nevertheless it cannot be dismissed as coincidence that of the appointees to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>First Degree</th>
<th>Second Degree</th>
<th>Third Degree</th>
<th>Total Relationships</th>
<th>Total Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832-44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878-88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each degree of family relationship shall be considered mutually exclusive with reference to each appointee. Although a man often fell into all three categories, he will be tabulated only in the degree of closest family ties, beginning with the first degree.

First degree: father, son, brother, nephew, uncle, first cousin, step-father, step-son, brother-in-law (including situations where two men marry sisters), son-in-law, father-in-law, and first cousin or nephew of a wife of a General Authority.

Second degree: grandson, grandnephew, first cousin, once removed, second cousin, grandnephew of wife of General Authority, the situation where an appointee's wife is a granddaughter of a General Authority, the situation where an appointee had married a former wife of a General Authority, and situation where the children of the appointee have married children of one of the General Authorities.

Third degree: distant cousin relationship and distant marriage ties.

Mormon hierarchy, 83 (67.5%) sustained some kind of family association to other General Authorities and 60 (48.8%) were related within the first degree, as defined in Table 10. During only two periods (1832-44 and 1911-21) did the percentage of first degree appointments drop below 32% and during three periods (1856-66, 1867-77, 1922-32) the percentage of first degree appointments lay between 75% and 100%. The fact that the percentage of such appointments was at nearly the lowest point during 1832-44 suggests that the founding prophet of the church put
less emphasis on such family-related appointments than did his successors (see Table 11).

### TABLE 11

DEGREE OF TOTAL FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS
BY APPOINTEES OF LDS PRESIDENTS, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>First Degree</th>
<th>Second Degree</th>
<th>Third Degree</th>
<th>Total Relationships</th>
<th>Total Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Smith</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilford Woodruff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Snow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph F. Smith</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber J. Grant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Table 10 for definition of degrees. Whether these men presided over the church as president of the Quorum of the Twelve or president of the church, the appointments are regarded as deriving from them.*

Table 11 confirms the statistical impression of previous tables that although Joseph Smith began the emphasis on familial appointments, his successors amplified that emphasis. By focusing only on appointments of the first degree of family connection this development is most clearly demonstrated. Whereas 29.5% of Joseph Smith's appointments reflected the first degree of family connections, as defined in Table 10, such appointments by his successors never fell below 40.0%. Family related appointments to the hierarchy were at their highest under the presidencies of Brigham Young and John Taylor, reaching a peak of 66.7% during the latter's administration of the church.

Although there was a twenty percent slump in such appointments during the decade of Wilford Woodruff's administration, the three following presidents of the church down to 1932 made 50.0% or more of their
appointments within the first degree of family relations. This
dynastic character of appointments to the Mormon hierarchy was further
demonstrated by the proportion of appointees who were related to the
president of the church or his counselors (see Table 12).

**TABLE 12**

**APPOINTEES TO THE HIERARCHY, 1832-1932, WHO WERE RELATED BY KINSHIP OR MARRIAGE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH OR HIS COUNSELORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Degree</th>
<th>Second Degree</th>
<th>Third Degree</th>
<th>Total Relationships</th>
<th>Total Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Taylor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilford Woodruff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Snow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph F. Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber J. Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the same general trends observable in the previous table also apply to Table 12, there are some differences in the proportions. As with the earlier table, the appointees of Joseph Smith related to himself or his counselors (11.4%) were lower than such appointments by any of his successors. Also similar to the previous table, the percentage of such appointments was highest during the administrations of Brigham Young and John Taylor, although Young rather than Taylor has the distinction of making the highest proportion of such appointments (32.1%). Of greater interest is the fact that following the administration of Brigham Young there was a positive downward trend in the appointment of General Authorities who were related to the president of the church or his counselors. This is most observable in the administration of Lorenzo Snow who refused to appoint one of his sons to the Quorum of the Twelve despite the insistence of several of the
apostles to do so. One of those who favored such an appointment, Brigham Young Jr., recorded the response to his suggestions in 1898:

Some suggestions made to fill the quorum of 12. I seemed to have made a blunder in suggestion all things being equal I would love to see President Snow represented in the 12. Afterwards His Counsellors took me to task for such an unwise suggestion said it placed Pres. S. in a very embarassing position. I could not see it.

Snow's disinclination was not shared by his successor, Joseph F. Smith, who made 22.2% of his appointments from among the first degree relations of himself or his counselors, but nevertheless the trend was still downward from the administrations of Young and Taylor. Moreover, the first fourteen years of the administration of Smith's successor, Heber J. Grant, represented a further decline in such appointments, approaching the level established by the founding prophet.

The family interrelationships of the General Authorities did not end with a man's appointment to the hierarchy, however. The introduction of polygamy by Joseph Smith added a dimension to Mormon dynasticism unavailable to virtually every other dynastic order of the Western world. Through polygamous marriages, a Mormon General Authority could marry the close relatives of his associates in the hierarchy, thus reinforcing preexisting kinship connections and also introducing into the hierarchical family other General Authorities who were otherwise unrelated.

Apparently Joseph Smith began this process about 1837 when he married Fanny Alger, the niece of Levi W. Hancock, a member of the First Council of Seventy. After a lull of three or four years, Joseph Smith married at least thirty additional wives between 1841 and 1844, among whom were numbered close relatives of at least seven General Authorities. In 1842, he married the widows of Presiding Bishop Vinson

---

Journal of Brigham Young Jr., October 5, 1898.
Knight and President of Seventy, Lyman R. Sherman. In 1843 he married a daughter of Apostle Heber C. Kimball, a sister-in-law of Apostle Parley P. Pratt, two stepdaughters of President of Seventy, Josiah Butterfield, and sisters of Apostles Brigham Young and Willard Richards. He also allied himself to the ecclesiastically prominent first bishops of the church, Edward Partridge and Newel K. Whitney, in marriages to their daughters.\(^{57}\) Some of his proposals were unsuccessful, as for example his proposal to the daughter of his first counselor Sidney Rigdon was rejected.\(^{58}\) Moreover, Joseph Smith also proposed spiritual marriage, for eternity only, to the wives of several of his close associates in the hierarchy, among whom apparently were first counselor William Law, Apostles Heber C. Kimball, John Taylor, Orson Hyde, and perhaps others.\(^{59}\) Joseph Smith's practice of marrying relatives of other General Authorities established a precedent that was followed by others after their own advancement to the hierarchy (see Table 13).

A final means by which the hierarchy reinforced its dynasticism was through the marriages of the children and other relatives of General Authorities to relatives of other members of the hierarchy. This

---


\(^{58}\) McKiernan, Sidney Rigdon, pp. 115-9.

### Table 13

**GENERAL AUTHORITIES WHO MARRIED**
**RELATIVES OF OTHER GENERAL AUTHORITIES, 1837-1885**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President of Church/ Presiding Apostle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor to President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of Twelve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Council of Seventy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total men in each Category</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*The years represent the first occasion and the last occasion on which a General Authority married the relative of an other member of the hierarchy. The Mormon Church publicly abandoned polygamy in 1890, making it less feasible for a member of the hierarchy to marry relatives of other General Authorities.

*b*Numbers represent the total members of each ecclesiastical group who married a particular kind of relative of another General Authority. The categories of relatives are not mutually exclusive in this chart, since one General Authority often married sisters, daughters, nieces, etc. of other members of the hierarchy.

Intermarriage of relatives of the General Authorities occurred on virtually every level of kinship conceivable, and is too complex to be comprehended through a diagram or chart. By selecting one type of such marriage, however, it is at least possible to suggest the nature of such additional family ties (see Table 14).

Marriages between children of General Authorities had the obvious effect of uniting the respective members of the hierarchy in a significant way. This is not to say that there was a lack of significance to the many marriages between nephews or nieces of General Authorities and
TABLE 14
CHILDREN OF LIVING GENERAL AUTHORITIES
WHO MARRIED CHILDREN OF OTHER GENERAL AUTHORITIES,
LIVING OR DEAD, 1843-1926a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of Living Fathers</th>
<th>President of Church</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
<th>Patriarch</th>
<th>Quorum of Twelve</th>
<th>First Council of Seventy</th>
<th>Presiding Bishop</th>
<th>Counselors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President of Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of Twelve</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Council of 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the inclusive years within this study that children of current General Authorities married children of other General Authorities, living or dead.

This chart does not account for children of deceased General Authorities who married children of other deceased General Authorities.

...
J: No, he was very serious. These two men, Grandfather Smith and Grandfather Grant, were very close in the councils of the Church and had often talked about having one of their children marry. They saw this as the golden opportunity, I guess, and were both promoting it (laughter). So it wasn’t long after that that they were married. 60

Although such "arranged" marriages may have been infrequent among children of General Authorities, they were but another extension of Mormon dynasticism, all of which resulted in the hierarchy being unquestionably an extended family (see Table 15).

### Table 15

PERCENTAGE OF HIERARCHY RELATED WITHIN SECOND DEGREE OF TOTAL FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER GENERAL AUTHORITIES, LIVING OR DEAD, 1832-1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>First Presidency</th>
<th>Quorum of Twelve</th>
<th>Presiding Patriarch</th>
<th>Council of Seventy</th>
<th>Presiding Bishopric</th>
<th>Total Hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1833</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1844</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1855</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1866</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1877</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1888</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1899</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1910</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1921</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1932</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMen holding two positions in the hierarchy at one time (e.g. Hyrum Smith in April 1844, as Assistant President and also Presiding Patriarch) are included in the tabulation for each unit, but counted only once in the total. The two degrees of total family relationships are as follows: First degree: father, son, brother, nephew, uncle, first cousin, stepfather, step-son, brother-in-law (including situation where two men marry sisters), son-in-law, father-in-law, and first cousin or nephew of a wife of a General Authority; Second Degree: grandson, grandnephew, first cousin, once removed, second cousin, grandnephew of wife of General Authority, the situation where children of the appointee have married children of one of the General Authorities, the situation of an appointee having married a former wife of a General Authority, and the situation in which the appointee's wife is a granddaughter of a General Authority.

bThis symbol indicates that the hierarchical unit was not in existence at the time.

---

60Florence Smith Jacobsen, Interview, interviewed by Gary Shumway, August 24, 1972, p. 6, Oral History Program, Church Archives.
Conclusions

The appearance of these intricate kinship and marriage connections within the Mormon hierarchy might be disconcerting to some people, but they were only a logical extension of the theological framework of Mormonism with respect to the family. In the Mormon view all humanity was the family of God; but through the covenant of the latter days, the Mormons had the responsibility of joining together on earth those who had experienced the new covenant of the Restoration of God's church. The heads of these spiritually organized families were kings and priests, queens and priestesses to their nuclear and extended families. Moreover, within the hierarchy, these marriage and kinship interrelationships may have had the purpose of providing additional unity, stability and loyalty which, presumably, the hierarchical family would achieve. Thus, the interwoven and replicating family relationships within the Mormon hierarchy may have been intended to produce an ecclesiastical Gordian knot of dynastic loyalties that could never be unraveled without destroying the entire organization.

There were limits, however, to the influence of family ties in the Mormon hierarchy. Even the closest family ties were not an assurance against friction and schism, as the periodic rebellion of Apostle William Smith against his brothers and cousins demonstrated. Moreover, extensive connections of kinship and marriage did not save General Authorities from being disciplined or rejected for unacceptable conduct, as the excommunications of William Smith (brother of President Joseph Smith), Amasa Lyman (brother-in-law of President Brigham Young), Albert Carrington (father-in-law of Apostle Brigham Young, Jr.) and John Q. Cannon (son of Counselor George Q. Cannon) demonstrate. In addition, just as being related to
a valiant General Authority did not assure one a place in the hierarchy, so also being closely related to a General Authority who had disgraced himself in the eyes of the hierarchy did not prevent capable men from being advanced to the hierarchy, as is demonstrated by the appointments of Henry Harriman (brother-in-law of excommunicated Apostle John F. Boynton), Jedediah M. Grant (brother-in-law of excommunicated Apostle William Smith), and Francis M. Lyman (son of excommunicated Apostle Francis M. Lyman). Although family connections may have been important in the appointment and interrelationships of the General Authorities, the overriding consideration to enter and remain in the hierarchy was personal worthiness. Without being venal nor pernicious, dynasticism in the Mormon hierarchy was a demonstration of theology, personal inclination, and administrative protectiveness.
CHAPTER III

ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE HIERARCHY

The theological preoccupation of Mormonism with economics became evident almost from the inception of the movement. Prominent within the 1830 Book of Mormon narrative was the description of ancient American members of "the Church" becoming materially wealthy through their righteousness:

And now because of the steadiness of the Church, they began to be exceeding rich; having abundance of flocks, and herds, and fatlings of every kind, and also abundance of grain, and of gold, and of silver, and of precious things. . . . and thus they did prosper and become far more wealthy, than those who did not belong to their Church.¹

Since virtually all early converts to Mormonism were within the Protestant tradition and had imbibed its work ethic within the Puritan legacy of America, such statements from the purportedly ancient Book of Mormon were both descriptive of things past and predictive of things hoped for. Leonard Arrington, LDS economic historian, has noted that more than twenty-seven percent of the content of Smith's revelations dealt with economic matters.²

As developed within these revelations, the Mormon work ethic was communitarian rather than individualistic, and socialistic rather than


entrepreneurial or capitalistic. One of the earliest documents of this
type, dictated in January 1831, began by promising riches to the Latter-
day Saints, but emphasized the unrighteousness of material inequality
that created and perpetuated a poor class. The revelation continued with
a parable about a father who would clothe some of his sons in robes and
others in rags, concluding with the admonition: "I say unto you, be one;
and if ye are not one, ye are not mine." Subsequent pronouncements
outlined the essential facets of Mormon economic theory: that the Latter-
day Saints were a gathered community of believers, that all things
belonged to God and therefore it was the duty of the saints to regard
themselves as stewards of God's property rather than as owners and profiteers
and that through frugality, unity, and cooperation the saints would build
an equalitarian Kingdom of God on earth.

Despite the equalitarian emphasis of numerous revelations by
Joseph Smith, there were also specific indications that is was God's
desire to make special provisions for the leaders of the latter-day church
who devoted their full time to its welfare. Mormonism's "revealed"
formula of economics was that the distributors of Mormon wealth should
"appoint unto this people their portion, every man equal according to
their families, according to their circumstances and their wants and
needs." Nevertheless, the "wants and needs" of the church leadership

---

Doctrine and Covenants, p. 119. Cf. Section 38:16-27 in recent
Utah editions.

The most cogent analysis of Mormon economic theory is Arrington's
Great Basin Kingdom, pp. 3-35. While Arrington's work is the finest
economic analysis of Mormon communitarianism after the Mormon exodus
to the Great Basin in 1847, the best analysis of the social and intellec-
tual context of pre-1847 Mormon communitarianism is DePillis, "The
Development of Mormon Communitarianism, 1826-1846."

Doctrine and Covenants, p. 150. Cf. Section 51:3 in recent Utah
editions.
were regarded as of a different dimension than those of the regular membership:

... I the Lord have appointed them and ordained them to be stewards over the revelations, and commandments which I have given unto them, and which I shall hereafter give unto them; and an account of this stewardship will I require of them in the day of judgment: wherefore I have appointed unto them, and this is their business in the church of God, to manage them and the concerns thereof, yea, the benefits thereof.

... He who is appointed to administer spiritual things, the same is worthy of his hire, even as those who are appointed to a stewardship, to administer in temporal things; yea, even more abundantly, which abundance is multiplied unto them through the manifestations of the Spirit: nevertheless, in your temporal things you shall be equal, and this not grudgingly, otherwise the abundance of the manifestations of the Spirit, shall be withheld.

Now this commandment I give unto my servants for their benefit while they remain, for a manifestation of my blessings upon their heads, and for a reward for their diligence; and for their security for food and for raiment, for an inheritance; for houses and for lands, in whatsoever circumstances I the Lord shall place them, and whithersoever I the Lord shall send them: for they have been faithful over many things, and have done well inasmuch as they have not sinned. Behold I the Lord am merciful and will bless them, and they shall enter into the joy of these things: even so. Amen. 6

This revelation of November 1831 provided a theological justification for regarding the leadership deserving special consideration within the Mormon framework of equalitarianism. Not only was provision made for the church members to contribute directly to the material needs of the evolving hierarchy, but there was also the suggestion that God would prosper his leaders still further in the acquisition of material wealth. Thus, even in theory, equalitarianism was not absolute within Mormon communitarianism.

The theoretical ideals of Mormon communitarianism and the institutional efforts to promote these ideals have preoccupied not only the anti-Mormons of the past, but also the historians of the present. For example, Leonard Arrington's analysis of the rise and decline of Mormon institutional communitarianism concludes that it was not until the beginning of the twentieth century that "individualism, speculation, and inequality—once thought to be characteristics of Babylon—were woven into the fabric of Mormon life."⁷ In actuality, even while anti-Mormons heaped vitriolic criticism and violence upon Mormon communitarianism, the Mormon community itself exhibited extensive financial inequalities. It is possible that inequality was greater in the laissez-faire economy of Mormonism's opponents, but using the Mormon hierarchy as the focal point, the extent of economic disparity in Mormon society was massive.

**Mormon Headquarters Property Structure, 1834–1843**

Central to the Mormon communitarianism of the nineteenth century were the places of refuge and consolidation where the saints were urged to gather. During Joseph Smith's leadership, the focal points were at Kirtland, Ohio (near Cleveland), in Jackson County and Caldwell County, Missouri, and at Nauvoo, Illinois (near Quincy). The mean assessed valuations for Kirtland and Nauvoo during the years 1834 to 1843 are

---

⁷Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, p. 409
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indicated in Chart 1. The Kirtland assessments prior to 1834 were not used because the hierarchy was barely represented until that year, and after 1837 the city had been deserted by those General Authorities who had not repudiated Mormonism during the apostasy connected with the Panic of 1837. Only two categories in Chart 1, and similar charts, are mutually exclusive: General Authorities and non-General Authorities. The property values of future and former General Authorities, because they were not actually part of the hierarchy at the time of the tax assessments, are included in the total tabulation of non-hierarchy.

Chart 1 provides statistical trends that both verify and modify certain conclusions by contemporaries and later historians about the economics of Kirtland's Mormon era. Contemporary and reminiscent accounts agree that the Mormons were in an impoverished situation in Kirtland from 1831 to 1835, but that economic activity improved during 1836, and rose to the crescendo of 1837 that preceded the national depression of that year. The prosperity was illusory because it was based upon inflated property values, and upon Mormon bank notes whose

---
6Geauga County, Ohio, Duplicate of Taxes, 1834-1837, manuscript volumes in Geauga County Court House, Chardon, Ohio; Nauvoo, Illinois, Property Tax Lists, 1841-1843, in Nauvoo, Illinois Collection, Church Archives. Each of these tax lists has a quirk that required adjustment for quantification. The Kirtland lists show personal property and real property as separate lists, with many of the same individuals in both lists. Far more persons were included in the personal property list, and the total number of persons assessed for personal property was used to arrive at mean values. In the Nauvoo lists, persons were listed in repetitious entries for real estate, but in only one entry for personal property, according to place of residence. James L. Kimball, Jr. has sifted through these Nauvoo tax lists for his projected demographic study of Nauvoo, and kindly furnished me with the total numbers of persons assessed for personal property taxes, which numbers were used in my own calculations of mean assessments for Nauvoo.
value was tied to the land values.\(^9\) Chart 1 shows the decline of non-
General Authorities and the hierarchy during 1834 to 1835, but the data
also reveal a different pattern than generally described for the 1836-
1837 period. The mean wealth of the non-General Authorities continued
to decline gradually throughout the period of Mormon presence in Kirt-
land, while the mean wealth of the General Authorities had declined
precipitously down to 1836, and then made a sharp upsurge in 1837. As
a group, the General Authorities were still less wealthy than the non-
General Authorities as of 1837, but the economic boom that began in
Kirtland in 1836 benefited the General Authorities greatly, whereas it
only moderated the economic decline of non-General Authorities. The
increased prosperity may have been illusory, but while it lasted the
General Authorities as a group had greater reason to anticipate that
it would bring them actual prosperity.

At Nauvoo, Illinois, the Mormons established a far larger
gathering place than that of Kirtland. Whereas Kirtland was still a
village at the apex of Mormon control there, Nauvoo mushroomed from
its establishment in 1839 to become a city of more than 10,000
inhabitants within five years. Between the abandonment of Kirtland
and the founding of Nauvoo, the church had passed through the harrowing
experience of being involved in virtual civil war in Missouri with
anti-Mormons. The Mormons were expelled from Missouri with the loss
of nearly all their property, and therefore Nauvoo was founded in 1839
by an impoverished populace. Robert B. Flanders has observed:

son and Larry T. Wimmer, "The Kirtland Safety Society: The Stock Ledger
Book and the Bank Failure," Brigham Young University Studies, XII
(Summer 1972), 430.
It was expected that an increasing population would bring prosperity to Nauvoo, but the opposite tended to be the case. Large numbers of poor English immigrants, as well as those from the states little better off, drove the per capita wealth of the city down.\footnote{Flanders, Nauvoo, p. 145.}

Chart 1 substantiates the view that for the general populace of Nauvoo, the early years of that city were characterized by economic decline. Although data are unavailable for 1839 and 1840, the assessments for 1841 indicate that the mean property total for non-General Authorities had continued the decline that occurred in Kirtland. Even though a slight recovery is evident for 1842 and 1843, the mean wealth of non-General Authorities in Nauvoo was still below that of Kirtland during the Panic of 1837.

Chart 1 also demonstrates that the mean wealth of General Authorities at Nauvoo was increasing markedly. Because the chart excludes church funds over which the hierarchy were indicated as trustees and funds held in assignation due to bankruptcy proceedings, the mean amounts for 1841 to 1843 represent the personal wealth of the hierarchy. The chart shows that the momentum of increase in General Authority wealth that had begun in Kirtland in 1837, actually accelerated at Nauvoo. This created a sharp discrepancy between the general economic condition of the hierarchy and that of the non-General Authorities. One disaffected Mormon, Oliver Olney, wrote a description in doggerel verse about these conditions as he saw them on April 6, 1842:

I look at the poor / I see them oppressed / I look at the widows / I see them rejected / I look at the orphan / I see him neglected / I look at the actual saints / That is adding the will of God / I see them neglected and counted of no worth . . . I see all such stand neglected / That would honour the cause of God / If they were put in their place / By the authority of the Church / But I
se a certain few say for to lead / That appears to be
some informed / In the things of the world / They know
how to manage / To accomodate themselves . . . The poor
is a mourning / Because of hard times / The rich are
arrayed in apparel / Of the best kind, They have horses
and Chariots / To move in good style.11

Olney's bitterness is evident in this passage, but a situation of
economic inequality did exist. Nevertheless, the mean valuations of
Kirtland and Nauvoo fail to indicate the individual non-General Authori-
ties (and non-Mormons, for that matter) who were quite wealthy, and
also the General Authorities who were not so wealthy. Chart 2 provides
a basis for examining how echelons of the Mormon hierarchy related to
the general economic trends of Kirtland and Nauvoo.

Immediately apparent from Chart 2 is the fact that poverty was
also characteristic within the hierarchy. The Council of Seventy was
not only the financially poorest echelon of the hierarchy during the
years of Joseph Smith's leadership, but it also had a mean wealth that
was consistently below that of non-General Authorities. Moreover, aside
from 1837 when the property of some apostles was inflated through land
speculation that eventually contributed to their apostasy during the
Panic of 1837, the Quorum of the Twelve also had less wealth than non-
General Authorities until 1842. The condition of three of the apostles
in Kirtland was later described by the man from whom they borrowed
money:

Shortly after we got to Kirtland, Brother B. Young,
H.C. Kimball, P.P. Pratt came to me to borrow money. I
had nearly 100 dol . . . they were very poor. Pres. Young
said he had nothing in the house to eat, and he knew not
where to get it. . . . He stood in the door of the printing

11Document 1, April 6, 1842, Oliver H. Olney Papers, Yale
University.
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office thinking of his condition and he felt so bad the sweat rold of [sic] him.\textsuperscript{12}

Even the wealth of counselors in the First Presidency declined at Kirtland below the level of non-General Authorities. The poverty of these three bodies of the hierarchy, as well as of the Presiding Patriarch (whose 1835 property valuation was lower than the Council of Seventy's) was such that it was decided on May 2, and September 14, 1835, to assist them financially.\textsuperscript{13}

This was in accordance with the 1831 revelation allowing such support, but it did not seem to alter the economic situation of these groups. The wealth level of the Council of Seventy remained consistently below that of the non-General Authorities, as did that of Counselors in the First Presidency (throughout the Kirtland period), and the wealth of the Quorum of the Twelve actually plunged the year following this decision. Even after the mean property value of the Quorum of the Twelve rose above that of the non-General Authorities in 1842 and 1843, Apostles John E. Page, William Smith, Lyman Wight, George A. Smith, Willard Richards, and Orson Hyde were consistently below the non-General Authority mean.

Chart 2 also presents the striking contrast between the affluent and impoverished within the hierarchy. While the assessments in Kirtland reveal a pattern of poverty for the Counselors in the First Presidency, for the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, the First Council of Seventy, and the Presiding Patriarch, Joseph Smith's wealth as President of the Church continued to increase, even between 1835 and 1836 when all other groups


\textsuperscript{13}Roberts, History of the Church, II, 221, 273.
were declining. Moreover, the disparities within the hierarchy increased at Nauvoo. Whereas the Quorum of the Twelve and Council of Seventy experienced relatively moderate gains at Nauvoo, Joseph Smith, his counselors in the First Presidency, and the new Presiding Patriarch (formerly a counselor and now also Associate President) made tremendous gains. Joseph Smith almost tripled his wealth between his high at Kirtland and at Nauvoo, Hyrum Smith had increased his assessed valuation from $104 in 1837 when he was a counselor in the First Presidency to $3000 in 1843 as Patriarch and Associate President, and the mean valuation of the Counselors in the First Presidency had increased tenfold. Although Joseph Smith at Nauvoo sought to relieve the suffering of the poor in a variety of ways, the social disparities of Nauvoo that Olney acidly recorded continued to exist and were reflected pointedly in the assessed valuations of those men connected with the church presidency.

Having examined the disparities that existed even within the Mormon hierarchy, another insight to be gained from the assessment rolls is the percentage of property at Mormon headquarters that General Authorities owned during the period of Joseph Smith's leadership. Chart 3 traces the progression of General Authority ownership in Kirtland and Nauvoo. This chart does not credit these men with businesses in which they were engaged with others, nor does it include church properties and enterprises for which they were indicated as trustees. The chart shows a general trend for the percent of ownership by General Authorities to increase. The sudden rise in 1835 resulted from the addition of the

---

14The poor were aided by direct gifts of food, clothing, and land, and by institutional efforts to promote public work projects. See Roberts, History of the Church, III, 254, IV, 608, V, 25; Flanders, Nauvoo, p. 126.
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nineteen men of the Quorum of Twelve and Council of Seventy that were created as new echelons of the hierarchy in that year, and the sudden drop in 1836 reflects the drop of mean hierarchy wealth indicated in Chart 1. Were those two sharp changes in percentage of ownership to be averaged, the result would be almost a straight line of increase from 1.21% in 1834 to 6.06% of ownership of Mormon community property in 1843. The nineteen General Authorities who owned assessed property in Nauvoo in 1843 constituted less than two percent of the assessed individuals and about two-tenths percent of Nauvoo's population in that year.

A final area that the assessments from the Joseph Smith period of Mormonism illuminate is the relative economic status of future members of the hierarchy. Chart 1 shows the assessed valuations of the future General Authorities as being below the non-General Authorities yet above the mean General Authorities during most of the Kirtland period. Chart 4 subdivides the future General Authorities according to those offices into which they entered the hierarchy. The future members of the Quorum of the Twelve and Council of Seventy who had assessed property during the lifetime of Joseph Smith were consistently below the mean for non-General Authorities of the period. Men who entered the hierarchy directly as counselors to the president of the church were few: John Smith was such an one and he was poorer in Kirtland than most, and Daniel H. Wells was the future counselor who was a wealthy non-Mormon at Nauvoo. Of the future Presiding Bishops, Vinson Knight was extremely poor in Kirtland, Newel K. Whitney had been one of the wealthiest men in Kirtland prior to his conversion to Mormonism but his wealth declined markedly from 1836 throughout the Nauvoo record of tax assessments, and Edward Hunter, wealthy prior to his conversion to Mormonism, remained
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among the wealthy men of Nauvoo. The wealth of the future bishopric and counselors in the presidency is the source of the increase of the mean values for future General Authorities at Nauvoo. During the Joseph Smith period, future presiding bishops tended to be quite wealthy, future members of the Quorum of Twelve and First Council of Seventy tended to be quite poor, and men who were advanced directly into the presidency of the Church represented both extremes of the economic spectrum.

Privilege and Privation on the Mormon Trail

It is not surprising that there is a lack of detailed information about Mormon economic patterns during the period between the height of theocratic Nauvoo and the establishment of Utah as a Mormon territory within the United States in 1850. These were years of mobbings, hegira, and social disorganization. Tax lists for the last two years of Nauvoo's Mormon rule may emerge one day along with tax lists from the temporary domicile at Winter Quarters, Nebraska, but in their absence, more impressionistic sources will have to suffice.

It would be characteristic of the mythic qualities of the Mormon pioneer saga to assert that the economic disparities of Mormon city life melted under the arduous influences of a forced mid-winter exodus from Nauvoo in 1846, and that on the pioneer trail to Utah the economic and spiritual ideals of Mormon egalitarianism existed by necessity. Certainly it is true that the propertied men of Nauvoo lost much, if not all, of their investments and improvements there, and all classes of people had to leave behind treasured things that could not be brought along. Moreover, the unmarked graves along the way and the Mormon
cemeteries at temporary stopping points in Iowa and Nebraska contained the losses of all Nauvoo's ecclesiastical and economic classes. Nevertheless, the existing evidence suggests that the economic strata continued in force on the Mormon trail.

With reference to the Mormon hierarchy, a few examples will demonstrate that the economic extremes that existed at Kirtland and Nauvoo continued in the covered wagons. The Quorum of the Twelve had been sustained as the presidency of the church in 1844, and Brigham Young as their president had been sustained as president of the church in 1845. From the journal of William Clayton on May 12, 1846, there is the following comment about the man who would be appointed Presiding Bishop within a year, and about the three apostles who were to become the organized First Presidency in December, 1847:

President Young, Heber, Dr. Richards and Bishop Whitney have all made out to get lumber sawed to make their wagons comfortable but I can't get enough to make a hind board for one of my wagons, which has none. They are tolerably well prepared with wagons and teams but I am here with about five tons of stuff and only six wagons and five yoke of oxen to take it. I have dealt out nearly all of my provisions and have to get more before I can go on. It looks as if I had to be a slave and take slave's fare all the journey for it has worked that way so far.15

Clayton's observations are the more significant because he was one of the elite of Nauvoo: private secretary to Joseph Smith and now to Heber C. Kimball, one of the few who both entered into and performed plural marriages during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, and an original member of the Council of Fifty.

If the evidence of privilege bothered some of the elite Mormons in

---

the wilderness, it seems to have caused some dangerous grumbling among
the rank and file. As Brigham Young addressed the Mormons at Winter
Quarters prior to his leading the first pioneer company into the Great
Basin, he met this question with characteristic abruptness:

Be contented with your lot and station and stop
your whining and babbling about the 12, saying that
Brigham oppresses the poor and lives off their earning
and that you can't see why you can't have some of his
good living, and so on. Did Brigham Young ever get
anything from you, did you ever help him to any of his
fine living, you poor curses, or was it through Brigham's
influence that thousands of the poor have been fed?16

Among those who felt privation on the way to Utah were the lower echelons
of the hierarchy that had been poor at Kirtland and Nauvoo. In 1849
Edward Hunter, who would be appointed presiding bishop of the church in
less than two years, was instructed by Brigham Young to arrange for the
transport of "the poor Saints from the United States to Great Salt Lake
City." Among the number were two members of the First Council of
Seventy.17

Mormon Headquarters Property Structure, 1850-1889

Following the arrival of the first company of the Mormon pioneers
in July 1847, Salt Lake City was the principal center of the cultural,
business, ecclesiastical, political, military, and social life of the
Great Basin. For that reason, Salt Lake County, despite colonizing
missions of Mormons throughout the Great Basin, remained the most populous
county of the territory (1850=54.10%, 1860=28.05%, 1870=21.13%, 1880=

16Lee, Journals, p. 129.

17Memoranda Book, inscription on first page dated October 13,
1849, in Edward Hunter Papers, University of Utah.
22.21%, 1890=27.73%). The Mormon population of Salt Lake City was
still approximately 93% in 1867, 83% in 1874, and 75% in 1887. The
property tax assessments of Salt Lake County, like all others in Utah
Territory, were conducted under provisions that by 1865 prescribed a
fine for concealment and fraud that was double the amount of tax required
by law on the property. Chart 5 provides a graphic representation of
the mean property values of General Authorities and non-General Authori-
ties (including Future and Former General Authorities) for the period
1850-89.

Because the General Authority mean wealth was much lower than the
non-General Authority in Kirtland but was much higher in Nauvoo, these
fluctuations and the brief time period involved might have suggested
that there would be less disparity between the two groups after 1843.
Chart 5, however, shows that whether or not Brigham Young's massive
personal wealth is included, the inequality continued to increase
throughout nearly fifty years of the economic development of Salt Lake
County. The "immediate family" of these General Authorities included a
multitude of wives and children that drew upon their support, and
therefore the actual living expense requirements of the hierarchy were

18 There R. Black, Jewell J. Rasmussen, Frank C. Hackman, Popu-
lation Projections, Utah and Utah's Counties (Salt Lake City: Bureau

19 Paul A. Wright, "The Growth and Distribution of the Mormon
and Non-Mormon Populations in Salt Lake City," (unpublished Ph.D.

20 Sheldon C. Tanner, "Historical, Critical, and Comparative
Analysis of the Utah State System of Taxation," (M.A. thesis, University
of Utah, 1925), no pagination.

21 Salt Lake City Assessment Roll and Tax List, 1850, Church
Archives; Salt Lake County Assessment Rolls, 1853, 1859-1889, Utah
State Archives, Utah State Capitol, Salt Lake City, Utah.
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1850 — 1889
greater than for the rank-and-file Mormons, at least seventy-five percent of whom chose to remain monogamist.

Nevertheless, contemporary evidence indicates that an apparent disparity in wealth was causing dissension among the Mormons as early as 1859, when Apostle Wilford Woodruff's journal records a discussion among the apostles:

Erastus Snow spoke concerning the feelings of many of the people against seeing the Twelve prosper in Temporal things. He thought if the Lord did not sanction [sic] this he permitted it to be & he thought perhaps it was not the will of God that we should be engaged in Temporal business . . .

C.C. Rich spoke upon the same subject & said that he did not no [sic] as all the Twelve all experienced the same thing but I think the people are exercised by a spirit that they do not comprehend or know what it meant but there is an opposition to Joseph [sic] & the Presidency & Twelve against their prosperity . . .

Lorenzo Snow spoke . . . with regard to our attending to temporal matters I think we shall have to attend to temporal matters & understand them in order to build up the Kingdom of God. . . .

0 Hyde said I have thought of the subject as Erastus spoke of but I have thought it was best for us to take a medium course we must have cares and if we could do as Bishop Hunter spoke of we might become dry & dull I believe we shall have a variety sometimes fat & sometimes lean & sometimes nothing . . .

. . . we had a mixed conversation upon the subject before us we finally concluded to fulfill our mission first and be industrious and providge for our families as well as we can & then trust in God. 22

By 1859 the non-General Authority wealth had barely escaped stagnation from its 1850 level, whereas General Authority wealth had increased sevenfold (excluding Brigham Young, a 525 percent increase). The concern of the members of the hierarchy was sincere, and the chart indicates that there may have been a conscious effort on their part to curb their own wealth during the years immediately following this 1859 meeting. Nevertheless, Chart 5 indicates that whereas the non-General Authority wealth

---

in Salt Lake County continued its snail's progression throughout the nineteenth century, with only few exceptions the mean wealth of the Mormon hierarchy soared. In 1874 the non-Mormons claimed that although they comprised only 17% of Salt Lake City's population, they were paying 50% of the property taxes. If that estimate of non-Mormon wealth is accurate, then to use Orson Hyde's phrasing, on the average the Mormon hierarchy and the non-Mormons were "sometimes fat," while the rank-and-file Mormons were "sometimes lean."

As indicated earlier, the mean property valuations conceal disparity that existed within the hierarchy, as of course it also does within the non-General Authorities. To examine the relative wealth of the echelons in the hierarchy, Chart 6 out of necessity must telescope the dollar scale in order to present the upper extremes and still show the fluctuations of the lower extremes. For convenience, Chart 6 shows the relative status of the hierarchy during the pioneer stage of Utah's economic history, from 1850 to the completion of the transcontinental railroad at Promontory, Utah, in 1869.

