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CHAPTER TWO

JOSEPH SMITH AND PLURAL MARRIAGE:
A HISTORY OF DECEPTION

At the time Assistant Church Historian of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, listed the names of twenty-seven women who had been married to Joseph Smith. Historian Record, pp. 233-4. Other references have been less conservative. John J. Stewart, claiming that the Prophet married between four and seven wives on April 6, 1841, of 1845, and died in 1844. Stewart, John. Brigham Young and His Wives (Salt Lake City: Mormons Publishing Co., 1961), p. 31. Ensign, Aug. Brodie listed forty-nine women who, in all probability, had been sealed to Joseph Smith during his lifetime. Young, We Have Known Our History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945), pp. 235-6. And, Stanley S. Wright, talk that Joseph Smith had married not counting those who were sealed to him after his death, in his own lifetime. (Ensign) Jerald and Sandra, Mormon—Shadow or Reality, (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilms Co., 1972), p. 211. In view of this evidence, it is impossible to Saints are fond of saying, that plural marriage was revealed to Joseph Smith practiced by his. (Ensign) Samuel H. McEwen, anyone can, of telling partial nonsense the invention of another story. (Ensign) Young.)

As a matter of fact, there is considerable evidence to the effect that Smith married many wives before the revelation of plural marriage on April 6, 1841. The revelation,
Feinberg, A. sources agree that Joseph Smith married Louisa Decker on April 5, 1831. In addition, Paul Brinton cites that Joseph took as his wife in Kirtland, Ohio in 1827. In addition, John Whitmer wrote that Joseph said: "in the fall of 1829, Joseph Smith Jr. took a few of the elders of the church at Kirtland, who were present at the time of the organization of the Church, and said: "to be the Church, History, and with this passion, this is a highly significant statement." (source: Brinton, "The Church, History, and with this passion, this is a highly significant statement.")

And, Oliver Cowdery referred to Smith's marriage to Pernie as "a dirty, mean, filthy affair."

F. Johnson, church Patriarch, states that Cowdery's fall from grace began at this point when he discovered Joseph and Pernie together.

But now, there is evidence that plural marriage goes back even further than Pernie Almon and Joseph Smith. Kenneth W. Godfrey, a historian, says he believes there is evidence to show that Joseph Smith seriously considered plural marriage as a part of the restoration of all things as early as 1831. /\ Kenneth W. Godfrey, "The
permitting it?

Lorenzo Snow was caught in this dilemma in the Temple Lot Case. (Snow is famous for penning the aphorism that reads, "As man is, God once was. As God is, man may become.") He testified that anyone living in plural marriage before July 12, 1843, was guilty of "adultery under the laws of the Church . . . ."\(^{15}\) As a result, he felt they would have been cut off from the Church. "I think I should have been if I had."\(^{16}\) Such a one was clearly in sin. By this judgement, his own sister, Eliza Roxey Snow Smith Young was an adulteress. By her own admission, she married Joseph Smith on June 29, 1842, more than one year before the revelation.\(^{17}\) When confronted regarding this problem, Snow relented and admitted that Eliza and Joseph were married under the laws of the Church before the revelation was received. "It put them in a first-rate, splendid condition for time and eternity."\(^{18}\)

Likewise, the Millennial Star contended that the

\(^{15}\)Tanner, Mormonism, p. 203.

\(^{16}\)Tanner, Mormonism, p. 203.


\(^{18}\)Tanner, Mormonism, p. 203.
in the presence of God in that circumstance, as fully as in any other. In my mental exercise, I was led to believe that some of my former errors were the proper means by which I was completely cleansed from the bondage of sin, which would, in all probability, have prevented me from the free exercise of the religion which had been, and was intended for, me.

In this state of mind, I was instructed by the spirit of Truth to be introduced into the church. The subject was very agreeable to my feelings, as I was very desirous of being in unison with my relations. I considered the church as the deposit of the inheritance of the saints in light, and the medium through which God was about to establish His kingdom. I was led to believe that I was called to the work of the ministry, and that I should be a partaker in the blessings of the dispensation of the grace of God.

