do not exist upon her soil, and yet, in truth, a slave to a number of her freemen. If we admitted the popular idea that there was no slavery except that which had originated the chattel laws on the subject, then the boast of England has truth and merit; but if slavery exists where men are plundered of all their earnings, and robbed of every right, then it exists the world over, not less in the northern States of this Union than the southern, and certainly not less in England than in other portions of the earth. If this be the case, it behooves all who are placed in the position of teachers to examine well their ground, to the end that they may not on any hand be inveighing against evils which with the other they are strengthening.

Now it seems to us it will not be denied that in Europe, and particularly in Great Britain, men are plundered of their earnings and robbed of their rights; and it is equally clear, and will not probably be denied, that they are enslaved. The magnitude and character of the slavery must be judged of by its results. And where, let us ask, does chattel slavery present a picture equal in hideousness to that presented by the slavery of Europe. We wish to call attention to the principles or causes at the bottom of this, and moreover wish to show that all slavery is the offspring of a common principle, the principle of taking from the people the products of their hands without remuneration.

We assert, men that a tariff, whether for protection or revenue, is a vile parent of slavery; and he who advocates such a tariff is a champion of slavery. A tariff from its nature, and from necessity, is a tax upon the many for the benefit of the few. It is a tax upon the poorer class of people for the benefit of the richer; and its inevitable tendency is to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer; to create extremes of wealth and poverty, and to make those hideous social inequalities which peculiarly mark European society. And it is the same whether it be a tariff for revenue or protection, for they are different degrees of the same principle, and will work in the lapse of time corresponding results.

It is a system which robs the laborer of his hard earned wages; it takes from him the means of life, and reduces him to the condition, if not of the chattel slave, a condition equally productive of evil results, that of a hired slave. We know of no evil of chattel slavery, which do not exist quite as hideously and forcibly in wages slavery; and as a tariff is the chief parent of wages slavery, we would not give one fig for the anti-slavery feeling which confused the anti-chattel slavery, advocates such a system of slavery as a tariff for revenue and protection.

C. L. S.

Good! Why don't the Telegraph exchange with us? A man can write such an article ought to read the writings of prophets.

From the Southport Telegraph.

The principal obstruction now to the liberty and happiness of man, is the great struggle for wealth and property. Society as it is, might be compared to a crowd of people climbing a steep hill, when those who get up first should have the others to work for them; then the strong would pull back the weak and trample them under foot, and when two of equal strength would come in contact in their struggle for advancement, both would come to the bottom. Such is society; that the strong is always running over the weak, and a constant struggle with all, who shall get the most and give the least for it; and when they have enough to entitle them to be enrolled in the list of the upper ten, the others are compelled to work for them. While such matters are held out to man society cannot be otherwise than it is. Every man has the fear of toil and the hope of ease; the fear of want and the hope of plenty; the fear of poverty and the hope of riches; the fear of being a slave and the hope of being a master, before him. These hopes and fears must make man in every transaction of life, and have considerable agency in all the evils that afflict society, and are a reasonable apology, or at least a sufficient cause, for almost anything he may do.

Those who pretend to argue against giving the public land in small quantities, to actual settlers only, admit that they have a right to produce, but deny that they have any right to the soil because they do not produce it. Now if this can be called an argument at all, it must come with double force against those who monopolize the soil which they have not produced, but bought from any one did produce it. The first title of all land was usurpation and robbery; and I am not certain, even by our present law, but possession is the very best title. If any should claim to have a better, why, from whom did you buy? The answer is, from government. For whom did government buy? From Virginia. From whom did Virginia buy? From the King of England. From whom did the King buy? Why he sold it and murdered the natives and took it as the feudal lords of England did, and as England has done with Ireland, America, and other nations, and as all tyrants have done.

Now I believe the present condition of slavery will not pass as a valid example in my court in this country, [we have no doubt it would pass precisely current in any Genevian court. If I do not we can possibly you the large speculators and take their land, and when it is sold a slave or the title will be clear.

It is absurd to talk of human rights if a man has no right to stand on this earth to stand, sit, lie or to live or die. The right to life is an empty title, without a place to live. Without this right the Declaration of Independence is a tautological lie.

It is much harder to get right after a wrong amendment, than it is to begin right at first. Suppose all the people of the United States were coming into the country together; and admitted to have equal rights; would any one have the presumption to propose such absurd a measure, as that a few should be allowed, under any circumstances, to hold all the land as their own, while the great mass should be without any, and become rent slaves like the inhabitants of Ireland. No man dare propose such a thing. How few are who know their rights, and fewer still who dare maintain them.