Chart 6 indicates that the poverty trends within the hierarchy had undergone some changes since the Joseph Smith period. The most radical change concerned the Presiding Patriarch. With the exception of 1853 and 1859, the patriarch's assessed property valuations were consistently below the mean valuation of non-General Authorities during the pioneer period. The difference between this trend and that of Nauvoo may result from the fact that Hyrum Smith as Patriarch in Nauvoo was also Associate President of the Church. Lacking such immediate connection with the role of the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\text{Wright, "Mormon and Non-Mormon Populations in Salt Lake City," p.15. This would indicate that as Utah's mining, banking, and commercial economy expanded after the arrival of the railroad in 1869, a lion's share of the wealth went to the non-Mormon minority.}\]
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[Graph showing the comparative wealth of the hierarchy from 1850 to 1869, with categories such as President Brigham Young, Presidency Counselors, Quorum of 12, Presiding Bishop, P.B. Counselors, Non-Hierarchy, Patriarch, and Council of 70. The graph illustrates the fluctuations in mean dollars over the years.]
church presidency, the economic status of the Presiding Patriarch in Utah returned to the level it had had in Kirtland. Another significant departure from the poverty trends of the Joseph Smith era concerns the First Council of Seventy: instead of being consistently below the mean property assessments of non-General Authorities, the Council of Seventy as a group was significantly above that level.

Poverty, however, is defined by many factors (including family size, which was large for the polygamous hierarchy) that are not revealed in simple statements of property owned. For example, although the mean wealth of the Quorum of the Twelve was more than 164% greater than that of the non-General Authorities in 1865, at a meeting of the apostles at the end of that year: "Elder Taylor prophesied that the Twelve should be delivered from the bondage of the poverty under which they have been wetering for years."24 Moreover, during the pioneer era of Utah, the property assessments of the following members of the hierarchy were almost consistently below that of non-General Authorities: Apostles Orson Pratt, George A. Smith, George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith and member of the First Council of Seventy, Levi W. Hancock.

As was true of the property valuations for the hierarchy at Nauvoo, Chart 6 indicates that the greatest property wealth was concentrated in the hands of the presidency of the church. During the pioneer period of Utah, Brigham Young's highest Salt Lake County assessed valuation was $159,230 in 1869, his first Counselor Heber C. Kimball's was $18,820 in 1860, his second counselor Daniel H. Wells' was $17,400, and his unannounced assistant counselor Joseph A. Young's was $19,000 in 1867. It has been suggested that Brigham Young as Trustee-in-Trust for the LDS Church merged

24Journal of Wilford Woodruff, December 22, 1865.
the church assets and financial operations with his own private interests to protect the properties of the church from federal confiscation under provisions of the 1862 Morrill Act which prohibited the church from owning more than $50,000.\textsuperscript{25} The Salt Lake County assessments for the pioneer period, however, modify that interpretation, for it was not until 1867 that the assessed valuation for the LDS Trustee-in-Trust dropped below the Morrill Act's limit, having hovered around $72,000 from 1863 to 1866. Moreover, prior to the 1862 act, when there was no protective reason to merge the two accounts, Brigham Young's own property assessments were only slightly below those of the entire church for Salt Lake County. In 1859 the Trustee-in-Trust assessed valuation was $102,250 and Brigham Young's own was $100,000, and in 1860 the Trustee-in-Trust assessed valuation was $97,300 and Brigham Young's own valuation was $82,525. After the mid 1860's, there can be no doubt that Young merged church accounts with his personal accounts in order to protect the church funds from confiscation, but the evidence also indicates that in Brigham Young's own view his personal wealth was not far behind that of the church itself. Various evidences indicate that by his death, Brigham Young regarded his

personal wealth as approximately a million dollars. 26

26 This interpretation disagrees with that of Ibid., pp. 9-10, but seems necessary on the basis of a variety of evidences. On October 8, 1872, Apostle George Q. Cannon publicly stated that a few days previous to the statement, Brigham Young had deposited "a hundred thousand dollars tithing--the tithing of his own personal means" in Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution for the promotion of the church cooperative movement. See Journal of Discourses, XV, 208. On the face of the statement, "tithing" was meant to convey the Mormon understanding of ten percent, and "personal means" was equivalent to total personal wealth, indicating that Brigham Young regarded his total wealth in 1872 as being a million dollars, of which he paid ten percent toward the cooperative movement. Further evidence of this view emerged in respect to the controversy between the heirs of Brigham Young and John Taylor, as Young's successor as Trustee-in-Trust for the Church. In a legal deposition of 1875, Brigham Young had estimated that his personal wealth was no greater than $600,000. See B. H. Roberts, A Comprehensive History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Century I, (six vols., Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1930), V, 443. That was at least no overstatement of his wealth, since the plaintiff in the suit, his dissatisfied plural wife Ann Eliza Webb Young, had claimed that he was worth eight million dollars. In a will that Brigham Young executed in 1873, there was an itemized schedule of real estate to be given to his heirs, which totaled nearly $600,000. See the published text of will in "The History of Utah and Her Founders as Told by Manuscripts," Heart Throbs of the West, Kate Carter, compiler (eleven vols., Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939-1950), VII, 344-350. The developments following his death, however, indicated that the will was not intended to be a complete statement of his entire worth. Brigham Young's nephew and the Young family's lawyer, LeGrand Young, commented: "The will of President Young is a fraud on him and his children in my opinion." See LeGrand Young 1878 Diary, January 24, 1879, in David Freed Papers, University of Utah. Three members of the Quorum of the Twelve, Brigham Young Jr., George Q. Cannon, and Albert Carrington, had been appointed in the will to be the executors, and after his death, John Taylor as Trustee-in-Trust ordered an audit of the accounts of Young and the church. In the official report of the executors, they claimed that Young's estate "justly owed to said church over $1,000,000," and listed the general areas of Young's indebtedness. See Deseret News, June 30, 1879. The private journal of the chief auditor of the accounts shows Young's indebtedness to the church was in large measure in his favor that the present Trustee-in-Trust was unwilling to allow: $628,867.18 of credits that were regarded as errors, and $300,000 credited to Young on August 28, 1866 for subsistence and quartermaster bills. See L. John Nuttall Diaries, four volume typescript, I, 151. April 10, 1878, Brigham Young University. The three apostles, as executors of the estate, claimed in the official report that Young's estate owed the Trustee-in-Trust $999,632.90, from which the executors deducted $300,000 as a credit to Young's estate for services he rendered to the church as president. See Arrington, "Settlement of Brigham Young's Estate," p. 15. In their dual role as apostles and as executors of the Brigham Young's estate, however, George Q. Cannon, Brigham Young Jr., and Albert Carrington carried out these complex arrangements only under duress,
Although affluence within the hierarchy during the pioneer period was a varied matter, as the differences in assessed valuations within the First Presidency indicate, even those differences did not ameliorate the stark gulf between the financial condition of the affluent and the impov-erished within the Mormon hierarchy. The situation of Orson Pratt, a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, in 1861 is a case in point:

Two of Br Orson Pratt's wives called upon the President and told him they needed clothing & furniture for they were very destitute. The Presidency requested Br Jno T. Caine to supply them with some things.27

In that year Orson Pratt's assessed valuation was $2,575 compared with Brigham Young's $52,250, his first counselor's $11,500, and his second counselor's $11,965. Orson Pratt, however, was not the lowest on the hierarchy's economic scale in that year: Apostle Erastus Snow was $2,290, member of the First Council of Seventy Zerah Pulsipher was $2,200, Apostle Amasa M. Lyman was $1,905, Apostle George A. Smith was $1,740, Apostle Charles C. Rich was $1,100, member of the Council of Seventy Henry Harriman was $1,045, Apostle George Q. Cannon was $965, Patriarch John Smith

as indicated in the LeGrand Young Diary: "I had some conversation with Bro. Cannon in regard to Estate matter. He told me that he told Brigham that the [y] would have to submit to the requisition of the [trustee] & T[rust] or loose their standing in the twelve. I don't think Bro. Cannon thought just [illegible word] this admission would have with me nor just how I would look at it. However it just what I expected and what Carring- ton had told me before." See LeGrand Young Diary, May 18, 1878. The accounts of Brigham Young were a labyrinth, it is true, but the evidence seems to indicate that neither he nor the executors of his estate actually thought his net worth at death was the $361,170 agreed upon by John Taylor as Trustee-in-Trust with the heirs, but instead a figure approaching one million dollars.

27Brigham Young 1858-1863 Office Journal, April 22, 1861, p. 246, Church Archives. In April 1860 Brigham Young had given Pratt the freedom of obtaining whatever wheat, flour, and other commodities he needed from the church tithing office, and in a public meeting with the bishops in September 1860, Young said: "Orson Pratt and Erastus Snow are poor." See Brigham Young 1858-1863 Office Journal, pp. 76-77, April 14, 1860, Brigham Young Papers, Church Archives; Wilford Woodruff Journal, September 13, 1860.
was $800, and member of the Council of Seventy Levi W. Hancock was $210. Most of these men were residents of the county in that year, and probably had little or no property wealth outside of Salt Lake County in 1861.

It is a tribute to those General Authorities who may have been on the short end economically that they continued their labors in behalf of the Latter-day Saint ideals with dedication and faithfulness. One of the ironies of the times is that the finest exposition of Mormon equalitarianism, "The Equality and Oneness of the Saints," was written by the ever-poor Orson Pratt in 1854. In 1866 all copies of the periodical (The Seer) in which he had published it were ordered suppressed or destroyed by the combined Quorum of the Twelve and the First Presidency because of doctrinal speculations he had also published in The Seer.28

The arrival of the railroad in 1869 brought momentous changes to the economy and society of Utah. Not only did the railroad end the necessity for arduous pioneer overland emigrations to Utah, but it also brought the prospect of rapid transportation within Utah. The economic results were many: the lackluster mining industry of Utah could be put on a profitable basis now that ore could be transported within Utah by spur lines and outside the territory on the transcontinental line, eastern manufactured goods could be transported far more cheaply into Utah, and the structure of labor, capital, and the entire money market was subject to expansion and reorientation. In brief, the arrival of the railroad in Utah meant that opportunities for the acquisition of enormous amounts of wealth were available to those who would use them.

28. The Seer (Washington, D.C.), II (July 1854), 289-301; James R. Clark, ed., Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1833-1964 (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, Inc., 1965), II, 239. Despite the order, copies survived and have been reprinted in recent years.
The institutional efforts of Mormon leaders to preserve the church's economic hegemony during this challenge have been well described.29

The promotion of the Mormon cooperative reaction to the railroad was proclaimed as an effort to avoid the creation of economic classes in Utah. In a circular by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve on July 10, 1875, which gave the reasons for the establishment of the cooperative movement, it was stated:

The experience of mankind has shown that the people of communities and nations among whom wealth is the most equally distributed, enjoy the largest degree of liberty, are the least exposed to tyranny and oppression and suffer the least from luxurious habits which beget vice. . . .

One of the great evils with which our own nation is menaced at the present time is the wonderful growth of wealth in the hands of a comparatively few individuals. . . .

Years ago it was perceived that we Latter-day Saints were open to the same dangers as those which beset the rest of the world. A condition of affairs [the arrival of the railroad] existed among us which was favorable to the growth of riches in the hands of a few at the expense of the many. A wealthy class was being rapidly formed in our midst whose interests, in the course of time, were likely to be diverse from those of the rest of the community. The growth of such a class was dangerous to our union; and, of all people, we stand most in need of union and to have our interests identical. Then it was that the Saints were counseled to enter into co-operation. In the absence of the necessary faith to enter upon a more perfect order revealed by the Lord unto the church, this was felt to be the best means of drawing us together and making us one.30

The document was a good statement of Mormon economic theory, but its implication that the arrival of the railroad would introduce a condition of economic inequality among the Mormons did not even reflect the pre-1869 economic realities of the hierarchy, let alone of the entire population. Moreover, by returning to Chart 5, it can be seen that the cooperative movement did not bridge the pre-1869 gap between the Mormon

29Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, pp. 236-256ff.

30Clark, Messages, II, 267-268.
hierarchy and the non-General Authorities. In fact, after 1869 the property wealth of the hierarchy (even excluding Brigham Young) in Salt Lake County actually increased its rate of growth and began accelerating at a faster pace away from the mean wealth of non-General Authorities.

Chart 7 illustrates that the increase of property wealth after 1869 altered the previous economic cleavages between echelons of the hierarchy. The property valuations of the Presiding Bishop, his counselors, and of the Council of Seventy skyrocketed in the new economic world of the railroad. The extent of the Council of Seventy's improvement was in large part due to the great wealth of one of its members, entrepreneur and merchant Horace S. Eldredge who reached a peak of $128,150 in assessed Salt Lake County property during the year of his death in 1888. The 1889 mean for the Council of Seventy indicates, however, that even after Eldredge's death the property wealth of the Council of Seventy was still far above that of its ecclesiastical superior, the Quorum of the Twelve. During the years 1873-1877 members of the Quorum of Twelve also served at the same time as additional counselors to Brigham Young, and therefore their amounts are computed exclusively with presidency counselors. The sharpest increases in the Quorum of the Twelve wealth occurred in 1877 and 1887, when former counselors in the presidency are again computed with the Twelve.

The mean wealth in assessed property of the non-General Authorities tended so much toward stagnation in the period after 1869, that the upward momentum of even the poorest of the pre-1869 General Authorities caught up and passed the non-hierarchy mean. The patriarch was above it from 1875 onward, and Apostle Orson Pratt exceeded it from 1876 to his death in 1881. After 1875 (when the hierarchy had organized Mormons throughout the great basin into communitarian United Orders), the only
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General Authorities whose Salt Lake County total property was below the non-hierarchy mean were men who were not actually residents of the county or who were newly appointed General Authorities.

Although the Mormon cooperative and communitarian enterprises successfully maintained Mormon institutional hegemony over the economic sector in the wake of the railroad, such enterprises did not achieve their highest goals of forestalling or lessening the existence of the very rich and the very poor classes in Salt Lake County. Even such direct aid to the poor by the church hierarchy as cancellation of indebtedness to the church, and the distribution of church livestock to the poor did not alter the basic economic inequalities indicated in the assessment rolls of 1869-1889. In fact, the church's policy of promoting the emigration to Utah of the European Mormons actually tended to cancel any leveling effects of the cooperative and communitarian enterprises: European immigrants to Utah were poor to begin with, had sacrificed much of their material wealth to make the journey; and for those who were middle class artisans in Europe, they had no economy to support their skills and therefore turned to farming.

Because of this continued influx of the poor into the economy, the post-1869 influx of wealth into Salt Lake County did not have equal application. It appears to have improved the condition of formerly impoverished General Authorities, to have added greatly to the wealth of already affluent members of the hierarchy, and (as apparent from other sources) to have made fortunes for some Mormon and non-Mormon businessmen. Even the General Authorities who seemed to have great

31Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, pp. 255-256.
32Ibid., pp. 355-356.
property wealth in relation to the rest of the assessed population, may actually have been "land poor," or may still have had insufficient means to support their many wives and children in more than a marginal way. The general condition of Salt Lake County's population seemed to remain in economic stagnation throughout the nineteenth century, but it is probable that the situation of the populace, seventy-five percent of which was Mormon in 1887, would have been even worse had it not been for the cooperative, communitarian, and charitable activities sponsored by the Mormon hierarchy.33

Chart 8 shows the percentage of assessed Salt Lake County property that was personally owned by General Authorities from 1850-1889. An initial item of interest in the chart is that by comparing it with Chart 3, the 6.79% of Salt Lake City property owned by the General Authorities in 1850 appears as nearly a statistical extrapolation from the 6.06% of Nauvoo property owned by General Authorities in 1843. In many ways, the church and commonwealth at Salt Lake City was a continuation of the Nauvoo experience, and the continuity was reflected even in this economic issue. General authority ownership of Salt Lake County property reached its apex in 1859, when twenty-three men (1.29% of the total assessed population) owned 11.12% of the property. Although that was apparently the saturation point beyond which Salt Lake County's swelling population allowed no advances, there were some dramatic reversals of

---

33 The anti-Mormon residents of Utah claimed in 1892 that the Mormon hierarchy "have reared here two classes—one of the very rich and the other of the very poor." See, Speech of O.W. Powers in Proceedings of the Territorial Liberal Convention Held at Salt Lake City, Utah, February 4th, 1892 (Salt Lake City: Tribune Job Printing Company, 1892), p. 43. A socio-economic condition of that kind did seem to exist in Utah, but it was self-serving rhetoric for the non-Mormons, who had garnered the bulk of wealth after 1869 but had developed no program to alleviate poverty, to criticize the Mormon leadership that had sought to better the condition of the poor.
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the downward trend of hierarchy ownership during the periods 1867-1871, 1874-1875, and 1879-1883. The peak of the first reversal was actually in 1871 rather than in 1869, due to the 1869 figures reflecting only Salt Lake City assessments. These three periods of increased percentage of General Authority property ownership correspond almost exactly to the three communitarian reorganizations of Utah: the cooperatives, the United orders, and the boards of trade. As suggested earlier, the personal ownership by General Authorities tended to increase, rather than decrease, during the times that the rank-and-file Mormons were put under the greatest pressures toward equalitarianism. By 1889 the combination of increasing population and federal pressures against the institutional wealth of the LDS Church had driven the percentage of hierarchy ownership at the headquarters of the church to its lowest level since 1834. Because the Mormon hierarchy was limited to a score of men, there can be little doubt that the General Authority ownership of Salt Lake County's property had become infinitesimal by 1930 when the county's adult male population was 55,488.35

Chart 9 indicates that during the period 1850-1889 the economic status of the future General Authorities continued some of the trends established during the Joseph Smith era, shown in Chart 4. Just as future members of the Council of Seventy had a mean wealth higher than that of future members of the Quorum of the Twelve during all but one of the Joseph Smith years, that same relationship existed during three-fourths of the Utah period. Moreover, similar to the Joseph Smith era,

34For details, see Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, pp. 293-349.
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the future members of the Presiding Bishopric had far more property on the average than either of the other two groups. The major discontinuity between the status of future General Authorities of the Joseph Smith period and the Utah period is that the future members of the Council of Seventy and Quorum of Twelve were no longer consistently below the property levels of non-General Authorities. Future seventies were lower than the non-hierarchy mean prior to 1871 and above it after 1871, while future apostles were higher than the non-hierarchy mean prior to 1871 and lower after 1871.

A corollary issue to the wealth of future members of the hierarchy is to what extent the wealth of men altered upon becoming General Authorities. Although the property assessment data were not sufficient for the Joseph Smith period to analyze this issue, the property assessments for Utah allow such study. To increase the number of men studied, property assessments for counties other than Salt Lake County were included. Table 16 presents the percent of annual increase or decrease in the mean property valuations for the nineteen men for whom data was sufficient. Because the dates of appointment were different for most of these new General Authorities during this thirty year period, the composite data of Table 16 therefore indicate the progressive economic status of new General Authorities irrespective of general economic conditions. On the average, appointment to the Mormon hierarchy did not bring immediate increases of wealth to new General Authorities. On the contrary, the men generally seemed to experience a pattern of continuing decline in their property wealth, or they in fact experienced a sharp reversal of

---

36Cache County Assessment Rolls, 1869-1892, Sanpete County Assessment Rolls, 1885-1890, Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City; Davis County Assessment Rolls, 1885-1891, Salt Lake County Assessment Rolls, 1850-1889, Utah State Archives.
TABLE 16
PERCENT OF MEAN WEALTH GROWTH
FOR NEW GENERAL AUTHORITIES, 1860-1889

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2 Years Prior</th>
<th>1 Year Prior</th>
<th>Year of Change</th>
<th>1 Year After</th>
<th>2 Years After</th>
<th>3 Years After</th>
<th>4 Years After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Hierarchy 19 Total</td>
<td>+30.8</td>
<td>+18.0</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td>+17.0</td>
<td>+7.7</td>
<td>+5.9</td>
<td>+10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of Twelve 10 Total</td>
<td>+17.0</td>
<td>+41.0</td>
<td>+8.1</td>
<td>+21.4</td>
<td>+10.4</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>+27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop 1 Total</td>
<td>-21.8</td>
<td>+35.6</td>
<td>+5.7</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>-77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopric Counselors 3 Total</td>
<td>+22.0</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>+50.3</td>
<td>+.16</td>
<td>+5.5</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council or 70 5 Total</td>
<td>+60.5</td>
<td>+12.3</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td>+22.1</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>+31.5</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

their prior economic growth, either in the year of their appointment or shortly thereafter. Only counselors in the Presiding Bishopric showed marked increases in property wealth the year of their appointment, following which their rates of economic growth tended to be slower than for years prior to their appointment.

The trends indicated in Table 16 immediately raise the question of how the mean wealth of the hierarchy could be so consistently above that of non-General Authorities, as indicated in Charts 5, 6, and 7. One obvious reason is that the majority of new appointees already had property assessed values above that of the average non-General Authority. Another reason is that with continued tenure in the hierarchy, men received special opportunities that could be utilized toward economic gain. Opportunities for special land allotments, public office, and corporate responsibility were often a function of one's position and tenure in the hierarchy. Although membership in the hierarchy was not a guarantee of
increased wealth—in fact men seem to have been financially hurt by becoming General Authorities—in the process of time fringe benefits did come to members of the hierarchy that could be capitalized upon. Although discussion of some of these fringe benefits appears elsewhere in this study, the question of land allotments is appropriate here.

At Nauvoo, Joseph Smith (as Trustee-in-Trust for the LDS Church) purchased and sold most of the land, the proceeds from which he used for his own support. Where possible, Smith obtained as much as $1,000 for unimproved one-acre lots in Nauvoo, but he also deeded land at no cost to the poor. Records of Nauvoo land transactions, however, also indicate that among those who were deeded lands at no apparent cost were eight members of the Quorum of the Twelve and members of the First Presidency. Several of the hierarchy then used their deeded lands for speculative purposes. Brigham Young advertised lots that, "I will sell very cheap, as I am going on my mission soon," whereas Joseph Smith publicly defended his practice of selling property at two or three times the purchase price. Such practices were viewed by the disaffected Oliver Olney as extortionate speculation: "By it many are sufferering / All in the name of the Lord / As their means is gone / By paying an Exorbitant prise / Or lending their substance / To those that say Thus saith the Lord."

In the Salt Lake Valley, the opportunities for economic betterment were far greater since the land was public domain and did not have to be

---

37 Flanders, Nauvoo, pp. 119-126.

38 Nauvoo Land Records, Church Archives.

39 Nauvoo Neighbor (August 2, 1843); Roberts, History of the Church, V, 356.

40 Document 2, April 6, 1842, Olney Papers.
purchased at the outset. As a part of Mormon communitarianism, land in pioneer Utah was allotted, even though the Mormons really were squatters until federal law allowed the securing of title in 1869. 41 The first apportionment of lots in 1847 was to the apostles. 42 When a general allotment was begun in 1848, the hierarchy received additional lands. 43 As the population and commerce of Salt Lake City grew, the potential value of lands deeded to the hierarchy increased. For example, Brigham Young received $26,360 in rents from his properties in 1869 and $27,542 in rents in 1875. 44 Although poverty dogged some members of the Mormon hierarchy, opportunities were often available to General Authorities to increase their economic status.

Those who seemed to maximize their capitalistic options most often during the nineteenth century were within the church presidency. Charts 2, 6, and 7 indicate that the President of the Church and his counselors were usually the highest owners of property within the hierarchy, and sometimes their land valuations as individuals were from ten to fifty times as great as the average non-General Authority's. The original allotments of land contributed to this increase. In 1848, for example, even though parcels of land were distributed in a lottery, Young and his counselors each received forty acres in Salt Lake City, compared with


42 Woodruff Journal, August 7, August 13, 1847.

43 Photocopy of Salt Lake City Land Book, September 27, 1848, in "Division of Land in Pioneer Days," Heart Throbs of the West, IV, 305.

44 Receipt books for 1865-1869, and 1869-1875, Brigham Young Papers, Church Archives. It cannot be determined to what extent these rents shown on his own account books may have been proceeds to the church from church lands.
allotments of twenty acres or less for other General Authorities and rank-and-file Mormons. In 1843, Brigham Young's total assessed property valuation of $1,727 was still somewhat behind Apostle Parley P. Pratt's, and less than half of Joseph Smith's and Hyrum Smith's property. In 1859 Young's property was valued at $8,018, and three years later it had climbed to $57,490, and five years after that it had doubled. Although less dramatic than Brigham Young's increases, the property valuations of his two successors also showed significant increases. John Taylor's property valuation when he formed a separate First Presidency in 1880 was $8,950, but the following year it had grown to $16,975. Wilford Woodruff's property valuation was $18,610 when he formed a separate First Presidency in 1889, but the next year it was assessed at $81,800. Heber C. Kimball's statement tended to apply to the entire nineteenth century LDS presidency when, as first counselor in 1860, he "observed that Mormonism had made him all that he was: he was worth $20,000 now; and if he had remained in the States he would have been a poor man to this day." The virgin land of Utah and the indirect benefits of office contributed toward such developments.

45 Photocopy of Salt Lake City Land Book.

46 This did not represent entirely an increase in wealth, however, for the anti-Mormon political party had gained control of Salt Lake City municipal government in 1890, and immediately inflated the valuations of property across the board in order to collect greater revenues. Nevertheless, while the increase of all other General Authorities from 1889 to 1890 was 218.95%, Wilford Woodruff's was 439.5%, which would indicate an increase in amount of property.

General Authority Income

Although the 1831 revelation referred to earlier had provided the theoretical basis for church support of the General Authorities, it was fifty years before any system was adopted to remunerate the hierarchy on a regular basis. In 1835, with the view that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," it was voted to provide $10.00 weekly to the Presiding Patriarch, but subsequently the main support that the Presiding Patriarch and local patriarch received was in the form of gratuities given by persons receiving the blessing. In 1835, it was also voted that the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and the First Council of Seventy had the right to call upon the church members for their support. Therefore, while travelling on missions to visit the scattered branches of the church, these men would receive collections from the local members to provide them with funds for transportation, food, lodging, and sometimes even clothing. Such voluntary support by local members was a haphazard affair, and was not used at the headquarters of the church.

Prior to the establishment of a system of set remuneration, the General Authorities were able to draw upon the general funds of the church for their needs, which included travel and clerical expenses for their church service. George Q. Cannon, for example, drew $27,488.67 (or nearly $2,300 annually) on his account with the Trustee-in-Trust from his appointment as an apostle in 1860 through the end of 1872. From January 1873 to April 1878, Cannon drew an additional $12,676 to build

48*Doctrine and Covenants*, Section 70:3-18 in recent Utah editions.

49Roberts, *History of the Church*, II, 273

50Ibid., II, 221.
himself a house.\textsuperscript{51} The funds drawn from the Trustee-in-Trust were regarded as interest-free loans, which could either be paid back in cash at a later time or be credited as payment for the services of the General Authorities to the Church. It has been noted that "this ability to draw, almost at will" on the church's reservoir of funds contributed to the enhanced economic standing of Brigham Young and other members of the Mormon hierarchy.\textsuperscript{52}

In addition to the above source of remuneration, the General Authorities received salaries when they served in the political arm of the Mormon Kingdom of God. At Nauvoo, salaries were given to municipal officers, among whom were many of the General Authorities. Joseph Smith, for example, received $601.61 for six months of service as Nauvoo's mayor from August 1843 to February 1844.\textsuperscript{53} In Utah Territory, Brigham Young's 1850-1857 federal salaries at their height were $2,500 annually as governor and $1,000 as ex-officio superintendent of Indian affairs.\textsuperscript{54} Moreover, the men who served in the territorial legislature, including General Authorities, also received compensation.\textsuperscript{55} Even the General Authorities who served on the Salt Lake City Council were eligible for


\textsuperscript{52}Arrington, "Settlement of Brigham Young Estate," pp. 7-8.

\textsuperscript{53}Nauvoo municipal financial record, February 9, 1844, in Nauvoo Collection, Church Archives.

\textsuperscript{54}U.S. Department of State, Register of Officers and Agents, Civil, Military, and Naval, in the Service of the United States, on the Thirtieth September, 1855... (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1856), pp. 90, 194. Prior to 1855 Young's combined federal salary was $2,500 annually.

remuneration: in 1877 it was $300 annually and in 1886 it was $3,500 annually. For the General Authorities who served in public office, these salaries provided important supplements to their other sources of income. As discussed elsewhere in this study, however, serving in public office by the hierarchy was the domain primarily of the First Presidency, Quorum of the Twelve, and Presiding Bishop. This tended to perpetuate economic strata within the hierarchy that corresponded roughly to ecclesiastical position.

A guide for analyzing income during the Brigham Young period is found in the records of the United States Internal Revenue Bureau during the period of America's first income tax, 1862-1872. Begun during the Civil War, the income tax was designed to apply only to the wealthiest income levels of the nation, and following the Civil War the taxpayers' exemption increased from $600 to $1,000 and finally to $2,000 during 1871-1872. Analysis of federal assessment lists for Utah indicate that the income tax applied to approximately six percent of Utah's wage earning population in 1863 and approximately one percent by 1871. The income tax lists for these years therefore make ciphers of the lower classes and the middle class. The percentage of the Mormon hierarchy that was included within America's economic elite during this period is shown in Table 17. Although there were obviously General Authorities

---

56Salt Lake City Council Minutes, 1877-1879 Book, p. 26, 1884-1887 Book, p. 644, microfilm, Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah.


58U.S. Office of Internal Revenue, Utah District, Annual Tax Assessment Lists, 1864-1873, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California. Utah income data for 1862, 1869, and 1872 is missing or is incomplete.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1863</th>
<th>1864</th>
<th>1865</th>
<th>1866</th>
<th>1867</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Hierarchy</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidency</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of 12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of 70</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. Bishop</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.B. Counselors</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

who were numbered within Utah's middle and lower classes economically, it is significant that when approximately six percent of Utah's wage earning population was eligible for income tax during the period 1863-1866, as much as fifty percent of the Mormon hierarchy was eligible. That proportion of disparity continued down to 1871 when only one percent of the population of Utah earned enough to be taxed, compared to nearly fifteen percent of the hierarchy.\textsuperscript{59} As far as echelons of the hierarchy go, the presidency (including secret counselors) and the bishopric were more represented in this upper income bracket than the Quorum of Twelve and Council of Seventy. The Patriarch was never within the taxable income bracket.

Even within this income elite of America and Utah, however, there was wide disparity. Most of the General Authorities were barely over

\textsuperscript{59}It is possible that the hierarchy, recognizing the scrutiny to which federal officials might subject them, actually declared an overestimate of their income. Brigham Young seems to have done so in 1870 by declaring his sale of railroad stock (which was church property) as his personal, taxable income.
the $600.00 exemption during the years 1863-1866, and the only members of the hierarchy who had more than one thousand dollars of taxable income during the entire period 1863 to 1871 were: Brigham Young at $111,181 in 1870, his secret counselor Joseph A. Young at $11,063 in 1866, his first counselor Heber C. Kimball at $2,500 in 1863 and 1864, his second counselor Daniel H. Wells at $2,000 in 1863, his secret counselor Apostle Brigham Young, Jr. at $6,580 in 1868, Apostle Lorenzo Snow at $1,080 in 1866, and member of the Council of Seventy Horace S. Eldredge at $9,051 in 1871. During the same period in Utah there were several men whose annual incomes averaged between $7,000 and $43,000 per year, and in Boston and New York of the period there were nearly one hundred men whose annual incomes were between $500,000 and $1,843,000. The fifteen to fifty percent of the General Authorities who were within America's income elite during 1863-1871, were at the bottom end of that affluence. As great as were the differences within the top five percent of Utah's and the nation's economic strata, however, such quantitative variation could hardly diminish the chasm that separated the economic life in the upper five percent from that of the rest of the population.

Following Brigham Young's death, there was sentiment within the Mormon hierarchy to establish limits on the amounts men could draw from the general funds of the church. While Brigham Young lived, anti-Mormons charged that he had manipulated church funds to his own financial interests. Following the death of Brigham Young, his confidant and

---


estate executor George Q. Cannon recorded in his journal that members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles were critical of Young's liberal use of church funds (even though some of that use may have been for church projects):

Some of my brethren, as I have learned since the death of President Brigham Young, did have feelings concerning his course. They did not approve of it, and felt opposed, and yet they dare not exhibit their feelings to him, he ruled with so strong and stiff a hand, and they felt that it would be of no use. In a few words, the feeling seems to be that he transcended the bounds of the authority which he legitimately held. I have been greatly surprised to find so much dissatisfaction in such quarters. It is felt that the funds of the Church have been used with a freedom not warranted by the authority which he held. . . .

That feeling finally resulted in a decision by the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, ruling in the absence of an organized First Presidency, on January 4, 1882 to establish a fixed salary for every one because they did not want to allow "any man in the Church President or Apostle to draw funds from the Church without limit for their own use or any other purpose."

Although that decision was consistent with revelations providing for financial support of the hierarchy, it nevertheless challenged a strong antipathy to salaried ministers that dated back to the Joseph Smith era. On May 12, 1838, for example, Joseph Smith and his first counselor Sidney Rigdon petitioned the high council in Missouri for financial remuneration for past services to the church. The high council granted the two men $1,100 each as a year's remuneration, but specified that this money was "not for preaching, or for receiving the word of God by revelation, neither for instructing the Saints in righteousness,


but for services rendered in the printing establishment, in translating the ancient records, etc., etc."64 There is evidence that even after this decision was couched in such careful terms by the high council, that a vote of the church members disapproved such remuneration.65 "Hireling priest" was an epithet the Mormons frequently hurled at the ministers of the rest of Christendom, and it was a designation the General Authorities were reluctant to have applied to themselves.

This resistance to the concept and conduct of receiving salaries continued long after the 1882 decision. At a meeting on September 8, 1887, Apostles Erastus Snow, Lorenzo Snow, and Joseph F. Smith stated their objections to salaries, and the latter apostle commented that "it was repugnant to the people to have the 12 draw a salary. He felt that it was a just principle that men should be assisted according to their necessities and that we should not draw salaries of a given amount." Nevertheless, it was Apostle Moses Thatcher's opinion that their remuneration was not a "full compensation" for their services to the church, and the meeting concluded with a vote to continue the allowances on an equal basis for all the apostles.66 When the Quorum of the Twelve proposed in 1888 to provide the members of the First Council of Seventy with a salary, in order to allow them to be freer of their private business employment, a member of the Council, Abraham H. Cannon, said: "I would prefer to receive no salary."67 Moreover, when the First

64 Roberts, History of the Church, III, 32.
66 Journal of Heber J. Grant, September 8, 1887, Church Archives.
67 Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, April 6, 1888, Brigham Young University.
Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve discussed the salary system again in 1896, President Wilford Woodruff said that he had not drawn money from the church until after 1877 and Apostle Lorenzo Snow, Woodruff’s presidential successor, said that despite the allowance system, he had not drawn from church funds for forty years. The meeting concluded with a vote to end fixed salaries and return to a system of allowing men to draw on church funds according to need. The persistent disinclination among the General Authorities to use church funds to support their needs reached its climax in President Heber J. Grant, who rode public street cars rather than use tithing funds to have an automobile and chauffeur for the presidency.

Despite the discomfort of many of the General Authorities, a salary or allowance system continued without significant interruption from 1882 onward. Initially, the apostles appear to have received $2,000 to $2,500 annually, until August 1887 when the senior apostle received $5,000, the apostles of middle seniority received $3,000, and the junior apostles received $2,000 annually. As mentioned earlier, in September 1887 that system was changed to one of uniform compensation with each of the apostles receiving $3,000. Although the allowance for the First Council of Seventy in 1888 is not extant, the “annuity” for the Presiding Patriarch was increased from $1,000 to $1,250 in 1888.