I was also instructed to be united to a man of God, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station. I was instructed to be united to Joseph Smith, who should be my partner in the work of the ministry, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station. I was instructed to be united to Joseph Smith, who should be my partner in the work of the ministry, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station. I was instructed to be united to Joseph Smith, who should be my partner in the work of the ministry, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station. I was instructed to be united to Joseph Smith, who should be my partner in the work of the ministry, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station. I was instructed to be united to Joseph Smith, who should be my partner in the work of the ministry, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station. I was instructed to be united to Joseph Smith, who should be my partner in the work of the ministry, and that I should continue to be faithful in the work of the ministry, until I should be called to a higher station.
Church had no authority "to marry any more than one wife each" prior to 1843. The facts, as we have seen, do not support this claim. For Joseph Smith was telling women of the law of sealing long before it was publicly announced. President Joseph F. Smith told R. C. Evans the following:

This same Apostle of the church, speaking of the marriage of Aunt Lucy Walker, Smith Kimbel, to Joseph Smith, May 1st, 1843, says: "The strong point which he attempts to make is the fact that Lucy was married to the Prophet Joseph Smith on May 1st, 1843, while the revelation on plural marriage was dated July 12, 1843. No one knew better than she did that the REVELATION WAS GIVEN AS FAR BACK AS 1834, and was first reduced to writing in 1843."

We now possess an earlier revelation concerning polygamy dated July 27, 1842. Sarah Ann Whitney was a secret wife of Joseph Smith while still married to Joseph C. Kingsbury. The revelation reads:

Verily, thus saith the Lord unto my servant N. K. Whitney, the thing that my servant Joseph Smith has made known unto you and your family and which you have agreed upon is right in mine eyes and shall be rewarded upon your heads with honor and immortality and eternal life to all your house, both old and young because of the lineage of my Priesthood, saith the Lord, it shall be upon you and upon your children after you from generation to generation, by virtue of the holy promise which I now make unto you, saith the Lord. These are the words which you shall pronounce upon my servant Joseph and your daughter S. A. Whitney. They shall take each other by the hand and you shall say, You both mutually agree, calling them by name, to be each other's companion so long as you both shall live,

18Millennial Star, 19, p. 475.
19R. C. Evans, Forty Years in the Mormon Church (Toronto, Canada: n. p., 1920), P. 52.
preserving yourselves for each other and from all others and also throughout eternity, reserving only those rights which have been given to my servant Joseph by revelation and commandment and by legal authority in times past. If you both agree to covenant and do this, I then give you, S. A. Whitney, my daughter, to Joseph Smith, to be his wife, to observe all the rights between you both that belong to that condition. I do it in my own name and in the name of my holy progenitors, by the right of birth which is of priesthood, vested in me by revelation and commandment and promise of the living God, obtained by the holy Melchizedek Gethrow and others of the powers to concentrate in you and through you to your posterity forever. All these things I do in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that through this order he may be glorified and that through the power of anointing David may reign King over Israel, which shall hereafter be revealed. Let immortality and eternal life hereafter be sealed upon your heads forever and ever. 21

Since this revelation is as genuine or as false as any of Joseph's others (including Section 132), we are left to wonder why a revelation from God was not included in the collection of revelations printed. To say that its contents were of a personal nature is no solution, since many of the printed revelations are of a personal nature as well. A desire to prevent genuine embarrassment is a more likely motive, since this reads more like a child playing games than a Prophet of God at work.

But, Mormon apologists do not escape this easily. Merely moving the revelation backward in time does not

help them. Neither the Mormon leaders nor Joseph Smith are necessarily acquitted of charges of either immorality or deception. If God had, indeed, given the Church revelation of a new and everlasting covenant which was of such importance that the man who did not abide in it would be damned, why was it kept such a total secret from the world? Are we to believe that a covenant of such importance was not even written down for a decade and still was not spoken of openly until 1852? And why was it that every time the authorities of the Church were hard pressed regarding the matter, they denied in public that any such doctrine existed (as late as 1852)? Would not that have been a good time to clarify matters publicly? It would have been if revelation of God's Will to earth had been the genuine motivation of the Principle. Therefore, we can safely assert that such was not the purpose of the document.

How is it that Section 101 came to be publicly printed in the 1835 edition of the *Doctrine and Covenants* while Joseph Smith and some others in leadership were privately living promiscuous lives? We are told that the Prophet was out of town when this Article on Marriage was approved by the Church in session. We are told that Oliver Cowdery or W. W. Phelps wrote it (there-
fore, we are told, it could not have been a revelation. But, we are not told how they dared to do such a thing without Joseph's permission. Nor are we told why Joseph never rebuked them for their error in teaching monogamous marriage at a later date. And we are not told why the Prophet could not prevent its being printed in the collection of sacred revelations at that time. But, even more damaging, we are not told why he never, in the nine years of life left him following the 1835 Edition, publicly repudiated the contents of that Section or the doctrine it contained as error. Section 132 commanded the plural marriage Smith was practicing. Section 101, however, stated that "one man should have one wife." Joseph Smith never even intimated that Section 101 should be removed from the 1844 Edition. In fact, he even printed it in Times and Seasons as part of his campaign against John C. Bennett. The section on monogamous marriage continued to be printed in all editions of the Doctrine and Covenants until 1876. (This is true in spite of the fact that polygamy had been publicly preached in Utah as early as 1852). Since Section 101 completely contradicted Section 132, it was removed so that Section 132 could be printed.