REPRINT.

Porter, Wis., February 10th, 1848.

Bro. James J. Strong:—Having been solicited by Bro. Wigg and the rest of the brethren, I will proceed and make a statement of my labors and also of my brethren in this part of God's vineyard.

If you think proper to insert it in your valuable paper, you will show to the brethren abroad that God's arm is not shortened that cannot save. The first winter after I came to a knowledge there were the true and lawful successor of Joseph Smith, I went to see and write in the brethren abroad with whom I was acquainted. I being young was drawn into young company, and attended public and neighborhood dances. I soon learned that this thing was darkness, and swallowed in darkness and in sin until the winter. The next winter I went to Koskong to teach school, and commenced preaching the word, God blessed me with his spirit, and success (that is four) during the winter and spring and obedience to the faith. I again went home to work on my farm and winter, when I went back to Koskong and commenced preaching again, and God blessed my labors and I baptized seven men, I organized a branch called the Koskong branch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and ordained one Elder as Teacher. I then went to Yeez, as you know, and brother John came out here and preached in Koskong, and I hope some more, and then we went from there to the Porter homesteads.
Dear Brother Straus:

I take this opportunity to drop you a line by a brother singing up to Yore. I thought I would send you two dollars. You may apply it as you think proper. If you have need of it you may keep it, or you may put it to the Temple. As soon as I can I will send you a little more. I wish to do all I can for Zion. I do bring to you these two dollars. It may never be in my power to give you as much, but it has been sick unto all summer, and it has got him into debt. We are poor, and I am a cripple. I have to walk with two sticks, and am getting old. If I live till July I shall be seventy-seven. I make two dollar barrells a day. You must continue to send the papers. Give our best respects to all the brethren and sisters, and we want their prayers, that the Lord would open a way for us to come up to Zion, for I long to be there. Your brother and sister in tribulation,

JOHN and MELINDA TYSON

Put this on record as a memorial that wheresoever this page is preached, there it may be had in remembrance forever.

The case of the widow's миле is not more worthy of remembrance. This is rather an extreme case, but the many similar to it is constantly occurring are the most conclusive evidence that the faith of the saints is renewed, and that the days of renewal favor are coming to an end.

We place the two dollars in the Temple funds, that some of the saints thereof may be as a monument of faith of those saints. God bless them, and bless the church with more of such faiths.

OPINION THAT CHRISTIANS HAVE OF ONE ANOTHER

The Albany Evening Journal thus prints out the moderate re- stored of the washoles of the South, when they insist upon carrying slavery into the new territories.

"Those who seek to carry slavery into the new territories, also ask to take the Slave Code with it. The former cannot exist without the latter. They are inseparable. Where one goes the other must follow. Hence, if Congress permits slavery to go to California or New Mexico, it must allow that law to go with it which provides thirty lashes for the negro, whether dead or free, who has the audacity to preach the Gospel: which ensures one year's imprisonment for any one who shall teach a slave to read, and twenty lashes for the slave who soil in a school learning to read; and which provides the enormous penalty of six months' imprisonment and $500 fine for whispering a slave to death.

It must do more even than all this. It must provide for the imprisonment of every dark skinned sailor who visits either New Mexico or California. Virginia and South Carolina have not only shown us the practical workings of such a law, but have declared..."
(At the request of some of our Porter subscribers, we publish the annexed letter. It will be found interesting as a part of the history of the times, if not useful for other purposes:)

Porter, Wis., Feb. 20th, 1849.

Bro. James J. Strang: -- Having been solicited by Bro. Wright and the rest of the brethren, I will proceed and make a statement of my labors and also of my brethren in this part of God's vineyard. If you think proper to insert it in your valuable paper, you will show to the brethren abroad that God's arm is not shortened that he cannot save. The first winter after I came to a knowledge that you was the true and lawful successor of Joseph Smith, I went to school and wrote to the brethren abroad with whom I was acquainted. I being young was drawn into young company, and attended parties and neighborhood dances. I soon learned that this thing begat darkness, and wallowed in darkness and in sin until the next July. The next winter I went to Koskonong to teach school, and commenced preaching the word. God blessed me with his holy spirit, and some (that is four) during the winter and spring were obedient to the faith. I again went home to work on my farm until winter, when I went again back to Koskonong and commenced preaching again, and God blessed my labors and I baptized seven more. I organized a branch called the Koskonong branch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and ordained one Elder and Teacher. I then went to Voree, as you know, and brother John E. Page came out here and preached in Koskonong, and I baptized some more, and then we went from there to the Porter branch, which we organized with about ten members, brother Nathan Foster being the presiding Elder, and brother Barker, Clerk. Last summer I preached at Koskonong and at Porter some, and this winter I commenced preaching again, and brother Foster assisted me in preaching the word and bearing testimony by the spirit and power of Israel's God, and we have baptized six more into the Koskonong branch. We now number in that branch about twenty-two members, Elders and all. We have some noble hearts in the branch who are willing to forsake all for Christ.