68 Journal History, April 2, 1896, pp. 3-6; Brigham Young, Jr. Journal, April 7, 1896.

69 Journal Sheets of Heber J. Grant, November 13, 1920, Church Archives.

70 Journal of Wilford Woodruff, January 10, 1883, August 12, 1887.

71 Journal of Heber J. Grant, September 8, 1887.

72 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, January 31, 1888, Church Archives.
By the turn of the twentieth century, the allowances of the Mormon hierarchy had become rapidly systemized according to ecclesiastical position. In 1890, the monthly allowance of the Quorum of the Twelve and Presiding Bishop were identical, with the counselors in the presidency receiving $50 more a month, and the President of the Church receiving still an additional $100. By 1907, the monthly allowances had become stratified into a six-tiered system: 1) the lowest allowance was given to the junior members of the First Council of Seventy, 2) the next higher allowance, to the middle members of the Council of Seventy and the Presiding Patriarch, 3) the next higher to the eight junior members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, 4) the next higher to the entire Presiding Bishopric, the two senior members of the Council of Seventy, and the four senior members of the Quorum of the Twelve, 5) the next highest to the counselors in the presidency, 6) and the highest to the President of the Church. One hundred dollars separated the 1907 monthly allowances of the top two tiers, and only fifty dollars separated each of the lower tiers. By 1932, there were only four tiers in the monthly allowance system: 1) the lowest allowance was for the counselors to the Presiding Bishop and the entire First Council of Seventy, 2) an allotment of fifty dollars more for the Presiding Bishop, the Presiding Patriarch, and the entire Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, 3) an additional increase of one hundred dollars for counselors in the presidency, 4) and a final increase of an additional $150 for the President of the Church.73

Another source of personal income to the hierarchy derived from

---
73Statements of monthly income in the estate appraisements and inventories of deceased General Authorities, Salt Lake County Probate Court, located at Utah State Archives and Salt Lake County Clerk's Office, Salt Lake City; Trustee-in-Trust records, Church Archives.
General Authority leadership in business corporations. It has been observed that men did not receive financial remuneration for serving as officers and directors of church business corporations during the Brigham Young period. Once the federal campaign destroyed Mormon political hegemony, however, it became more common for General Authorities to be paid for their services to church-owned, controlled, or affiliated business enterprises. By the twentieth century, financial remuneration for General Authorities serving as officers and directors in such firms was the general policy. Such business leadership was primarily the realm of the First Presidency, Quorum of the Twelve, and the Presiding Bishopric, and therefore the resultant income was distributed in a manner that continued the economic stratification of the Mormon hierarchy.

The best illustration of the corporate side of General Authority finances is George Albert Smith, an apostle from 1903 to 1945, and President of the Church from then to his death in 1951. As a member of the Quorum of the Twelve in 1915, for example, he was a director of three church enterprises (Utah Savings and Trust Company, Utah Home Fire Insurance Company, and ZCMI) for which he received a total of $1,260 in directors fees out of his annual income of $5,088. His allowance from the church in that year was $1,800. This same general proportion continued throughout his service as an apostle, but in the first year of his service as President of the Church his income jumped more than 500%. This increase was a direct result of George Albert Smith’s sudden advancement to corporate positions that were functions of his new role as President of the Church. An undated statement indicates that as

74Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, p. 299.

75All data for this paragraph is taken from Box 110, George Albert Smith financial papers, University of Utah.
President of the Church George Albert Smith's monthly income of $2,307.85 came from the following sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Authority allowance</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State National Bank</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zions Savings Bank</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-I Sugar Company</td>
<td>307.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Life Insurance Co.</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber J. Grant &amp; Company</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Home Fire Insurance Co.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Utah Company</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCMI</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because corporate leadership in church business enterprises by General Authorities was a function of their position in the hierarchy, the opportunities for financial improvement were the highest for the President of the Church, and decreased at subordinate echelons.

A less stratified and less formal source of income became available to General Authorities because their positions in the hierarchy gave them a status of trust within the Mormon community. Many businesses that were not controlled by the church seemed to include General Authorities on boards of directors because of the prestige these men lend to the organizations, rather than because of the amount of stock the man held or his business acumen. Another source of income derived from the position of the General Authorities as doctrinal and ecclesiastical experts within Mormonism. Beginning with Parley P. Pratt's *A Voice of Warning* in 1837, more than a score of the General Authorities appointed down to 1932 wrote articles and books on doctrine, history, biography, autobiography, collected sermons, and religious poetry. The reading and purchasing appeal of these works resulted directly from the fact that their authors were revered as authority figures by the Mormon reading public. Not all General Authorities who did publish actually sought or received financial remuneration for their writings, but for those who did, the income could be substantial. When Joseph Fielding Smith died,
after a publication career that had begun even before his appointment as an Apostle in 1910, his uncollected royalties (apparently for a six month period) were $9,636.48. Relatively few of the General Authorities obtained these indirect benefits, but membership in the Mormon hierarchy made such opportunities possible.

The tendency for income to be stratified within the twentieth century hierarchy is demonstrated in Chart 10. Because the source of information is confidential, no absolute values of total annual incomes are indicated in the chart, although the relative values of annual income are shown according to echelons of the hierarchy. Throughout the entire period 1912-1928 there was a consistent clustering at the bottom end of the income scale of the mean income values for the counselors to the Presiding Bishop, the members of the First Council of Seventy, and the Presiding Patriarch. This is a marked change in economic status for both the counselors to the Presiding Bishop and the Council of Seventy, from their late nineteenth century status as shown in Chart 7. As stated earlier, the Council of Seventy were offered set salaries in 1888, so that they would not have to engage in private business activities. Once they began receiving such allowances from the church, however, members of the Council of Seventy not only were seldom included in corporate leadership in church business enterprises, but their allowances were set below that of their ecclesiastical superiors. The combination of these factors seems to have contributed directly toward the change in the economic status of the First Council of Seventy. The change with respect to the counselors to the Presiding Bishop is not as easily

76 Estate File of Joseph Fielding Smith, Salt Lake County Probate Clerk's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.
CHART 10
RELATIVE INCOME OF HIERARCHY, 1912–1928

[Graph showing relative income of hierarchy from 1912 to 1928 with various categories such as First President, Counselors, President, Pres. Bishop, Quorum of 12, P.B. Counselors, Council of 70, Patriarch.]
explained, for these men were consistently involved in corporate leadership of church businesses in the twentieth century. It may be that their change in income status may also derive from the fact that their allowances were on par with that of the First Council of Seventy. Moreover, as indicated in Table 17, only one of the counselors of the bishopric earned enough to be taxed during the 1863-1871 period.

Chart 10 shows that the upper incomes of the hierarchy also tended to cluster. The close proximity of the incomes of the counselors in the presidency and of the Quorum of the Twelve during the period 1912-1924 reflects not only the nearness of their monthly allowances, but the fact that during this period the counselors were former members of the Quorum of the Twelve. The sharp change that occurred in 1925 resulted from the change in position of the extremely wealthy Charles W. Nibley: from Presiding Bishop to a counselor in the First Presidency. Even after that change, however, the Presiding Bishop had greater income than the mean annual income of the Quorum of the Twelve: a continuation of the trend for property ownership found in Chart 7. As was true of the property ownership and annual income for the nineteenth century, shown in Chart 7 and Table 17, the President of the Church and Presiding Bishop both tended to have the top incomes in the twentieth century. This was reinforced, and perhaps made possible, by the allowance structure and the allocation of corporate responsibility that was characteristic of the twentieth century hierarchy.

Debt and Debt Cancellation

As mentioned earlier, records of property ownership and annual income give no indication of such economic factors as personal indebtedness. Debt was a recurring factor in the economic life of the General
Authorities, extending back to Joseph Smith. Amid the decline of Kirtland's economy and the subsequent collapse of the church there, Joseph Smith was named as defendant or co-defendant in twelve lawsuits to recover unpaid debts. Judgments were rendered against the prophet in five suits, totalling awards of $15,221.76, plus court costs and out-of-court settlements of debts amounting to more than nine thousand dollars.78 Debt continued to plague Joseph Smith and other General Authorities at Nauvoo.

In Utah, the Panic of 1893 resulted in a situation wherein half of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles were in heavy personal debt.79 Moreover, in 1910, Apostle Anthony W. Ivins recorded that the following other members of the Quorum of the Twelve were in debt: Francis M. Lyman, George Albert Smith, Heber J. Grant, Rudger Clawson, Hyrum M. Smith, George F. Richards, and David O. McKay.80

The anguish felt in such circumstances was indicated poignantly by three apostles. John Henry Smith wrote in 1893, "Money matters are simply

78Geauga County, Ohio, Court of Common Please Record Book Q, pp. 506-508, Book U, pp. 67-69, 97-99, 100-101, 106-107, 237, 277-278, 351-353, 362-364, 383, 512-513, Book V, pp. 5-6, 63-65, in Geauga Country Court House, Chardon, Ohio. On page 200 of No Man Knows My History, Fawn M. Brodie presents a list of suits against Joseph Smith for Kirtland debts, the factual errors of which cause a discrepancy between her data and that presented here. Her first error is in the implication on page 201 that creditors were awarded or received by default all damages sought in suits not settled out of court. This would have amounted to $24,000, when in fact the court awarded only $15,221.76 in damages. Moreover, using her number identification of the suits, her list contains the following factual errors: #7, Hyrum Smith, not Joseph Smith, was co-defendant; #9, the plaintiffs were Seymour & Griffith, and the court ruled against them, requiring them to pay court costs and defendants' costs; #13, Jacob Bump was the plaintiff. I could not locate her #5, #10, or #12 suits, which may have been my own oversight. She, however, failed to note a suit in Book Q, pp. 506-508 by Dennis Lake v. Joseph Smith Jr. in which the court decided in favor of Smith, and a suit in Book V, pp. 5-6 by Commercial Bank of Lake Erie v. Smith and others, which was settled out of court.


desperate no person seems to know how to turn in order to meet their obligations." Heber J. Grant in 1899 wrote, "I was ruined financially," and Reed Smoot wrote in 1930, after learning that he owed $600,000 in defaulted obligations in which he was co-signer for others, "Not a wink of sleep last night. I feel like life is not worth living." Heber J. Grant was the most philosophical about debt:

A president of the stake begged and pleaded with me to quit paying tithing. He said I did not owe any tithing until I got out of debt. Would not that have been a fine record for a man who now stands as president of the Church, not to have paid tithing for thirty-two years? Nearly all the hierarchy knew the struggle with indebtedness: many repaid their debts after long years of effort, and others died in debt.

Joseph Smith established a precedent for still another response to debt: a form of debt cancellation. On April 23, 1834, he dictated a revelation that stated in part: "...behold it is my will that you should pay all your debts." Then with characteristic irony, on the very same day Smith also required Kirtland's bishop Newel K. Whitney to cancel $3,635.35 of debts owed by several church leaders to Whitney, the largest of which was Smith's $1151.31 debt. Whitney could hardly have relished such a personal loss to his own finances, and he variously described this transaction as having occurred "because Joseph said it must be done" and because

81Journal of John Henry Smith, August 7, 1893; Heber J. Grant 1898-1899 Journal, p. 100, January 5, 1899; Reed Smoot Diary, November 19 and 20, 1930, Brigham Young University.

82G. Homer Durham, compiler, Gospel Standards: Selections from the Sermons and Writings of Heber J. Grant, Seventh President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1942), p. 59.

83Doctrine and Covenants, p. 245; Section 104:78 in Utah editions.
"Joseph said it was the will of the Lord." If such demands were made frequently upon Whitney, this would account for the steady decline in wealth of this formerly prosperous merchant and future Presiding Bishop, as discussed in reference to Chart 4.

At Nauvoo, Joseph Smith canceled his debts in 1842 by declaring legal bankruptcy under the recently passed federal bankruptcy act. A handwritten "Schedule setting forth a list of Petitioners, Crediters, their residence, and the amount due to each," signed by Joseph Smith, was apparently prepared to support his bankruptcy petition, and lists $107,395.60 in debts, at least $31,597.02 of which were debts contracted at Kirtland. Joseph Smith's bankruptcy proceedings did not free him from indebtedness, and on April 24, 1844, the crowning achievement of Nauvoo's cultural history was the performance of a five act play "Pizarro," which was produced "to aid in the discharge of a debt, against President Joseph Smith, contracted through the odious persecution of Missouri, and

84Document 113, Newel K. Whitney Family Papers, Brigham Young University. The men for whom debts were canceled were the three members of the First Presidency (Smith, Sidney Rigdon, and Frederick G. Williams), the former "Second Elder" and future Associate President Oliver Cowdery, and John Johnson (father of two men who would become members of the new Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in 1835, and father-in-law of another original member of that body). The four previously had formed the United Firm, a cooperative experiment to which Whitney had contributed most of the capital.

85The Wasp (Nauvoo, Illinois), May 7, 1842.

86Document in RLDS Archives. Fawn Brodie data on pages 201 and 266 of No Man Knows My History differs from the amounts shown here for two reasons: she failed to include a debt of $911.14 to Thompson & Co., and she included in Smith's Kirtland debts two debts that may not have been incurred there: $921.06 to W.T. Jones & Co., and $1000.00 to John Ayers. The amount of Smith's indebtedness was quoted as $99,325.57 in the LDS newspaper The Wasp, June 25, 1842. That may have been a statement of the value of the initial indebtedness without the accrued interest. The itemized list includes accrued interest on several of the debts, and on others the interest appears to have been included.
vexatious law suits." In addition, Smith's own unhappy experience with debt, creditors, lawsuits, and bankruptcy did not dissuade him from filing suit in Nauvoo on June 7, 1844, to collect a debt of $22.75.88

Joseph Smith's example in debt cancellation was followed by several other members of the hierarchy during the next sixty years. On the same day Joseph Smith filed for bankruptcy, similar petitions for bankruptcy were filed by his counselor Sidney Rigdon, Patriarch Hyrum Smith, and Presiding Bishop-designate Vinson Knight.89 Aside from suits in which they were co-defendants with Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon and Hyrum Smith had been successfully sued in Kirtland for more than six thousand dollars, but the extent of their Nauvoo debts is unknown.90 Although the highest leadership of the church had filed for bankruptcy in April 1842, the same Mormon newspaper that had published the legal notices of their applications, printed on June 11 a satirical criticism of the abuse of the federal bankruptcy law.91 Bankruptcy at Nauvoo, however, was not a significant disability to the status of the hierarchy, since Roger Orton was sustained a member of the Council of Seventy in 1845 after he had filed

87Playbill for "Pizarro," Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

88Nauvoo Docket Book, 1841-1845, p. 251, Mormon Collection, Chicago Historical Society, Chicago, Illinois. The suit was probably intended to punish its defendant, Sylvester Emmons, for having been the editor of the Nauvoo Expositor's first edition of anti-Smith propaganda the day the suit was filed. Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 430.

89The Wasp, May 7, 1842.


for bankruptcy.\footnote{Nauvoo Property Tax Assessments, s.v. "Roger Orton."} Apparently the next current General Authority to file for bankruptcy was a member of the Council of Seventy, J. Golden Kimball, who was declared a voluntary bankrupt on April 28, 1899, due to his having $11,126 in debts and only $2031 in assets.\footnote{Bankruptcy case 467, U.S. District Court of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.} By the twentieth century, however, the upper echelons of the hierarchy were unwilling for any of their members to be declared a bankrupt. Thus, Apostle Reed Smoot in 1902 persuaded the creditors of fellow apostle John W. Taylor to settle Taylor's $140,000 debts at ten cents on the dollar.\footnote{Journal of Anthon H. Lund, March 27, 1902.} Although Joseph Smith had led the way in debt cancellation practice, the theological standard of debt repayment that he announced in 1834 was the more usual policy for the General Authorities who succeeded him.

**Net Worth at Death**

The various economic indicators discussed up to now, both from quantitative and impressionistic sources, have given insights into the wealth of the General Authorities from a variety of perspectives. None of the sources, however, have been able to indicate with precision the actual net worth of the Mormon hierarchy at any point in time. The only economic resource that can do this is the probated estate record of each deceased man, and even this resource has its limitations. First of all, estate records can be found for only seventy-one of the 124 General Authorities in this study. Because the probate records are available for a higher percentage of the men who served in the hierarchy during the Utah phase of Mormon history, the focus will be primarily upon the net worth of the
hierarchy during this period. The figure of net worth arrived at here will be the total appraised value of the estate, minus life insurance policy awards, and minus all debts of the deceased that do not derive directly from the fact of his death. Debts that are not included in the calculations are hospital fees for the last illness, funeral expenses, and administrative costs of the probate. In some instances the real worth of the individual was concealed through prior transfers of property to wives, and through the establishment of a living trust that freed much of his personal wealth from probate inventory. Nevertheless, with all their limitations, the estate records provide the best indication of the net worth of the General Authorities at the time of death.

The only available pre-Utah estate for a man who died while still functioning as a General Authority was that of Joseph Smith Jr. The inventory and appraisement of his personal property showed a total of $1022.25, including the value of his clothing. Moreover, a deposition filed on May 30, 1845, stated that the real property of his estate "will not bring more than one thousand dollars," and further indicated that it would be insufficient to pay the legal debts against the estate. The estimate of Smith's real estate was undoubtedly too conservative: not only was the 1843 appraised value of Joseph Smith's real estate several times the amount estimated, but the final account of Emma Smith as guardian of the Smith children in 1847 shows that she had sold five of the twenty-

---

95Data for this section are taken from individual estate files from Salt Lake County, Cache County, Washington County, Weber County, Sanpete County, Utah, and from Bear Lake County, Idaho.

96Inventory and Appraisement of Estate of Joseph Smith Jr., August 10, 1844, and deposition of Almon W. Babbitt, May 30, 1845, both documents in private autograph collection of Steven Barnett, Provo, Utah.
nine blocks of Nauvoo Real Estate for $1,060. This suggests that the value of Joseph Smith's real estate at his death was closer to $5,000. Nevertheless, the evaluation of his property as being insufficient to cover his debts was accurate: between 1845 and 1849 the probate court allowed debts against his estate totalling $25,023.95, plus $2,645.78 of interest on specified debts. More than $13,400 of these estate debts were among those he had previously included in his bankruptcy petition.

For the men who died while serving as General Authorities during the Utah period of Mormonism, the inclusive dates for available estates stretches between the first estate record for Willard Richards in 1854 and the final estate record of Joseph Fielding Smith in 1972. To analyze the relative net worth of the echelons of the hierarchy, the full period will be divided into two segments: 1854-1913 and 1914-1972. The men will be grouped in the period in which they died, according to the office within the hierarchy they held the year of their deaths. Only the estates of General Authorities appointed prior to 1932 are included here, excluding those men who died several years after being dropped from the hierarchy.

Table 18 indicates the mean values of the net worth of each of the echelons in the hierarchy during the period 1854-1913. The table verifies trends that were observable in the property assessments and in the income tax rolls for nineteenth century Utah. In all three economic indicators, the President of the Church tended to be high on the economic ladder.

97 Final Account of Emma Smith, May 3, 1847, Circuit Court, Carthage, Illinois.

98 Hancock County Probate Court, Claim Record C, 242, Hancock County Probate Court 1841-1849 Record, 229, 250, 275, both records at Carthage, Illinois. Cf. Smith's bankruptcy schedule at RLDS Archives.
Just as Chart 7 and Table 17 indicated that the Council of Seventy tended to have more property and income wealth during the mid and late nineteenth century than the Counselors to the President, the net worth of the men involved seems to bear out this relation. Moreover, the suggestion of Chart 7 that the Presiding Bishop and his counselors would be significantly more wealthy than the Quorum of the Twelve on the average is also supported by Table 18. With one or two exceptions, the men whose estates are included in the calculations for Table 18 were men included in the tabulations for Charts 6 and 7 and Table 17, and the general economic trends indicated on the basis of income tax assessments and property tax assessments are reflected in the estates. Individual variations of course existed, and therefore attention will also be given to the net worth of deceased members of each echelon.

**TABLE 18**

**NET WORTH OF DECEASED GENERAL AUTHORITIES, 1854-1913**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President of the Church</td>
<td>$137,729.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Council of Seventy</td>
<td>89,480.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors to President</td>
<td>83,711.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop</td>
<td>52,961.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop Counselors</td>
<td>15,132.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of Twelve Apostles</td>
<td>6,913.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch to the Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Presidents of the Church who died prior to 1913 on the average had the highest net worth, the disparities were notable. Brigham Young's estate (1877) was complicated due to his mixing of personal and church accounts, and the original estate file is now missing
at the Utah State Archives. Therefore his net estate figure is only that amount given for distribution to his heirs: $361,170.\textsuperscript{99} Although that is undoubtedly a conservative statement of Young's pre-death wealth, it is still the largest net worth of the Presidents in this period, each of whom had substantially less total wealth than his predecessor. John Taylor's net worth at death (1887) was $138,901, Wilford Woodruff's (1898) was $32,000, and Lorenzo Snow's (1901) was $18,845. The decline is most remarkable with Woodruff and Snow, and can best be understood in terms of their own attitudes toward wealth. Wilford Woodruff was more interested in history than business, and, although his property assessments indicate that he was not really poor, he seemed not to care about being very rich. The financial advantages that came to him as President of the Church he accepted, but did not expand upon. Although Lorenzo Snow was the only member of the Quorum of the Twelve whose income was high enough to be taxed in 1870 and 1871, he had developed the cooperative movement in Brigham City, Utah, on his own initiative and seemed intent throughout his life on achieving the equalitarian ideals of Mormonism. During his brief tenure as president, he began to dismantle the church's corporate structure and to urge tithing as a general practice among Mormons.\textsuperscript{100}

Although the average net worth of deceased members of the First Council of Seventy was second only to the Presidents of the Church, the disparities were greater within the council than within any other echelon of the hierarchy during the period. The highest net worth was that of Horace S. Eldredge (1888) at $585,444, and the next plateau was that of Edward Stevenson (1897) at $18,023 and Albert P. Rockwood (1879) at

\textsuperscript{99}Arrington, "Settlement of Brigham Young Estate," p. 10. See discussion of Brigham Young estate in Footnote 25.

\textsuperscript{100}Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, pp. 406-407.
$14,308. Each of these men had been involved in business and corporate leadership, contrary to the trend of the Council of Seventy. The next plateau was occupied by John Van Cott (1883) whose net worth of $7,006 seems likely to have placed him in Utah's middle class, or upper middle class at the most. The next level within the council is low enough to have been well within Utah's poverty bracket: William W. Taylor (1884) at $856, Christian D. Fjeldsted (1905) at $530, and George Reynolds (1909) at $200. Although both Taylor and Reynolds had been engaged in corporate leadership, they had been primarily given secretarial positions within the companies, which had little of the remunerative rewards that directors and officers increasingly received at the turn of the century. Fjeldsted was a member of the council who fulfilled the spirit of his calling by serving many proselyting missions, but who became poor thereby.

The Counselors to the Presidency were all more wealthy at their deaths than the lower strata of the Council of Seventy, even though disparity existed among them as well. The lowest value of net worth was for Willard Richards (1854) whose $8,444 was nonetheless substantial for the time and place. The next lowest was at the other end of the time period, when John Henry Smith (1911) died with a net worth of $19,219, which certainly was above poverty. Throughout the time period the rest of the counselors had a net worth rivalling the Presidents of the Church. Heber C. Kimball (1868), who had boasted that Mormonism had made him a rich man of $20,000 in 1860, left a net worth of $95,050.77 to his dozens of wives and children in 1868. George A. Smith (1875), who had been among the poorest property holders in the hierarchy prior to his becoming a counselor to Brigham Young in 1868, gradually increased his wealth until at his death it was $33,332.15. George Q. Cannon (1901) had served four presidents as a counselor, and at his death his net worth was $200,419, more than ten
times that of the last man he served as counselor. John R. Winder (1910) had been counselor to the Presiding Bishop from 1886 to 1901 and to the President of the Church from then to his death, when his own net worth was $145,805.82. Kimball and Richards gained the start toward much of their wealth through the generous allotments of land they received at the founding of Mormon Utah, and George A. Smith, Cannon, and Winder had been very prominent in church enterprises and private businesses. John Henry Smith's relatively lower economic standing is unusual in terms of his quite active role in church and private corporations, and may reflect over extension on his part financially, or a transfer of property prior to his death.

In the Presiding Bishopric, the trend was downward, although still at a comparatively high level. Presiding Bishop Edward Hunter (1883) who had been one of the wealthiest men in Nauvoo prior to his appointment was worth $68,494.59 at his death, and his successor William B. Preston (1908), whose property valuations declined steadily for some years after his appointment, died with a net worth of $37,428. Significantly below the Presiding Bishop were Counselors Leonard W. Hardy (1884) at $16,473.26 and Robert T. Burton (1907) at $13,791.68. Although the men of the Presiding Bishopric were almost totally involved with financial interests, their estates and previously examined economic indicators all demonstrate that even such proximity to the church's financial resources did not guarantee financial affluence.

The men who died as apostles prior to 1913 showed evidence of the poverty, debt, and modest economic status that characterized the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles in the nineteenth century. The lowest figure was that of Abraham H. Cannon (1896) who died $32,800 in debt, and whose heirs were saved from crushing financial embarrassment only through an insurance
policy he had obtained shortly before his death that paid nearly $48,000. Cannon's situation at his death was clearly a combination of over-extension and the effects of the Panic of 1893: his 148,187 shares of capital stock in twenty-two companies (primarily speculative ventures) were valued at $11.00. Aside from Cannon, there were no estates as low as the First Council of Seventy's extremes: Brigham Young, Jr. (1903) at $1,200, Franklin D. Richards (1899) at $1,416, George Teasdale (1907) at $2,262, Abraham Owen Woodruff (1904) at $2,388, Orson Pratt (1881) at $2,566, and Orson Hyde (1879) at $2,798. Had no figure been given for the net worth of these apostles, one would recognize their common denominator almost at once as men whose interests, aside from Orson Hyde, had never been in the realm of material acquisitiveness and entrepreneurial endeavors. In the case of Hyde, he had not been given the institutional opportunities of the church with which to develop his entrepreneurial interests. The real surprise within the Quorum of the Twelve was Daniel H. Wells (1891) who had served since the death of Brigham Young as a counselor to the quorum, and whose worth at death was $3,156. In Nauvoo he was one of the wealthiest landowners, his income had been within America's elite until 1869, and the assessed valuation of his property in 1876 was $30,000. By the time Brigham Young's death removed Wells from the presidency in 1877, he was heavily in debt, and his property valuations began a downward spiral that ended only at his death in 1891. After the death of Brigham Young, Wells no longer had the corporate advantages of the presidency and he was apparently too old or no longer inclined to develop his own entrepreneurial resources as he had done in Commerce, Illinois, before it became Nauvoo. Extreme wealth was not plentiful in the Quorum of the Twelve for this period: Parley P. Pratt (1857) had amassed a net worth of $26,000, which was high for the times, Erastus
Snow's (1889) net worth was $14,780, and Marriner W. Merrill's (1906) net wealth was $40,890.

The twentieth century hierarchy, as might be expected, demonstrated a higher wealth at death that corresponded with Utah's own material increases. Table 19 indicates the slightly altered financial status of the echelons within the Mormon hierarchy for the men who became General Authorities prior to 1932, and who died between 1914 and 1972. It is unfortunate that no men appointed prior to 1932 died as members of the Presiding Bishopric after 1914, for the gaps therefore do not allow a complete analysis of trends. Ignoring the Presiding Bishopric and discounting the tremendous wealth of Charles W. Nibley who became a counselor to the president in 1925, it is evident that the only major change in the financial status between Chart 10's statement of income and Table 19's statement of net worth at death is that the First Council of Seventy's mean wealth at the time of death had surpassed that of the Quorum of the Twelve. Analysis of the individuals within the echelons, however, gives added evidence of disparity, but also of a tendency for financial status to mirror position in the hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NET WORTH AT DEATH OF MEN WHO WERE GENERAL AUTHORITIES BEFORE 1932 AND DIED, 1914-1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors to the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Council of Seventy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishopric Counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of Twelve Apostles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch to the Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although by now it is evident that extreme wealth for Presidents of the Church was almost axiomatic, there were still differences of degree. The greatest wealth in the period 1914-1972 centered in a father-son combination of direct descent from the founding Mormon family of Smiths. Joseph F. Smith (1918) died with a net worth of $415,180, and in consideration of the sh\'nking dollar over the century, his wealth was relatively greater than his son's, Joseph Fielding Smith (1972), which was $509,030 (in liquid assets). Considering that both men were employed in clerical positions when they entered the hierarchy at twenty-six and thirty-three years of age, respectively, their rise to wealth was inextricably connected with the opportunities given them by their positions in the hierarchy. Lower on the scale, but still very substantial was the final wealth of Heber J. Grant (1945), $150,026. Farther down the scale, possibly because advancing age had made it advisable to distribute property to avoid inheritance tax for the heirs,\textsuperscript{101} were the estates of David O. McKay (1970) at $37,183 and George Albert Smith (1951) at $80,676.

The men who died as counselors in the presidency during this period tended to cluster in wealth, with one exception. Stephen L. Richards (1959) had the highest net worth at death, amounting to $297,204, which reflected his earnest and intricate activity in corporate leadership and investment that had predated his 1917 appointment as an apostle. In a general cluster of wealth were Anthony W. Ivins (1934) at $43,391, Anthon H. Lund (1921) at $33,289, and Charles W. Penrose (1925) at $24,113. The latter two men had indicated greater interest throughout their lives in

\textsuperscript{101}Joseph Fielding Smith gave a total of $210,000 in cash gifts during the two years prior to his death, which were subject to probate and inheritance tax due to Utah's then current law about gifts in anticipation of death. See his estate file at Salt Lake County Probate Clerk's office.
areas other than business: for Lund it was education, and for Penrose it was journalism. All of them, inevitably, had carried out corporate responsibilities as an extension of their church office. The lowest in the group was Charles W. Nibley (1931), whose $18,831.36 of probated net wealth reflects both the inroads upon his former wealth that losses in his sugar and lumber investments caused, as well as the fact that he had previously put many of his assets into a family corporation.102

Although the Council of Seventy came next in mean wealth, again its internal disparities were massive. At the bottom end were Seymour B. Young (1924) whose estate showed him $1,097 in debt at his death, and Brigham H. Roberts (1933) whose net worth at death was $348. Somewhat better were J. Golden Kimball (1938) at $8,588 and Rulon S. Wells (1941) at $9,446. Like the wealthy members of the nineteenth century council, however, the next plateau rises almost vertically from those of intermediate wealth: Antoine R. Ivins (1967) at $139,059 and Levi Edgar Young (1963) at $186,633. The wealth of each of these latter men was almost exclusively in liquid assets, representing a judicious corporate investment.

Had pre-1932 members of the Presiding Bishopric died as functioning members of that body after 1914, their mean wealth would probably be represented at least at this point, if not up with the presidency. In view of that gap, however, the next echelon in mean wealth at death is the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. As was true of the quorum in the 1854-1913 period, only moderate disparities exist. At the lowest end of the spectrum, it is surprising to find Francis M. Lyman (1916) whose net worth was only $5,123, despite an extremely active business life. Either he had not escaped from the condition he was in when Ivins listed him as one

of the debtor apostles in 1910, or he had transferred most of his liquid assets to the Francis M. Lyman Company he had incorporated in 1912. Orson F. Whitney's (1931) net worth of $7,159 is, on the other hand, quite expected, since his non-ecclesiastical life had been devoted to journalism and writing poetry, rather than to business. At the next level, James E. Talmage (1933) had a net worth of $29,576 and Melvin J. Ballard (1939) a worth of $31,000. Like Whitney, Talmage's interests had lain primarily in a non-business field, but Talmage's publications were so massive that through royalties and the sale of copyrights to the LDS Church, Talmage had fared somewhat better than Whitney. Ballard, on the other hand, had been engaged in business prior to his calling to the apostleship in 1919, but afterwards he limited his business activities to being an officer in his son's businesses and in one or two of the church's enterprises. The next two men had been more actively engaged in business activities, even though they were better known as educators: John A. Widtsoe (1952) at $42,117 and Joseph F. Merrill (1952) at $99,386. The remaining two apostles in this period, Reed Smoot (1941) at $68,000 and Sylvester Q. Cannon (1943) at $56,301, had been ardent businessmen both in church enterprises and in private business activity. The relatively small size of their final worth reflects the reverses each experienced: Smoot's near bankruptcy during the Depression due to the investments of his sons for which he assumed responsibility, and Cannon's physical breakdown in the late 1930's that had resulted from his massive corporate responsibilities as a Presiding Bishop and which caused his being released as Presiding Bishop to join the Quorum of the Twelve.\footnote{Journal of Sylvester Q. Cannon, April 5, 1938, Church Archives.}
within the hierarchy has by now become as predictable as the position of
the President of the Church as the highest. When Patriarch John Smith
died in 1911 after fifty-six years of service in his office, his net worth
was probably too low to require a probate. In any event, no record of
an estate for him seems to exist. His grandson, Hyrum G. Smith, became
his successor as Presiding Patriarch in 1912, and when he died in 1932
his net worth was $250. The temporary economic elevation of the office
of Presiding Patriarch at Nauvoo was merely a reflection of Hyrum Smith's
role as Associate President over the church with Joseph Smith, rather
than an elevation of the status of the patriarch. Throughout the rest of
the period from 1833 to 1932 the status of the Presiding Patriarch in
economic terms was consistently the lowest within the Mormon hierarchy.

Having examined the individual and group characteristics of final
worth in the hierarchy, the question that remains is how did their final
net worth compare with that of the rest of the population in Utah? To
answer that question with precision would require far more quantification
than is possible for the present study: in Salt Lake County alone more
than 18,000 individual estates had been probated by 1932 and by the death
of the last man of this study in 1972, there were more than 59,000 indi-
vidual estate files for Salt Lake County. A means for determining the
highest level of worth for the period does exist, however, in the inheri-
tance tax records for Salt Lake County, where the estates of most of the
General Authorities were probated. In the period 1905-1938, only nine
percent of the total number of estates probated were entered in Salt
Lake County's inheritance tax and lien books. Therefore, just as the
income tax records for 1862-1872 defined America's highest level of
wealth for the living, these inheritance tax records defined the highest
level of wealth for the recently deceased of Salt Lake County, 1905-1938.  

Within this group of Salt Lake County's affluent were fifty percent of the General Authorities whose estates were probated during this period. Every member of the First Presidency and Presiding Bishopric whose estate was probated in Salt Lake County was within the top nine percent of wealth, and forty percent of the Quorum of the Twelve was likewise within this level of affluence. Not included within this economic elite of Salt Lake County's deceased were the Presiding Patriarch and members of the First Council of Seventy whose estates were probated during the period. By comparing the percentages of representation of hierarchy echelons in this economic elite with the percentages of inclusion in Table 17 for the 1862-1872 income tax, it is apparent that during the twentieth century, the personal wealth of the Presidency, the Quorum of the Twelve, the Presiding Bishop and his counselors had become more firmly established within Utah's economic elite. By the same comparison, however, the economic position of the members of the First Council of Seventy and of the Presiding Patriarch had deteriorated with respect to Utah's income elite. These trends of wealth are entirely consistent with the institutional controls of economic opportunity for the hierarchy in terms of allowance strata and corporate leadership.

As was true of all previous economic grouping, there was an economic spectrum within this upper level of wealth for Salt Lake County's deceased persons. The mean value of the estates for non-hierarchy men was more than $84,000, whereas the mean value of the General Authority estates in this group was $76,500. Moreover, the largest General

\[104\] Information for this section was extracted from the Salt Lake County, Utah, Inheritance Tax and Lien Sooks, 1905-1938, Utah State Archives.
Authority estate was that of Joseph F. Smith, at $421,783.105 Although this sizable estate was ten or twenty times greater than the estates of other General Authorities, Joseph F. Smith's wealth was far below the upper extremes of Salt Lake County's economic elite. The top twenty-one estates of Salt Lake County during the period 1906-1938 were: Thomas Kearns ($2,078,671), David Keith ($2,071,466), Enos A. Wall ($1,467,145), Albert Fisher ($1,383,195), Windsor V. Rice ($1,379,258), Robert D. Gemmell ($1,290,298), William H. McIntyre ($1,123,463), P. W. Madsen ($1,001,223), Matthew H. Walker ($989,978), Francis D. Clift ($951,385), James D. Murdoch ($903,585), Edmund J. Kearns ($878,343), John Q. Packard ($859,775), William A. Clark ($851,804), John Dern ($839,343), Jacob E. Bamberger ($825,215), Samuel H. Auerbach ($779,210), Solomon Rosenbaum ($755,134), George E. Gunn ($720,053), George W. Lambourne ($623,536), and Ashby Snow ($609,496). Of these twenty-one men, apparently only McIntyre, Madsen, Murdoch, and Snow were Mormons. Therefore, although fifty percent of the Mormon hierarchy was within the income elite of Salt Lake County in the early twentieth century, it was in the lower to middle portion of that elite.

Conclusions

Because no single economic indicator can fully describe the economic status and history of a group or an individual, this study has included as many economic factors as seemed practical in order to assess the economic history of the men who comprised the Mormon hierarchy, 1832-1932. The sum total of these various statistical and impressionistic factors leads to the conclusion that the Mormon hierarchy throughout its history was a

105This is the amount of the estate upon which inheritance tax was computed, not the net worth of the individual as defined previously.
stratified economic elite. New members of the hierarchy tended to be
drawn from economic levels that were above the average of the Mormon
population from which they came, and once in the hierarchy their economic
status tended to remain at inertia until opportunities for economic bet-
terment came to them by virtue of their ecclesiastical office. These
opportunities for economic improvement were structured by the hierarchy
in such a way that they corresponded roughly to the ecclesiastical status
of the echelons of the hierarchy: the greatest improvements in income
and wealth came with service as the President of the Church, then as his
counselors, then as the Presiding Bishop and Quorum of the Twelve, then
as the counselors to the Presiding Bishop, and to the least degree, if at
all, with service as Council of Seventy and Presiding Patriarch.