---


24 *Times and Seasons*, 3, p. 939.
The casual way in which these "revelations of God" were treated by the Mormons makes one wonder of what real value these revelations were.

In the context of the general and recognized patterns of deception operating within the Mormon hierarchy, this section on monogamous marriage appears to be a cleverly constructed propaganda vehicle. It even contains within itself the germ for a later public reinterpretation of its contents. It said:

Inasmuch as this church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication, and polygamy; we declare that we believe, that one man should have one wife; and one woman, but one husband, except in the case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.25

The placement of the comma suggests that fornication was considered a crime, but polygamy was not. It speaks of "the crime of fornication," and, as well, of "polygamy." In addition, while it says that a woman should have "but one husband" (a statement which limits her to only one), it only says of a man that he should have one wife. It does not say he cannot have more than one. Thus, even though the Section on marriage seems to deny the possibility of polygamy among the Mormons, it actually did no such thing. It had a loophole big enough to drive a tank

through.

We should ask ourselves why the Church would be reproached for practicing polygamy. This document strongly suggests that the non-Mormon world already had an inkling of what was taking place in Joseph Smith's bedroom. Yet, Lorenzo Snow, who knew better, maintained in all sobriety that polygamy before 1843 was "adultery."26 Thus, we have caught both Lorenzo Snow and Joseph Smith in deliberate deception, one in court testimony and the other by his life-style. There is no evidence to indicate that this was anything other than the deliberate policy of the Mormon hierarchy.

Now, if Joseph Smith had actually been a Prophet of the living God, we would have expected him to be unequivocal and unashamed in the defense of the revealed will of the Lord. The Old Testament is replete with examples of Prophets who did not hesitate to proclaim "the whole counsel of God" (Acts 20:27) despite persecution and trial and tribulation. We are reminded of Jeremiah, who went to prison for the Word and would not allow it to be misrepresented. There was also Samuel, the son of a polygamist, who was not afraid to tell a king to his face that God had rejected him because he had rejected the Word of the Lord. But,

26 Tanner, Mormonism, p. 203.
Joseph Smith hid his talent in the earth, knowing that he had a hard Master and that the world was not ready for His revelation. We might pause to consider just who this Master was. It is clear that it was not the God of the Bible.

Thus began a deliberate policy of lies and deception, one which the heirarchies of the various Mormon movements have seen fit to perpetuate in varying degrees, to this day. Elder John Jaques frankly admitted that such was the case when he declared:

The answer is very plain, because neither the body of the Saints nor Christendom were prepared for it—Neither is it wisdom in the Elders to publish all knowledge the moment it is revealed to them. Your little child asks you various questions respecting its origin, or its course when it shall arrive at maturity, and makes most amusing remarks on the subject, you sit and smile at it, you do not tell it the truth about these things—but you consider it proper and wise to evade its interrogations, or to refuse to answer them. ... If the doctrine of polygamy had been publicly preached by the Elders when the church was in its infancy, and when the saints were comparatively ignorant and weak in the faith, it is probable that very few indeed would have been able to endure.27

Jaques is telling us that the God that Joseph Smith knew and revealed was so completely odious in nature, that his direct revelations not only could not be endured

by civilized society, but they could not even be endured by some initiates to the "one true Church."

We are told that even Joseph Smith was revolted by the contents of the revelation and entered into polygamy only after being threatened with destruction. And Brigham Young later said:

Some of these my brethren know what my feelings were at the time Joseph revealed the doctrine; I was not desirous of shrinking from any duty, nor of failing in the least to do as I was commanded, but it was the first time in my life that I had desired the grave, and I could hardly get over it for a long time. And when I saw a funeral, I felt to envy the corpse its situation, and to regret that I was not in the coffin, knowing the toil and labor that my body would have to undergo; and I have had to examine myself, from that day to this, and watch my faith, and carefully meditate, lest I should be found desiring the grave more than I ought to do.

You will probably wonder at this, and that such should have been my feelings upon this point, but they were even so.29

Sometimes, various Saints who knew about spiritual wifery would become indiscreet in action or proclamation. Smith's general policy was to make an example of such persons to save the more discreet practitioners of plural marriage from a similar shame.