We all believe that James J. Strang is the prophet of the most high God, and successor to Joseph Smith. We enjoy the gifts of the spirit. Some the gift of tongues, some the interpretation of tongues, and the most powerful manifestation of the gift of healing I ever saw. The sick are healed immediately by the laying on of hands according to the law of God, and my brother Richard was healed a few nights ago of a pain in the breast immediately, and he does not belong to the church. God has blessed us wonderfully. Almost the entire neighborhood are obedient to the faith. There are several more
believing, and I anticipate baptizing one of superior talent, if it is God's will so to be.

We have ordained in our branch four Elders, one Priest and one Teacher, who are bound, if faithful, to make this generation tremble under the word of the Lord. I feel clear that I have done my duty, God being my witness; I have not failed to declare the full counsel of God, according to the inelligence given me. I have always tried to prepare their minds to receive truth. I have always first learned a thing and then have taught them, and never have I adopted the principle of guess work. I have prepared their minds to receive and keep the word of wisdom. I have always, since I have had any knowledge of the Order of Enoch, been preparing their minds to become one in all things. May God forgive my enemies and those that have said I did not preach all parts of the gospel when I understood it. I have come to the conclusion to obey God in all things, and the authority of his church never to oppose, come what may. The brethren tender their sincere thanks to you for sending brother Phineas Wright out here to instruct us in the way of the Lord more perfectly. We were glad to see him, and cordially recommended him to the fellowship of the saints. Give my love to all the saints at Voree. Brother Wright and myself have had a protracted meeting here just after a Mrthodist excitement, and we have had a huge school house crowded full for eight meetings. The people listened with profound silence and wonder, while we laid before them the gospel of Jesus Christ in its fullness. They want to hear, and manifest a believing and inquiring spirit. I hope to baptize some more in this place. May God bless our works here. Your brother in the gospel.

H. P. BROWN.
and went her way, apparently as well as any body.

This is the testimony of a very good old Metho-
dist, who I met with some twenty-five miles from
Oakland, California, Feb. 28th, 1880.

President Joseph Smith, Dear Sir and Bro-
thers and Sisters, at Pleasant Grove, Utah, on
March 1, 1880, 1880, I received a letter from the
Herald, I find the following passage. "In an
editorial of the Deseret News, the same organ from
which we have quoted for November 24th, under
the caption, 'Be not led astray by deceivers,' it is
stated that at the time H. P. Brown was cut off
for preaching polygamy and other corrupt
dogmas, polygamy was no part of the creed of
the Church.

I desire to know whether the Deseret News,
H. P. Brown was cut off from the Church? Will
you be kind enough to send me the copy of said News.
I am certainly surprised to hear that there were
such publications among your friends, and I am
not in the habit of reading such articles.

I have been informed that the Editor of the
Deseret News is your son, and I would like to
know if he has any qualms of conscience after
seeing such a publication.

Brother Henry, do you have no preaching
polygamy and other corrupt dogmas in your Church?
I think I was speaking of the polygamy part.

I have been in the Church for some time.
I have heard about polygamy many times, but I
never understood what it was.

I would like to know if you have ever heard
about polygamy before.

I am happy and will press on and see what
all we can do for the cause of the Master. Peace to
our years, pray for us.

T. N. HUDSON.

INDEPENDENCE, Jackson Co., Missouri,
February 18, 1880.

Bro. Joseph and Henry. Today was our fast
day, it is the first sacrament Sunday in the month.
At 7 a.m. we had our sacrament and testi-
mony meeting. During it the power of God was
manifest in promises, saying that the Saints who
would prove faithful, should be protected and
enriched with the spiritual blessings of the Church.
The peace of love and joy would be sent to all who
were willing to receive it, and many testified to
their joy.

I think I was speaking of the polygamy part.
I have been in the Church for some time.
I have heard about polygamy many times, but I
never understood what it was.