Men who lacked the interest or the ability to capitalize upon these
options, failed to show marked gains in wealth even if they were in
echelons where the opportunities to do so were the greatest. Even though
men in the lower echelons, like the Council of Seventy, were not expected
to enter into capitalistic enterprise (in fact, they were institutionally
discouraged from doing so), some used their own initiative in doing so.
Therefore, these industrious men of the lower echelons obtained greater
financial increase than those who neglected their economic opportunites
in the presidency, Quorum of Twelve, or bishopric. As a leadership group,
it should not be surprising that the economic status of the Mormon hier-
archy even at its lowest levels was on par or higher than the average
population over which it had dominance, and at its highest levels was
dozens of times higher than the average non-hierarchy population of the
Mormon headquarters communities.

The process by which the General Authorities acquired their wealth
was similar for all the men, but was influenced directly by the amount
of wealth they had at their advancement into the hierarchy. Because many of the General Authorities were above the average in economic status prior to their advancement, they were already part of the community's economic elite structure. Therefore, the enhanced status of trust in the community that derived from becoming a General Authority made it easier for men already possessing capital to expand their wealth in anticipation of increased patronage and investment opportunities within the Mormon community. For these already financially comfortable new General Authorities, the institutional opportunities for service as officers in church-affiliated businesses also expanded their resources for investment. For the men who were relatively poor or of only average wealth upon entering the hierarchy, their first few years of service often involved tremendous economic strains and sacrifice. Having a limited capital base to begin with, it was extremely difficult for these men to advance in wealth as rapidly as already affluent General Authorities, unless these men of few means were given special considerations such as the land allotments in pioneer Utah. Nevertheless, for both groups of men membership in the Mormon hierarchy afforded them new opportunities for travel to distant areas, for associating as superiors with Mormon businessmen and entrepreneurs, for receiving the respect and trust of the Mormon community that could enhance business ventures, and (if they were in the right echelons of the hierarchy) for guiding the affairs of Mormon businesses.

Neither rank-and-file nor high ecclesiastics within the Latter-day Saint Church tended to regard the mission of General Authorities as primarily economic, yet the structure of Mormonism itself inevitably made the Mormon hierarchy an economic institution. The combination of economic communitarianism, religious faith, and a rigid authority system
gave to the Mormon hierarchy not only the opportunity but the responsibility for economic management. In this context, it was to be expected that the new General Authorities would often be drawn from an above-average economic class, and that entrepreneurial experience and talent would be desirable characteristics in prospective additions to the hierarchy. In view of the massive economic resources at their disposal, it is extremely significant that many members of the hierarchy were only moderately wealthy or even poor throughout their tenure. Although their responsibilities for the economic development of the Mormon Church put many of the General Authorities very much in the world of finance, they self-consciously resisted defining themselves in economic terms. Nevertheless, the Mormon hierarchy as a whole tended to be in a better economic condition than the rank-and-file of Mormonism, and the men who served in the hierarchy's echelons of power constituted an economic elite within their own community.
CHAPTER IV

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Mormon Political Theology

As with all issues in Mormonism, the essential starting point for Mormon political theory is within the standard works of LDS scripture. In the midst of Andrew Jackson's first term when the rhetoric of government, at least, was in praise of the common man and democracy, the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith's earliest written revelations favored monarchy. Although the Book of Mormon indicated that people were better off without monarchy because of the dangers of having a tyrant upon the throne, monarchy was still the ideal:

Now it is better that a man should be judged of God than of man, for the judgments of God are always just, but the judgments of man are not always just; therefore, if it were possible that ye could have just men to be your kings, which would establish the laws of God, and judge this people according to his commandments; yea, if you could have men for your kings, which would do even as my father Benjamin did for this people; I say unto you, if this could always be the case, then it would be expedient that ye should always have kings to rule over you.

The key issue in this passage is that the laws of God would be established, indicating that the ideal form of Mormon government was not merely a monarchy of good men, but a theocratic monarchy. On January 2, 1831, this ideal was given more precise expression within the apocalyptic strain of early Mormonism:

But verily I say unto you, that in time ye shall have no king nor ruler, for I will be your king and watch over you. Wherefore, hear my voice and follow me, and you shall

1Book of Mormon, p. 218; Mosiah 29:13 in recent Utah editions.
be a free people, and ye shall have no laws by my laws, when I come, for I am your Lawgiver, and what can stay my hand.\textsuperscript{2}

Thus, in the Mormon conception of the perfect millennial political system, individual freedom comes by being subject to Christ as king. Prior to the establishment of this millennial rule, Mormons were conditioned by the Book of Mormon to regard authoritarian government by godly men as the stepping stone of this world which would lead to the perfect order of the next.

If the Mormons and non-Mormons of 1830-1831 could not see the development of a radical departure from the American political system in these propositions, it was because the socio-political radicalism of Mormonism was obscured by its theological content in these early years. Writing about Mormonism in 1831, Alexander Campbell seemed to feel he had said all that was necessary when he dismissed the Book of Mormon and Mormonism itself as shallow reflections of the pressing theological debates of the day.\textsuperscript{3} Were it not for Mormonism's authority system, such an assessment might have been adequate, but from the inception of the movement, authority was the central issue and appeal: God chose Joseph Smith as his spokesman, and gave him authority to speak and act in His name, and to commission others to do likewise.\textsuperscript{4} If Joseph Smith had limited himself to metaphysical exposition, it would have enough to dismiss him and his followers as deluded, but when Smith included the conduct of government within his domain as God's representative on earth,

\textsuperscript{2}Book of Commandments, p. 82; Doctrine and Covenants, Section 38: 21-22 in recent Utah editions.

\textsuperscript{3}Alexander Campbell, "Delusions," Millennial Harbinger (Bethany, Virginia), II (February 7, 1831), 93.

then Mormonism became a potentially revolutionary alternative to the existing political order in which it was thriving.

As Mormonism was developing into an increasingly communitarian society, Joseph Smith provided greater definition of the political sphere of Mormonism. In August 1833, Smith dictated a revelation which extended the Mormon authority system into the realms of law and warfare. Although the provisions concerning warfare are not central to this present discussion, it is sufficient to indicate that the revelation freed the Mormons of secular direction in matters of war, specifying that like the armies of ancient Israel the Mormons should be subject only to the commandment of God. With reference to law and government, the document stated:

And now verily I say unto you, concerning the laws of the land, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them, and that law of the land, which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom, in maintaining rights and privileges belongs to all mankind and is justifiable before me: therefore I the Lord justifieth you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land: and as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever is more or less than these, cometh of evil. I the Lord God maketh you free: therefore ye are free indeed: and the law also maketh you free: therefore when the wicked rule the people mourn: wherefore honest men and wise men should be sought for, diligently, and good men and wise men, ye should observe to uphold, otherwise whatsoever is less than these cometh of evil.

And I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good, that ye shall live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God . . .

The document immediately constricted the authority of secular government as it correspondingly expanded the prerogatives of a this-worldly theocracy: 1) the question of secular law is introduced with the proviso that the Mormons first remember their obligation to obey the commandments

5*Doctrine and Covenants*, pp. 216-217; Section 98:4-11 in recent Utah editions.
of God, thus establishing the primacy of religious law over secular law; 2) "constitutional law" is defined as liberating, rather than proscribing, personal conduct and rights; 3) the Mormons are to obey these secular "constitutional laws" not because they were created by a secular authority to which the Mormons are subject, but because God "justifies" the Mormons in obeying them; 4) both the laws which do not meet the definition of "constitutional" in this document and the rulers who are not good and wise, "cometh of evil," which God commands Mormons to forsake. Thus this 1833 revelation of Joseph Smith not only authorizes, but commands the Mormons to disobey secular laws and civil leaders that do not conform to the commandments of God. An earlier revelation had indicated that only Joseph Smith, as president of the church, could reveal commandments for the church.6

It is upon this foundation of theocratic autonomy that all other political pronouncements of Mormonism must be built. An 1833 revelation stated that God had "established the Constitution of this land," and instructed the Mormons to seek satisfaction through civil courts and authority for losses sustained by persecution.7 Moreover, an 1835 policy statement of belief regarding government not only supported the existence of civil government, and obedience to secular laws and officers of government, but stated:

We do not believe it just to mingle religious influence with civil Government, whereby one religious society is fostered and another proscribed in its spiritual privileges, and the individual rights of its members, as citizens, denied.8

---

6Book of Commandments, p. 67; Section 28:2 in recent Utah editions of the Doctrine and Covenants.

7Doctrine and Covenants, p. 239; Section 101:80ff. in recent Utah editions.

8Ibid., 253; Section 134:9 in recent Utah editions.
This seems on the surface to be a denial of theocratic prerogatives, but within the Mormon context, it was not. First, neither this policy statement nor that of Smith's 1842 Wentworth Letter on Mormon beliefs could have the force of first person declarations by deity previously quoted from revelations dictated by Joseph Smith. Second, the above quote denies the right of civil government to limit the freedoms of contrary religious societies, but it does not address itself to the situation in which a religious society permeates all functions of civil government, yet at the same time allows freedom to competing religious systems. That was the Mormon ideal of the theocratic Kingdom of God, even though in practice that religiously tolerant theocracy stumbled at times when schismatic groups proved too great a threat.

Before the church was five years old, Smith had set the stage for theocracy. The Book of Mormon in March 1830 erected theocratic monarchy as the political ideal, and the following September one of Joseph Smith's revelations deftly removed the dividing line between religious and secular concerns of Mormonism by stating "that all things unto me are spiritual." By 1833 Joseph Smith had not only established an authoritarian system of priesthood that was intended to be monolithic, but in his dictated revelations the voice of God had commanded the Mormons to be one in all things and to make their decisions unanimously. Thus, Mormons were to be

---

9"We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law." (Roberts, History of the Church IV, 541). This is one part of Joseph Smith's credo that is known by the LDS Church of Salt Lake City as "The Articles of Faith," and by the RLDS Church of Independence as "The Epitome of Faith."

10Book of Commandments, p. 65; Section 29:34-35 in recent Utah editions of the Doctrine and Covenants.

subject in all things to divine guidance through priesthood authority, and they were to regard any factionalism in spiritual or temporal matters as contrary to God’s will. Moreover, the revelations had provided for civil disobedience against “evil” proscriptive laws and against unwise or evil rulers, with the proviso that such departures were only by God’s command through the prophet (thus avoiding rampant anarchy within Mormonism). Moreover, in a manner left unclear in Joseph Smith’s revelations, all these authoritarian, theocratic prerogatives were somehow to be meshed with the republicanism of the United States Constitution. During the time that Mormonism was so fragile in numbers that it could be dismissed as a temporary annoyance, its theological system had legitimized a Mormon theocracy that would be organized a decade later in a city-state in Illinois, and that would dominate millions of square miles of the American West within only a few more decades.  

The Hierarchy in Public Office

The high water marks of Mormon theocratic history must necessarily be those in which its General Authorities served in civil office. Although Mormonism has always been diminutive within the spectrum of Christendom, Mormon General Authorities serving in civil office would be the ecclesiastical equivalent of public office being filled by Catholic popes and cardinals, Episcopal and Methodist bishops, or incumbent members of the General Council of the Presbyterian General Assembly. Even isolated instances of such high ecclesiastics in civil authority would be noteworthy in a country without an established religion, but a proliferation of such

---

12 Useful discussions of Mormon political theory are found in Hyrum L. Andrus, Doctrines of the Kingdom, Volume III of Foundations of the Millennial Kingdom of Christ (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1973), pp. 352-401; Hansen, Quest for Empire, pp. 3-44.
ecclesiastical representation in public office would be cause for considerable attention. It is in this context that the Mormon hierarchy entered the political arena of nineteenth century America.

The political initiative of the General Authorities at Kirtland, Ohio must have been somewhat disappointing to them. After four rank-and-file Mormons were elected to township offices in April 1834, Joseph Smith, Jr. sought an office that presumably he felt confidant of winning: coroner. When the votes were counted on October 14, 1834, Smith had received only two votes and his opponent had received sixty-two.\(^{13}\) His official history of the church is silent about this event and his feelings regarding it,\(^{14}\) but Joseph Smith must have taken this defeat very hard for he did not again venture into the political arena until the Mormons comprised virtually all the electorate. It was not until April 1836, when the Mormon population of Kirtland had increased substantially, that other General Authorities attempted to fill public office. The results were somewhat dismal again: Second Counselor Frederick G. Williams was defeated, after a tie vote, in his bid for the inauspicious office of Overseer of the Poor, and Associate President Oliver Cowdery was defeated after the casting of lots broke a tie vote for the office of town clerk. Cowdery had the consolation of being elected the same day as one of three supervisors of highways. The two men finally had the satisfaction of being elected justices of the peace for Kirtland, Williams on June 20, 1836 and Cowdery on April 15, 1837, but like the prosperity of Mormon Kirtland itself, their tenure was brief: they were replaced in October

---

\(^{13}\) Kirtland Township Trustees' Minutes and Poll Book, 1817-1838, pp. 123-124, 129, Lake County Historical Society, Mentor, Ohio.

\(^{14}\) Roberts, History of the Church, II, 167-168.
1837 due to the resignation of Williams and the departure of Cowdery. Despite the sour experience, the political activity of the hierarchy at Kirtland did establish the trend that the highest echelons would be in the vanguard of Mormon efforts at theocracy.

Because the Mormon headquarters at Far West, Caldwell County, Missouri, were so quickly engulfed in civil war with anti-Mormons after the arrival of the General Authorities in 1838, the hierarchy did not become candidates for public office there. Not until Joseph Smith had escaped from prison in Missouri and gathered his followers in Illinois, was he able to inaugurate the theocracy that he had provided for a decade earlier. These revelations had committed Mormon theocracy to work, at least on the outward level, within the republican framework, and so Smith needed to gather his followers into an area where they could constitute nearly all the electorate. This had been done unsuccessfully at Kirtland, where the non-Mormons were economically and politically more powerful, and at Far West, where the political framework of county government was too weak to sustain the embattled Mormons against hostile neighboring counties and against the state itself.

The situation in Illinois in 1839 was propitious for a more successful advancement of Mormon theocracy. Illinois was on the verge of public bankruptcy, and therefore tended to favor massive immigration as a stimulus to the economy. Thousands of Mormons seeking refuge in the state after being expelled from Missouri thus offered the state an opportunity to show genuine humanitarian interest while at the same time providing an enlarged settlement and economic base. Moreover, politically, the Whigs and Democrats in the state were nearly at an equilibrium, and the influx of the bloc-voting Mormons dangled the prospect of secure political

15 Kirtland Township Trustees' Minutes, pp. 139, 153, 157.
power to whichever party attracted their votes. 16

These combined factors worked entirely to the benefit of the Mormons at the outset. Through a series of loans and speculative land transactions, Joseph Smith obtained land in Hancock County, Illinois and Lee County, Iowa, eventually making Hancock County the location of the new Mormon capital, Nauvoo. The Illinois legislature in bipartisan action during December 1840 hurriedly passed a charter for Nauvoo that was nearly a verbatim duplication of the charter granted to Springfield the previous year. The duplicated provisions, plus some provided by Joseph Smith and his future counselor John C. Bennett, gave the newly incorporated Nauvoo tremendous potential: the mayor was also chief justice of the municipal court, and the municipal court was empowered to issue writs of habeas corpus; the city was authorized to enlarge its boundaries almost at will; the city council was authorized to pass all laws "not repugnant" to the state and national constitutions; and the city council was authorized to form its citizens "into a body of independent militiamen," known as the Nauvoo Legion, with its officers commissioned by the governor of the state, but limited in its operation only by the state and national constitutions. 17

For other incorporated cities of Illinois, such provisions may have served as window-dressing, but for the Mormon hierarchy at Nauvoo, the Nauvoo charter provided the constitutional structure from which Mormon theocracy could be erected and protected. Table 20 18 shows the outward appearance

16Flanders, Nauvoo, p. 19


18Nauvoo City Council Minutes, Nauvoo Collection, Church Archives; Roberts, History of the Church, IV, 287, 414, 442, 501, 543, V, 12-13, 264-265, 271, VI, 347, VII, 350, 370; The Wasp (Nauvoo, Illinois), Nauvoo Neighbor. The percentages reflect the period of highest representation in each year, since deaths and other changes caused the composition to vary within the year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1842</th>
<th>1843</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1845^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Mayor</td>
<td>.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldermen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Health</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a This symbol indicates that the office was not created at the time.

^b Because of the difficulties after the death of Joseph Smith, the hierarchy voluntarily absented themselves from civil office.

The election of February 1, 1841, began the theocratic process when John C. Bennett was elected mayor, and then was publicly sustained as assistant president in the church the following April. The same election put four General Authorities in the nine-member city council: Joseph Smith, his first counselor Sidney Rigdon, the Associate President and Patriarch Hyrum Smith, and Presiding Bishop-designate Vinson Knight. When the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles arrived at Nauvoo in July, 1841, after a tremendous success in proselyting among the British, Joseph Smith was in a dilemma: he wanted to include the apostles in the civil structure of Nauvoo but all the offices authorized by Nauvoo's charter had already been filled in the February election. When his own brother Don Carlos died in August, Joseph Smith had the city council fill the
vacancy with Apostle Brigham Young, senior member of the Quorum of the
Twelve. This still did not satisfy Smith's intentions, and less than
two months later he chose an extra-legal solution: on October 23 and
October 30 the city council increased its numbers by seven men, six of
whom were apostles. With the Nauvoo City Council now almost twice the
size authorized by the charter, First Counselor Sidney Rigdon lessened
the overabundance two days later: he resigned to take the position of
Nauvoo city attorney.¹⁹

During the 1841-1844 period the General Authorities who served in
Nauvoo's civil government were almost exclusively from the presidency
or Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. The only exception was Joseph Young,
senior member of the First Council of Seventy, who was appointed a pro-
tem member of the city council in September, 1842. Otherwise, the
presidency and apostles were joined in their theocratic rule by non-
General Authorities who were prominent local leaders in the church at
Nauvoo.

Once the theocratic structure of Nauvoo was secure, there were
mixed efforts at entering a broader political field. In May of 1841
Assistant President and Nauvoo Mayor, John C. Bennett, was appointed
Master in Chancery for Hancock County.²⁰ On August 1, 1842, Apostle
William Smith, who had been added to the Nauvoo city council only three
months earlier, was elected by a large margin as one of Hancock County's
two representatives in the state legislature.²¹ In contrast, Sidney
Rigdon as first counselor to Joseph Smith and as Nauvoo's city attorney

¹⁹Nauvoo City Council Minutes.
²⁰Quincy Whig, May 15, 1841
and postmaster had announced his candidacy for a seat in the state senate in June, 1842, but in the August election Rigdon received only one vote, compared to 1530 for the winning candidate and a total of nearly eight hundred for three other contenders.\textsuperscript{22} This devastating defeat undoubtedly resulted from the fact that shortly after Rigdon's announcement it was rumored that he was in sympathy with Mormon dissenters.\textsuperscript{23} It is probable that the two votes Joseph Smith received for governor and the one vote for county school commissioner in the 1842 election were pranks rather than part of a campaign, but Apostle William Smith's twenty-six votes for school commissioner may have represented an earnest effort on his part to hold office as city councilor, county school commissioner, and state senator all in the same year.\textsuperscript{24}

As the year 1844 approached, Joseph Smith made momentous efforts to expand the public theocracy of Nauvoo. Since May 1842, he had been serving as President of the Church, as Trustee-in-Trust for church finances, as Nauvoo mayor, as city recorder of deeds (a position and function not authorized in Illinois law or the Nauvoo Charter),\textsuperscript{25} and as lieutenant general and commanding officer of the Nauvoo Legion. But Joseph Smith was defending an embattled position: since 1842 there had been efforts in the legislature to repeal the Nauvoo Charter in part or

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.; The Wasp, June 11, 1842.

\textsuperscript{23}McKiernan, Sidney Rigdon, pp. 119-120. As early as July 27, 1842, the Mormon newspaper The Wasp had published a denial by Rigdon of any association with Mormon dissenter John C. Bennett. Nevertheless, Rigdon's son-in-law was publishing articles against Joseph Smith throughout the summer of 1842, and on the day of the election, the church periodical republished a report from the non-Mormon press that linked Rigdon with Bennett and Robinson. See "Bennett," Times and Seasons, III (August 1, 1842), 877.

\textsuperscript{24}Illinois Election Returns, 50:26, 29. Unlike Rigdon's announced candidacy, there is no evidence that Joseph Smith sought these offices.

\textsuperscript{25}Flanders, Nauvoo, p. 102.
whole, and in 1843 attempts at kidnapping or extraditing Smith back to a certain death in Missouri had been defeated only through the use of the habeus corpus provision of the charter. In June 1843 Joseph Smith public ly argued that once Illinois had given Nauvoo a charter, the state had no right to repeal it, concluding with the staggering assertion: "All the power there was in Illinois she gave to Nauvoo; and any man that says to the contrary is a fool." Nevertheless, as sentiment for repeal increased within the legislature, Smith devised a desperate bid for Nauvoo's protective autonomy: he and the other elected officers of Nauvoo petitioned the United States Congress on December 21, 1843 to give territorial status to Nauvoo, securing all the privileges of the Nauvoo Charter and authorizing the mayor of Nauvoo (with consent of the President of the United States) to call upon federal troops to assist the Nauvoo Legion in defending Nauvoo. In view of the failure of the Cherokees to gain an independent dominion within the State of Georgia (despite a favorable ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court), it is hard to understand how even desperation could have given the Mormons hope that their similar proposal would succeed barely ten years later.

It is within this context that Joseph Smith astounded non-Mormons and many of his own followers by announcing his candidacy for the presidential election of 1844. He was nominated by the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles on January 29, 1844, when he realistically indicated the unlikelihood of his effort with a comment of what he would do "if I ever get

26 Roberts, History of the Church, V, 466.
27 Ibid., VI, 125-132.
into the presidential chair." But with characteristic humor he also said: "There is oratory enough in the Church to carry me into the presidential chair the first slide." 29 Inquiries to presidential hopefuls of national prominence had brought unsatisfactory results, and Smith's candidacy at least gave Mormons a candidate whom they trusted.

Although the campaign may have been intended for symbolic or propaganda purposes, there was an earnestness in Joseph Smith's presidential bid that cannot be denied. He first invited James Arlington Bennet of New York City to be his vice-presidential candidate, and subsequently settled for Sidney Rigdon after it was thought Bennet's Irish birth disqualified him. Smith's presidential platform revealed him to be more than a one-issue (Mormonism) candidate: reduction of the size and salary of Congress, rehabilitation of convicts through work projects and vocational training, liberal pardoning of convicts, compensated emancipation of slaves, less taxation through increased governmental efficiency, the establishment of free trade and securing of international rights on the high seas, the establishment of a national bank with branches in every state and territory, the increase of presidential power to intervene in civil disturbances within states, and the annexation of Oregon and Texas. After a state presidential nominating convention at Nauvoo on May 17, 1844, Mormon proselyting activity in the United States virtually ceased as missionaries, including most of the hierarchy, were commissioned to campaign for Smith's candidacy in every state, including Missouri. 30

Despite all these preparations, Smith had already indicated definite intentions of removing himself and the Mormons into the unsettled

29 Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 188; Joseph Smith Journal, January 29, 1844.

30 Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 197-209, 386-397.
west beyond U.S. territory. These contradictions have resulted in varying historical interpretations of his actions: his only scholarly biographer categorically dismissed the campaign as intended merely to publicize Mormonism and startle the other candidates, but one political scientist has suggested that Joseph Smith's balance of power in Illinois and the effect of his campaign in pivotal states could have been a potent force in the election of 1844. It is certain that Illinois politicians regarded Joseph Smith's actions and a possible Mormon bloc-vote at the last minute for Polk or Clay as crucial: "Their vote will about turn the Scale in the State," wrote one politico.

Joseph Smith's own anticipations about his 1844 campaign may have been expressed by one of his presidential campaigners, Apostle Heber C. Kimball. He wrote from Washington, D.C. on June 9, 1844 that although Congress would do nothing for the Mormons, "we will teas them all the day long," until "we will go whare we can find a home and worship God in his own way, and injoy our rites as free citizens." After thus repudiating the present condition of U.S. Government and conceding Smith's defeat at the present time, Kimball then described the presidential White House and with a fervor of anticipation of distant things wrote: "I want to see our Prophet here in the Chare of Stats then we will come and see him."

31Brodie, No Man Knows My History, p. 362. A similar view by a less caustic analyst of Joseph Smith is James B. Allen, "Was Joseph Smith a Serious Candidate for the Presidency of the United States, or Was he Only Attempting to Publicize Gospel Views on Public Issues?" The Ensign of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, III (September, 1973), 21-22.


33Anson G. Henry to John J. Hardin, January 24, 1844, Hardin Collection, Chicago Historical Society.

34Heber C. Kimball to Helen Mar Kimball, June 9, 1844, Winslow Whitney Smith Papers, Church Archives.
Defeat of Smith's 1844 campaign was conceded, but if Kimball's views are representative, it was anticipated that at some future date Joseph Smith would be elected president. Such an optimistic view of the presidential effort of Joseph Smith was stated forty years later: "In short, Joseph Smith became a candidate for the presidency of the United States. The first contest would of course have been lost; the second and third perhaps also: but ere this, the Mormon elders would have swept over the States in a political mission like an avalanche down the mountain."35

When Joseph Smith was murdered by a mob on June 27, 1844, the service of the hierarchy in public office went into a temporary eclipse as they concerned themselves with the survival of the church as an institution and the Mormons as a community. Brigham Young and the other apostles specifically declined to be candidates for public office on January 8, 1845.36 During the next four years, the hierarchy struggled with the succession crisis, anti-Mormon mobs, and the massive logistical problem of conducting an orderly exodus into the wilderness of the American West. Until the Mormon community was firmly established at the new headquarters in the Salt Lake Valley, the hierarchy governed the Mormons without a structure of republican government.

By the time the Mormons had secured their foothold in the Great Basin, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo had been signed on February 2, 1848, making the new Mormon gathering place a part of United States dominion. As usual Congress delayed providing governmental machinery and legitimacy to settlers in the new hinterland, and so in December 1848

35Edward W. Tullidge, History of Salt Lake City (Salt Lake City: Star Printing Co., 1886), "Biographies," p. 9. The preface indicated that this book had been revised by members of the LDS Presiding Bishopric.

36Roberts, History of the Church, VII, 350.
the Mormons sent a petition to Congress, signed by more than two thousand Mormons, requesting either territorial or state status. Not content to wait for Congress to provide the machinery of civil rule, a public notice was given on February 1, 1849 that a convention would consider formation of a "Territorial or State government" during the next month. The result was the formation of the State of Deseret in March 1849, which continued its existence until March 28, 1851, when the General Assembly of the State of Deseret unanimously voted to dissolve the provisional government in view of the 1850 Organic Act of Congress providing government for the "Territory of Utah." From then until January 4, 1896, Utah remained a territory within the United States.37

Once the forms of representative government were again available to the Mormon community, the Mormon hierarchy was conspicuous in public office until the end of the nineteenth century. As might be expected, the degree of penetration was highest in the State of Deseret, 1849-1851, where the president of the church was governor, his first counselor was chief justice and lieutenant governor, his second counselor was secretary of state, the presiding bishop and an apostle were the associate justices, and other General Authorities comprised 19.2% of the House of Representatives and 21.4% of the Senate.38 Even after Congress created Utah Territory in 1850, the President of the United States sanctioned this overlapping of church and state in Mormon Utah by appointing Brigham Young as governor of the territory and ex-officio superintendent of Indian affairs between 1850 and 1857. Civil rule by the highest leaders of the Mormon church was not just a transitory affair, but permeated territorial,


38 Ibid., pp. 86-89.
TABLE 21
MORMON HIERARCHY IN UTAH TERRITORIAL LEGISLATURE, 1851-1890

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

county, and municipal government until 1890.

The extent of the hierarchy's service on the territorial level is best shown in their composition of the two chambers of the territorial legislature between 1851 and 1889. Table 21 demonstrates immediately the fact that the parliamentary status given to the upper chamber of any

---

Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1851-1895, published under varying titles; Utah Territory, Secretary of State, Election Papers, 1850-1895, Utah State Archives, Utah State Capitol, Salt Lake City; Ronald Collett Jack, "Utah Territorial Politics: 1847-1876," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1970), pp. 546-697; Gordon Irving, "Roster of Members of the Legislative Assembly, Utah Territory, 1851/2 to 1894," Task Papers in LDS History, No. 5 (December 1975), History Division, Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Some discrepancies in the listings of legislators in these various records had to be reconciled in order to arrive at the calculations in the table.
legislative body was mirrored in the fact that the General Authorities were most dominant in the Legislative Council. Moreover, the period during which the hierarchy most dominated the upper chamber of the Utah legislature was 1863-1867, when the attention of the federal government was distracted in assuring its own survival in the civil war and immediate aftermath of Confederate defeat. During this period Utah had adopted an aloofness from the federal government that verged on neutrality, while the Mormon leaders awaited the outcome of the civil war. The increase of General Authority representation in the upper chamber of the territorial legislature was one indication of an expansive theocratic impulse that was manifested during the period. The rapid decline of General Authority presence in the Utah Territorial Legislature after 1883 reflects the influence of the federal effort to restructure the political and social life of Utah through disfranchising Mormon polygamists under the provisions of the 1882 Edmunds Law.

As was true during the Joseph Smith era, theocratic service in public office was conspicuously the domain of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve. During the entire period 1851-1883, as long as there was an organized First Presidency there was at least one counselor of the presidency serving in the legislature. Aside from the years


41See section, "The Hierarchy and Monolithic Shadow Government" to follow.

42For a general history of this period, see Gustive O. Larson, The Americanization of Utah For Statehood (San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1971).
1864-1867 and 1872, a counselor in the presidency was president of the upper chamber of the legislature. During all but six years of the period 1863-1873 either ten or eleven apostles were in the legislature each session. A member of the Quorum of the Twelve was president of the upper chamber during the period 1864-1879 (including periods when the same man served both in the Quorum of the Twelve and as an assistant counselor in the First Presidency), and a member of the Quorum of the Twelve also served as speaker of the house in the lower chamber from 1857 to 1883. Moreover, during the period 1872-1882, Apostle George Q. Cannon served as Utah's Territorial Delegate to Congress.

Whereas the lower echelons of the hierarchy had virtually no role in the civil government of Nauvoo, they were frequently represented in Utah's territorial legislature. A total of eight members of the First Council of Seventy served in the legislature between 1851 and 1879. Although Levi W. Hancock, William W. Taylor, Horace S. Eldredge and Joseph Young served only a session or two, other men like Jacob Gates, John Van Cott, and Albert P. Rockwood served in multiple sessions. Moreover, during the period 1852-1854 a junior member of the First Council of Seventy, Jedediah M. Grant, served as Speaker of the House in the legislature. Although the Presiding Bishop served in the Utah legislature only during 1851-1852, counselors in the bishopric served periodically until the mid-1880's: Nathaniel H. Felt (as assistant presiding bishop) from 1851-1853, Jesse C. Little from 1856 to 1859, Robert T. Burton from 1875 to 1877, and John Q. Cannon in 1886. Neither of the two Presiding Patriarchs of territorial Utah served in the legislature, even though the first of the two, "Uncle" John Smith, had been a member of the legislature of the State of Deseret, 1849-1851.

The remaining policy-making body at the territorial level was that
of the convention which periodically drafted proposed constitutions to be submitted to Congress for statehood consideration. In 1856, in the midst of the enthusiastic Reformation in Utah and a year prior to federal troops descending upon Utah, the General Authorities comprised 18.4% of the delegates to the constitutional convention. In subsequent years the proportion was less: in the 1862 convention it was 10.8%, in the 1872 convention it was 7.7%, in the 1882 convention it was 2.8%, and in the 1887 convention, at the height of the federal campaign against the Mormons, there were no General Authorities in the convention. The proportion of the Mormon hierarchy in each of these conventions was often one half or one third of their proportion in the territorial legislature that met during the same years. Since the General Authorities were more heavily represented on the committees that drafted the proposed state constitutions, it was apparently felt that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Up until 1895 the work of these conventions was in vain, because neither Congress nor the President of the United States would give serious consideration to statehood applications submitted by an openly polygamous and theocratic territory. After the Mormons publicly repudiated polygamy in 1890 and theocracy in 1891, Congress passed an enabling act in 1894 that authorized Utah to hold a constitutional convention. In the convention of 1895 that drafted Utah's eventual state constitution, the non-Mormons tolerated a swan song demonstration of General Authority presence in territorial politics: four General Authorities were among the delegates to the convention (3.8%), and the president of the convention was Apostle John Henry Smith.43

General Authorities also cropped up occasionally in some of the miscellaneous territorial offices of Utah. Counselor in the bishopric Jesse C. Little was the territorial assessor for the U.S. Internal Revenue, 1863-1866. Albert P. Rockwood, a member of the First Council of Seventy, was the first Fish Commissioner for the territory, and from 1855 until the 1870's, Rockwood served as inspector and warden of the Utah Penitentiary. Another member of the Council of Seventy, Horace S. Eldredge, served as Collector and Assessor of Utah Territory in 1852, and still another member of the council, John Van Cott, was repeatedly elected between 1863 and 1874 as one of the three territorial commissioners to locate university lands.44

In contrast to their extensive penetration of municipal and territorial government, the General Authorities had relatively minimal service in county government of the Great Basin. The only General Authority who served as a county selectman was a member of the First Council of Seventy, Jacob Gates, who served in Washington County in 1862-63 and 1870-71. County clerk positions were filled by Francis M. Lyman in Tooele County for three years following his appointment as an apostle in 1880, and by Brigham Young, Jr. in Cache Country during 1873-75, when he was both a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and an assistant counselor to his father. County financial responsibility was given to Apostle Charles C. Rich who was elected in 1876 as Gea, Lake County, Idaho's first treasurer, and by bishopric counselor Robert T. Burton who was Salt Lake County Assessor and Collector in 1880.

The one county office that had particular importance to Mormon

44Utah Secretary of State, Territorial Election Papers; Frank Esshom, Pioneers and Prominent Men of Utah (Salt Lake City: Utah Pioneers Book Publishing Co., 1913), passim.
theocratic prerogatives was the county probate judge, which until the
Poland Act of 1874 combined both civil and criminal responsibility, and
thus afforded a tremendous opportunity to protect Mormons against non-
Mormons. Most probate judges were Mormon bishops who presided over local
congregations, but in some cases General Authorities filled the office:
Apostle George A. Smith was "Chief Justice" in Iron County in 1851,
Apostle Orson Hyde was the first probate judge in Carson County (now Ne-
vada) in 1854, Apostle John Taylor was elected probate judge for Utah
County in 1868 as a possible insurance against the effects of the arrival
of the railroad, and once the railroad was completed, making Ogden, Weber
County, Utah its junction, Apostle Franklin D. Richards served as probate
judge for the heavily non-Mormon Weber County from 1869 until 1883.\textsuperscript{45}

Having such direct control of municipal and territorial offices, the hier-
archy seemed to feel that county offices required less of their direct
attention. Nevertheless, in political terms the Mormon hierarchy was
still quite "available" for county office during the nineteenth century.

The hierarchy's domination of Utah's territorial government was
closer to the extent and spirit of Nauvoo's theocratic city-state, but
the General Authorities were still active in municipal office in the

\textsuperscript{45}Utah Secretary of State, Territorial Election Papers; James B.
Allen, "The Development of County Government in the Territory of Utah,
1850-1896," (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1956), pp. 15, 168,
169; Edward W. Tullidge, Tullidge's Histories, (Volume II.) Containing
the History of All the Northern, Eastern and Western Counties of Utah;
Also the Counties of Southern Idaho (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor,
1889), pp. 94, 396; Orson F. Whitney, History of Utah (4 vois.; Salt Lake
City: George Q. Cannon & Sons Co., 1892-1904) IV, 83; Leonard J. Arring-
ton, Charles C. Rich: Mormon General and Western Frontiersman, Volume I
in Studies in Mormon History, edited by James B. Allen (Provo, Utah:
American West. Table 22 shows the extent of the hierarchy's thirty-six year control of the most important elective offices in Salt Lake City. A quick comparison of Table 20 and 22 shows that the General Authority presence in the Salt Lake City Council was substantially less than was the case at Nauvoo. From 1851 to 1866, the hierarchy was represented in the Salt Lake City Council by men of the lesser echelons: Benjamin L. Clapp, Zerah Pulsipher, and John Van Cott of the First Council of Seventy, and Nathaniel H. Felt and Leonard W. Hardy of the Presiding Bishopric. Although Leonard W. Hardy continued to serve on the city council until 1874, he was joined in 1866 by Apostle Joseph F. Smith and in 1872 by President Brigham Young.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46Salt Lake City Council Minutes, 1851-1888, microfilm at LDS Genealogical Society.
From 1874 onward, the Salt Lake City Council was the domain of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve. The high point of penetration occurred during the years 1874-1875 when the Mayor of Salt Lake City was First Counselor Daniel H. Wells, and the nine member city council included President Brigham Young, his assistant counselor and apostle Albert Carrington, and his former assistant counselor and present apostle Joseph F. Smith. Even after the Edmunds Law of 1882 disfranchised polygamists, the hierarchy was able to continue its local rule for several years: although he was a well-known polygamist, former Mayor Daniel H. Wells served in the city council from 1882 to 1884; he was replaced by a temporary monogamist Apostle Heber J. Grant who married two plural wives shortly after taking office in 1884 and remained in the city council until 1888. Grant was joined in 1886 by monogamists Apostle John W. Taylor and bishopric counselor John Q. Cannon, but Cannon was excommunicated from the church later in the year. When these three men left the Salt Lake City Council on February 28, 1888, the nineteenth century presence of the hierarchy in that body ended.