John Cook Bennett was the most well-known of these examples. Some Mormon writers claim that Bennett was


29Journal of Discourses, 3, p. 266.
never told of the divine revelation because Smith always questioned Bennet's moral standards. In this respect, it is true that Smith produced a letter which said that Bennett had left a wife behind in McConnelsville, Morgan County, Ohio, "but knowing that it is no uncommon thing for good men to be evil spoken against, the above letter was kept quiet but held in reserve." But, even after Bennett began keeping company with unmarried women in Nauvoo, Smith did no more than privately confront him with this evidence and warn him that he would be exposed if he persisted in his actions. There were no witnesses of this event. In short, this letter and the facts it contained had no effect on Bennett's meteoric rise in Mormon circles. Joseph Smith saw nothing wrong in his close association with a wife deserter.

Actually, the validity of this letter is a problem. It was written in 1841 from McConnelsville, Ohio by George Miller, Master of the Nauvoo Mason's Lodge and Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Joseph Smith claimed the letter had been written by a resident of McConnelsville, while we know that he was from Nauvoo. The letter was not unsolicited.


31Compare Smith's attitude with Brigham Young's. Young married Augusta Cobb Young of Boston who had deserted her husband and family. And she married him without bothering to divorce her first husband.
Miller reminds the Prophet that the letter was written "by your request." This implies that Joseph Smith had reason to suspect Bennett from the beginning. But, he did no more than send Miller to dig up the dirt for his files. This same Miller reported in the Wasp a year later that Bennett had been left by his wife "under satisfactory evidence of his adulterous connections."

Thus, it is clear that Joseph Smith knew of Bennett's propensities for sexual immorality for about a year before he took any action to curb him. Legally, this makes Joseph Smith, Jr., an accomplice in all of Bennett's misbehavior.

And, on May 26, 1842, the very day that Bennett was supposed to have confessed his "wicked and licentious conduct toward certain females, ..." Joseph made a significant address to the Relief Society which seems to touch upon the whole matter. The sermon was reported by Eliza Roxel Snow (who was soon to become the Prophet's plural wife). Eliza quoted Smith in the following terms:

There is another error which opens a door for the adversary to enter. As females possess refined feelings and sensitiveness, they are also subject to overmuch zeal, which ever must prove dangerous, and cause them to be rigid in a religious capacity—

---

32*Times and Seasons*, 3, p. 839.
33*The Wasp [Nauvoo]*, June 25, 1842, p. 3.
[they] should be armed with mercy, notwithstanding the iniquity among us. Said he had been instrumental in bringing iniquity to light—it was a melancholy thought and awful that so many should place themselves under the condemnation of the devil, and going to perdition. With deep feeling he said that they are fellow mortals, we loved them once, shall we not encourage them to reformation? We have not [yet] forgiven them seventy times seven as our Saviour directed; perhaps we have not forgiven them once.35

These are strange words indeed. One would not think that Smith would speak of forgiving seventy times seven after Bennett had openly confessed defiling the fair women of Zion, yet the record speaks for itself. How unlike the example of the Apostle Paul, a true Prophet of God, who delivered such a one to Satan "that he might learn not to blaspheme." (I Tim. 1:20; I Cor 5:1-5.)

As if this were not enough, however, Smith proceeds still deeper into the quagmire. His argument, as recorded by E. R. Snow, continued:

At this time, the truth on the guilty shall not be told openly, strange as this may seem, yet this is policy. We must use precaution in bringing sinners to justice, lest in exposing these heinous sins we draw the indignation of a Gentile world upon us (and, to their imagination, justly too.)."36

Expediency was the first order of the day.

Indeed, it was more than the order of the day. It was made necessary because of Bennett's prominence in

the Mormon establishment. Joseph was Prophet and
Lieutenant General of the Nauvoo Legion. Bennett was
Mayor of Nauvoo and Major General of the Legion. Only
a month earlier, Bennett had served as President pro tempore
of the General Conference of the Church in Joseph's
absence. In this case, Joseph's choice of Bennett was
surprising, because Nauvoo was already teeming with
rumors about Bennett's debauchery.37 John J. Stewart
points out that it is impossible to believe that the
Prophet was still unaware of Bennett's promiscuity in
April, 1842. "Why he would still honor Bennett as he
did at the conference is puzzling."38

We do not have to look far to find a reason for
this, however. The Prophet pled for Bennett's forgiveness
and restoration because Bennett had him over a barrel.
He knew too much. He had charged that the leaders of
the church were guilty of promiscuity disguised as a
divine system of plural marriage.39 And it was true.
Many of his charges have been independently substantiated.