I would like to know if you have ever heard
about polygamy before.

I am happy and will press on and see what
all we can do for the cause of the Master. Peace to
our years, pray for us.

T. N. HUDSON.
We had a pleasant correspondence a short time ago with A. Miller Musser of Salt Lake City. He was curious to know if we were the "Hiram Brown" who was cut off from the Church by Joseph Smith in 1843 for teaching polygamy in Lapeer county, Michigan. As many others may be like him, we here say, we are not the man; and never saw or heard of him only as we saw his name in the Nauvoo Times and Seasons; and as we have always hated the detestable doctrine, none need be afraid of our either teaching or practicing it.
factional priesthood?
Apparently the question of factional priesthood authority continued to be debated from 1853 until 1866, thirteen years later, when it was incorporated as law by the General Conference ruling that factions could not confer priesthood.

The Priesthood Status of Some of the Other Reorganizers
Elder Hight had questions about the following leaders who helped reorganize the Church in 1852–1853. (Also, Rudy Leutzinger, who is currently the pastor of the Independence Restoration Branch, mentioned the names of H. B. Deam and W. W. Blair when conversing with me.) But the following information shows that they had true original authority—not factional authority:

Jason W. Briggs. In spite of Jason’s use of his Strangite high priest office, he stated under oath:
I did not understand at that time that my authority tobuild up the church was derived from William Smith or Strang. I had that authority by virtue of my eldership in the original church. (RLDS History of the Church 3:197–198, also 739)

Inez Smith Davis, daughter of the Church historian, Heman C. Smith, wrote:
It should be noted that Jason W. Briggs presided over the church from 1853 to 1860 as president pro tem, not because of his ordination to the office of high priest under Strang, but by virtue of his apostleship, the honor of presiding having been declined by Zenas H. Gurley and Henry H. Deam. (The Story of the Church, 413, footnote 12)

Zenas H. Gurley, Sr. Zenas H. Gurley, Sr., was ordained a seventy at Far West, Missouri, in 1838 (RLDS History of the Church 3:743), and used that original priesthood during the reorganizing process. It has been claimed that Zenas was ordained a bishop in Strang’s church. If so, his ordination to that office was not recognized by the Reorganization, for as Editor Jason Briggs wrote, “...they [the factions] ordained Bishops, which, was clearly in violation of the law” (The Messenger 2:15).

Brother Gurley testified that the Lord gave him a vision in the fall of 1851 in which he was told that Strang’s church was false:
At this time Strang’s Beaver Island operation appeared before me. It looked mean and contemptible beyond description. A voice—the Spirit of God—the Holy Ghost, then said to me ‘Can this (alluding to Strang’s work) ever effect this great work?’ I answered, ‘No, Lord.’ I felt ashamed to think that I had ever thought so. (RLDS History of the Church 3:205–206)

After this vision, Brother Gurley surely would not have condoned the use of priesthood authority from Strang’s church.

Lo Daniel B. Rasey. Daniel Rasey was one of the first seven apostles in the Reorganization. Brother Hight said on page 4 of his paper concerning Brother Rasey, “No record of RLDS baptism.” Church history explains, however, that “Z. H. Gurley visited Wingville and the Blue Mounds [Wisconsin] settlement and succeeded in getting several to unite with the church, among them George White of Wingville, and John Cunningham, a brother-in-law of H. H. Deam at the same place, and Daniel B. Rasey, an old member of the church at Blue Mounds (Inez Davis, The Story of the Church, 407; italics added). This indicates that Brother Rasey was a member of the “old” or original Church, and did not function in the Reorganization with Strangite priesthood.

Henry H. Deam. Pastor Rudy Leutzinger correctly stated to me that Henry H. Deam was one of the “two high priests” who were present when the reorganizers were told that the highest officer should preside (see RLDS History of the Church 3:217). However, Rudy stated that Brother Deam had received his high priesthood from Strang. But Church history records that: “He [Deam] was at Nauvoo before the death of Joseph Smith, and under his direction was ordained a high priest” (ibid., 3:734; see also Temple Lot Case, 210). When Brother Deam withdrew from Strang’s church, he automatically repudiated any ordination he may have received from Strang, and continued to function in his office of high priest which he had received in the early Church.

W. W. Blair. Brother Leutzinger also questioned W. W. Blair’s priesthood. Brother Blair joined William Smith’s church in 1851, but later separated from him (RLDS History of the Church 3:727). In 1857 he joined the Reorganization by being baptized by Zenas Gurley on April 7, and was ordained a high priest on April 8 (ibid., 729). (Brother Gurley had become an apostle in the Reorganization in 1853.)