Although General Authority domination of the Salt Lake City Council was the most prominent example of their service in municipal office, such municipal service did not end there. From 1851 to 1853, one out of Salt Lake City's four Aldermen was a General Authority. When Leonard W. Hardy and Jesse C. Little were appointed counselors in the presiding bishopric in 1856, each of them had municipal offices they continued to fill for several years: Hardy was captain of the Salt Lake City Police Department and Little was Chief of the Salt Lake City Fire Department. Outside the church and territorial headquarters in Salt Lake Valley, General Authorities periodically served in important policy making capacities on the municipal level. Apostles Amasa M. Lyman and Charles C. Rich consecutively
served as mayor of San Bernardino, California during the period 1854-1856, and President of Seventy, Jacob Gates, served as mayor of St. George, Utah from 1866 to 1870. Those who served on city councils outside the Salt Lake Valley were President of Seventy Levi W. Hancock at Manti, Utah from 1852 to 1853, Apostle George A. Smith at Provo, Utah from 1851 to 1853, President of Seventy Jacob Gates at St. George from 1862 to 1866, Apostle Wilford Woodruff and Joseph F. Smith at Provo, Utah from 1868 to 1869, Apostle Brigham Young Jr. at Logan, Utah from 1874 to 1875, Apostle Erastus Snow at St. George from 1877 (or before) until 1881, and Apostle Heber J. Grant at Tooele from 1882 to 1883. When the Mormon hierarchy was presented with the need and opportunity for direct control of municipal government in the nineteenth century, the men of the hierarchy were ready for service.  

Moreover, the General Authorities often held several civil offices at the same time. At Nauvoo, John C. Bennett was both city mayor and county Master in Chancery, Sidney Rigdon had sought to hold both municipal office and a position in the state legislature, William Smith was partially successful in his effort to hold office in municipal, county, and state jurisdictions, and Joseph Smith's final efforts in 1844 were to be mayor and postmaster of Nauvoo, governor of a territory, and president.

of the United States. In the Great Basin, a total of sixteen General Authorities held public office in different political jurisdictions at the same time. The most common combination was to serve on a city council and in the Utah territorial legislature at the same time, and eleven General Authorities did so: bishopric counselor John Q. Cannon and Apostle Wilford Woodruff for one year; assistant presiding bishop Nathaniel H. Felt, President of Seventy Jacob Gates, Counselor Daniel H. Wells, and Apostles Heber J. Grant, George A. Smith, and John W. Taylor for two years; President of Seventy John Van Cott and Apostle Erastus Snow did so for four years; and Apostle and Counselor Joseph F. Smith managed to do so for thirteen years. Other General Authorities held territorial office at the same time they were city mayors, county probate judges, or county clerks. Service in multiple civil offices at the same time was not unique to the General Authorities of Utah territory, but the rank-and-file Mormons who did so were following a trend rather than legitimizing it.

In some instances, the General Authorities did not even reside in the multiple jurisdictions in which they were elected. In 1851-1853 Apostle George A. Smith was chief justice of Iron County, Postmaster of Centre Creek in the county, and a representative of Iron County in the territorial legislature, while at the same time he was a member of the Provo City Council in Utah County, more than 160 miles from Iron County. Apparently Smith overcame the inconvenient distance of his several civil offices by attending the Provo City Council meetings while he was enroute between Iron County and Salt Lake City on church and legislative business. In 1868-1869, Apostles Joseph F. Smith and Wilford Woodruff served on the

---

Provo City Council in Utah County and Apostle John Taylor served as Utah County probate judge, at the same time all three men were representing Salt Lake County (fifty miles distant) in the territorial legislature. Before legislation set residency requirements for public office in Utah, such odd arrangements were not only legal but also reflected American republican traditions extending back into the notorious rotten boroughs and non-resident representation in the English Parliament during the Age of Revolution.

The significance of this control in a General Authority's life can be illustrated by two examples. Brigham Young, as President of the Church, delivered the word of the Lord to the Mormons in sermons on doctrine, morality, and such mundane subjects as disciplining children and irrigating land. At the same time, as governor he recommended and approved legislation, and as ex-officio superintendent of Indian affairs, he conducted the territorial policies toward the Native Americans of Utah. Mormons also came to Brigham Young for personal advice on questions about family relations, disputes with neighbors, business ventures, and virtually any other subject. In addition to his own pastoral activities, Apostle Joseph F. Smith was a chief officiator in the highest ordinances Mormons sought in the Salt Lake Endowment House, at the same time he drafted and voted upon legislation for Utah territory, and while he also directed the municipal affairs of Salt Lake City. The role of the Mormon hierarchy in providing social control was pervasive in the nineteenth century.

After the Mormon Church publicly repudiated theocratic prerogatives in 1891, the hierarchy's activity in public office underwent severe alterations from prior trends. One unprecedented development was the frequency with which General Authorities declined nomination to be candidates
for public office. Apostle John Henry Smith declined nomination as a representative to the territorial legislature in 1893. Apostle Brigham Young, Jr. turned down offers to nominate him as Utah's first state governor in 1895. Apostle John Henry Smith refused the nomination as Utah's representative to Congress in 1896, and after seeking the nomination of U.S. Senator in 1898 he withdrew from the race. Counselor George Q. Cannon did not accept the nomination as Utah's first U.S. Senator in 1896, and Apostle Anthon H. Lund declined the nomination for U.S. Congressman in 1900. In 1920, after announcing his candidacy for Utah's governorship in 1930, President of Seventy Brigham H. Roberts withdrew from the campaign.\(^49\)

Most unprecedented of all were the frequent defeats General Authorities experienced at various stages in the new political world after 1891. Apostle Anthon H. Lund was defeated in his bid for the territorial legislature in 1892. Although Apostle Heber J. Grant and Presiding Bishop William B. Preston were both favored as candidates for Utah's governorship in 1895, both men failed to receive the nomination. Despite their popularity, President of Seventy Brigham H. Roberts and Apostle Moses Thatcher failed in their 1895 candidacy for the respective offices of U.S. Representative and Senator. In 1899 Counselor George Q. Cannon was defeated in the final election for U.S. Senator.\(^50\) Moreover, although

President of Seventy Roberts was elected in 1898 as Utah's representative to Congress, the U.S. House of Representatives voted in 1900 to exclude him from that body due to his polygamist marriages.\textsuperscript{51}

In marked contrast to the hierarchy's prolific service in public office up to the end of the nineteenth century, only two current General Authorities served in public office from Utah's statehood to 1932. President of Seventy Rulon S. Wells served in the Salt Lake City Council from 1904 to 1908, and Apostle Reed Smoot in the U.S. Senate from 1903 to 1932. Although there was opposition even to this manifestation of the highest leadership of a church in civil office, the twentieth century record of the Mormon Church in this regard was still quite tame compared with its earlier history.

\textit{The Hierarchy and Monolithic Shadow Government, to 1890}

Whether it is the proverbial "smoke-filled room" of American politics or the Byzantine-Borgia approach to political survival, it is always true that the record of service in public office is only a part of political control. This is certainly true of Mormonism. Latter-day Saint scripture authorized Mormons a role in this-worldly government and provided the rationale for authoritarian rule, despite a predilection for the U.S. Constitution. The priesthood structure of Mormonism provided the mechanism not only for ecclesiastical rule, but for social and political control. Nevertheless, because written scripture is not dynamic, the Mormon hierarchy had two responsibilities: first, to provide the Mormons with an understandable philosophy of government that could be refined and applied

to varying circumstances; and second, to provide a structure through which political action would be directed, as indicated in Smith's revelations, by God's word and power rather than by man's.

During the first decade of Mormon history, however, the Mormons were given little indication of the radical political potentials of their faith. In contrast to later Mormon exegesis of such biblical passages as the second and seventh chapters of Daniel, for example, early Mormon polemicists portrayed the role of Mormonism in distinctly apolitical terms. In an open letter to Queen Victoria of England on May 28, 1841, Apostle Parley P. Pratt discussed the Daniel apocalypse at length, but expressly indicated that the role of the Stone cut without Hands, or the Kingdom of God, was fulfilled in the spiritual and religious mission of the latter-day church. An even more detailed treatise on the Daniel passages was published in the church organ at Nauvoo in December 1841, which stated:

Indeed, in many instances church and state have been united; but according to Daniel there was to be no union of the ecclesiastical, and political powers in this way; but the whole world to be subjected to one ecclesiastical form of government— and that will be God's government.

The treatise went on to affirm that "none shall have power or authority over the spiritual affairs of the kingdom but those whom God appoints: and again, its laws, and ordinances shall not be changed; but remain invariably the same for ever." Each of these examinations puts the role of Mormonism as a spiritual, religious force, rather than a political force. Moreover, the rule of a governmental Kingdom of God is deferred until the Advent of Christ.

Once the role of the Mormon hierarchy in the political affairs of

52 "A Letter to the Queen of England," Times and Seasons, III (November 15, 1841), 591-596.

53 "Nebuchadnezzar's Dream," Ibid., III, 612, 613.
Nauvoo became unquestionably evident, the incipient political potentials of Mormonism were slowly unfolded to the public. The first evidence of that process occurred in July, 1842, when an editorial in the church periodical stated: "It has been the design of Jehovah, from the commencement of the world, and is his purpose now, to regulate the affairs of the world in his own time; to stand as head of the universe, and take the reigns of government into his own hand," and then pointed out that Moses and Aaron "taught the people in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs; they were both one; there was no distinction; so will it be when the purposes of God shall be accomplished . . ." It is probably no coincidence that this editorial was published three months after Joseph Smith is reported to have received a revelation that outlined the political Kingdom of God. Nor would it seem coincidental that only five days after Joseph Smith organized the Council of Fifty, an editorial in the church periodical argued that the constitutional separation of church and state had been overly emphasized. The Mormon hierarchy began to depart from vague generalities into concrete references to the political role of the church at the April conference of 1844. On April 5, 1844, Counselor and Vice-presidential candidate Sidney Rigdon said: "When God sets up a system of salvation, He sets up a system of government. When I speak of a government, I mean what I say. I mean a government that shall rule over temporal and spiritual affairs."


55 This original revelation was given on April 7, 1842, according to the minutes of the Council of Fifty on April 10, 1880, typed copy, Brigham Young University.


Until the Mormon hierarchy began to reveal the extent of Mormonism's political role, the Latter-day Saints had been able to engage in bloc-voting and had unanimously elected General Authorities and other ecclesiastics to civil office without feeling that they were participating in an alternative to the present forms of American government. Increasingly, in the spring of 1844, Joseph Smith let it be publicly known that such an alternative was about to be launched. On April 15, 1844, Joseph informed the non-Mormon press of his new political order:

As the 'world is governed too much,' and there is not a nation or dynasty, now occupying the earth, which acknowledges Almighty God as their lawgiver, and as 'crowns won by blood, by blood must be maintained,' I go emphatically, virtuously, and humanely for a THEO-DEMOCRACY, where God and the people hold the power to conduct the affairs of men in righteousness, and where liberty, free trade, and sailor's rights, and the protection of life and property shall be maintained inviolate for the benefit of ALL.58

When Joseph Smith died on June 27, 1844, he had been able to provide the public with only an indistinct foreshadowing of the new political order. What precisely did "Theo-democracy" mean? Not until the succession crisis had been resolved and the security of the Mormons was secure, did the apostles allow themselves the luxury of explaining such things to the public.

An important beginning of the decades-long explanation and defense of the Mormon political order occurred on May 29, 1847, when Brigham Young addressed himself to some non-Mormons in the emigrant camp. He affirmed that their rights would be protected in the "Kingdom of God" so long as they did not introduce wickedness, and that all persons of every nationality and religion would find refuge among the Mormons as long as

58"History of Joseph Smith," LDS Millennial Star, XXIII (June 22, 1861), 391. The letter was written to the Daily Globe, but was deleted from the later published history. See Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 340-341.
they acknowledged Christ and His right to reign, even if they never converted to the gospel preached by the Mormons.\textsuperscript{59} The Quorum of the Twelve Apostles published a more explicit proclamation on that issue, dated December 23, 1847, in which Protestants, Catholics, Moslems, and Pagans were invited to partake freely of the new refuge in the Great Basin: "The kingdom which we are establishing is not of this world, but is the kingdom of the Great God."\textsuperscript{60} Although Joseph Smith had chosen "Theo-democracy" to describe the Mormon political order to the public, this term was only infrequently used by the Mormon hierarchy after his death. "The Kingdom of God" for the Mormons of the Great Basin became a political shibboleth.

As a practical consideration, "Kingdom of God" was a better term to describe the authoritarian political order the Mormons advocated. In 1855 Apostle Franklin D. Richards editorialized:

\begin{quote}
There is one kind of government that will insure permanent prosperity and happiness, as long as the people will render willing obedience to it, and that is a Theocracy, or the government of God through His Prophet, Seer, and Revelator. . . . A Theocracy embodies the two extremes of absolute power and republicanism.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

The admiration for absolute power was such that Brigham Young criticized the United States for limiting the president to specified terms, and he argued that capable men should remain in civil office for life.\textsuperscript{62} In addition, the Mormon leaders argued that factionalism, contending political

\textsuperscript{59}Journal of Wilford Woodruff, May 29, 1847; Clayton, William Clayton's Journal, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{60}Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, I, 334.

\textsuperscript{61}"Union," LDS Millennial Star, XVII (May 5, 1855), 274.

\textsuperscript{62}Remarks of Brigham on July 24, 1854, in Ibid., XVI (November 18, 1854), 725-726; Journal of Discourses, XIV, 92 (given April 8, 1871).
parties, and more than one candidate for political office were destructive of political order, and that in the Kingdom of God the people exercised their freedom by sustaining the decisions of their leaders and by voting unanimously for the candidates presented to them.63 As Brigham Young said in 1855, "the Priesthood will bear rule, and hold the government of the Kingdom under control in all things..."64

There is ample evidence of the nearly universal success of this political rule by priesthood decree and common consent. At Nauvoo the votes for municipal officers were nearly always unanimous.65 That was an impressive accomplishment for elections involving several hundred voters, but in the territory of Utah, where thousands of votes were cast, the degree of political unity was staggering. Between 1851 and the arrival of the railroad in 1869 the percentage of territorial votes against the church candidates was almost negligible: none in 1851, .49 percent in 1852, less than .3 percent in 1861, less than six percent in 1862, less than five percent in 1863, less than .1 percent in 1864, less than .3 percent in 1865, less than .1 percent in 1867, less than .3 percent in 1868, and only 45 contrary votes out of 11,000 votes in 1869.66 Moreover, unanimous voting on legislation by the territorial legislators was common in Utah until the 1880's. A factor that may have contributed to such near unanimity was the fact that until 1874 elections in Utah were either by voice vote or by


64Ibid., II, 189 (given February 18, 1855).


ballots marked with a number identifying the voter. 67

It should be obvious that such monolithic political activity did
not occur without direction. Public statements about unanimity were not
sufficient in themselves to arrive at political activity that was both
cohesive and successful. In recent years, historians have concluded that
the secretive, non-ecclesiastical "Council of Fifty" was the moving
instrument of this political control within Mormonism. 68 Concerning the
relationship of the Council of Fifty to the Mormon hierarchy, one historian
has written:

In the early years in the Great Basin, the Council of
Fifty was as important, if not more so, in building the tem-
poral Kingdom than the Council of the Twelve Apostles. As
far as is known, all the members of the Council of the Twelve
were members, at one time or other, of the Council of Fifty,
but the Quorum of the Twelve in these years was more concerned
with gathering Saints than governing them after their arrival
in the valley of the Great Salt Lake. 69

In order to evaluate the non-public role of the Mormon hierarchy in
managing the political affairs of the Mormons, attention must first be
given to the Council of Fifty.

Despite the lack of detailed information about the early years of
the Council of Fifty, enough data is available to be sure of its general
function. On March 10, 1844, Joseph Smith's journal records that he met
with his brother Hyrum, and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, the Nauvoo
Temple Committee, and several other men to discuss a letter from Apostle


68Hansen's Quest for Empire, despite some inadequacies, errors,
and overstatements will probably remain the standard work on the Council
of Fifty until all the presently existing minutes and records of that
body are released from present restrictions and made available to
scholars.

69Jo Ann Barnett Shipps, "The Mormons in Politics: The First
Hundred Years," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1965),
p. 165.
Lyman Wight. Then Smith's sketchy journal continues:

Joseph asked., can this council keep what I say. not make it Public-all held up thir [sic] hands.
Copy the constitution of the U.S.
No law can be enacted but what every man can be pro-
tected from.

The group of men reconvened in the evening, "Joseph enjoined perfect
d secrecy of them," and thus began the organization of a secret governing
body.70 Because it tended to comprise about fifty men, this special
council was called the Council of Fifty by its members. One of the
original members of the body later said that the Council of fifty was
"the embryo kingdom of God upon the earth--an organization distinct from
the Church, a nucleus of popular government which will exist for all
people."71 Another member of the Council of Fifty wrote the following
while summarizing meetings of the council he was attending in 1848:

This council aluded too is the Municipal department of
the Kingdom of God set up on the Earth, and from which all
Law eminates, for the rule, government & controle of all
Nations Kingdoms & toungs and People under the whole Heavens
but not to controle the Priesthood but to council, deliberate
& plan for the general good & upbuilding of the Kingdom of
God on the Earth.72

The role of the Council of Fifty as a legislative and governing body also
relates to the copy of the U.S. Constitution that Joseph Smith referred
to the day the council was organized. According to one of the original

---

70Journal of Joseph Smith, Jr., March 10, 1844, and Wilford Woodruff
Journal, March 10, 1844. The official history of the church omits the
details of this meeting, and indicates that the Council of Fifty was
organized on March 11, 1844. See Roberts, History of the Church, VI,
260. Perhaps March 11 was the day of the formal organization, for on
March 11, 1849, one member of the Council of Fifty wrote: "It is five
years to Day [the 11 of March] since the Council now called the Legis-
lative Council was first formed by the Prophet Joseph Smith." See the
Joseph Fielding Journal, March 11, 1849, p. 149, Church Archives.

published version, My Life's Review which deletes the entry.

72Lee, A Mormon Chronicle, I, 80
members of the Council of Fifty, Peter Haws, and a later member, George Q. Cannon, Joseph Smith asked the council to write a constitution for the Kingdom of God. After a week of effort, the men confessed their inability to write such a document, and upon inquiring of God, Joseph Smith is said to have received a revelation that stated: "Ye are my constitution."73 This event indicated that the Council of Fifty was not limited in its operation by any written document, and the council was nicknamed by its members as "The Living Constitution."74

Although a detailed history of the Council of Fifty is not practical here, a summary of its activities will give an indication of its function from 1844 to 1884. At Nauvoo, the Council of Fifty conducted the campaign for Joseph Smith's presidential candidacy, sent emissaries to Washington, D. C. and foreign capitals to negotiate for refuges and welfare of the Mormons, coordinated the economic and political life in the brief time before the abandonment of Nauvoo, negotiated for the sale of the Nauvoo Temple and other buildings once it was determined that abandoning the city was necessary, and provided for the defence of the

73 Pottawattamie High Council Minutes, p. 137, January 20, 1849, Church Archives; Salt Lake Herald, September 16, 1897, p. 5.

74 John D. Lee, Mormonism Unveiled; or the Life and Confessions of the Late Mormon Bishop, John D. Lee, edited by W. W. Bishop (St. Louis, Missouri: Bryan, Brand & Co., 1877), p. 173. The full name of the council was "The Kingdom of God and His Laws with the keys and power thereof and judgment in the hands of His servants, Ahman Christ." See Wilford Woodruff Journal, May 29, 1847; Franklin D. Richards Diary, March 16, 1880; and Abraham H. Cannon Journal, October 9, 1884. "The Living Constitution" was not only a private nickname for the secret council, but it was also a public designation for a different organization that was formed in 1845 to regulate manufacturing at Nauvoo. See Minutes of the Mercantile and Mechanical Association of Nauvoo, pp. 9-11, Nauvoo Collection, Church Archives. Cf. Roberts, History of the Church, VII, 369, 371, 375, and Amasa M. Lyman journal, January 28, February 4, February 7, February 18, 1845, Church Archives. The more public "Living Constitution" was comprised of twelve counselors (most of whom were members of the Council of Fifty), and a presidency of three apostles.
Mormons while in Nauvoo and for their departure from the city. The council of Fifty also directed the migration of the Mormons to Utah by commissioning scouts, examining descriptions of the Far West and deciding upon the Great Basin as their destination, supervising the officers of the various emigrant companies, and by deciding who would make the journey and at what intervals. En route to the Great Basin, the Council of Fifty also approved the negotiations that resulted in the enlistment of the Mormon Battalion for the Mexican War. Once in the Great Basin, the Council of Fifty provided the instruments for law, order, and punishment, drew up the petition to Congress for territorial government, and provided the provisional State of Deseret to govern the Mormons civilly in the interim. Both before and after Utah became a territory in 1850, the Council of Fifty operated as a shadow government in the political life of the Mormons: desired legislation and candidates for office were secretly proposed and approved by the Council of Fifty, whose members would then inform the pertinent civil bodies what laws and nominations were to be approved publicly. For the forty years in which the Council of Fifty
played out its role, its accomplishments seemed impressive.\textsuperscript{75}

Insufficient attention, however, has been given to the significance of the periods during which the Council of Fifty held no meetings. The Council of Fifty was not in existence prior to March 10, 1844. Even after the organization was functioning, there were two long periods when the Council of Fifty held no meetings even though there were no obstacles to prevent such gatherings: from September 13, 1851 to January 23, 1867, and from October 10, 1868 to April 10, 1880. If the Council of Fifty was the supreme governing council of Mormon theocracy, then the Mormon commonwealth had no shadow government during thirty years of its theocratic heyday in Utah. Moreover, after 1849 the Council of Fifty convened only four to ten days annually during the years in which it held any meetings at all. If the Council of Fifty is regarded as the \textit{sine qua non} of the political Kingdom of God, then these enormous gaps in the official convocations of the Council of Fifty are puzzling.

A partial explanation of this apparent contradiction lies in the

fact that, although membership in the Council of Fifty was even open to trusted non-Mormons, this theocratic council was comprised primarily of currently presiding officers of the LDS Church. As stated in a revelation directed to the Council of Fifty by John Taylor in June 1882:

Behold you are my Kingdom and rulers in my Kingdom and then you are also, many of you, rulers in my Church according to your ordinations therein. For are you not of the First Presidency, and of the Twelve Apostles and some Presidents of Stakes, and some Bishops, and some High Priests and some Seventies and Elders therein?  

From April 1844 to October 1884 the Council of Fifty's president was the president or presiding apostle of the LDS Church, and nearly forty percent of the council's members were current General Authorities, including every member of the Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve, all Presiding Bishops, all but one of the Presiding Patriarchs, and nearly half of the Council of Seventy and counselors to the Presiding Bishop. Moreover, becoming a new General Authority was often the cause for being admitted to the Council of Fifty within a few days or months, as was the case with Apostles Ezra T. Benson, Franklin D. Richards, Lorenzo Snow, Moses Thatcher, and John W. Taylor, Presiding Bishop's counselor John Q. Cannon, and Presidents of Seventy William W. Taylor and Seymour B. Young. In addition, Francis M. Lyman, John Henry Smith, George Teasdale, and Heber J. Grant were approved as members of the Council of Fifty in apparent anticipation of their being called to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles within

---


77The most glaring omission of the hierarchy in the Council of Fifty was John Smith who was never admitted before or after he became Presiding Patriarch in 1855.
a few months. In an obvious manner, the Mormon hierarchy not only dominated the Council of Fifty statistically, but also provided a power structure that had more continuity than the infrequently convened Council of Fifty.

In a more direct way, there is evidence that the Council of Fifty was actually subordinate in its activities to the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the church. Initially, the President of the Church had organized the Council of Fifty, and when the council was functioning it was convened at his direction. On August 12, 1844, the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, not the Council of Fifty, directed Lyman Wight, George Miller, and Lucian Woodworth to undertake the mission to Texas that had been appointed to them as members of the Council of Fifty by the now deceased Joseph Smith. When Brigham Young died in 1877, the Council of Fifty had been inactive as a body for nearly a decade and was now without its president. When the decision to reconvene the Council of Fifty in 1880 was made by the presiding apostle and the rest of the Quorum of the Twelve, it was not only done without the supporting vote of members of the Council of Fifty who resided in Salt Lake City, but among the apostles voting for its reestablishment was Moses Thatcher, who had not yet been admitted to the Council of Fifty. As expressed by Brigham

---

78 Hansen, Quest for Empire, pp. 66, 223-228. Hansen's list of members lacks more than thirty names that can be supplied from other sources, but the proportion of LDS General Authorities remains about the same. The specific admission dates for the men cited can be found in Ibid., pp. 208, 211, 223, 226, and in the previously cited diaries and journals of members of the Council of Fifty.

79 Journal of Willard Richards, August 12, 1844; Roberts, History of the Church, VII, 249.

80 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, March 3, April 1, 1880; Joseph F. Smith Journal, March 16, April 1, 1880.
Young, it was the LDS Church that produced the government of the Kingdom of God.81

The Council of Fifty was not only the creature of the Mormon hierarchy, but it also appears to have been an elaborate rubber-stamp for decisions previously made by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. On January 29, 1844 the Quorum of the Twelve nominated Joseph Smith for the U.S. Presidency, and on March 4, 1844 nominated his vice-presidential running mate. After the Council of Fifty was formed on March 10, that body simply validated what had already been decided, and continued the political campaign.82 On February 21, 1844, the Quorum of the Twelve was given the responsibility to plan an exodus into the American West, and they initially chose eight men to act as scouts. After the turmoil of the ill-fated presidential campaign and the succession crisis, the Council of Fifty decided on March 1, 1845 to select nine men to act as scouts for a new location in the far west.83 On April 1, 1880, the Quorum of the Twelve considered who should fill the vacancies in the Council of Fifty, and when the council was reconvened on April 10, the other members of the Council of Fifty had only a perfunctory role in selecting the new members of that body, because the initiates had already been notified to attend the meeting.84 The most striking example of this rubber-stamp quality of the Council of Fifty occurred in October 1882.

81Journal of Discourses, II, 317 (discourse given on July 8, 1855); Andrus, Doctrines of the Kingdom, pp. 389-390.

82Journal of Joseph Smith, Jr., January 29, 1844; Willard Richards Journal, March 4, 1844; Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 187-188; Hansen, Quest for Empire, pp. 77-78.


84Diary of Franklin D. Richards, April 1, April 10, 1880; Junius F. Wells Diary, April 9, 1880.
The First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve had discussed on October 4 who should be the candidate for Utah's delegate to Congress, and in the morning of October 11, 1882 the First Presidency and Quorum of Twelve voted that John T. Caine be the nomination. Three hours later the Council of Fifty convened, discussed who should be the delegate to Congress, nominated John T. Caine, and appointed a committee to contact the nominating committee of the church's People's Party.85

The members of the Council of Fifty who were not in the Presidency or Twelve were probably unaware of the extent to which meetings of the Council of Fifty were manipulated to arrive at predetermined decisions, and therefore the unsophisticated drew expansive conclusions about the role of the Council of Fifty. In January 1849, one member of the Council of Fifty, Peter Haws, expressed dissatisfaction about the council not meeting regularly and about the ascendency of several of the apostles in the political Kingdom of God. His complaints brought forth an irritated and somewhat devastating rebuke from Apostle George A. Smith: "Elder G.A. Smith interrupted him by telling him that the fifty was nothing but a debating School."86 That knowledge proved too much for Haws, and he deserted the Council of Fifty. Thirty years later, an incident of supreme irony occurred after Apostle Joseph F. Smith, as a member of the Salt Lake City Council, had successfully led that body in adopting legislation that had been privately approved in advance by Presiding Apostle John Taylor. After the measure was approved by the city council, another member of the city council, John Sharp (who had been a member of the Council of Fifty

85 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, October 4, October 11, 1882.

since 1867), angrily accused Apostle Smith of "attempting to manipulate the city council." It should now be seen as more than coincidental that most expansive descriptions of the supreme role of the Council of Fifty in the Kingdom of God were written by John D. Lee, Benjamin F. Johnson, George Miller, and others who were not members of the hierarchy's shadow government within the shadow government.

At this point, it is natural to wonder what purpose the Council of Fifty fulfilled in the political order of Mormonism. At the most practical level, the Council of Fifty was the "debating school" referred to by Apostle George A. Smith. It provided a forum, buttressed by oaths of secrecy, in which the hierarchy could receive different perspectives on pressing questions of political, economic, and social significance. Undoubtedly many of the decisions reached in these deliberations were not orchestrated by the presidency and apostles to arrive at preconceived conclusions, but all available evidence indicates that the opinions and recommendations of the Mormon hierarchy carried tremendous weight in the debates of the Council of Fifty. The Council of Fifty also provided more than two dozen men who could be relied upon to influence a far wider sector than the hierarchy could alone. Most important of all, the Council of Fifty was the symbolic legislative body of the unattained ideal of a democratically functioning Kingdom of God.

Although it has been persuasively and accurately argued that the practical Mormon quest in the political Kingdom of God was protective

---

refuge rather than expansive empire, it must be remembered that the embattled Mormon leaders doggedly anticipated that one day their theocracy would cease to be on the defensive and would successfully expand its beneficent dominion to an anxiously waiting and diversely religious world population. On May 12, 1844, Joseph Smith publicly stated:

I calculate to be one of the instruments of setting up the kingdom of Daniel by the word of the Lord, and I intend to lay a foundation that will revolutionize the whole world. 89

In the semi-secure environment of the Great Basin, the Mormon leaders frequently expressed their anticipation that they would one day be invited by peoples and rulers throughout the world to extend the institutions of the Kingdom of God beyond the headquarters of the church.

In the see-saw of expanding theocratic autonomy and federal efforts to enforce pluralistic political institutions on the Mormons, Brigham Young alternated between indignation and hyperbole. As troops marched on Utah in 1857 to suppress a non-existent rebellion against federal authority, Brigham Young spoke of establishing "an independent kingdom," and promised to declare independence from the Union if Congress revoked Utah's territorial status. 90 After that conflict with the federal government was settled with a presidential pardon in 1858, Brigham Young expressed the hope to a friendly non-Mormon "that the time is not far distant when Utah shall be able to assume her rights and place among

88 Marvin S. Hill, "Quest for Refuge: An Hypothesis as to the Social Origins and Nature of the Mormon Political Kingdom," Journal of Mormon History, I (1975), 3-20. The article is flawed by relegating the public and private developments of 1844 to a paragraph, and by failing to relate its thesis to any of the publicly stated anticipations about the role of the Kingdom of God in the world.

89 Roberts, History of the Church, VI, 365.

90 Journal of Wilford Woodruff, August 26, October 26, 1857.
the family of nations.91 In apparent and symbolic anticipation of such independence a flag of the Kingdom of God had been devised, based on the design of the American flag, but with blue and white stripes, and with a field of twelve stars encircling one large star.92 The Mormon theocracy became more bold in its intentions during the American Civil War, even to setting up a publicly proclaimed duplicate government for Utah, called the State of Deseret, which continued to meet until 1870.93 As federal attention was able to turn from the Confederacy to theocratic Utah, the Mormon theocracy was progressively in retreat, yet Mormon leaders continued to affirm that the Kingdom of God would one day be free of such oppression and would spread throughout the world.

The Great Basin from 1847 to at least the 1860's was as much or a tabula rasa as mortality could provide for the Mormon Kingdom of God, yet the Mormons failed to establish the Kingdom of which they dreamed. Those who most successfully fulfilled their role as the vanguard of the Kingdom of God were the men who recognized the elements of the Mormon theocracy as imperfect foreshadowings of what could and would transpire when the hearts of a sinful world and an imperfect church turned sufficiently to Christ the King. Those who were least successful in that secret trust were the men who accepted the symbols in literal terms, and consequently became discouraged and bitter at the disparity. In like manner, the greatest weakness of the "kingdom school" in Mormon historiography lies in the failure to distinguish symbol from substance, in the failure to separate the temporal forms of the Kingdom of God from its eschatological
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91Letter, Brigham Young to Col. Thomas L. Kane, September 1, 1858, Yale University.

92D. Michael Quinn, "The Flag of the Kingdom of God," Brigham Young University Studies, XIV (Autumn 1973), 105-114.

fulfillment.

When one looks beyond the various symbols of the Kingdom of God to discover the dynamic force of nineteenth century Mormon theocracy, one discovers that the seat of power was in the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles of the LDS Church. Nevertheless, authoritarian political rule by this group of men alone was incompatible with the egalitarian and democratic ideals of the Kingdom of God. For this reason the Mormon hierarchy created a series of political or para-political institutions through which the forms of expanded political participation might become available to Mormons outside the hierarchy, while at the same time these democratized forums were subject to the direction and manipulation of the Mormon hierarchy. The Council of Fifty was one such forum, but there were others as well.

In Utah the "School of the Prophets" constituted one institution whereby the political base was democratized. The School of the Prophets was first organized at Kirtland in 1833 as a pioneering adult education center for Mormon leaders.94 Brigham Young reinstituted the School of the Prophets in Salt Lake City on December 9, 1867. More than nine hundred men belonged to the central school at Salt Lake City, and approximately five thousand other Mormons belonged to schools throughout the Great Basin. Admission to the schools was by ticket only, thus providing control over attendance. In addition to theological discussion, the schools of the prophets deliberated and formed policy on economic and

political issues. Concerning the political significance of these organizations, one analyst has written:

The two Schools of the Prophets organized by Brigham Young between 1867 and 1874, participated actively and enthusiastically in the planning, organization, and conducting of Utah Territorial political affairs. The various schools nominated and sustained local officials prior to their names being placed upon the election ballot, and these schools made the decisions and arrangements for protecting polling places and transporting voters to and from the polls.

Such studies imply that the political process originated in the heavily attended School of the Prophets, from which it was imposed upon the civil political structure. This overestimates the extent to which the Mormon hierarchy was willing to allow the political process to be democratized.

The Mormon hierarchy provided the School of the Prophets in Utah as a form of broader political participation, but still controlled the final outcome in a variety of ways. The first control was in the leadership of the Schools. General Authorities presided over the Schools in several of the most important Mormon population centers: The entire First Presidency in the School of the Prophets at Salt Lake City, Apostle Ezra T. Benson at Logan, Utah, Apostle Erastus Snow at St. George, Utah, and Apostle Charles C. Rich at Paris, Idaho. Moreover, when it came time for the School of the Prophets to decide on nominations for public elections, the nominating committee was comprised of General Authorities. On January 29, 1870, for example, the Salt Lake School was turned into a "caucus" and the nominating committee consisted of Apostles Wilford

---

95 John R. Patrick, "The School of the Prophets: Its Development and Influence in Utah Territory," (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1970), pp. 142-143; Arrington, Great Basin Kingdom, pp. 245-251; Minutes of the School of the Prophets, Salt Lake City, 1870-1874, Church Archives.

96 Patrick, "School of the Prophets," p. 47.

97 Ibid., pp. 142-143.
Woodruff and George Q. Cannon and Presiding Bishop Counselor Jesse C. Little. The hierarchy's political control did not begin at the nominating committee, however, as is shown in the 1872 Salt Lake City election. On January 28, the Presidency and apostles held a "preliminary meeting" to decide upon the municipal candidates; on February 3 the School of the Prophets met, received the already approved nominations from the chairman of the School's nominating committee, Apostle George Q. Cannon, and unanimously reapproved them to be presented to the voters for a final, legal approval. In 1874, Brigham Young left the approved list of candidates for the School to nominate while he was out of town.

It has also been pointed out that in October, 1868, the Provo School of the Prophets reenacted a decision arrived at by the Council of Fifty. In view of the evidence that the Council of Fifty was often manipulated into "originating" proposals that already had been decided upon by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve, it is possible that the same was true in this case. October 1868 therefore may provide a classic example of a three-tiered system of Mormon institutional theocracy: a decision was originated and approved by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve, then was proposed and approved by the Council of Fifty, and then was proposed and approved by the School of the Prophets. Those members of the Council of Fifty and School of the Prophets who were unaware of the rubber-stamp character of their own role in these proceedings undoubtedly felt that they "participated actively and enthusias-

98Minutes of the Salt Lake City School of the Prophets, January 29, 1870.