For instance, Bennett wrote that Smith had claimed
Sarah Pratt as one of his plural wives with the following

37 John J. Stewart, Joseph Smith the Mormon Prophet,


39 Smith et al., History, V, p. 42.
approach: "Sister Pratt, the Lord has given you to me as one of my spiritual wives." It is hard to see how the Prophet's polygamy was less reprehensible than his disciple's. Bennett was notably promiscuous, but Joseph Smith more so. During this period of time, the Prophet was primarily involved in taking to himself women who were already married to other men. He would tell them that the marriage covenants they had made were void and God had given them to him as wife. They fell in line like sheep.

In short, the fact that Bennett was a vile man does not clear Joseph Smith. From 1831 until his death, he privately practiced and sanctioned plural marriage while publicly denying that the Latter-day Saints had any such doctrine. And, when his friend and confidant got caught, Joseph naturally set out to destroy him.

But, even though Bennett had been removed as a liability to the cause, he was not openly attacked until he began publishing anti-Mormon material in the Sangamo Journal. It was no longer expedient to forgive and forget. All rhetoric about forgiving seventy times

---

40 Tanner, Mormonism, p. 219.

41 Among these women were: Sally Ann Fuller Gatty, wife of Samuel Gatty; a Mrs. Durfee; Delcera Johnson Sherman, widow of Irman Sherman; Patty Bartlett Sessions, wife of David Sessions; and Mary Elizabeth Rollins Lightner, wife of Adam Lightner. See Brodie, p. 335.
seven became irrelevant.

Thus began a great media campaign against Bennett.

It took a while for *Times and Seasons* to catch up with the pace of events, however. In the issue of June 1, 1842, Bennett's signature appeared in connection with the office of Mayor of Nauvoo, Illinois. In that same issue, Joseph Smith defended Bennett's viewpoint on abolition.\(^4^2\)

This was one week after Bennett's confession was recorded in *History of the Church*.

But, in *Times and Seasons* for June 15, 1842, the first printed evidence of a parting of the ways is found. On the back page, a short notice reads:

**NOTICE**

The subscribers, members of the First Presidency of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, withdraw the hand of fellowship from General John C. Bennett, as a Christian, he having been labored with from time to time, to persuade him to amend his conduct, apparently to no good effect.

JOSEPH SMITH,
HYRUM SMITH,
W. LAW.

The following members of the Quorum of the Twelve concur in the above sentiments.

BRIGHAM YOUNG,
HERBERT C. KIMBALL,
LYMAN WIGHT,
WILLIAM SMITH,
JOHN B. PAGE,
JOHN TAYLOR,
WILFORD WOODRUFF,
GEORGE A. SMITH,
WILLARD RICHARDS.

We concur in the above sentiment.

\(^4^2\) *Times and Seasons*, 3, p. 814.
N. K. WHITNEY,
V. KNIGHT,
GEORGE MILLER,
Bishops of the above mentioned Church,
Nauvoo, May 11, 1842. 43

Notice that there is no mention of spiritual wifery.
Smith was clearly reluctant to publicly state the
real reason for Bennett's departure (and with good
reason). It may be alright to let one hundred hand-
picked Saints hear Bennett's confession, but it would
never do to publish those gross details to the whole
world. Smith's restraint was still operative to a
degree.

There is a curious historical problem which related
to this notice. Times and Seasons demonstrated that
Bennett was disfellowshipped on May 11, 1842. History
of the Church conflicts with this date. Smith's entry
for May 11, 1842, does not even mention Bennett's name. 44
In fact, I could find no indication of any awareness of
a morals problem regarding Bennett in History of the
Church until May 17, 1842. 45 On that date, we are told
that John Cook Bennett made an affidavit to Daniel H.

43Times and Seasons, 3, p. 830.

44Smith et al., History, V, p. 6.

45The only negative entry regarding Bennett's char-
acter that I could find in History of the Church was
about a minor breach in military manners (May 7, 1842)
in the Nauvoo Legion. Sexual morality was not mentioned.
The Prophet regarded the matter as a plot on his life.
Wells, an alderman of the City of Nauvoo, regarding the morals of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{46} On May 19, both sources agree that Bennett appeared before the City Council and testified falsely that Joseph Smith had never had anything to do with plural marriage.\textsuperscript{47} Finally, on May 25, \textit{History of the Church} states that Bennett was notified of his disfellowshipped status.\textsuperscript{48} That would be fourteen days after the fact.