Hiram P. Brown. Brother Hight said concerning Hiram that he was “a man who never held priesthood in the original church under Joseph Smith Jr. He received his call to the priesthood while in the James J. Strang faction ... Under his hand, ordinances of the Strangite church were performed at Yellowstone. The RLDS church upheld those ordinances” (Hight, 2).

Hiram P. Brown, who was an apostle in Strang’s church (RLDS History of the Church 3:44), was at least ordained to the office of elder during the lifetime of Joseph the Martyr, and later a high priest in the RLDS Church. Joseph Smith III indicated that Brown was one of the elders at the Amboy conference of 1860. He said:

Besides Elders [William] Marks and [Zenas] Gurley, there were quite a number present, who were members of the old church. ... Among the people that were present were Elders Isaac Sheen, Dwight Webster, Zenas Whitcomb, Israel L. Rogers, and Hiram P. Brown. (Temple Lot Case, 39)

As editor of the Saints’ Herald, President Joseph Smith III published Hiram P. Brown’s obituary which read, [Died] At his residence [at] ... Oakland, California, December 4th, 1889 ... Hiram P. Brown, attorney at law and editor of the Expositor [a newspaper published in Oakland]. ... became identified with the [original] church by baptism in 1842 in the seventeenth year of his age. He was a man of more than ordinary ability and a profound Biblical scholar, an earnest, logical and eloquent speaker, and ... an openly avowed and ever aggressive and uncompromising enemy to polygamy. (Saints Herald 37 [December 28, 1889]: 851)

Hiram P. Brown, though young in years, was definitely a member of the Church in 1842 and apparently an elder, for he is listed with “honorable
mention" with many other Church leaders, "who with but few exceptions were connected with the church in the days of Joseph Smith" (RLDS History of the Church 3:199). In spite of his youth he could have been an elder before Joseph's death, for it was common for young men in their teens to be ordained. For instance, Don Carlos Smith was ordained at the age of fourteen (see Lucy Smith, Joseph Smith the Prophet and His Progenitors, 181).

Hiram attended the April 1864 Conference at Amboy where he was received into the Reorganized Church and ordained an elder (see RLDS History of the Church 3:338).

Brother Hight, on page 8 of his paper, suggested that Hiram P. Brown, of the Yellowstone Branch, performed a number of factional Strangite ordinances, and that "the entire Yellowstone Branch was 'grandfathered' into the RLDS Church without any requirement for re-baptism or re-ordination." In order to prove or disprove this statement extensive research must be made on each individual member.

It should be noted that there was a Hiram Brown listed in Church history as having been expelled in 1844 for preaching polygamy in Lapeer County, Michigan (see Times and Seasons 5:423). Hiram P. Brown published in 1888 that he was not that Hiram Brown (see The Expositor 4 [Oakland, California, February 1888]: 293).

Hiram P. Brown had been ordained an apostle under James Strang's leadership (see ibid., 2 [July 1886]: 141), but he was not allowed to use the office of apostle in the Reorganized Church.

The Early Reorganizers Were Careful to Examine Priesthood Authority

It is unlikely that the early reorganizers, such as those in the Yellowstone Branch, entered the Reorganization without returning to their priesthood authority in the original Church, for the main leaders were careful in this regard. Brother Zenas H. Gurley explained:

-- Our April conference was near at hand, and we were unable to decide on the validity of the ordinations of our brethren, who were present at the fall conference, and as we all felt satisfied with the [Lord's] answer to our inquiry concerning polygamy, we thought the most proper course for us was to make this also a subject of prayer. Accordingly we presented a question something like this: 'Were those ordained apostles by William Smith recognized by God?' The manifestation of the Spirit was fully equal to any on former occasions, and perhaps it is well to say that this was the first time that the angels of God were seen present in our meetings. . . . We were then told that those ordinations were not acceptable,-were not of God. (RLDS History of the Church 3:216)

There is every reason to believe that this applied to ordinations performed under Strang's leadership also.