99Diary of Albert Carrington, January 28, 1872; Joseph F. Smith Journal, January 28, February 3, 1872; Robert McQuarrie Journal, February 3, 1872, Church Archives; Minutes of the Salt Lake City School of the Prophets February 3, 1872, January 26, 1874.

100Hansen, Quest for Empire, p. 145.
tically in the planning, organizing, and conducting of Utah Territorial political affairs. 101

The power of the Mormon hierarchy was also manifested in the non-institutional, ad hoc gatherings to arrange nominations in nineteenth century Utah. LeGrand Young was invited to participate in one of these secret ad hoc meetings on January 19, 1878, even though he was not a member of the hierarchy nor of the Council of Fifty. His reaction was not favorable:

Met with several of the brethren this P.M. at the office of the president of the Twelve to talk over the candidates for next term of the City Council. I must confess I am disgusted with what took place there. All the persons present were City Councilors except President Taylor and myself. Bro Taylor was called to the chair, and the rest proceeded to elect themselves to the new council.

It was then arranged to have primaries and to send men to the convention to nominate city officers. Of course the names have been selected for them and when that august body meets it will have a committe of eight or ten, named by the chair who will withdraw and in all likelyhood bring in the names of those previously selected. 102

LeGrand Young's distaste for the situation would have changed to amazement had he known that he was participating in a charade he thought was reserved for the public convention: the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles had already met on January 16 to decide upon the city officers. 103 With the senior apostle as chairman of the secret caucus and with Apostle Joseph F. Smith as one of the city councilmen in attendance, the meeting's outcome was merely an echo. During other periods in Utah's history, members of the unconvened Council of Fifty also met with the apostles in secret ad hoc meetings to decide upon nominations or other political

101See note 96.

102Journal of LeGrand Young, entry and memorandum for January 19, 1878.

103Diary of Franklin D. Richards, January 16, 1878.
matters, but whether or not the outcome had been prearranged by the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve, the General Authorities dominated all ad hoc political conferences in which they participated.

Available documents indicate that up to 1890 the General Authorities were the source of first approval for every political nomination in Utah that they regarded as important. John M. Bernhisel, William H. Hooper, George Q. Cannon, and John T. Caine were first approved by the hierarchy before any caucus nominated these men as Utah's delegates to Congress.104 The hierarchy not only initiated the nominations for men elected to the territorial legislature, but also decided who would be the replacements for legislators who died during a legislative session, who the legislators would elect as officers of the respective legislative chambers, and who the legislators would recommend to the governor for territorial appointments.105 The Presidency and the apostles also decided in advance of any other caucus who would be elected and re-elected as mayor and city councilmen in Salt Lake City, Ogden, and Provo, Utah.106 Even as the federal campaign against polygamy began chipping away at the Mormon theocracy, the hierarchy's political control was temporarily undaunted: when the 1882 Edmunds Law disqualified polygamists from holding


105 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, December 17, 1879, February 16, 1888; Heber J. Grant Journal, January 13, 1884.

public office, the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles decided which municipal and county officers should resign because they were polygamists and also decided that "faithful men" would replace them.  

After the General Authorities had placed their preferred men in public office, they continued to advise and counsel them in the conduct of their office. Utah's territorial delegates to Congress regularly received instructions from the President of the Church in the conduct of lobbying at the nation's capitol. In the 1850's President Brigham Young, Counselor Willard Richards, and Apostle Ezra T. Benson participated in the meetings of the Salt Lake City Council, even though not members of that body. Apostle George A. Smith did the same in Provo during the early 1850's, and Apostle Ezra T. Benson continued the practice in the Logan City Council from its first meeting in 1868 until his death in 1869. When Brigham Young knew he would be out of town during meetings of the Salt Lake City Council, he informed the mayor in advance of the agenda he wished presented. Moreover, up to 1890 the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve conferred with the Salt Lake City council and mayor about such matters as the level of salaries, dividing the city into districts, and the use of funds for municipal projects designed to promote the church's well-being. Members of the presidency and apostles also drafted legislation they wanted introduced in the territorial legis-

107 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, March 15, 1882.

108 Brigham Young-William H. Hooper Correspondence, Yale University; John M. Bernhisel Papers, Brigham Young University; correspondence to and from the territorial delegates in Brigham Young, John Taylor, and Wilford Woodruff papers, Church Archives; Gwynn W. Barrett, "John M. Bernhisel, Mormon Elder in Congress," (Ph.D. dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1968), 91-181.


lature, and met with individual legislators to discuss other bills they wanted introduced, killed in committee, passed, or defeated.\footnote{111} Even friendly non-Mormons were subject to the political manipulation of the Mormon hierarchy, as in 1889 when Apostle Heber J. Grant drafted a petition for non-Mormons to sign as a protest by "Gentiles" against the federal campaign against the polygamous Mormons.\footnote{112}

Because this extraordinary political system, like the Mormon Church itself, depended upon voluntary assent, political independence was not absent. Sincere debate often occurred at all stages of the theocratic process, and there were political defectors from "approved" rulings, as well as from the theocracy itself. Because of the Mormon theology of voluntary assent and evidences of individualism within the Mormon theocracy, it has been affirmed by theologians, historians, and political scientists that Mormonism was a politically democratic society.\footnote{113} Nevertheless, when a small group of men (who hold their non-civil office for life tenure) formulates the social and political policy for a people, presents for popular vote only one approved list of candidates, proclaims that contrary votes are destructive of the social order, and then dominates the conduct of the elected civil officers, it is difficult to say


\footnote{112} Letter Book Journal of Heber J. Grant, December 29, 1889.

that the society produced thereby is significantly democratic or pluralistic.

Mormon political life up to the Church's official abolition of polygamy in 1890 was created and administered as a monolithic theocracy by the LDS First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. For both practical and symbolic reasons, the Mormon hierarchy established such theocratic appendages as the Council of Fifty and the Utah School of the Prophets, wherein a larger group of Mormons could feel that they were participating in the subterranean formulation of the affairs of state, even though they were subtly or openly under the supervision of the Mormon hierarchy. Obviously, the General Authorities did not intervene in the civil affairs of every town and hamlet of the Great Basin, and most often the ordinary operations of civil government were left to the established civil authorities, who were under the watchful care of the local LDS ward bishoprics and stake high councils. On the other hand, whenever and wherever the LDS General Authorities regarded control of politics as crucial, the public institutions of Mormon theocracy—the conventions, legislatures, individual office holders, and the ballot box—amounted to the final performance of a symphony composed by the Mormon hierarchy, and orchestrated by them through a series of rehearsals.114

The theocratic role of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve was given its ultimate expression by LDS President Joseph F. Smith. When Smith first joined the hierarchy in 1866 he had been ordained "a councilor unto the First Presidency of the Church & Kingdom of God upon the

114Political Scientist G. Homer Durham compared the shadow government of early Mormon Utah "before civil machinery appeared" to the secret political control of Number 10 Downing Street, the White House, and the Kremlin. See "The Development of Political Parties in Utah: The First Phase," Utah Humanities Review, I (January, 1947), 125. If anything, the comparison was more accurate after civil government was established.
Earth." With an unmistakable allusion to the Council of Fifty (the theoretical governing body of the Mormon Kingdom of God), Joseph F. Smith, as president of the LDS Church, stated on April 7, 1910:

I merely wish to say in addition to what Prest. Lyman has said, (which I endorse thoroughly) that this body of men, this Council of Presidency and Apostles, compose the living constitution of the Church, with power to legislate, judge and decide.116

The Hierarchy and Partisan Politics, to 1932

By theology, religious observance, and political practice, the Mormons of the nineteenth century were predisposed to authoritarian political control that was supported by voluntary submission to recognized theocratic authority. When faithful Mormons banded together to challenge the "approved" candidates for public office—as occurred in San Bernardino in 1855, in Salt Lake City in 1866, 1868, 1874, 1879, in Ogden in the mid 1870's, and in Provo in 1890—the Mormon hierarchy regarded such political dissent as dangerous aberrations that required private (if not public) rebuke and effective suppression.117 In fact it was with a certain amount of pride that a committee of the apostles in 1888 described the extent to which the apostles controlled Mormon political life:

The great majority of the Saints respect the advice and counsel of this Quorum in political as in other matters, and obey it in most instances: at times even against their

115 Journal of Wilford Woodruff, July 1, 1866. Joseph F. Smith was a teenager when the Council of Fifty had last convened in 1851, and he was not admitted to that body until January 1867.

116 Document dated April 7, 1910, p. 5, in Joseph Fielding Smith Papers, Church Archives.

own judgment.

In the opinion of your committee it is of the utmost importance that this influence for good be maintained and even increased, for upon it largely depends the political well-being of the Saints of GOD. Destroy the influence of the Priesthood in political affairs and the people fall victims here, as elsewhere, to the plans of unscrupulous rings, who make office the means of individual gain through personal advancement.118

In nineteenth century Mormon theology and practice, partisan politics had no legitimate function within a community that sought to discourage political pluralism.

In that same context, however, partisan politics could be manipulated for the benefit of the Mormon Kingdom of God. The communitarian practice of gathering Mormon adherents gave the LDS Church increasing political importance in the voting districts in which the Mormons resided. Although the Mormon hierarchy was unwilling to countenance political factionalism among the Mormons, it became very receptive at certain times to using the bloc-voting Mormons to obtain favors from the competing political parties. Thus, the General Authorities felt the church could be politically in the world without being of the world.

The Mormon hierarchy's effort to manipulate the political parties for the ends of the Mormon commonwealth began in Kirtland, Ohio less than four years after the church was organized. On December 5, 1833, Joseph Smith wrote that the church was going to establish a Democratic newspaper because "the influential men of that party have offered a liberal patronage to us, and we hope to succeed..."119 Although the Jacksonian largesse did not descend upon the Mormons, the church established a Democratic

118Moses Thatcher 1888-1890 Letter Book, p. 21, Moses Thatcher Family Papers, Special Collections, Hilton R. Merrill Library, Utah State University, Logan, Utah. The irony of Moses Thatcher being co-author of this statement will appear later in this section.

119Roberts, History of the Church, I, 450.
newspaper the *Northern Times* at Kirtland in February, 1835. Edited by Associate President Oliver Cowdery and printed by Second Counselor Frederick G. Williams, the *Northern Times* supported the principles of Jacksonian Democracy and advocated the election of Andrew Jackson's designated successor, Martin Van Buren. If the First Presidency's establishment of an openly Democratic newspaper were not sufficient evidence of the political wishes of the hierarchy, Oliver Cowdery ended all doubt when he attended the Democratic state convention at Columbus on January 8, 1836 as a delegate from Geauga County. Although Van Buren lost in Ohio and in Geauga County, the Mormon vote gave him a majority in Kirtland.\(^{120}\)

Three years after the election, Joseph Smith tested the extent to which Mormon support of Van Buren could benefit Mormon interests. The Mormon leadership had deserted Kirtland because apostasy decimated the church there, but they were driven out of Missouri by force after a civil war with anti-Mormons that had been occasioned by Mormon bloc-voting. After the Mormon majority had swept Mormons into virtually every office of Caldwell County, the non-Mormons of Daviess County tried to prevent Mormons from voting. The resulting melee left the anti-Mormons in unconscious disarray, but provided the catalyst for the mobbing and eventual expulsion of the Mormons from the state.\(^{121}\) Having lost property estimated at several millions of dollars, the Mormons appealed to the U.S. Congress for compensation because it seemed unlikely that Missouri would consent to be sued for the amount. It had been an order of the governor


of the state that had legitimized the expulsion. When Joseph Smith obtained a personal interview with President Van Buren on November 29, 1839, the chief executive infuriated Smith by saying that he could do nothing about the matter. This rebuff, despite Mormon support for Van Buren's election, appears to have soured the Mormon hierarchy on supporting political parties simply because their partisan ideologies corresponded to Mormon philosophy. Throughout the rest of the nineteenth century, the calculated *guid pro quo* of Real Politik governed any dealings the Mormon hierarchy chose to have with the national political parties.

As discussed earlier, when the Mormons arrived in Illinois in 1839, the situation was perfect for such manipulation of the political parties. Nevertheless, the only success the hierarchy had in exploiting the Whig-Democratic scramble for Mormon votes was in obtaining the Nauvoc Charter from the Illinois Legislature. To a large extent, this initial triumph in exploitative politics was the responsibility of Mormonism's only successful Machiavellian, John C. Bennett.

Joseph Smith himself did considerably less well when he sought to bargain with the Mormon vote. Up to 1841 the Mormons bloc-voted for the Whigs in a reflex response against Van Buren which nevertheless built up Whig party expectations. In December 1841 Smith publicly announced, "we care not a fig for Whig or Democrat: they are both alike to us; but we shall go for our friends, our TRIED FRIENDS," and in the gubernatorial election of 1842 the Mormons voted Democratically. This increased anti-Mormon feeling in the Whigs and gave the hope to the Democrats, which Smith soon quashed by privately assuring the Whig Congressional candidate

---


123 *Times and Seasons*, III (January 1, 1842), 651; Roberts, *History of the Church*, IV, 480.
in 1843 that he would vote for him. As early as 1841 a Mormon dissenter had informed the inhabitants of Illinois what such a promise meant about the Mormon vote: "Let the ballot box, at every election where they have voted answer, and it will be found that they have voted almost to a man, with Smith." 124 Nevertheless, two days before the 1843 election Hyrum Smith, the Associate President and Patriarch, announced that he had a revelation that the Mormons should vote Democratic, and the day before the election Joseph Smith publicly stated that he had received no revelation about politics, deferred to Hyrum's inspiration, yet said he would vote for the Whig candidate. The Mormons got the message, and Nauvoo voted for the Democratic candidate. This clumsy approach to political manipulation outraged the Whigs, and destroyed the faith of both parties in the promises of the Mormon hierarchy. Thus, by 1844 the Mormons had alienated both political parties, and Joseph Smith began an independent bid for the White House. After Smith's death, the Mormons continued to bloc-vote, but neither party in Illinois was seriously courting them. 125

When the Mormons left a hostile Illinois in 1846, they were welcomed temporarily in Iowa when they again established a gathering place in a state where the Whig and Democratic parties were at equilibrium. On March 18, 1848, the Whig State Executive Committee wrote a long letter to "Rev. Brigham Young," commiserating with previous Mormon sufferings and laying the responsibility upon the Democratic parties of Missouri and Illinois. After several consultations, the hierarchy issued a resolution on March 27, 1848, that the Mormons in Iowa would vote for the Whigs at


125 Roberts, History of the Church, V, 526; Flanders, Nauvoo, pp. 211-240.
the next election. Since the Mormons had voted for Democrat James K. Polk in Nauvoo, the Iowa Democrats may not have taken the pledge seriously. When the Mormons held true to the resolution, their votes helped elect Whig candidate Zachary Taylor as U.S. President, but failed to prevent a Democratic majority in Iowa's legislature. The Democrats were so enraged at the outcome of the 1848 Mormon vote, that there was serious talk of driving the Mormons from the state. A bill to abolish the Mormon-controlled Pottawattamie County and thereby disfranchise them failed to become law in the state legislature by only one vote. Temporarily safe, Apostle Orson Hyde turned the church newspaper in Iowa, The Frontier Guardian, into a Whig political organ and urged the Mormons to remain true to the Whig party, whose members had vigorously opposed the anti-Mormon bill in the legislature. Despite Hyde's partisanship, the Democrats moderated their antagonism, and in the 1850 campaign again tried to court the Mormon vote. The election results showed that the Mormons had voted heavily Whig in Pottawattamie County while the rest of Iowa went totally Democratic. Although the Mormons under Hyde's direction had alienated only one party, it was the party in control of the state. A partial reason why Brigham Young had the Mormons of Iowa move en masse to Utah by 1852 may have been his concern over the volatile political situation of the Mormons in Iowa.126

Although the General Authorities sought to eliminate all traces of partisanship in the Great Basin, there is evidence that they periodically tried to use the partisanship of delegates to Washington as leverage for

the non-partisan Kingdom of God. When the Mormons sought statehood status from the national government in 1849, the administration was Whig, but the Democrats controlled both houses of Congress. It seems more than coincidental that John M. Bernhisel, a Whig, was sent as an emissary to Washington with a petition for territorial status in May 1849, to be followed by the election in July of Almon W. Babbitt, a Democrat, as the official delegate of the State of Deseret to Washington. Once Congress had created Utah Territory, Bernhisel wrote Brigham Young that Utah's territorial delegate had better be a Whig if the Mormons expected favors from the Whig president, Millard Fillmore. Young obliged, and Bernhisel was elected as the territory's first delegate. Bernhisel was an able delegate, and the hierarchy kept him in office until the conclusion of the Utah War in 1859. That conflict had begun when the Democrats controlled both houses of Congress and the White House, and it seems again more than coincidental that a year after Democratic president James Buchanan's 1858 amnesty to the Mormons, Whig Bernhisel retired as delegate, and a Democrat, William H. Hooper, was elected. When the new Republican Party gained control of all branches of government in 1860 and 1861, it was Hooper's turn to retire, and Bernhisel, whose Whig party had been absorbed into the Republican, returned to Washington as Utah Territory's delegate.127

Despite the 1856 Republican party platform pledging to suppress polygamy in the territories, the Mormon hierarchy and Bernhisel himself felt confident that amidst the secession of the Southern States, the

Union would welcome Utah as a state. Instead, in 1862 the Republican Congress rejected Utah's petition for statehood, and passed the Morrill Act, which not only made polygamy a federal crime, but also disincorporated the LDS Church. Stung by this Republican affront, the Mormon hierarchy from that time forward selected only Democrats to serve as delegates from the Territory of Utah.128

In 1872, the Mormon hierarchy involved themselves in partisan politics as part of a tremendous effort to obtain statehood for Utah. For the first time, non-Mormons were included in the convention which drew up the proposed state constitution, and non-Mormons were also among the proposed state officers. As a more startling element of the statehood effort, the 1872 constitution contained a provision that obliquely invited Congress to add to the state constitution some clause prohibiting polygamy.129 The statehood petition and constitution had barely been sent off to Washington, when the Mormons began to divide along national party lines. By 1870 elections in Utah had become formalized, but uneven, contests between the minority anti-Mormon Liberal Party and the People's Party of the Mormon Church. It has been suggested that one purpose for Mormon support of the formulation of national parties in Utah was to split the already factionalized Liberal Party.130 While this may have been true, the key to understanding General Authority involvement in the national parties in 1872 is that the Mormon hierarchy sought to obtain bi-partisan Congressional support for statehood by winning over

128Barrett, "John M. Bernhisel," pp. 159-167; Diamond and Alligood, Members of Congress, pp. 30, 31, 94. This source indicates that George Q. Cannon was a Republican as Territorial Delegate, but he was a Democrat during his later territorial service, as will be indicated here.


former opponents and maintaining traditional supporters.

Because the Republican party had traditionally been opposed to Mormon Utah, the hierarchy concentrated its efforts there. On March 15, 1872, a call for a Republican Mass Meeting was signed by Counselor in the First Presidency, Daniel H. Wells. At the mass meeting on April 2, 1872, President of Seventy Albert P. Rockwood and Bishopric Counselor Jesse C. Little joined Wells. Three apostles and the first counselor in the LDS Presidency joined the others as delegates to the Territorial Convention. The territorial convention voted for Counselor George A. Smith as a delegate to the 1872 Republican National Convention at Philadelphia, and organized the territorial Republican Party with the following officers: Apostle Franklin D. Richards as President, and as Vice Presidents, Counselor George A. Smith and Apostles Charles C. Rich and Erastus Snow.131 So that the leadership of the Republican Party would not mistake the intentions of the Mormons, the Salt Lake Herald editorialized on May 30, 1872: "The vote of Utah is over 25,000. Of this number not more than one-tenth are Gentiles...If it is desired to encourage the Mormons to enter the Republican organization, the Philadelphia convention will admit the Salt Lake delegates."

Although the Mormon hierarchy made this effort to court the support of the majority party of Congress and the White House, the General Authorities also did not want to lose the Democratic friends in Congress who had been cultivated through the efforts of Utah's territorial delegates up to 1872. With one exception, the General Authorities were conspicuous by their absence in the organization of the Democratic Party in Utah. That exception was Apostle George Q. Cannon, who attended the Democratic Terri-

131Ibid., pp. 276-288; Journal History, April 5, 1872, p. 3; Salt Lake Herald, March 14, April 3, April 6, 1872.
torial Convention in July 1872, was elected a vice-president of the ter-
itorial organization, and was nominated as the Democratic candidate for
the election of Utah's territorial delegate to Congress. The Mormon
hierarchy apparently reasoned that the massive public support given to
the Republicans would contribute toward their approving the entry of a
Republican state, while at the same time Cannon as a Democratic delegate
to Congress could privately reassure Democratic Congressmen of Utah's
future support once statehood was achieved.

Unfortunately for the General Authorities, their own lack of sin-
cerity in establishing political pluralism in Utah actually contributed
toward the defeat of the 1872 statehood effort. A rival non-Mormon dele-
gation had been sent to Philadelphia, where the Republican convention
voted as a compromise to accept both delegations. Counselor George A.
Smith refused to be seated with the Gentile delegation, which was a self-
inflicted prelude to the failure of the 1872 statehood petition. That
ended the blossoming of General Authority participation in the Utah or-
ganization of the Republican party, even though the local organizations
met again in 1876. 133

The Mormon hierarchy's apolitical manipulation of partisan politics
was quite transparent in the immediate wake of the events of 1872. By
the time Apostle George Q. Cannon took his seat as delegate in the U.S.
House of Representatives, the Republican Party had gained majority con-
trol of both houses of Congress in addition to the White House. There-
fore, Cannon declared himself a Republican and sat on the Republican side

132Journal History, July 27, 1872, p. 3; Salt Lake Herald, July 14,
1872.
133Jack, "Utah Territorial Politics," pp. 317-517; Calvin W. Hiibner,
"Utah Delegations at the National Nominating Conventions: 1860-1928,"
of the House, even though he had been elected as the joint candidate of
the People's Party and Democratic Party of Utah. The anomaly brought
the following response from the Salt Lake Tribune:

He now calls himself a Republican because there is
a Republican majority in Congress. Had the Democrats been
the stronger in numbers, our facile Delegate would have set
himself down as a Democrat. But in simple truth, he belongs
to neither of these two great political parties. He is sim-
ply a son of the Church, a pliant tool in the hands of Brigham.

George Q. Cannon himself provided ample support for this assessment after
the Democrats gained majority control of the U.S. House of Representa-
tives in 1874, 1876, and 1878: he sat on the Democratic side of the
House, and in a published interview on February 6, 1878 stated: "The
Mormons generally on national issues are inclined to be Democrats, and
all other things being equal, in the respective candidates of the parties,
would vote the Democratic ticket." A similar reversal was shown pub-
licly when the 1872 vice-president of the Republican Party in Utah,
Apostle Charles C. Rich, became an avowed Democrat in the Territory of
Idaho, where he was elected to Democratic office in 1876. The organi-
zation of national political parties in Utah in 1872 never moved beyond
the Mormon theocracy, and it was another two decades before the hierarchy
actively supported the establishment of the two national parties in Utah.

During the next fifteen years, both national parties helped to dis-
mantle Mormon political hegemony. In 1874, the Poland Act restricted

134Diamond and Alligood, Members of Congress, p. 31.
Utah's judiciary, and placed it more firmly under federal control. In 1879, the famous United States vs. George Reynolds case by the U.S. Supreme Court declared polygamy a heathen threat to western marriage institutions, and sanctioned the constitutionality of laws prohibiting polygamy. In 1880, Counselor George Q. Cannon was rejected as a delegate to the national Democratic Party convention, and in 1882 he was excluded as Utah's delegate from the U.S. House of Representatives. In 1882 the Edmunds Act disfranchised polygamists, and provided for the reconstruction of Utah's political life. The final symbol of bipartisan repression of Mormon theocracy was the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker Act in 1887 (which reaffirmed the 1862 disincorporation of the LDS Church, and provided the machinery for confiscation of its assets) by the vote of a Democratically controlled House of Representatives and with the silent acquiescence of Democratic President Grover Cleveland.138

Nevertheless, Cleveland gave the Mormon hierarchy reason to support the national Democratic Party in June 1887 by personally providing them with provisions outlawing polygamy for a proposed state constitution for Utah. President of the Church John Taylor approved the provisions, which were to be included in the constitution as though by the independent action of the constitutional delegates.139 Moreover, in 1888 Cleveland appointed as Chief Justice for Utah a man who was favorable to the Mormons.


139Letter Book Journal of Heber J. Grant, June 20, 1887. See also Henry J. Wolfinger, "A Reexamination of the Woodruff Manifesto in the Light of Utah Constitutional History," Utah Historical Quarterly, XXXIX (Fall, 1971), 328-349.
and who understood that he was to administer the anti-polygamy laws leniently. 140

Cleveland's personal efforts for the Mormons were responsible for a flurry of Democratic support by the Mormon hierarchy in the last year of Cleveland's first term. In August 1888, John W. Young, counselor to the Quorum of the Twelve, urged that body to establish a Central Democratic Club in Salt Lake City and to buy up and reorganize the New York Star to support the church political interests in New York City. 141 The apostles decided against these proposals, but did authorize a Mormon organization of Democrats in Ogden, Utah, as long as there was no separation from the People's Party of the church. 142 On September 2, 1888, the apostles instructed the Arizona Mormons to vote for the Democratic candidate for U.S. Representative, but to vote for Republicans as local officers. 143 In Idaho, Republican stake president William Budge astounded a Democratic supreme court judge of Idaho on September 30, 1888, by promising that the Mormons of Idaho would vote a straight Democratic ticket if the judge would administer the anti-polygamy laws "justly and


141 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, August 7, August 29, 1888.

142 Letter Book of Moses Thatcher, pp. 18-21; Franklin D. Richards Diary, September 20, 1888.

not oppressively."\textsuperscript{144} How far the Mormon hierarchy would have continued its support of the Democratic Party can only be inferred, for contrary to the expectations of both the Mormon hierarchy and Cleveland, the Republicans swept the national elections in November 1888. For the first time since 1875, the Republicans controlled both houses of Congress as well as the White House.

Because years of public and private support of the Democratic Party had failed to produce either statehood or an end to anti-Mormon legislation, the Mormon hierarchy began a crucial tilt toward the Republican Party as the repressive force of the federal government was reapplied against the Mormon practice of polygamy in 1889. On May 31, 1889, the President of the Church instructed Apostle Heber J. Grant, a Democrat and president of the board of the Democratic Salt Lake Herald, to stop the editorials by that paper that were critical of President Benjamin Harrison and other prominent Republican leaders. Grant met with the board of directors, and they agreed that such editorials "did us more harm than good."\textsuperscript{145} On October 8, 1889, the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve retracted its previous instructions to the Arizona Mormons to vote for the Democratic national leaders, and told them instead to vote for "the best men" of each party.\textsuperscript{146}

By July 1890 the situation of the Mormons was desperate. The U.S. Supreme Court had declared that disfranchisement of all Mormons was con-


\textsuperscript{145} Letter Book Journal of Heber J. Grant, May 31, 1889.

\textsuperscript{146} Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, October 8, 1889.
stitutional, and both houses of Congress were preparing bills to do that very thing. On July 31, 1890, the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve decided to instruct Mormons who could vote in Idaho, Wyoming, and Arizona to vote Republican, because: "Self protection demands that we look to the Republicans for relief, now that the Democrats have proved themselves cowards on our question." Furthermore, Secretary of State James G. Blaine advised an emissary of the First Presidency that the disfranchisement bills would be allowed to fail of passage, but that a revelation should be announced that would allow the abandonment of polygamy. In September 1890, the President of the Church Wilford Woodruff and his counselor George Q. Cannon traveled to San Francisco, where they visited with prominent Republican leaders, including the National Chairman of the Republican Party. On September 25, 1890, three days after his return to Salt Lake City, Woodruff issued the famous "Manifesto" urging Mormons to comply with the laws of the land regarding marriage.

The Mormon Church's sanction for the practice of polygamy had become symbolic of the alleged chasm that separated Mormon society from "American" society. It was an inappropriate symbol because the Mormons had been driven by mobs and had been accused of being "un-American" long before polygamy became significant. Even after polygamy was institutionalized by Brigham Young, it involved only an elite minority within Mormonism: more than ninety-five percent of the Mormons of Utah voted for church candidates, while only ten or twenty percent of the Mormon voters had entered into polygamous marriages. Although plural marriage was

147 Ibid., July 31, 1890.

actually a non-essential of the communitarian Mormon commonwealth, polygamy became the central issue of Mormon and anti-Mormon polemics because it was so vulnerable. As federal pressures against polygamy increased after the death of Brigham Young, the Mormon hierarchy adopted a defensive stance that was the undoing of the Mormon commonwealth: amid cries of "No compromise!" the General Authorities insisted that the practice of polygamy was the essence of Mormonism and therefore could not be given up. Rather than discouraging anti-Mormons, this claim inspired them to renewed efforts. When the President of the Church capitulated to the supremacy of federal authority in 1890 by publicly abandoning the practice of polygamy, the surrender of more central features of the Mormon commonwealth would paradoxically become easier to contemplate.

It is in this context that the Mormon hierarchy arranged the dismantling of Mormon political homogeneity less than a year after the announcement of the Manifesto. By 1890, the anti-Mormon Liberal Party had gained control of the municipal government in Ogden and Salt Lake City. On February 17, 1891, Mormon leaders of Ogden asked the First Presidency what to do in view of the fact that the Liberal Party there wanted to divide along national party lines. Two days later the First Presidency, two apostles, and the Presiding Bishopric met with Ogden's political 'saddicts and decided to organize the national political parties among Ogden's Mormons. On February 25, 1891, the First Presidency instructed the presidency of Salt Lake Stake "to move quietly among the people and advise them cautiously of the changes pending in political affairs as to their becoming Republicans or Democrats."149 After more than fifty years of ridiculing political factionalism, the hierarchy moved cautiously:

in a meeting of the First Presidency, Quorum of the Twelve, and First Council of Seventy on March 19, 1891, it was decided to restrict the political division of Mormons to Weber County, because "we desire to see first how the experiment will work there before we advise the adoption of a similar course elsewhere."150 Apparently pleased with the outcome, "the Presidency and other brethren" decided on May 25, 1891 to instruct the leadership of the church's political party to consider a total division along political lines.151 As a result of this decision, the Central Committee of the People's Party submitted resolutions to precinct meetings on May 29 that called for the dissolution of the party. It was therefore another example of the political orchestration of the Mormon hierarchy when the People's Party disbanded on June 10, 1891, and urged its members to join one of the two national parties.152

In 1890, the Mormons voted as a bloc and had their own political party, but within a half century the Mormons of Utah and all other regions were as politically independent as the rest of American society. Between the Mormon division along political lines in 1891 and the emergence of the New Deal in 1932, the Mormons experienced a difficult and often painful transition from the uncomplicated acceptance of authoritarian theocratic rule to the ambiguous political world of American partisan politics. Caught between the necessity of encouraging political pluralism and a longing for the verities of the theocratic past, the Mormon hierarchy frequently exhibited an ambivalence that was both ironic and

151 Ibid., May 25, 1891.
152 Ibid., June 10, 1891; The Deseret Weekly, XLIII (June 6, 1891), 763, (June 20, 1891), 835.
melancholy.\textsuperscript{153}

The first adjustment the hierarchy had to accept was the fragmentation of its political unity that occurred almost immediately after the division of the Mormons along political lines. One reason for this is that the General Authorities had always of necessity been informed on national political issues in order to know how to exploit the political parties for the welfare of the Mormon commonwealth. Because of this and because of their behind-the-scenes management of local political affairs, by 1891 many of the General Authorities were calculatedly political whereas the average Mormon was obediently apolitical.\textsuperscript{154} The possibilities for political coalitions within the hierarchy are suggested in Table 23.\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{153}For an analysis of Utah-Mormon politics after 1932, see the work of Professor Frank H. Jonas and his students in the Political Science Department at the University of Utah. See also a relevant essay on this issue by J. D. Williams, "The Separation of Church and State in Mormon Theory and Practice," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought, I (Summer, 1966) 30-54, reprinted in Journal of Church and State, IX (Spring, 1976), 238-262.

\textsuperscript{154}For a similar view, see Jack, "Utah Territorial Politics," p. 517.

\textsuperscript{155}Political affiliations were determined through a combination of the following sources: newspaper reports of attendance at political conventions; references to political preferences and activities in the diaries and correspondence of the hierarchy; through consultation with descendants of General Authorities; through examination of political reminiscences of James H. Moyle, chairman of Utah's Democratic Party from 1898 to 1902; and through consultation with Charles Smurthwaite, secretary of the Salt Lake County Democratic Committee, 1934-1941. Where sources have disagreed about the political affiliation of an individual General Authority, preference has been given to the source that seemed to be the most authoritative.
TABLE 23

AFFILIATION OF THE HIERARCHY
IN NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES
1891-1932

FIRST PRESIDENCY

WILFORD WOODRUFF (1891-1898), Republican (former Democrat)
  George Q. Cannon (1891-1898), Republican (former Democrat)
  Joseph F. Smith (1891-1898), Republican

LORENZO SNOW (1898-1901), Republican (former Democrat)
  George Q. Cannon (1898-1901), Republican
  Joseph F. Smith (1898-1901), Republican
  Rudger Clawson (1901-1901), Republican (former Democrat)

JOSEPH F. SMITH (1901-1918), Republican
  Anthon H. Lund (1901-1918), Republican
  John R. Winder (1901-1910), Democrat
  John Henry Smith (1910-1911), Republican
  Charles W. Penrose (1911-1918), Democrat

HEBER J. GRANT (1918-1932ff), Democrat (nominal)
  Anthon H. Lund (1918-1921), Republican
  Charles W. Penrose (1918-1925), Democrat
  Anthony W. Ivins (1921-1932ff), Democrat
  Charles W. Nibley (1925-1931), Republican (former Democrat)

QUORUM OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES (in order of seniority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apostle</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Snow</td>
<td>(1891-1898)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin D. Richards</td>
<td>(1891-1899)</td>
<td>Democrat (former Republican)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young, Jr.</td>
<td>(1891-1903)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Thatcher</td>
<td>(1891-1896)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis H. Lyman</td>
<td>(1891-1916)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Henry Smith</td>
<td>(1891-1910)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Teasdale</td>
<td>(1891-1907)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber J. Grant</td>
<td>(1891-1918)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Taylor</td>
<td>(1891-1906)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriner W. Merrill</td>
<td>(1891-1906)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthon H. Lund</td>
<td>(1891-1901)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham H. Cannon</td>
<td>(1891-1896)</td>
<td>Republican (former Democrat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias F. Cowley</td>
<td>(1897-1906)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Owen Woodruff</td>
<td>(1897-1904)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudger Clawson</td>
<td>(1898-1932ff)</td>
<td>Republican (former Democrat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Smoot</td>
<td>(1900-1932ff)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum M. Smith</td>
<td>(1901-1918)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Albert Smith</td>
<td>(1903-1932ff)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Penrose</td>
<td>(1904-1911)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George F. Richards</td>
<td>(1906-1932ff)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orson F. Whitney</td>
<td>(1906-1931)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David O. McKay</td>
<td>(1906-1932ff)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony W. Ivins</td>
<td>(1907-1921)</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Fielding Smith</td>
<td>(1910-1932ff)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James E. Talmage (1911-1932ff), Republican
Stephen L. Richards (1917-1932ff), Democrat
Richard R. Lyman (1918-1932ff), Republican (former Democrat)
Melvin J. Ballard (1919-1932ff), Democrat
John A. Widtsoe (1921-1932ff), Republican
Joseph F. Merrill (1931-1932ff), Democrat

PATRIARCH TO THE CHURCH

John Smith (1891-1911), Republican
Hyrum G. Smith (1912-1932), Republican

FIRST COUNCIL OF SEVENTY (in order of seniority)

Jacob Gates (1891-1892), Republican (former Democrat)
Seymour B. Young (1891-1924), Republican
Christian D. Fjeldsted (1891-1905), Democrat
John Morgan (1891-1894), Republican
Brigham H. Roberts (1891-1932ff), Democrat
George Reynolds (1891-1909), Republican
J. Golden Kimball (1892-1932ff), Democrat
Rulon S. Wells (1893-1932ff), Democrat
Edward Stevenson (1894-1897), Democrat
Joseph W. McMurrin (1897-1932), Republican
Charles W. Hart (1906-1932ff), Democrat
Levi Edgar Young (1909-1932ff), Republican
Rey L. Pratt (1925-1931), Republican
Antoine R. Ivins (1931-1932ff), Democrat

PRESIDING BISHOPRIC

WILLIAM B. PRESTON (1891-1907), Democrat
   Robert T. Burton (1891-1907), Democrat
   John R. Winder (1891-1901), Democrat
   Orrin P. Miller (1901-1907), Democrat

CHARLES W. NIBLEY (1907-1925), Republican (former Democrat)
   Orrin P. Miller (1907-1918), Democrat
   David A. Smith (1907-1925), Republican
   John Wells (1918-1925), Republican

SYLVESTER Q. CANNON (1925-1932ff), Republican
   David A. Smith (1925-1932ff), Republican
   John Wells (1925-1932ff), Republican

Several of the General Authorities seem to have been politically ambivalent. Before the People's Party was disbanded in 1891, President Wilford Woodruff confided that he was a Republican, and it was reported that he declared himself a voting Republican in 1894.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless,
when confronted in 1892 with angry leaders of Utah's Democratic Party who charged that church influence was being exerted for the Republicans, Woodruff cold them: "I'm a Democrat myself."\(^\text{157}\) Apostle (and later President) Lorenzo Snow attended a Democratic convention in 1895 where he said that he "had come to the conclusion that he was a Democrat now that he had become stirred up."\(^\text{158}\) Nevertheless, as President of the Church, Lorenzo Snow attended a Republican convention in 1900, and in 1901 he supported the election of Republican Thomas Kearns as Utah's Senator.\(^\text{159}\) Apostle Abraham H. Cannon was identified as an active Democrat up to September 1892, but during remaining years of his life he indicated a more support for the Republicans.\(^\text{160}\) Apostle Abraham Owen Woodruff was allegedly identified by his father as a Democrat and he also voted for Democratic General Authority Brigham H. Roberts in 1898, yet he attended Republican conventions in 1900 and actively worked for the election of Republican Senator Kearns in 1901.\(^\text{161}\) Although Heber J. Grant was known as a Democrat even before the disbanding of the


\(^{158}\) Salt Lake Herald, October 25, 1895.