It is hard to believe that Bennett had been cut off from fellowship for fourteen days before being notified. After all, we know that the Prophet saw him on the nineteenth (and possibly the seventeenth as well). Another thing difficult to understand about all this is why he confessed his sin on May 26, fifteen days after he was determined to be guilty? And, equally difficult to understand is why the Prophet (for his signature appears on the notice) disfellowshipped Bennett on

\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Times and Seasons}, 3, p. 840. It would appear that \textit{Times and Seasons} served as the primary source for \textit{History of the Church} when it was compiled (cf. \textit{Times and Seasons}, 3, pp. 841-2 and Smith et al., \textit{History}, V, pp. 32-3). In spite of this interdependence, serious chronological difficulties are manifest. The Mormon claim that \textit{History of the Church} is the most perfect of all histories composed by men is bunk.

\textsuperscript{47}There is evidence that Bennett may have testified under psychological duress, but the case is not granted a high degree of probability. It matters little. Based on what we know of the Prophet from other sources, it is certain that Bennett lied when he appeared before Wells.

\textsuperscript{48}Smith et al., \textit{History}, V, p. 18.
May 11 only to plead for mercy on May 26? As it stands, his behavior was totally inconsistent. It was so inconsistent that it is hard to believe that even Joseph Smith would have been guilty of it. The documentary evidence must be in error. Since this is the case, *Times and Seasons*, a primary source document, should be preferred over *History of the Church* wherever there are chronological conflicts. For, this portion of *History of the Church* was neither written by Joseph Smith nor was it written during his lifetime. The compilation of this portion of *History of the Church* was performed by Thomas Bullock between April 14, 1845 and July 3, 1845.\(^9\) *Times and Seasons* has the advantage of being edited by the Prophet himself.

The motivation behind Bennett's confession is difficult to assess. It may be that he hoped that a lie would help in his restoration. More likely, he just wanted to get out of Nauvoo in safety.

On July 1, the first written tirade of any length appeared in *Times and Seasons*. The document was damaging to Bennett, but it also had a boomerang effect. Smith admitted that he knew of Bennett's actions, but had really done nothing about them. In that journal he wrote:

When he said that I would not submit to any such conduct, he went to some of the females in the city, who knew nothing of him but as an honorable man, and began to teach them that promiscuous intercourse between the sexes, was a doctrine believed in by the Latter-Day Saints, and that there was no harm in it; but this failing, he had recourse to a more influential and desperately wicked course; and that was, to persuade them that myself and others of the authorities of the church not only sanctioned, but practiced the same wicked acts; and when asked why I publicly preached so much against it, said that it was because of the prejudice of the public, and that it would cause trouble in my own house.  

One wonders where Bennett got such depraved ideas, if not from Joseph Smith himself. At a previous point, we noted in passing that Joseph Smith used comparable methods in his attempted seduction of Sarah Pratt (of whom more will be said later) Bennett used similar methods in approaching Martha Brotherton as well.  

In short, Bennett's methods appear to have been the established policy of the Nauvoo elite. One painful question supports this hypothesis. If Joseph Smith knew of Bennett's depraved promiscuity in the summer of 1841, why did he not disfellowship him immediately? It would seem that Joseph Smith felt there was nothing wrong with sexual promiscuity, provided one did not get ...

---

50 Times and Seasons, 3, p. 840.
51 See page 22.
52 Tanner, Mormonism, pp. 220-1.
caught.

The July 1 issue also carried two anonymous letters concerning Bennett's character. One is from Urbana, Illinois and dated June, 1842. The other is from Monticello, Illinois and dated June 3, 1842. As can easily be seen, both were posted after Bennett was disfellowshipped. They could have been written by Mormons and posted from those towns. Therefore, little historical value can be given these letters.

On August 1, another long attack on Bennett was printed. The Prophet compared Bennett with all the arch-heretics who have ever lived. The same issue also records several relevant activities in Nauvoo during the end of July.

On the twenty-second of July, the City Council petitioned Governor Carlin in behalf of Joseph Smith. The petition specifically denied Bennett's charges. The Council was guilty of deception, for the following men were members of the City Council in Nauvoo at that time: Wilson Law, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, Winson Knight, Heber C. Kimball, John P. Greene, William Marks, George A. Smith, George W. Harris, Newel K. Whitney, Brigham Young, Charles C. Rich, and Orson Spencer. Several of these men probably knew about plural marriage. For instance, Newel K. Whitney would know just five days later that his daughter,
Sarah Ann Whitney, was given by revelation to the Prophet as a plural wife. By July 22, Whitney probably had an inkling of that.