Joseph W. Briggs, who became the president of the Quorum of Twelve, also indicated that factions were not acceptable when he stated that William Smith and his ordinations were rejected of God. In the revelation to Briggs in 1831, which began the work of reorganizing, he was told:

-- But as Esau despised his birthright, so has William Smith despised my law, and forfeited that which pertained to him. . . . And his spokesman, Joseph Wood, shall fall with him, for they are rejected of me. (ibid., 200–201)

It is also worthy of note that the Lord told Jason in that same revelation:

-- Therefore, let the elders whom I have ordained by the hand of my servant Joseph, or by the hand of those ordained by him, resist not this authority, nor faint in the discharge of duty, which is to preach my gospel. (ibid., 201)

Note that the Lord did not say that those who were ordained by leaders of factions should have that authority.

Joseph III Did Not Condone Factions

Joseph Smith III indicated that factions were not acceptable. He asked, Where was the Church during the lapse of time between the disorganization and the reorganization? It was with the remnant scattered abroad, who remained true to the principles first given as the gospel of Christ; and with any body of such remnant, numbering six or more, under the pastoral charge of an elder, priest, teacher, or deacon. (ibid., 5:346)

He did not say it was in J. J. Strang's church. He condemned factions, mentioning the "polygamic faction" as an example (ibid., 3:352), and indicated that when the Reorganization began there were only "three lone, solitary folds" (branches) in which was "found sufficient to the work of reorganizing the hosts of Israel . . . one at Beloit, one at Zarahemla, Wisconsin, and one at Jeffersonville, Illinois" (ibid., 5:352).

In his effort to substantiate the factional priesthood theory, Elder Hight referred on page 9 of his paper to what Joseph III said in Doctrine and Covenants Section 119:4, about "the elders must cease to be overcareful concerning the return of those who were once of the faith but were overcome in the dark and cloudy day." Brother Hight used this quotation to mean that we should not be too careful about the priesthood in the modern factions—we should accept them. But Joseph III did not say we should. He said, "those who were once of the faith." The implication is that they could come back with their original baptism and ordination—but not with ordinances received in factional churches, like the modern factional elders want to do. For instance, Joseph III did not accept the priesthood offices of those who had been ordained as apostles in Strang's faction. Jason Briggs came back as an elder (Temple Lot Case, 402), and Zenas Gurley as a seventy—the offices they held in the original Church. This is entirely different than how some of today's elders want to come back.

RLDS Orthodox Branches Versus Factional Restoration Branches

To summarize, for some time there has been a growing difference between Restoration branches which claim to be a part of the orthodox portion of the RLDS Church, and those which have rejected the RLDS Church completely and now consider themselves to be factions. It is becoming apparent that this difference is increasing, and this problem should be discussed openly. Those branches which are orthodox RLDS, are secure in knowing that they are a part of the true Church—but the ones who have rejected the RLDS Church are at a loss to know of what church they are a part. Many of them now list their name as the "Branch of Vision".
J. T. Strong Collection
Hiram P. Hall, Feb. 16, 1856
May 21, 1856
from Fulton, Wis.
Notes by Dale R. Broadhurst:

Note 1: The editor of the Oakland Expositor was Elder Hiram P. Brown (1825-1889). He was born in Queensbury, Warren Co., New York and was baptized a Mormon in 1842. The Feb. 1, 1844 issue of the Times and Seasons carried this notice: "As we have lately been credibly informed, that an Elder of the Church of Jesus Christ, of Latter day Saints, by the name of Hiram Brown, has been preaching Polygamy, and other false and corrupt doctrines, in the county of Lapeer, state of Michigan,... he has been cut off from the church, for his iniquity." Wilford Woodruff's Journal entry for June 4, 1844 gives his name as "Elder Hiram J Brown," of Jacksonburg, Michigan, "who had been cut off from the church in Nauvoo by an accusation presented by Elder Elsworth." Woodruff also says: "He was still preaching. We talked with him. He said he would harken to council & do what we told him to, manifested a good spirit & wished to be restored. Said that Elsworth misrepresented him. We gave him liberty to teach." History has not recorded the names of Elder Brown's plural wives, if he had any. In 1845 Brown united with James J. Strang and was made an apostle in Strang's church. He remained with Strang until the early 1850s, when, according to Warren Post, he "partially set himself up, and denied the faith, and was also cut off. Hiram was an associate of early Reorganization leader, Zeros. H. Gurley, in the Yellowstone branch in Lafayette Co., Wisconsin, but he did not join the RLDS until 1864.