\(^{159}\) Salt Lake Tribune, March 31, 1900; Abraham Owen Woodruff Journal, January 17, 1901, in possession of Helen W. Anderson, Salt Lake City, Utah.

\(^{160}\) Edited Journal of John M. Whitaker, I, 271, September 1892; Abraham H. Cannon Journal, July 7, 1891, January 12, October 23, November 7, 1892, November 2, November 7, November 12, 1894, September 6, October 1, October 22, October 28, October 30, November 5, November 6, 1895. His brother Frank J. was a prominent Republican and his brother John Q. was a prominent Democrat.

People's Party, by the time he was President of the Church he could com-
ment: "It is amusing for me to pose as a Democrat, and when I come to
vote at our State elections and National elections divide my vote for a
larger number of Republicans than Democrats." The continuing disdain
for the political party system was expressed by Apostle John W. Taylor,
a Republican, when he said in 1892, "as for me I do not care which party
is victorious," and then affirmed in 1895 that no apostle should join a
political party without the permission of the First Presidency.

In contrast to the General Authorities who continued to be apoliti-
cal or at least politically ambivalent after 1891, there were other mem-
ers of the Mormon hierarchy who were stridently partisan. On the Re-
publican side were Counselor and President Joseph F. Smith, Apostles
John Henry Smith, Francis M. Lyman, Marriner W. Merrill, Anthon H. Lund,
Reed Smoot, George Albert Smith, David O. McKay, Presidents of Seventy
Seymour B. Young and John Morgan, and Presiding Bishop Charles W. Nibley.
On the Democratic side were Counselors and Apostles Charles W. Penrose
and Anthony W. Ivins, Apostles Franklin D. Richards, Moses Thatcher,
Orson F. Whitney, Stephen L. Richards, Presidents of Seventy Brigham H.
Roberts, Rulon S. Wells and Charles H. Hart, Presiding Bishop William B.
Preston, and Bishopric Counselors John R. Winder and Orrin P. Miller.
Several of these men had formed their political views long before the
Mormons officially divided along national political lines: Joseph F.
Smith had voted for Abraham Lincoln in California in 1864, and Moses
Thatcher had been a Democratic delegate from Cache County during the 1872

162 Journal of Heber J. Grant, November 2, 1920.

163 Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, July 13, 1892, April 4, 1895; let-
ter of Samuel W. Taylor to the present author, January 15, 1976.

164 John Henry Smith 1884-1894 Letter Book, p. 787, University of
Utah.
organization of the Democratic Party in Utah. Others of these partisan General Authorities adopted their politics about 1891 or later.

Although the partisan political preferences of the men appointed prior to 1891 could not have been a factor in their selection as General Authorities, political affiliation may have been a factor in the selection of new General Authorities after 1891. For the total number of new appointees to the Mormon hierarchy from 1892 to 1932 there does not appear to be a significant political demarkation: of the thirty new General Authorities, seventeen were Republicans. When the new appointees are classed politically according to the echelons in the hierarchy, however, political affiliation seems to become a significant factor. Of the eighteen appointees to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles between 1897 and 1932, 66.7% were Republicans, and all of the six new apostles between 1897 and 1903 were Republicans. On the other hand, of the eight appointees to the First Council of Seventy between 1892 and 1932, only 37.5% were Republicans. This correlates directly with the dynamics of power in the two respective echelons: the Quorum of the Twelve, unlike its ecclesiastical subordinate, traditionally had a prominent role in the social, political, and economic life of the Mormons. Deference to the Republican party in the appointment of men to the echelons of power was also reflected in the Presiding Bishopric. William B. Preston, a Democrat, had been appointed as Presiding Bishop seven years before the division along party lines and while he lived the entire Presiding Bishopric was Democratic. Preston's two successors as Presiding Bishop were Republicans, and under their leadership the composition of the bishopric shifted to the Republican. The statistical preference for Republicans in the echelons of economic and political power within the Mormon hier-

165 *Deseret News*, July 29, 1872.
TABLE 24
PERCENTAGE OF REPUBLICANS
IN THE MORMON HIERARCHY
AT ELECTION TIME, 1891-1931*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1896</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1926</th>
<th>1931</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Hierarchy</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Presidency</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum of Twelve</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Patriarch</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Seventy</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Bishopric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out of necessity, this statistical chart maintains the national party identification for men who were basically apolitical despite affiliation with a particular national party. Moreover, from 1918 onward the President of the Church was a registered Democrat who had become a Republican in everything but name by 1931.

Archaic was consistent with the First Presidency's relationships with the national Republican party, to be discussed later in this section. The trends of Republican dominance in the hierarchy are shown in Table 24.

Whether these partisan General Authorities were early or late converts, the intensity of their political confrontations was unmistakable. In February 1892, Apostle Abraham H. Cannon recorded:

"I then went to the President's office where I remained a short time listening to the political talk of the brethren. I was surprised to see the warmth of feeling in John R. Winder when his Democratic principles were assailed, and he did not hesitate to oppose the expressions of Joseph F. Smith in favor of Republicanism. I very much fear that the politics which are being introduced among us will lead to a spirit of disregard and disrespect for the Priesthood. Such a feeling is already beginning to make its appearance in some places."

Three months later, prominent Mormon (and future apostle) James E. Talmage could hardly conceal his shock at the reciprocated personal attacks

---

166Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, February 8, 1892.
published in the newspapers by Republicans Joseph F. Smith and John Henry Smith against Democrat Moses Thatcher. The newness of partisan politics was not the sole reason for this hostility between partisan General Authorities, for when Apostle Reed Smoot returned to Salt Lake City in 1909 from his duties as U.S. Senator, he felt his reception by three partisan members of the hierarchy "was rather cool." Moreover, when Democratic member of the First Council of Seventy B.H. Roberts made a personal attack on Republican Senator Smoot in a 1910 political speech, Smoot said that Roberts was contemptible and dishonest. A decade later, when the apostles discussed another public attack by Roberts on Smoot, Roberts was defended by Democratic apostle Anthony W. Ivins, and Apostle Smoot said that he wished to drop the subject. Such partisan strife within the hierarchy, as Abraham H. Cannon had feared in 1892, had a ripple effect in reinforcing the political autonomy of rank-and-file Mormons.

The political disunity within the Mormon hierarchy was complicated by the tendency of the General Authorities to reassert their former ecclesiastical control of political activity, while at the same time denying that such "church influence" was being exercised. In an interview with the Salt Lake Times (popularly regarded as a non-Mormon newspaper) in June 1891, President Wilford Woodruff and his counselor George Q. Cannon stated: "As officers of the Church we disclaim the right to control the political action of members of our body." Had the statement

167Journal of James E. Talmage, May 28, 1892, Brigham Young University.
168Diary of Reed Smoot, August 10, 1909.
169Ibid., November 6, 1910.
170Ibid., October 14, 1920.
ended there, both Mormons and non-Mormons would have understood the message without ambiguity. Nevertheless, the interview went into other areas in which the statements had to be interpreted differently by Mormons who had specific knowledge of the hierarchy's past subterranean political control: Presidents Woodruff and Cannon stated that the Mormon Church had had no role in dissolving the People's Party, disclaimed either past or present desires to unify church and state in Utah, and stated that the phenomenon of church authorities serving in Utah political office in the past was a coincidence deriving from the fact that Mormons chose for public office men of the "best talent" who happened also to be church leaders.\(^{171}\) As a final irony, because this interview was conducted and published by the "non-Mormon" Salt Lake Times rather than the Deseret News, the impression was given that the interview was the product of tough, independent journalism rather than a carefully arranged statement by the Mormon hierarchy, yet the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles had secretly purchased the Salt Lake Times in March 1891.\(^{172}\) Nevertheless, this 1891 interview set the pattern for the many future denials of the First Presidency that there were any desires or authorized efforts by the Mormon hierarchy to influence or control the political action of voters or public office holders.\(^{173}\)

\(^{171}\) Salt Lake Times, June 23, 1891; Deseret Weekly, XLIII (July 4, 1891), 33-34; Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, III, 211-217; Roberts, Comprehensive History, VI, 302-306. On pages 305-306, Roberts attempted to reconcile the statement about the dissolution of the People's Party with later acknowledgements of the role of the hierarchy in that development.


\(^{173}\) Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, III, 233, IV, 79-80, 152, 153, 225, 227-228, V, 260-261, 310, VI, 155-156.
After 1891 there were varied specific issues that occasioned the application of the Mormon hierarchy's influence in political activity, but an overriding factor was the conviction of the First Presidency that the welfare of Mormonism required support of the Republican Party's national organization. In July 1891, Second Counselor Joseph F. Smith informed the apostles that among the prominent Republicans who were interested in Utah Mormon welfare were Secretary of State James G. Blaine, National Chairman of the Republican Party James S. Clarkson, former chairman of the 1888 national Republican convention and California judge M.M. Estee, and U.S. Senator Leland A. Stanford. Moreover, in October 1891 Judge Estee wrote counselor George Q. Cannon that Clarkson was being persuaded that "if the Mormons are now properly handled they will make of Utah a Republican State..." One of the ironies of this period is that although the non-Mormons had virulently opposed the political influence of the Mormon hierarchy before 1891, the leaders of both national parties expected the hierarchy to deliver voting majorities among the Mormons after 1891. With that understanding, Clarkson devoted several years of effort among Congressional Republicans to obtain statehood for Utah. Not only did the Republicans offer concrete progress

174 Ibid., October 15, 1891.
175 Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, July 9, 1891.
176 Apostle John Henry Smith, a Republican, recorded during the Utah Legislature's election of a U.S. Senator in 1899, that Utah's non-Mormon Supreme Court Chief Justice, George W. Bartch, "wanted me to convert Democrats but I could not see how it could be done. He was quite confident as to the way it could be reached." See the John Henry Smith Journal, February 26, 1899. In 1902, Idaho Democrats privately threatened the First Presidency that Idaho Mormons would be disfranchised if the First Presidency did not insure a Democratic election victory in the counties with Mormon majorities. See the Anthon H. Lund Journal, October 30, November 3, 1902.
177 Letter, James S. Clarkson to Wilford Woodruff, December 14, 1895, pp. 1-2, George Q. Cannon Papers, Church Archives.
toward the hierarchy's decades-old goal of Utah statehood, but the conservative tariff and business policies of the Republican Party were more favorable to the hierarchy's involvement in banking, railroads, mining, sugar, and other industries.178

The question of Utah's statehood vis-a-vis the Republican Party was symptomatic of a more fundamental dilemma in which the Mormon hierarchy was placed after 1890. On the one hand, political issues that were regarded as crucial to the church's interests could fail without active support of the hierarchy. On the other hand, any time the Mormon hierarchy became involved in a political issue (whether collectively or individually), both Mormon and non-Mormon partisans of the contrary view would become alienated and accuse the hierarchy of violating promises concerning the separation of church and state. Concerning this situation, one historian has written:

Neither alternative was accepted as church policy and instead, a vacillating course between the two was pursued. Denials of the use of ecclesiastical influence followed hard upon decisions announcing the "Will of the Lord" concerning political matters. The consequent confusion gave credence to the earlier charges of duplicity.179

Although members of the Mormon hierarchy, especially the First Presidency, often tried to avoid becoming involved in partisan politics after 1891, the theology and tradition of monolithic political management prior to 1891 acted as an incentive for intervention. When the need was perceived as sufficient, the Mormon hierarchy involved itself, often clandestinely, in the new political world that the Mormons entered after 1890. A de-


tailed history of the chronology and issues of Mormon and Utah politics from 1891 to 1932 is not possible here, but an outline of the types of hierarchy intervention in those developments will indicate the extent to which the Mormon hierarchy was unable to remain aloof from partisan politics.

An area of political manipulation into which the Mormon hierarchy entered even prior to the division along national party lines was the control of partisan newspapers. On February 19, 1891, the hierarchy had decided that the Ogden Standard would be a Republican newspaper, and that the Salt Lake Herald would be Democratic. On February 21, it was further arranged that another Ogden newspaper, the Commercial, would be a Democratic newspaper. This gave Ogden a church-supervised paper for both major political parties, with sons of Counselor George Q. Cannon as the editor and manager of each. In Salt Lake City, although the church organ, Deseret News, announced itself as politically independent, and Apostle Heber J. Grant's Salt Lake Herald was Democratic, the hierarchy wanted Utah's capital to have its own Republican newspaper under church control. Therefore, in March 1891 the General Authorities agreed to purchase secret control of the Salt Lake Times to make it a Republican, "non-Mormon" newspaper, in order to reduce the influence of the Republican, anti-Mormon Salt Lake Tribune. Thus, as the Mormons entered national politics, the hierarchy either openly or privately controlled prominent Democratic, Republican, and politically independent newspapers of

Utah's two most populous cities.

Unlike the earlier establishment of the Democratic Northern Times in Kirtland, Ohio, and the Whig Frontier Guardian at Council Bluffs, the Mormon hierarchy's domination of partisan newspapers after 1891 very soon became ambiguous in intent and result. Church control of newspapers on both sides of the national political division was disruptive of the hierarchy's effort to persuade non-Mormons that the political division was sincere, and it was especially at odds with the First Presidency's effort to enlist the aid of the national Republican Party. After the Republican Times discontinued publication in 1892, the financially strained LDS Presidency tried to put increased distance between itself and Democratic newspapers. Apostle Heber J. Grant was encouraged to withdraw Mormon control from the Salt Lake Herald in 1896, and the Presidency refused to take over the operation and financial responsibility for this Democratic newspaper in 1900.\footnote{Journal History, April 29, pp. 3-4, July 27, 1900, p. 1, July 28, 1900, p. 1.} More serious than the tactical error of providing initial support to papers of both parties was the Mormon hierarchy's inability to control the partisan newspapers it supported financially. Although nominally independent, the Deseret News was editorially Democratic until well into the twentieth century, a fact that both nettled and worried the Republican members of the hierarchy.\footnote{Meeting of December 29, 1899, pp. 202-204, Joseph F. Smith Papers; Reed Smoot Diary, October 8, 1915; Anthon H. Lund Journal, December 29, 1899.} Moreover, the First Presidency subsidized Apostle Reed Smoot's three Republican newspapers (Inter-Mountain Republican, 1906-1909, the Herald-Republican, 1909-1918, which later merged with the Salt Lake Telegram in 1918), but could not control their editorial positions when they conflicted with the
the political views promoted by the First Presidency. Commenting on the Inter-Mountain Republican's opposition to state-wide prohibition, Counselor Anthon H. Lund stated the problem directly: "I am a prohibitionist, but I told them it was folly for us to fight the paper we sustain with our money." The confidence with which the Mormon hierarchy began its control of partisan newspapers deteriorated into an uncomfortable acceptance of the divisive influence of partisan politics.

Another means by which the Mormon hierarchy sought to control political developments after 1891 was by encouraging General Authorities and other prominent Mormons to promote publicly an approved political view, while at the same time asking General Authorities and others of a contrary persuasion to remain silent. On January 12, 1892, Democratic apostles in the Quorum of the Twelve criticized the Republican John Henry Smith for going "on the stump" for the Republican Party, and the decision of the Democratic president of the quorum, Lorenzo Snow, was that Smith should not be politically active. The next day, however, the Republican-inclined First Presidency met with the Quorum of the Twelve and authorized John Henry Smith to promote the Republican cause in public. As the 1892 elections approached Apostle Anthon H. Lund, a Republican, told an adjourned priesthood meeting of Arizona Mormons, "If I were an ardent Democrat I would lie low during this election at any rate."

As would be expected, the partisan members of the hierarchy resisted the imposition of such limitations on their own political activities. In the 1890's (as will be discussed shortly), Apostle Moses Thatcher and

---

183. Journal of Anthon H. Lund, February 2, 1909; Reed Smoot Diary, October 2, 1911, October 22, 1922; Alter, Early Utah Journalism, pp. 312-315, 337-338.


185. Journal of Anthon H. Lund, October 2, 1892.
President of Seventy B.H. Roberts got into ecclesiastical difficulty because they openly rebelled against such selective restrictions on their Democratic activities. In 1910, Republican Reed Smoot wrote that Democrats Heber J. Grant and Anthony W. Ivins "talked wild on question of politics" in a meeting of the apostles, and "claimed Democrats had had no show and were not treated with impartiality and he [Grant] was muzzled on the prohibition question. He had his say and no one answered him." When Democrat Heber J. Grant became President of the Church in 1918, the situation was occasionally reversed, and it was Republican Reed Smoot who complained that he was expected to remain silent on partisan issues even though he was a U.S. Senator while other apostles without civil office were encouraged to work publicly for partisan issues. Despite the difficulties involved, the First Presidency exercised selective restrictions on the political activity of individual Mormons whenever the circumstances seemed to require it and as long as it was felt that the men would be willing to acquiesce.

As an extension of this approach, the Mormon hierarchy after 1891 frequently became involved in the effort to convert rank-and-file Mormons to the Republican Party. Although the Mormons had traditionally favored the Democratic Party, the First Presidency in 1891 privately expressed the desire that within the year there would be an equal number of Republicans and Democrats in Utah. This obviously required former Democrats...

186 Diary of Reed Smoot, September 29, 1910.
188 Diary of Franklin D. Richards, June 29, 1891; Abraham H. Cannon Journal, June 29, 1891; Marriner W. Merrill Journal, June 29, 1891, Church Archives.
to become Republicans, and was reflected in some of the political ambivalence within the hierarchy itself. Nevertheless, the First Presidency did not really want political parity, but instead wanted Republican domination in Utah so that the national Republican Party would support Utah's statehood, amnesty for polygamists, the return of the LDS Church's escheated property, and other issues favorable to the LDS Church. The goal was indicated in Apostle John Henry Smith's statement in 1891 to Republican Judge Charles S. Zane: "I then told him if this was the case, I would go into the movement with the determined purpose of making Utah Republican."¹⁸⁹ The approach of the Republican partisans in the hierarchy was quite direct: in 1892 Counselor Joseph F. Smith published a pamphlet titled Another Plain Talk: Reasons Why the People of Utah Should be Republicans, and Apostle Francis M. Lyman told a Mormon priesthood meeting in southern Utah "that we had too many Democrats."¹⁹⁰ It has been argued that Utah's shift to Republicanism by 1895 was consistent with the trend in most western states prior to the silver issue of the Democratic Party's 1896 campaign,¹⁹¹ but it is still quite evident that the Mormon hierarchy's active encouragement of Republicanism and discouragement of Democracy played a tremendous role in that shift.¹⁹²


¹⁹⁰Joseph F. Smith, Another Plain Talk: Reasons Why the People of Utah Should be Republicans (Salt Lake City: Republican Central Committee, 1892); Anthon H. Lund Journal, September 11, 1892.


The Mormon hierarchy's efforts at changing the political affiliation of rank-and-file Mormons did not cease with the supremacy of the Republican Party in Utah. In 1914 Apostle Francis M. Lyman, President of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and next in line for the Presidency of the Church, requested Nephi L. Morris, President of the Salt Lake Stake and a prominent leader in the Progressive Party, to return to the Republican Party. The manner in which the request was phrased and the effect it had upon Morris is indicated in his written response:

The request, though made in a kindly and brotherly spirit, is of great importance and must be regarded in a most serious light, since you place yourself and the first presidency on the Republican side of the question, and consider my attitude as being in conflict with yours. I use the word "conflict" because you ask me if I wish to fight you and the brethren. To be arrayed against the leaders of the Church is the one thing I have studiously avoided in the past, and have solemnly resolved never to do.

I have always believed in obeying the counsel of my file leaders, but when I have seen the counsel of my leaders disapproved by their successors in office, I have been perplexed beyond measure in determining how far a man is justified in surrendering his private judgment for that of others. Neither am I exactly clear as to how far a man may avoid responsibility for his acts when he thus surrenders his own opinions to his ecclesiastical superiors. These, I say, are the delicate phases and the perplexing problems that have confronted me for some time. Especially is the situation a trying one when I am asked by you to forsake the party that has my devotion, and come over into a party which has repudiated me and from which I have been for a long time completely divorced. Added to that requirement is an equally difficult one, in asking me to support Senator Smoot, whose policy and paper and colleagues have been in conflict with all my activities for a number of years.

When these requirements are made of me, I naturally wonder what meaning and force the public declarations of the Church can possibly have, wherein the Church has declared that all its members are politically free.

After weighing the question with such feeble judgment as I have, I feel that my interests in and my love for the
Church and Kingdom of God overwhelmingly outweigh my interest in and devotion to political affairs.¹⁹³

Despite the inner turmoil of this political conversion, Morris was true to his word: he absented himself from activity in the Progressive Party and on February 17, 1916 conferred with his former adversary Reed Smoot about uniting the Progressives and Republicans of Utah.¹⁹⁴

Aside from seeking total political conversion, the Mormon hierarchy also made repeated efforts to have the Mormon electorate vote as directed at elections. Sometimes the message was given in what Utahns have come to call a "whispering campaign." On February 9, 1892, the First Presidency sent its private secretary, George F. Gibbs, and one other man "to go quietly to Logan and work to make the Republican ticket successful in the approaching city election..."¹⁹⁵ As often happened with such methods, Gibbs' effort backfired and brought accusations of "church influence" from the angry Democratic Central Committee of the territory, which in turn brought forth a denial by the First Presidency that Gibbs had been authorized to use their names for influencing voters.¹⁹⁶

After Ben E. Rich and Apostle Matthias F. Cowley had performed a similar mission in promoting the Republican candidates for the 1900 election, Rich returned to the First Presidency's office and proudly stated that their work had been conducted so circumspectly that no trouble for

¹⁹³Letter, Nephi L. Morris to Francis M. Lyman, March 20, 1914, pp. 1, 7, typed copy in Nephi L. Morris Papers, University of Utah.

¹⁹⁴Diary of Reed Smoot, February 17, 1916.

¹⁹⁵Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, February 9, 1892.

¹⁹⁶Ibid., March 16, 1892; Roberts, Comprehensive History, VI, 308-309; Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, III, 232-233. The carefully worded statement did not deny that the Presidency had sent Gibbs to influence Mormons to vote Republican, but denied authorization "to use our names."
the church would result. President Lorenzo Snow's response was to show Rich a handful of telegrams protesting the church influence that Rich and Cowley had used.\textsuperscript{197} Despite the perils, the Mormon hierarchy continued to authorize occasional "whispering campaigns" at election time.

Another approach to influencing Mormon voters at election time was to make the wishes of the First Presidency a matter of public record. In the 1912 election, President Joseph F. Smith published an article in the October issue of the church periodical, \textit{Improvement Era}, in which he favored the election of William H. Taft.\textsuperscript{198} In 1922, Heber J. Grant joined with the LDS stake presidents and Protestant ministers in an endorsement of an independent candidate for sheriff, and the \textit{Deseret News} published an article instructing voters how to vote a party ticket and still scratch vote for the independent candidate for sheriff.\textsuperscript{199} In 1932, President Heber J. Grant publicly stated it was his intention to vote for the re-election of Reed Smoot as U.S. Senator, but left all Mormons to use their own judgment.\textsuperscript{200}

Even prior to the ballot box, the Mormon hierarchy sought on occasion to influence the selection of candidates for public office. The First Presidency felt that at a minimum it had appropriate jurisdiction in advising and consenting to high Mormon ecclesiastics who wanted to become

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{197}Journal of Anthon H. Lund, November 9, 1900.
\end{flushright}
candidates for public office. Therefore, on April 6, 1896, the LDS general conference was presented with a "political manifesto" that stated in part:

We have maintained that in the case of men who hold high positions in the Church, whose duties are well defined, and whose ecclesiastical labors are understood to be continuous and necessary, it would be an improper thing to accept political office or enter into any vocation that would distract or remove them from the religious duties resting upon them, without first consulting and obtaining the approval of their associates and those who preside over them.201

At face value that was not an unreasonable position, but in the context of the Presidency's efforts to encourage Republican partisans and "muzzle" Democratic partisans, this political manifesto created an uproar among the Democrats.202 By the end of September 1896, the First Presidency had retreated from what may have been its original intention of applying this manifesto to all presiding officers of the church. When a Republican stake president and a Democratic bishop asked the Presidency on September 29, 1896, if they should accept nomination for political office, President Woodruff said that he felt the political manifesto should apply only to General Authorities and that all others were free to use their own wisdom in accepting political nominations.203 Although this still put Democratic General Authorities at somewhat of a disadvantage, all but one of them were willing to accept this political constraint that quite naturally derived from a man's accepting the burdens and opportunities of a lifetime position of presiding over the affairs of the LDS Church.

The lone dissenter from the 1896 proclamation of the General

201Clark, Messages of the First Presidency, III, 275-276.


Authorities was Moses Thatcher, and his case is the most well-known instance of the use of ecclesiastical sanctions that derived from political activity. The use of ecclesiastical power to achieve partisan political ends began as early as February 9, 1892, when the First Presidency considered whether to divide an ecclesiastical stake in order to prevent the Democratic stake president from influencing the Mormons of the stake away from the Republican Party.  

Although General Authorities had been given freedom to speak and publish on behalf of the Republican Party throughout most of 1892, the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve decided on October 4, 1892 that no General Authorities "should take the stump to make political speeches." Two Democratic General Authorities, Moses Thatcher and Brigham H. Roberts, felt that this ruling was designed to aid the Republican cause, and they therefore continued their political activity in the 1892 campaign. This brought upon them the censure of the First Presidency, and on March 23, 1893 it was decided that Thatcher, Roberts, and Charles W. Penrose (a future apostle) would be denied the opportunity to attend the dedication of the Salt Lake Temple on April 6 unless they acknowledged their error. The three men held out until the night before the long awaited temple dedication, when they confessed their error in not following counsel and were allowed to attend the temple dedication.

By 1895 the selective nature of political restrictions upon the hierarchy became a publicly divisive issue. Although President Woodruff decided on July 30, 1895 that "the leading men" should not be active in

---

204 Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, February 9, 1892.
205 Journal of Wilford Woodruff, October 4, 1892.
the 1895 campaign, by September 27, 1895 Joseph F. Smith and George Q. Cannon were authorizing General Authorities like President of Seventy Seymour B. Young to campaign for the Republicans.\textsuperscript{207} For Moses Thatcher and B.H. Roberts, such special preference was unacceptable, and they not only campaigned for the Democratic Party but also accepted nominations for public office. Counselor Joseph F. Smith publicly denounced Thatcher and Roberts on October 7, 1895, for accepting political office without seeking consent of the First Presidency, and the rest of the campaign was charged with acrimonious statements by Democrats about the separation of church and state.\textsuperscript{208}

The First Presidency regarded Thatcher and Roberts as worthy of censure and church discipline, but delayed action so that nothing would interfere with the admission of Utah as a state in the Union.\textsuperscript{209} After President Grover Cleveland signed Utah's statehood bill on January 4, 1896, the hierarchy prepared to deal with Roberts and Thatcher. When Roberts refused to acknowledge any error in his activities during the 1895 campaign, he was dropped from the First Council of Seventy and deprived of the right to exercise his priesthood on March 5, 1896, with the stipulation that this action would become final if he did not recant within three weeks. Roberts was prepared to allow the decision to be permanent, but was finally persuaded to write a letter of apology by Republican Francis M. Lyman and Democrat Heber J. Grant of the Quorum of the Twelve. That letter and a subsequent acknowledgement by Roberts

\textsuperscript{207}Journal of Seymour B. Young, September 27, 1895, Church Archives.


\textsuperscript{209}Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, November 14, 1895.
before the Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve put him in a position wherein he could function both as a Democrat and a General Authority with the advice and consent of the First Presidency. 210

The conclusion of Moses Thatcher's case was less happy. Thatcher had been in periodic conflict with the First Presidency about economic, business, ecclesiastical, personality, and political matters for a decade before he refused to sign the political manifesto of April 6, 1896. Even though current apostles had been aligned with him in some of these earlier difficulties, it was almost impossible for the hierarchy to view Thatcher's 1896 rebellion as anything other than a culmination of a pattern of spiritual disaffection. From April to October 1896, the hierarchy hesitated to force the issue because Thatcher's physical condition was precarious due to long illness and inadvertent morphine addiction. Nevertheless, the General Authorities became enraged at reports that Thatcher was conducting business and political activities at the same time he professed to be too ill to meet with the apostles, and therefore Moses Thatcher was denied entrance to the Salt Lake Temple on October 15, 1896—the one occasion he tried to meet with the apostles. The relationship between Thatcher and his associates deteriorated to the point that they were convinced he wished only to embarrass the church in order to win the Democratic candidacy for the U.S. Senate. The situation had transcended politics, and Democratic apostles like Heber J. Grant and Brigham Young, Jr., and Lorenzo Snow were prominent in encouraging the Quorum of the Twelve to drop Thatcher from office, which

---

210 Journal of Marriner W. Merrill, March 5, March 19, March 26, 1896; Heber J. Grant Journal Sheets, March 5, March 12-13, March 26, 1896, Brigham Young, Jr. Journal, February 13, March 5-6, March 14, March 19, March 26, 1896.
was done on November 19, 1896. \(^{211}\)

The public and official influence of the Mormon hierarchy in the process of candidate selection and nomination was circumscribed, but the actual influence of the hierarchy continued to be significant. Correspondence between LDS Mission President Ben E. Rich and Apostle John Henry Smith in 1902 indicated how the hierarchy continued to discourage Democratic candidates in order to insure Republican victories. In one letter Rich wrote Apostle Smith:

I left a message for you by George [Albert Smith, the apostle's son], to the effect that Bassett [Thomas E. Bassett, President of the LDS Fremont Stake in Idaho] had said to some one that he intended to withdraw from the Democratic ticket if he found out he had not done right. If you have no time to see him I would suggest that you leave at the house a confidential letter to me, asking me to see brother Bassett and explain our promises to the Pres. [Theodore Roosevelt] &c. I will use it as a basis of talk. He might go and see Pres. Smith, therefore if you would drop him (Pres S) a note and tell him if Bassett comes to refer him to me, it would fix it. It might not be wise to ask them both [Bassett and Don C. Driggs, President of the LDS Teton Stake in Idaho] to get off, unless you think so, but if Bassett will do so (and I think he can find a way) I believe we can win. Fremont County is a large one and has four members of the legislature. Without it there is no hope of a Republican Senator. \(^{212}\)

In a subsequent letter, Ben E. Rich indicated that he felt both men should get off the Democratic ticket, indicated more confidence about

\(^{211}\)Journal of Brigham Young, November 1, 1895, January 7-8, January 23, April 5, April 13, April 29, July 9, July 25, September 17, October 15, November 19, 1896; Wilford Woodruff Journal, September 17, October 15, October 22, November 12, 1896; John Henry Smith Journal, May 4, May 28, June 25, July 9, July 16, July 26, September 17, October 14, October 15, 1896; Heber J. Grant Journal Sheets, May 28, July 8-9, 1896; Anthon H. Lund Journal, November 19, 1896; Marriner W. Merrill Journal, November 12, 1896; Calvin Reasoner, Church and State: The Issue of Civil and Religious Liberty in Utah (Salt Lake City: n.p., December 15, 1896); Stanley S. Ivins, The Moses Thatcher Case (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Co., n.d.). The Reasoner work is a pro-Thatcher polemic. Ivins' work is the best known study of the case, but is now inadequate due to the availability of pertinent manuscript materials.

\(^{212}\)Letter, Ben [E. Rich] to John Henry Smith, October 4, 1902, in folder 19, Box 9, George A. Smith Family Papers, University of Utah.
"Drigg's following advise" than Bassett, and complained about the possibility of the two Democrats getting contrary advice from "other apostles, who perhaps does [sic] not fully understand matters..." 213 Fourteen years later, LDS President Joseph F. Smith asked an Idaho stake president "to hint our wishes [about a possible Republican candidacy] to Bro Steele. He could not write to Steele as this might be found, and the Idahoans are so jealous of being dictated to from Salt Lake." 214 The agreements with national Republican leaders, the clandestine conversations and letters, and the instructions relayed through intermediaries of the President of the Church were all part of the difficult passage of the Mormon hierarchy through the divided loyalties of partisanship.

Once an approved or disapproved candidate was up for election, there was little direct influence the Mormon hierarchy could exert, except in the case of U.S. Senators, who were elected by the Utah State Legislature until the ratification of the seventeenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1917. The First Presidency, however, realized that its political powers had been fragmented by the accommodations of 1890 and 1891, and that it could not automatically assume that the state legislature would elect the hierarchy's choice for U.S. Senators. 215

213 Ibid., October 12, 1902, in folder 20.

214 Journal of Anthon H. Lund, July 5, 1916. In addition, President Joseph F. Smith and Apostle Reed Smoot in a private meeting with Utah Governor William Spry in 1916 tried to persuade him against seeking reelection. They were unsuccessful and he was defeated. Reed Smoot Diary June 16, 1916; William L. Roper and Leonard J. Arrington, William Spry: Man of Firmness, Governor of Utah (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1971), pp. 199-205.

215 When James S. Clarkson relayed to Counselor George Q. Cannon his expectation that Cannon would guarantee that the first two senators from Utah would be Republican, Cannon replied: "I had said I could not give a pledge of that kind, and I did not know any one else that could. I would do anything in my power to have Utah admitted as a State and to have it Republican, but could make no pledge of that kind." Journal of George Q. Cannon, extract for September 25, 1894, George Q. Cannon Papers, Church Archives.
that their influence would not be sufficient to elect Counselor George Q. Cannon as U.S. Senator in 1897 "without trouble," the Presidency and apostles decided against his candidacy despite President Woodruff's frequently expressed desire that Cannon be U.S. Senator.\textsuperscript{216} Because the Democrats controlled the Utah Legislature in 1897, the hierarchy's goal was to stop the election of former apostle and anti-church candidate Moses Thatcher, and to support the election of non-Mormon Joseph L. Rawlins. The General Authorities first began their effort by having emissaries instruct the legislators not to pledge themselves to any one candidate, to avoid a Thatcher stampede.\textsuperscript{217} Then the First Presidency and apostles met frequently with responsive legislators to promote the election of Rawlins rather than Thatcher as U.S. Senator.\textsuperscript{218} After a heated contest in the Utah Legislature, the Mormon hierarchy had the satisfaction of seeing Joseph L. Rawlins elected on the fifty-third ballot.\textsuperscript{219}

Somewhat more confident by 1899, the General Authorities sought to influence the state legislators to elect Counselor George Q. Cannon as U.S. Senator. The method used by the hierarchy in its contacts with legislators was described by Apostle Brigham Young, Jr.:

\begin{quote}
The plot is working favorably. His servants know His voice. I consider Pres. Snow is brave and wise asking no
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{217}Diary of Franklin D. Richards, October 24, 1896; Journal History, November 26, 1896, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{218}Journal of John Henry Smith, January 27, 1897; Wilford Woodruff Journal, January 20, 1897.

man or bystander to vote for Pres. C. but stating that the Presidency and nine of the Twelve are a unit on this point and can elders think them wrong and party right. We want you to vote for Pres. C. but not unless you can see it your duty to do so. You have agency and we cannot gain say it.\footnote{220}

The effort misfired, however, because the hierarchy had pitted Counselor Cannon against his own popular son Frank J. Cannon, and in the deadlock between these two men and six other candidates, the legislature adjourned without electing a U.S. Senator.\footnote{221} Two years later, however, Apostle Abraham Owen Woodruff was commissioned by President Lorenzo Snow to secure the election of Thomas Kearns as U.S. Senator, which Woodruff carried out successfully as "My mission."\footnote{222} The seventeenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution eliminated this more direct means of influencing the election of public officers.