One man definitely knew about the revelation of plural marriage, turning the document into a patent lie by his signature. His name was Brigham Young. He claims to know that the Prophet had given no revelation of plural marriage. Yet, he was, at that very time, living in plural marriage sanctioned by the Prophet himself. It is possible that some of the signatories may have known nothing of plural marriage, but the signature of one deceiver invalidates the entire document. Brigham Young should have told the truth.

The same day, a public meeting was held in Nauvoo. About a thousand men were present. They passed a resolution which stated that Joseph Smith was good, moral and virtuous, a defender of the Constitution. History of the Church stated that this resolution passed "unanimously." Even this, proved to be a fraudulent statement, however. The evidence proves that not

53See pages 10 and 11.

54Stewart, Brigham, pp. 79-80, 85.

55Smith, et al., History, V, p. 70. History of the Church needs to be totally reorganized in a scholarly fashion. Until the Mormon Church sees fit to produce a scholarly edition with a workable apparatus, students of Mormon history would be wise to take this source cum grano salis.
everyone in Nauvoo felt that Joseph Smith was good and moral and virtuous. A check of the same article as it appeared in the Millennial Star reveals that the word "unanimously" was added to the text at a later date than it, for it is absent from that printing.\textsuperscript{56} In this regard, Times and Seasons, the primary source, is even more explicit. It notes opposition to the resolution.

Two or three voted in the negative.
Elder Orson Pratt then rose and spoke at some length in explanation of his negative vote.
Pres. Joseph Smith spoke in reply—

Question to Elder Pratt. 'Have you personally a knowledge of any immoral act in me toward the female sex, or in any other way?' Answer, by Elder O. Pratt, 'Personally, toward the female sex, I have not.'

Elder O. Pratt responded at some length.
Elder B. Young then spoke in reply, and was followed by Elders Wm. Jiw H. C. Kimball and Pres. H. Smith. Several others spoke bearing testimony of the iniquity of those who had calumniated Pres. J. Smith's character.\textsuperscript{57}

Thus, the pattern of deception is complete. While the most recent source says the vote was unanimous, the source closest to the event says that the Apostle Orson Pratt had grave doubts as to the morality of his Prophet.

Why did Pratt doubt the truth of the resolution? Why did he challenge the entire Mormon movement? He knew that his wife had been approached by Joseph while he had been on a mission to England. We have already

\textsuperscript{56}\textit{Millennial Star}, 19, p. 615.

\textsuperscript{57}\textit{Times and Seasons}, 3, p. 869.
seen Bennett's claim that Joseph tried to seduce Mrs. Pratt. This claim has been confirmed by Mrs. Pratt as well. As late as 1886, she still told people that the Prophet had attempted to seduce her in the presence of John Cook Bennett.

He knew that Joseph had his plans set on me; Joseph made no secret of them before Bennett, and went so far in his impudence as to make propositions to me in the presence of Bennett, his bosom friend. . . . He used to state to his intended victims, as he did to me: "God does not care if we have a good time, if only other people do not know it." He only introduced a marriage ceremony when he had found out that he could not get certain women without it. 58

Yet, Joseph silenced Orson in one respect. He could not speak as an eyewitness because he had never caught the Prophet in the act. All he could speak of was the hearsay evidence of his wife. Personally, he knew nothing. His testimony would not have stood up in court without the corroboration of other witnesses.

On this occasion, a very common Mormon defense came into play. Prominent elders stood up and bore testimony against anyone who would "calumniate" the Prophet's character. Such a person was guilty of iniquity. They did not deny or disprove the allegations. They bore testimony to the iniquity of their opponents. After all, everyone knows that an iniquitous man can never speak the truth. An apostate is not a trust-

58Tanner, Mormonism, p. 220.
worthy witness in a rape case. This Mormon para-legal psychology is still in effect.

The only problem with this Mormon defense is that Orson Pratt consistently behaved (in that time frame) like a man who had been wronged. There is contemporary evidence that he may have temporarily gone insane on his return from England.59 On this date, he was one of three who had the courage to challenge the Prophet.60

On August 15, 1862, *Times and Seasons* again attacked the morality of John C. Bennett. At this time, the Prophet cited Section 101 as proof of the falsity of Bennett's charges.61

On October 1, 1862, the matter climaxed in *Times and Seasons*. Section 101 was again printed as a defense. Joseph Smith added:

> We have given the above rule of marriage as the only one practiced in this church, to show that Dr. J. C. Bennett's "secret wife system" is a matter of his own manufacture; and further to disabuse the public ear, and shew that the said Bennett and his misanthropic friend Origen Bachelor, are perpetrating an foul and infamous slander upon an innocent people, and need but be known to be hated and despised.62


60Later, Pratt surrendered and was restored to his place of honor in the church. He became the Apostle of polygamy. He was given the honor of being the first to publicly preach polygamy in Utah in 1852.