Note 2: Hiram P. Brown's first wife, Hannah A. Barker (1827-1883?), was born in Chautauqua Co., N. Y. She was baptized a Strangite Mormon March 1848 at Fulton, Rock Co., Wisconsin. Hannah was the daughter of Elder William Barker, Sr., and Sylvia Barker. The Barker family was living at Busti (near Jamestown), Chautauqua Co., New York in the early 1830s when D. P. Hurlbut first associated with the Mormons. According to Elder George Reynolds, D. P. Hurlbut "embraced the gospel [i.e. was baptized a Mormon] in 1832." According to Elder Benjamin Winchester, Hurlbut "resided at Jamestown, N. Y. previous to his embracing the profession of a Latter Day Saint." According to the Sept. 26, 1832 issue of the Jamestown Journal D. P. Hurlbut was living in Ellicott, near Jamestown, as early as Sept. 13, 1832. Combining these various pieces of information with Hiram P. Brown's account, it can be said with considerable certainty that D. P. Hurlbut was baptized a Mormon on the William Barker farm late in 1832 or very early 1833.

Note 3: According to Gilbert W. Hazeltine, Elder William Barker was the "advance agent" for a group of eastern Mormon converts who gathered temporarily at West Jamestown (i.e. Busti township). Hazeltine says: "early in March [1833] Barker had charge of the Jamestown rendezvous, although Rigdon himself was frequently here... During this Mormon exodus and occupation of West Jamestown, the small pox broke out in one of the Mormon houses... The last of the Mormons left Jamestown in the spring of 1834. They made very few converts here..." (Early History of the Town of Ellicott Jamestown, 1887, pp. 343-45). LDS researcher Dale W. Adams speculates that "Hurlbut may have fled from smallpox" in Chautauqua Co., New York to the Mormon headquarters at Kirtland, Ohio. Hurlbut was ordained an elder by Sidney Rigdon at Kirtland on Mar. 18, 1833.
Note 4: If Sidney Rigdon claimed to have a divine revelation which prompted him to join the LDS Church, modern Mormons might consider this to have been a truly divine revelation. Non-Mormons, on the other hand, would probably be compelled to judge Sidney's claim in this instance to be a falsehood, similar in nature to several other reported cases where Rigdon "lied in the name of the Lord." If Rigdon lied about his miraculous conversion to Mormonism, he may just as well have lied about his having no previous knowledge of the origin of the Book of Mormon.
in the Afternoon by Elder G. A. Smith, followed by Elders D. Fulmer S. Bent & C. C. Rich, all of which ably set forth the first principles of the gospel of Christ, & deliver their testimony (attended with the spirit & power of God) unto the audience who sat in silence manifesting great interest and attention. At the close of the meeting that warmth of friendship & kindness of that marks the noble & generous soul was manifest by many in the assembly among whom was Gen. Comstock & Dr. Hooe.

At the adjournment of the conference the Elders were again called together by President C. C. Rich. Proceeded to appoint the Elders their stations in the different Counties in the State. Adjourned sine die.

W. Woodruff President
Crandell Dunn
E. M. Webb Clerks

We have had an interesting conference & good time with the Saints. General Rich manifested much wisdom in concocting his plans in carrying out his work both on politics & religion, in the State of Michigan this season. We took up a collection to assist us on our mission & obtained $4.50 & $1 sold $8.25 cts worth of books. We took the parting hand with many of the Saints & Elders who began to scatter abroad.

We spent the night with Elder Lee. Elder Lee proposed to Elder Smith if he would return he would give him 2 boxes of fine honey com to take home with him one for his wife & one for mine.


4th We passed through Sandstone & Jacksonburgh a large town; the state prison is there. We spent the night at Br. Noah W. Bartholomew near Jacksonburg.

Here we found Elder Hiram J. Brown who had been out of from the church in Nauvoo by an accusation presented by Elder Elsworth. He was still preaching. We talked with him. He said he would harken to council & do what we told him to, manifested a good spirit & wished to be restored. Said that Elsworth misrepresented him. We gave him liberty to teach. We ascertained that Elder Samuel Parker had done much injury in teaching false doctrine. 25 m.