Once men were elected to public office by their respective parties, the Mormon hierarchy tried to continue its pre-1891 direction of men and legislation. On the municipal level George Romney, a member of the Salt Lake City Council, felt it necessary in 1896 to confer privately with the First Presidency to explain the city council's action in not paying exhorbitant utility bills and thus leaving the city in darkness at night.\footnote{223} With reference to legislation, the First Presidency, in order "to prevent as far as possible the passage of improper legislation," set up a committee in 1894 comprised of two apostles and the church attorney, "to revise the bills which are presented to the Legislature, and on which our

\footnote{220}{Journal of Brigham Young Jr., February 24, 1899.}


\footnote{222}{Journal of Abraham Owen Woodruff, January 17, January 20-23, 1901.}

\footnote{223}{Journal History, April 28, 1896, p. 2}
people in that body may desire counsel, and report our findings and judgment to the Presidency.\textsuperscript{224} When a similar committee was established in 1896 and was publicly exposed, the First Presidency denied that it had tried to supervise legislation and stated that the committee was only for purposes of information.\textsuperscript{225} Nevertheless, in 1901, President Lorenzo Snow established another such committee with two apostles on it, and one product of that committee was a bill designed to protect the Mormon polygamists from criminal complaints. The First Presidency arranged for Abel John Evans, a member of the Utah Legislature, to introduce the bill that had been prepared by the hierarchy's committee, and the "Evans' Bill" passed the legislature.\textsuperscript{226} In 1915, Utah's governor, William Spry, asked the First Presidency to instruct friendly state legislators to sustain his veto of a prohibition bill that the First Presidency had initially encouraged the legislature to pass, but which Presiding Bishop Nibley and Counselor Penrose feared would result in the formation of anti-Mormon political party. When it was objected that such a reversal would destroy the confidence of the Mormons in the First Presidency, Governor Spry replied: "Oh, the people will do what you people want them to do!"\textsuperscript{227}

Governor Spry's facile assessment of the political power of the

\textsuperscript{224}Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, January 25, 1894.

\textsuperscript{225}Deseret Evening News, April 13, 1896; White, "Utah State Elections," p. 143.


Mormon hierarchy in the early twentieth century was not accurate, either of the Mormons themselves or of elected officials who were friendly and responsive to the influence of the Mormon hierarchy. For example, when Governor Heber M. Wells reversed his agreement with Apostle John Henry Smith to sign the hierarchy's Evans' bill and instead vetoed it, the Utah legislature failed to override the veto. Moreover, Apostle Reed Smoot was hardly a pliant tool in the hands of the First Presidency as U.S. Senator: in 1913 he voted to override President Taft's veto of an immigration bill despite instructions from LDS President Joseph F. Smith to sustain the veto, and during his 1918-1920 opposition to the League of Nations (for which he was severely criticized by the First Presidency and most of the Quorum of the Twelve), Reed Smoot abruptly informed his associates in their weekly temple meeting: "I claim I have a right to vote on the League as my judgment dictates, and in conformity with my oath of office." Although such political independence disturbed some of his associates in the hierarchy, an expression of that type in the era prior to 1890 would have been grounds for immediate dismissal from service in the theocratic community of Mormonism. The situation had changed substantially since 1890, and political control by the hierarchy was no longer automatically exerted or respected.

A primary reason for the decline of effective church control of politics was that the politically divided hierarchy wished church influence to be exerted along partisan lines. Apostle Francis M. Lyman rarely

---

228 Journal of John Henry Smith, March 14, 1901; Anthon H. Lund Journal, March 15, 1901. Wells' action may be the reason President Joseph F. Smith said "he was not in politics," when approached by men seeking support for Wells' re-election in 1904. Anthon H. Lund Journal, June 29, 1904.

229 Diary of Reed Smoot, February 18, 1913, July 29, 1920.
hesitated to use his church position to further the Republican cause, but in 1898 he objected to Apostle Heber J. Grant's use of church influence to support a Democratic candidate.\textsuperscript{230} When Apostle Reed Smoot objected to the use of church influence for state-wide prohibition (to which he was politically opposed in 1909), President Joseph F. Smith commented: "He had no objection to Priesthood influence when he wanted to be elected. Then he said all they honored was power."\textsuperscript{231} Moreover, Apostle-Senator Reed Smoot welcomed and defended President Joseph F. Smith's public endorsement of Republican William H. Taft for President in 1912, but criticized President Grant's 1922 endorsement of Democrat candidates.\textsuperscript{232} Undoubtedly, Democratic members of the Mormon hierarchy had exactly opposite reactions. The political divisions within the Mormon hierarchy made it a rare occurrence when church political influence of either a public or private nature could be exerted with unanimity.\textsuperscript{233}

A second factor in the decline of rank-and-file allegiance to the hierarchy's political direction was the extent to which General Authorities sometimes became involved in contradictory issues of ethics and power. Many Mormons were disturbed when the hierarchy supported the election of former anti-Mormons who in the past had publicly stated their distaste for Mormon doctrine and practice. More serious strains upon political allegiance came when Mormons were asked to vote contrary to their conscience, as indicated in Nephi L. Morris' explanation for his 1901

\textsuperscript{230}Journal of Heber J. Grant, December 29, 1898.

\textsuperscript{231}Journal of Anthon H. Lund, January 27, 1909.

\textsuperscript{232}Diary of Reed Smoot, September 28, October 4-5, October 8, November 6, 1912, October 24, October 27, 1922.

\textsuperscript{233}For examples of General Authorities vigorously supporting opposing sides of political issues, see Allen, "Personal Faith and Public Policy," and Milton R. Merrill, Reed Smoot: Utah Politician, Utah State Agricultural College Monograph Series 1 (April, 1953), 19-27.
legislative vote for Thomas Kearns as U.S. Senator even though he had
publicly denounced Kearns as unfit for the office:

If you do not know the reason why I did that humiliating
thing, I shall tell you. An apostle [Abraham Owen Woodruff]
of the Church made a positive command, in the name of the
president of the Church, that I do that thing. To my re-
monstrances and protests and arguments there was only a
threat--no man who went contrary to the wishes of the proph-
et would prosper. I have never to this day seen the right-
fulness of that demand; but I made the sacrifice for the cause
which is dearest to me on earth, though it was a humiliation
from which I thought I should never lift my head again in
politics.234

In 1910, Apostle Heber J. Grant threatened to prevent a Mormon newspaper
editor from being married in the temple if he did not retract an editorial
criticizing Grant's political remarks at a stake conference, to which
Apostle Reed Smoot replied that if the man were denied entry to the
temple, he could be married in Smoot's own house.235 Moreover, when
President Grant urged the election of a man in 1922 whom his counselor
in the First Presidency knew to be "dishonest and unclean," his counselor
was unable to stop the campaign in the man's favor, but did succeed in
having the published endorsement signed by Grant alone rather than by
the entire First Presidency.236 Although Apostle Reed Smoot had adopted
a superior attitude toward Grant's actions in 1922, the Senator was placed
in an identical situation in 1928 when General Authorities and others ob-
jected to Smoot's promoting the election of a man who had an unsavory
reputation. The man was the nominee of the Republican Party of Utah of

234Letter, Nephi L. Morris to Francis M. Lyman, March 20, 1914. When the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve discussed whom to
support for U.S. Senator in 1901, Apostle Lund wrote in his journal:
"Kearns is thought to be the man who can do us the most good; but what a
man to send east! It will be a bitter pill for many to swallow!" Anthon

235Diary of Reed Smoot, August 14, 1910.

236Ibid., November 1–2, November 7, 1922.
which Smoot was the recognized head, and this put Apostle Smoot into a perplexed situation: "I did not sleep much last night. I hardly know just what action to take but I am not going to be a coward. I shall do my duty as a leading Republican no matter what happens."237 Having committed themselves to the American system of politics, the partisan General Authorities were often trapped within the amoral convolutions of that system.

Conclusions

Although Mormonism in its theological and ecclesiastical framework was an authoritarian system, the Mormon hierarchy had always tried to work out the political implications of Mormon revelations within a republican framework. During most of the nineteenth century, this had resulted in the establishment of a series of republican façades within the Mormon theocracy, such as the Council of Fifty, the political role of the School of the Prophets, the People's Party organization, and even the institutions of civil government. The role of the Mormon hierarchy in creating and supervising these political institutions was more monolithic than most people realized, but the anti-Mormons perceived enough of the hierarchy's political power to be determined to crush "Uncle Sam's Abscess," as Utah Mormonism was called. During decades of bitter confrontation, both the Mormons and anti-Mormons defined their goals within a dichotomy of extinction versus survival. The anti-Mormons claimed that if Mormon polygamous theocracy were to survive, it would mean the extinction of American matrimonial and political institutions whereas the Mormons claimed that if the polygamous theocracy did not survive, then Mormonism would be extinct. Each side hoped that the other was right, and as it

237Ibid., September 27-28, 1928.
turned out both were wrong. American institutions and Mormonism had a vitality that was mutually underestimated: the former survived a civil war and the unrealistic constraints of the Victorian age, and the latter survived the public abandonment of both polygamy and theocracy. As for the theocratic rule of the Mormon hierarchy, there was no necessity to alter the traditional reverence for republican government even though the General Authorities had to discover the painful limits that partisan politics imposed upon them.

The transition from monolithic theocracy to pluralistic partisanship reversed the success quotients of the Mormon hierarchy's political activity. Prior to 1890, the Mormon hierarchy had sought to manipulate the national political parties in a very clumsy and unsuccessful manner. In part the isolation of the Mormon hierarchy in the Great Basin misled them about the need of the national parties to court the favor of polygamous and theocratic Utah. Moreover, the ill-concealed contempt that the Mormon hierarchy had for American political parties doomed each effort at manipulating the national parties: it was as though the Mormon hierarchy were a reluctant Jonah, forced by circumstances to give one last opportunity to the Republican and Democratic Nineveh before the hand of the Lord destroyed it. The political aftermath of the Mormon surrender of polygamy and theocracy was a complete reversal. The Mormon hierarchy successfully obtained nearly everything it wanted from its judicious negotiations with the Republican Party: Utah's statehood, amnesty for pre-1890 polygamists, return of church property confiscated under the terms of the Edmunds-Tucker Act, defeat of repeatedly introduced constitutional amendments against polygamy, and the presence on Capitol Hill of an apostolic senator who became a power within the National Republican Party, with his fellow senators, and with five presidents of twentieth century
America. The Mormon hierarchy's political activity had been initially conceived as a defense against non-Mormons, but developed into a comparatively successful accommodation to the non-Mormon power structure.

This reversal was the product of that which had been sought by anti-Mormons and little-dreamed of by Mormons: the destruction of the Mormon hierarchy's monolithic political control over the Mormons. In view of the more than fifty-year history of monolithic control, the Mormons reverted to divisive partisanship with startling rapidity. Part of the reason lay in the fact that the repeated opposition movements by "faithful" Latter-day Saints to approved candidates during those fifty years was an indication of a suppressed independence that welcomed the end of theocratic control. As long as Mormons perceived of themselves as the only true Christian commonwealth in combat against the Mongols, Goths, and Vandals of the Gentile world, it was relatively easy to sacrifice individualism and political independence. Once an accommodation was arrived at, however, there was no longer a need for suppressing individuality.

The primary factor in the rapid development of grassroots political partisanship, however, was the fact that Mormons were as obedient to the First Presidency's 1891 admonition for pluralism as they had been to the previous admonitions for political unity.

It is doubtful that the Mormon hierarchy realized in 1891 how thoroughly the abandonment of theocracy would destroy the ability of the First Presidency to control the political sphere of Mormons in the future. The public disavowals of church influence had the opposite effect that the First Presidency desired. Non-Mormons continued to believe that the First Presidency controlled the Mormon vote at will, whereas the Mormons (whom the Presidency would like to have controlled on occasion) became convinced that the repeated disavowals of church influence meant that any political
The statement by the First Presidency was to be regarded as mere counsel or opinion. The painful result for the General Authorities was described in 1940 by political scientist Frank H. Jonas: "The Church membership has not obeyed its leaders on any important political issue or candidacy during the last ten years. Only a small group of sincere members blindly follow the Church leaders." The contrasts in the Mormon hierarchy's political controls and successes before and after 1891 have resulted in a series of myths. An initial myth is indicated in the not uncommon assumption that the Mormon hierarchy was not involved in what one political scientist described as the true nature of politics: "an intricate labyrinth of intrigues and machination." The Mormon General Authorities were always involved in political intrigue and machinations, but the groups they alienated by these activities varied: before 1891 it was primarily the non-Mormons who were alienated, and after 1891 it was primarily the Mormons who were disaffected. A second myth was the assumption of national political leaders the "Utah was for thirty years a pocket borough belonging to Reed Smoot." The successes that Apostle-Senator Smoot and his fellow Republican advocates within the Mormon hierarchy achieved during his thirty-year political activity were most often hard-won battles against dedicated Mormons of conflicting political persuasions.

A third myth (believed and advocated for different reasons by twen-
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tieth century Mormons) is that "The Church" is an impersonal entity that is politically separate from the actions and statements of the Mormon General Authorities. This has been a convenient device for avoiding the charge of "church influence" on the one hand, or for rejecting the intended church influence on the other, but the argument fails to describe reality. Even when the Mormon hierarchy has been divided on a political issue, the President of the Church has usually sanctioned one of the factions, and that view has been regarded by partisans in and out of the hierarchy as the "Church" view. The "Church" in Mormonism, and in any authoritarian religion, cannot be separated from the decisions of its highest leaders.

A curious corollary of the myth of the partisan hierarchy and the non-partisan church was the expectation by General Authorities that rank-and-file Mormons should show respect to the office of the General Authorities by not criticizing members of the hierarchy who publicly advocate a political position that is opposed by rank-and-file Mormons. As mentioned earlier, ecclesiastical sanctions have been employed against Mormons who publicly criticized individual General Authorities for taking a partisan position, even though these General Authorities were political candidates. Although affirming that they were acting as private citizens when urging political positions, the General Authorities often expected to be treated differently than private citizens in the combatative arena of partisan politics.

A fourth myth is that Mormons are "free" to accept, reject, or modify the political counsel of the General Authorities. In the Mormon

---

242 This apologetical view has infected academic analyses of Mormon church-state relations: Jones, "Utah Politics," p. 109; Gilchrist, "An Examination of the Problems of L.D.S. Church Influence," pp. 34, 141-143; Penrod, "The Election of 1900," pp. 104-5.
conception of "free agency," one is free only if one has a choice to obey or disobey a divine law, or to accept or reject an evil temptation. The Mormon hierarchy has always regarded its political pronouncements as expressions of the prophetic will of God for the people, and therefore those Mormons who used their freedom to reject such political "counsel" were choosing the latter of Mormonism's ubiquitous dichotomy of obedience versus disobedience. In such a context, political freedom has limited significance.

The Mormon hierarchy from the mid-1830's to the mid-1930's was unquestionably a political power structure. The men who directed that political power were within the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, from whom all individual and collective functions of theocracy and political direction obtained their legitimacy. The political accommodations to the federal government in 1891 actually made the power of the Mormon hierarchy more attractive to the national political power structure, because those pluralistic accommodations made it possible for non-Mormons to have a greater share in the Mormon political pie. Although the Mormon General Authorities were limited by political pluralism, they retained the theological sanction for political intervention and adjusted their methods to those necessitated by the American political system's public reverence for pluralism and private expectation of voter management.

CHAPTER V
THE MORMON HIERARCHY AND AMERICAN SOCIAL STRUCTURE

When one assesses the extent of the Mormon hierarchy's influence in the religious, social, economic, and political life of the Mormon community, particularly in the nineteenth century, the problem of perspective arises. To what extent was the Mormon hierarchy representative of religious leadership groups? To what extent was the Mormon hierarchy's social influence typical of the American society in which Mormonism developed? If the Mormon hierarchy's social manifestation were an historical non pareil or a cultural mutation, then Mormon uniqueness would require an explanation that had little relevance to any other historical or social issues. If, on the other hand, the manifestations of Mormonism were representative, then the Mormon experience could illustrate thematic issues of broad historical and social significance.

Recognizing the authoritarian character of Mormonism and the role of the LDS President as God's spokesman on earth, one is struck with the similarities between the social influence of the Mormon hierarchy at its zenith and that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy at its zenith. In his analysis of the medieval papacy, Walter Ullmann observed that within the European domain of the papacy in the Middle Ages, there was no secular ruler, "no layman or cleric, however high or low, whose life in one way or another was not affected by the exercise of papal authority."\(^1\) Although quantita-

tively miniscule by comparison with the domain of the medieval papacy, the Mormon hierarchy's influence was qualitatively similar to that of the papacy's monarchy. Even the role of the family interconnections of the Mormon hierarchy bear similarity to the administrative importance in the Catholic Church of nepotism, which one recent analyst has called a social subsystem of the papacy.²

In a crucial respect, the temporal domain of the Mormon hierarchy at its zenith was more pervasive and successful than that of the medieval papacy. Ullmann has demonstrated that fundamental to the development of medieval papal government was the clear ideological demarkation between the ordained clergy and the laity, with the pope, as St. Peter's successor, as the only true monarch on earth with responsibility for both ecclesiastical and temporal government of Christianity. Because this "hierocratic doctrine" denied secular kings and emperors, who were of the laity, true monarchical status and autonomy, there was a persistent tension between rulers and papacy in the matter of government. In Mormonism, the "hierocratic doctrine" was virtually the same with respect to the consequences of Joseph Smith's claim that in 1829 he received the keys of the kingdom from Peter, James, and John. The crucial difference was that Mormonism eliminated the distinction between clergy and laity, and therefore all Mormon rulers in the secular realm were also part of the priesthood "hierocracy." Each Mormon priesthood bearer was a priest and a king who could build up his own spiritual and temporal kingdom, subject to the Mormon hierarchy, who were subject to Christ as King. The role of the Mormon hierarchy was superior to that of the rank-and-file Mormon who was a secu-

²Wolfgang Reinhard, Papstfinanz und Nepotismus unter Paul V. (1605-1621), Studien und Quellen zur Struktur und zu quantitativen Aspekten des päpstlichen Herrschaftssystems (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1974), 159.
lar ruler, but unlike the lay rulers of the medieval Church, a Mormon secular ruler could be advanced to the highest levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Between medieval Christian society and nineteenth century America, there were such chasms of disparity that the similarity between the papal monarchy and the Mormon Kingdom of God makes Mormonism appear like some monstrous apparition rather than an indigenous American religion. England had its Cardinal Wolsey and France its Cardinal Richelieu in the sixteenth century, and Cyprus its Orthodox Archbishop Makarios in the twentieth century; but America had no non-Mormon equivalent in its highest levels of government. In fact, it was something of a cause célèbre that a Sulpician priest was elected as delegate to Congress from Michigan Territory in 1822 and that a Jesuit priest was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1970. The election of Mormon apostles to Congress in the nineteenth century and to the U.S. Senate in the twentieth century were developments which had no parallels in the hierarchy of the American Catholic Church.

If analogies to the Mormon hierarchy's domain are sought within Protestantism, historical antecedents can be found within both the radical and established wings of European Protestantism. In sixteenth century Germany, Jan of Leyden proclaimed himself as the prophet Enoch in the city of Münster in 1534-1535, where he appointed a subordinate ruling body of twelve elders, created a draconian system of discipline, was crowned king and introduced a "restoration of all things" that included polygamy, economic communitarianism, and an army of the saints.

---

under his direction. A century later in England, a heterogeneous group of religious radicals, the Fifth Monarchists, saw themselves as "God's aristocracy" whose right it was to rule over the ungodly, and to restructure the economic and political order of society in anticipation of the imminent establishment of the Fifth Monarch, the Kingdom of God according to Daniel's prophecy. Without the frenzy of the Reformation radicals and with far more significance, the clergy of the European establishment continued to exercise direct influence in politics and government. Contemporary with the Mormon hierarchy's political role in America, local vicars in England served as proprietors and justices of the peace at the same time that 22% of the Anglican bishops of England served in the House of Lords.

As was true of the Catholic experience, the Protestant clergy's influence in secular government became far more restricted in America than in Europe. Even though civil government was directly involved in protecting pure Christianity in Puritan Massachusetts, the Puritan clergy and even lay officers of the church were prohibited from holding civil


office. In other colonies the clergy had an important political role, as for example in Virginia where commissaries appointed by the Bishop of London were members of the governor's council. After the Revolution, anticlericalism was prevalent due to the Loyalist sympathies of a large proportion of the colonial clergy, and therefore provisions prohibiting civil office for the clergy were adopted into the constitutions of Delaware, New York and of every southern state except Alabama and Arkansas. These exclusions continued in force in New York until 1846, in most of the South until after the Civil War, and in Delaware until 1897.

Nevertheless, there were occasions after the American Revolution when the clergy had an active role in government. Contrary to the Puritan colony's exclusion of clergymen from civil office, the state of Massachusetts often had clergymen in the state legislature where twenty-four ministers served as legislators in 1855. Reverend Lester H. Clee served as Speaker of New Jersey's Assembly, and James D. Lynch, a black Methodist minister, served as secretary of state in Mississippi during

---

7Edmund S. Morgan, Roger Williams: The Church and the State (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967), pp. 62-85; Stephen Foster, Their Solitary Way: The Puritan Social Ethic in the First Century of Settlement in New England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), pp. 45-46. Morgan remarked on page 79: "Before Roger Williams founded Rhode Island, there was probably no place in the western world where clergymen were as carefully cut off from political power as in Massachusetts Bay." Despite its theocratic nature, the Massachusetts Bay colony is the least appropriate analogy to the theocratic rule of the Mormon hierarchy.


Reconstruction. Among ministers in the U.S. House of Representatives were Manasseh Cutler (Congregationalist, 1801-1805), Henry Augustus Mühlenberg (Lutheran, 1829-1838), Owen Lovejoy (Congregationalist, 1856-1864), and Samuel J. Barrows (Unitarian, 1896-1898). In addition, two Methodist ministers served in the U.S. Senate: William G. Brownlow (1869-1870) and Hiram B. Revels (1870-1871). Moreover, Congress and the U.S. President on occasion cooperated in appointing clergymen to civil office: Protestant ministers and Roman Catholic priests were assigned and financed in educating particular groups of Indians between 1870 and 1899, and diplomatic ambassadors included Rev. Henry A. Mühlenberg (Lutheran, to Austria from 1838 to 1840) and Rev. Henry van Dyke (Presbyterian, to the Netherlands from 1913 to 1917). A former Presbyterian minister, Norman N. Thomas, even ran as the Socialist candidate for U.S. President.

---


12 Stokes, Church and State, I, 627.

13 Brownlow also served as governor of Tennessee from 1865 to 1869, and Revels was a black who also served as a member of the Natchez city council. National Cyclopaedia of American Biography, VI, 210, XI, 405.


15 Stokes, Church and State, I, 627.
in 1924.\textsuperscript{16} The only public political activity of a Jewish rabbi was by Stephen S. Wise who was a delegate to the Democratic national convention in 1924.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, of course, religious leaders used the pulpit press, and personal influence in political issues.\textsuperscript{18}

Despite the existence of a tradition of clerical activity in American politics, the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish ministerial politics fell short of the broad spectrum of influence exerted by the Mormon hierarchy. First, the political role was performed by local ecclesiastics rather than national leaders of a church. Second, available evidence does not even indicate an American town (much less a territory or state) where religious leaders exercised the kind of pervasive influence that was true of the Mormon hierarchy in Nauvoo, Illinois, San Bernardino, California (to 1857), and the Great Basin. This absence of evidence may reflect the relatively minor attention local clergies have received in the American social history, rather than an actual lack of pervasive clerical influence in socio-economic and political spheres.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16}He was also the unsuccessful Socialist candidate for New York governor in 1924 and New York City mayor in 1929. National Cyclopaedia of American Biography, C, 258.


\textsuperscript{18}Darrow, "The Church and Techniques of Political Action;" Stokes, Church and State, passim.

\textsuperscript{19}Harry S. Stout commented that "the New England clergy as a social group has been almost completely ignored." See "The Great Awakening in New England Reconsidered: The New England Clergy as a Case Study," Journal of Social History, VIII (Fall, 1974), 22.
The primary social characteristic that paralleled the experience of the Mormon hierarchy was that American clergymen in other areas of the United States were also intricately interrelated. Although the Mormon hierarchy's extensive influence and control in society was not without religious parallel in other cultures at other times, apparently no other religious leadership in American history has exerted the degree of pervasive societal regulation that was manifested by the Mormon hierarchy.

By maintaining the religious focus, how then does one account for the rise of an authoritarian religion in a society that seemed to indicate a suspicion of religious authoritarianism? By emphasizing the millennial expectation of Mormonism (which was a fundamental context for Mormon theology, family relations, economics, and politics) one could place Mormonism conveniently within the millenarian tradition of religious history. On the other hand, one could analyze the religious characteristics of Mormonism along the sociological lines of church-sect

---
typology initially suggested in 1904 by Max Weber, popularized in 1911 by Ernst Troeltsch, applied to American denominationalism by H. Richard Niebuhr in 1929, and further refined by Howard Becker, Liston Pope, and J. Milton Yinger. Each of these interpretative approaches has functional application to Mormonism as a religious movement, but the character of the Mormon hierarchy and its relation to Mormonism can perhaps best be understood by extending analysis beyond the religious sphere to the structure of power in America.

The analysis of power structure has become the center of controversy since the mid-1950's. Floyd Hunter's publication in 1953 of Community Power Structure began the controversy due to his methodology and his conclusions. By conducting extensive interviews in Atlanta, Georgia, Hunter identified the individuals in the community who were regarded as the source of power and influence by those persons interviewed. Through this "reputational" approach, Hunter arrived at a list of forty persons who were wealthy and prominent in business and who had overlapping associations in business and society. These forty individuals originated the policies that were "officially" implemented by subordinate leaders of Atlanta. Hunter's study also indicated that the power structure of Atlanta ("Regional City" in the pseudonymic approach of sociology) was

---

independent of (in fact, more powerful than) the persons who had formalized offices of leadership. By ignoring the "positional" approach to identifying leadership, Hunter suggested that the "reputational" method identified metropolitan power structure as covert, monolithic, and highly concentrated.

The initial impact of Hunter's study had barely been assimilated when the controversy was intensified by studies that concluded that there was a similar national power structure in America. Sociologist C. Wright Mills began the national phase of the controversy over monolithic elites in his 1956 publication of *The Power Elite*. Analyzing the very rich, the businessmen, military leaders, political leaders, and even celebrities, Mills returned repeatedly to his pungent thesis:

> What I am asserting is that in this particular epoch a conjunction of historical circumstances has led to the rise of an elite of power; that the men of the circles composing this elite, severally and collectively, now make such key decisions as are made; and that, given the enlargement and the centralization of the means of power now available, the decisions that they make and fail to make carry more consequences for more people than has ever been the case in the history of mankind.

... The top of the American system of power is much more unified and much more powerful, the bottom is much more fragmented, and in truth, impotent, than is generally supposed by those who are distracted by the middling units of power which neither express such will as exists at the bottom nor determine the decisions at the top.  

Mills followed the traditional positional approach of identifying leaders, and showed the overlap or inter-locking character of their associations and powers. Three years later, Hunter published a study that reached similar conclusions about the composition of an American national

---


power structure by use of his reputational method of interviewing influential persons in various segments of society and asking them to identify the chain of authority or power they used and knew. Hunter, however, qualified the modus operandi national power structure he identified:

Let it be clearly understood again that I am not suggesting that the top leaders in the nation ever sit face to face around a table and decide in solemn judgment what will or will not be good for the nation. Such a view would deny the whole notion of process that is contained in the social power structure concept. Nor do I believe that much policy is ever wholly decided in smoke-filled rooms, nor in club leadership outings of the Aspen, Hot Springs, or Bohemian groups. ...Yet, there is a selective process of agreement and habit patterns related to leadership recognition that can be observed.

Continuing to utilize the model of a community power structure in my interviews, I found certain common elements among the top leaders, whom I began to look upon as a national power structure, as they lock upon themselves. I have already mentioned the facts that they knew each other, that they could rate each other in a status scale, and that they tended to include and exclude others from their company. ...They represented a cross-section of national civic life, and active recruiting into the circuit goes on continuously to fill vacancies, geographic and otherwise. 25

The work of Mills and Hunter has been extended or qualified by others who have found concentration, rather than diversity, in the exercise of national power in the United States. 26

The response to the theories of elitist, monolithic power structures was spearheaded by Robert A. Dahl. In his 1961 study of the politics of

---


New Haven, Connecticut, Dahl described the progression of community power from domination by an aristocratic oligarchy up to the 1840's, followed by entrepreneurial domination, to be followed in the twentieth century by the politicians of recent immigrant origins and lower socio-economic backgrounds. Rejecting Hunter's reputational method of analysis as built upon the presupposition of a unified power structure, Dahl concentrated on the role of persons and institutions in actual decisions and issues. On the basis of this decisional methodology, Dahl concluded that New Haven was composed of competing power groups, that there was no unified coalition of community leaders, and that the power that was achieved and exercised was by successful competition that was independent of class lines. Just as disappointed liberals and suspicious conservatives have pointed to a monolithic, covert, conspiratorial, and unified power structure as the fundamental characteristic of American society, Dahl represents the pluralist school of political science in affirming that the central characteristic of the United States and other democracies is competitive pluralism in contrast to the hegemony or oligarchy of other regimes.

Between the polarized interpretations of American society as either controlled by overlapping, elitist monoliths or compromised by diverse, competing interest groups, there have been less dichotomous interpretations. Eleven years after Hunter published his Atlanta study, M. Kent Jennings published an analysis of the elites of Atlanta in which Jennings identified the elites as cutting across socio-economic status lines, but


composing a coalition of diverse groups that accommodated to each other in varying ways in order to obtain desired goals. In a specific response to Hunter and Mills, Arnold M. Rose analyzed both national and local society and concluded that power was indeed structured, but in ways different from the secreitive monoliths: the power structures tended to comprise less than one percent of the population, that each elite exercised power primarily within its own domain (business, military, political, etc.), that the economic elite was not supreme but often was influenced by the other elites, and that the power structure of America was diversified and relatively democratic. Moreover, in a very significant contribution to the controversy, Robert Presthus suggested that not only was the degree of overlap (or inter-lock) fundamental to the concept of a unified control by individuals in various spheres of leadership, but that the degree of overlap tended to be an inverse function of the size of the community: the smaller the community the larger the number of areas over which an individual or group of individuals exercised control. In this middle view of American elite and power structure, larger population increases the complexity of society, and therefore also increases the diversity of interest groups that overlap both in conflict and in compromise.

A central issue that has not been given due attention (particularly by the pluralist school) is the intent of leadership groups within society—whether at the village level or the national level. The intent of a lead-

---


ship group is to exercise increasing power and eventually to establish a sector of complete control, an hegemony. Once that sector of hegemony is established—no matter how limited its extent—the leadership group has two challenges: first, to protect and reinforce the already established hegemony; second, to expand the hegemony without endangering the already secured sector of control. The manner in which the leadership group seeks to realize its primary intent and to respond to the resultant challenges depends upon two factors: first, the self-definition of the leadership group in terms of what it is willing to do to achieve its purposes; second, the external circumstances that may necessitate, restrict, or allow both the purposes and the methods of the leadership group. This process is applicable to the least complex of the world’s societies that are discretely organized around the family, as well as to the most complex of industrial societies.

The search for hegemony has particular application to the development of American society. The western hemisphere came to the attention of Europe at a time when European society was experiencing increased competition among the territorial states, as well as intense economic, religious, and social tensions. North America was not only a tabula rasa for territorial conquest, mineral and mercantile exploitation, but also became the refuge for groups of dispossessed Europeans who found themselves excluded or jeopardized by the political, economic, and religious hegemonies of Europe. The religious refugees of Europe, for example, were not fleeing the concept of hegemony, but were seeking the opportunity to establish their own sector of religious control that was isolated, and therefore protected, from competing or hostile religious hegemonies. To European sovereigns, mercantilists, and religious leaders, the American wilderness represented an opportunity for domination.
As Americans passed from the age of discovery and exploration, through the colonial period and revolution, and into the industrial age, hegemonies were established, displaced, merged, expanded, and adapted. Unlike the European society from which America derived, America provided its people with dual opportunities for hegemony: in the growing towns and cities, and along the perimeters of the frontier. In the former, already existing resources could be combined to exercise dominance in a particular sector of society, and in the latter every frontiersman had the opportunity of founding a "first family." In fact, it was through family interconnections that many hegemonies were created or maintained. This was true not only of the aristocratic families of Boston, Philadelphia, and Charleston, but of rural farming communities and urban immigrant ghettos. For example, in one Tennessee farming community sixty families had intermarried from 1786 onward.\textsuperscript{32} Moreover, the leadership of urban crime organizations has been comprised almost exclusively of persons related by kinship or marriage.\textsuperscript{33}

The opportunities for advancement and hegemony were available in America, but they were by no means of equal access. During the mid-nineteenth century the disparities between the egalitarian myth and entrenched hegemony were acute in the cities. In Philadelphia of 1860, for example, ten percent of the population owned ninety percent of the city's assessed

\textsuperscript{32}Elmora Messer Matthews, Neighbor and Kin: Life in a Tennessee Ridge Community (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1965). Matthews described the community as "an egalitarian island" because the residents did not define themselves in terms of class or prestige strata, yet the entire community had achieved a sense of identity that aligned them to everything of importance in the community, and distinguished them in a superior way from the society outside the community.

wealth. Economic status is only one aspect of the exercise of power, but the control of economic resources by such a minority of the urban population severely limited the degree to which the rest of the urban population could have access to power. Even granting the accuracy of studies of contemporary American society which indicate that power in cities is exercised by competing and diverse groups, current studies also indicate that the degree of monolithic power structure is greatest in cities below 50,000 population. If these contemporary findings are projected back to the nineteenth century situation of America, then one can conclude that monolithic, elitist community power structures were the rule where 91.1 percent of America's population resided in cities of less than 25,000 in 1850 and 77.8 percent in 1890. Whereas the royalty and nobility of Europe's ruling classes were statically unapproachable by the bourgeoisie, the elite power structures of America were comprised almost exclusively of a middle class imitation of European aristocracy. By the acquisition of wealth, exercise of political power, and use of familial interconnections, enterprising Americans were able to establish elite ruling hegemonies and power structures in commercial centers and frontier settlements.


35 Presthus, Men at the Top, pp. 95-96, 430.

Mormonism's pervasively authoritarian character was not a medieval or bizarre aberration of an egalitarian society, but was instead a religious reflection of the elite power structure that existed in American society throughout the nineteenth century. When the Mormon Church allowed virtually all its male members opportunity to receive ecclesiastical power, it was appealing to the masses of the American (and certainly European) population that had been excluded from the power structures of cities, towns, and villages. By enabling all Mormons to become kings and priests, Mormonism was egalitarian in ways that contemporary American society was not.

Moreover, by institutionalizing elite structures within the church, Mormonism also appealed to the bourgeois envy of aristocracy. Rank-and-file Mormons could preside over wards and stakes and thus administer in spiritual, economic, and political activities. In addition, polygamy enabled those who participated in it to become allied through marriage to the highest echelons of the community, even if they themselves were not a part of the highest power structure of the Mormon community. A farmer could become a bishop or stake president, and often did. Although many of the men who became General Authorities of the Mormon Church were above the average Mormon's economic standing, many members of this Mormon hierarchy were of the humblest origins and remained relatively poor. The Mormon power structure was therefore accessible in ways that the American power structure was not.

Joseph Smith's progressive adoption of political, economic, and social control within the realm of priesthood authority was entirely compatible with the overlapping character of elite rule. What the Mormon hierarchy achieved in Nauvoo, Illinois and in the Great Basin of the American West was the realization of hegemony that was central to any leadership
group. The difficulty that beset the Mormon hierarchy was that Mormonism was too successful in achieving the total hegemony that was only approximated by the Boston Brahmins, Philadelphia aristocracy, New York *nouveau riche*, and frontier power structures. It was the shock of recognition and the uncomfortable realization of supreme achievement that inspired America's national and local power structures to dismantle the Mormon hierarchy's hegemony. Polygamy was the pretext, but power was the motive. Once Mormonism's independent hegemony was decimated, the Mormons were more susceptible to power structures not exactly of their choosing but more completely within the domain of the larger American power structure.
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