During this day's travel we called upon Br. Samuel Graham. He was 87 years of age & was baptized by Elder Zebedee Coltrin in the fall of AD. 1832. As he was in the grave for the grave we laid hands upon him & ordained him unto the office of an high priest. Elder Z. Coltrin was spokesman. After which Elders W. Woodruff & G. A. Smith laid hands upon him & sealed him upon the following blessing:

NOTE 4 June: The following appears with an X through it before the second version titled "Blessing": "Samuel Graham, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the authority of the Holy Priesthood and the Apostleship resting upon us we lay our hands upon your head & which is blossoming for the grave & Seal upon your head the blessing of Abram Isaac & Jacob, for thou art the Seed of Abraham of the tribe and lineage of Joseph of the blood of Ephraim. "Thy life hath been preserved on the earth for a special purpose in the mind of God, which purpose thee shalt fully understand in the morning of the first resurrection. We seal thee up unto eternal life. For thou shalt come forth in the morn of the first resurrection & stand in thy lot in the lineage of thy fathers, with all thy posterity & kindred that shall receive the gospel. Thou canst say like Simeon of old thou hast seen the seen the salvation of God for thou art made partaker of the blessings of the fulness of the gospel & the powers of the priesthood, & we seal upon your head every blessing of the seal of the covenant belonging to the priesthood & kingdom of God."
Bro. Joseph Smith:

You will pardon me for the suggestions I may make; but in this fight we all feel an interest and if what I suggest does you no good it will not, I hope, mislead or injure you.

In L. O. Littlefield's proof of polygamy he makes his witness Lovina Walker say, "She, Emma Smith, told me she was present and witnessed the marrying or sealing of Eliza Partridge, Emily Partridge, Marie Lawrence and Sarah Lawrence to her husband, Joseph Smith, and that she gave her consent thereto. Now let us see what the witness Emily D. Partridge Young says about this same transaction. If it really [sic] occurred she ought to know all the particulars.

She says on oath that on the 11th day of May AD 1843 at the city of Nauvoo, County of Hancock, State of Illinois, she was married or sealed (which?) to Joseph Smith, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, by James Adams, a High Priest, in said church, according to the laws of the same regulating marriage, in the presence of Emma (Hale) Smith, and Eliza Partridge (Lyman). Now if this witness is true her marriage was "according to the laws of the Church regulating marriages." If she was a plural wife then the Church then had "laws" regulating [page 2] plural marriage. Did such a "law," (rule of action) exist. If so when? The pretended celestial law was not given until July 12, 1843 over two months after that marriage. Therefore the statement of the witness is untrue and they have impeached their own witness in the first instance.

If her statement was true, then and in that case Joseph Smith and her self were transgressors of the law then existing and were in the very condition of those people whom Littlefield says were condemned because they entered into plural marriages before the law of plural marriages was given them and hence they merrited [sic] and received the condemnation of God and his prophets.

Littlefield says, "By means of the revelation the law of plural marriage was given to the Church:" then it was not given to the Church before July 12th, 1843. Consequently the marriages of Emily D. P. Young with Joseph Smith was without law & contrary to law and her statement that it was "according to the laws of [page 3] [of] the saints" is a base and shameless lie, concocted by the Utah leaders to screen themselves in their iniquity. He says: "But long prior to its date the principle was revealed to your father and he was commanded to practice it." The first proposition is true. It was revealed in the book of Mormon and condemned--But the second proposition is an assertion [assertion], a begging of the question.

If he was commanded to practice it where is the proof—who knows the fact. Where is the command written. And is it reasonable that God would command Joseph to practice a law not given, the details of which were unknown and existed only in the mind of God?

In entering into that relation how would he know in what manner to perform the ceremony and what were the duties enjoined upon him, and what relation he would sustain to God in that state of comnubial bliss? If he H.
could do all these things acceptably without revealing the law, why could not
the Nephites and the rest of Joseph Smith's brethren? What the use of the
revelation of July 12th 1843? [page 4]

Now I will give you a brief account of our Dist. Conference just closed.
Before Conference we made it a special subject of prayer that Satan should be
bound and that we might have a session of peace. Our prayers were answered.
We had a peaceful session, the best ever held since I came to California. I
was elected Dist. President; Geo. S. Lincoln I chose vice president, under a
resolution authorizing me to do so. All the authorities of the church were
sustained in righteousness. Adjourned to meet the first Friday and Saturday in
March next at San Francisco.

Sister Elora Gibbs, one of I. J. Patten's daughters and niece of David
W. Patten, one of the old Twelve who was killed in Mo., was baptized.
Saturday the 8th was devoted to business. Saturday night, Bro. D. J. Philips
preached an interesting discussion on the first principles. Sunday morning,
Bro. Wm. Anderson discoursed upon the subject of "Evolution," giving some good
points and arguments against Bucher's folly. In the afternoon we had a
splendid testimony meeting. Several were administered to, children blessed,
tongues spoken and interpreted, and in the evening I did my best to the
largest house of hearers I have ever spoken to in Cal.

We are all well. God bless you.

Truly and sincerely, H. P. Brown.