61Times and Seasons, 3, p. 900.

62Times and Seasons, 3, p. 930.
Notice that the Prophet called monogamous marriage "the only" rule of marriage practiced in the Mormon Church. That statement was a bald-faced lie. The Prophet knew that plural marriage was a proper order of marriage in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints! Perhaps some people did not know, but the Prophet knew!

Equally interesting is the certificate of the Relief Society. They declared that monogamous marriage was the only form being practiced by the Saints. Again, however, among the signers were people who either knew about plural marriage or should have. By 1842, Emma Smith was probably aware of her husband's sexual activities. Sarah M. Cleveland is said to have married the Prophet in 1842. Eliza Roxey Snow married the Prophet on June 29, 1842. Some of the others may have had information. In short, some of the signers of this document were liars. Deception again raised its ugly head, most likely at the direction of the Prophet.

The Bennett matter was the bitterest and most public case of wrangling over polygamy during the Nauvoo. But, it was not unique. By the Nauvoo period, polygamy was an open secret. The inner circle of

---

63Brodie, p. 335. 64Brodie, p. 335. Palmer, p. 130.

65Joseph Smith was Editor of *Times and Seasons*. 
Saints already knew, a large number of the Mormons still thought monogamy was the only order of marriage. For instance, William Clayton took a plural wife in April, 1843 at the direction of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{66} Orson Hyde had three wives before the revelation.\textsuperscript{67}

But, the doctrine was top secret. There was no forgiveness if one got caught. And the punishment for public proclamation was severe. In History of the Church we find this entry for May 24, 1842:

Chauncey L. Higbee was cut off from the Church by the High Council, for unchaste and unvirtuous conduct toward certain females, and for teaching it was right, if kept secret, &c. He was also put under $200 bonds to keep the peace, on my complaint against him for slander, before Ebenezer Robinson, justice of the peace.\textsuperscript{68}

John J. Stewart also lists persons who practiced the so-called false spiritual wife system, among them: "Robert Foster, Francis and Chauncey Higbee and others, as well as William and Wilson Law."\textsuperscript{69}

And Hiram Brown was cut off as well:

NOTICE

As we have lately been creditably 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

\textsuperscript{66}Dyer, p. 120. \textsuperscript{67}Dyer, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{68}Smith et al., History, V, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{69}Stewart, Brigham, p. 33.
of Michigan.

This is to notify him and the Church in general, that he has been cut off from the church, for his iniquity; and he is further notified to appear at the Special Conference, on the 6th of April next, to make answer to these charges.

JOSEPH SMITH.
HYRUM SMITH.
Presidents of said Church.70

When one realizes that Hiram Brown was cut off from the Church for preaching polygamy half a year after the revelation (published Feb 1, 1844) and that he was cut off by two polygamists, both of whom had been present when the revelation was written down on July 12, 1843, he sees that the lies and deception did not cease with the writing down of the revelation.

A related matter also appeared in May, 1844, relating to a legal action between Joseph Smith, Sr., and Francis M. Higbee in May, 1844.71

In short, a man who publicly preached polygamy spoke the truth apart from the permission of the Prophet. Truth spoken apart from permission was a crime. Joseph expressed this attitude in the History of the Church:

> There is never but one on earth at a time on whom the power and its keys are conferred and I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time, unless the Lord directs otherwise.72

---

70Times and Seasons, 5, p. 423.
71Times and Seasons, 5, p. 538.
72Smith et al., History, VI, p. 46.
Polygamy was permissible if the Prophet allowed it. The statement Smith made in the Elder's Journal about not believing in polygamy was a lie.\textsuperscript{73} So was his statement that he was accused of having seven wives, but only "can...find one."\textsuperscript{74}

In spite of this aura of secrecy, the Gentiles knew that the Mormon Church was honey-combed with polygamy during the Nauvoo period. Fawn Brodie gives us this example of Gentile poetry, entitled "Buckeye's Lamentation for Want of More Wives." This poem, published in February, 1844, preceded any official proclamation of polygamy by eight years. Yet, it reads so much like Section 132 that one wonders if the author had a copy of the revelation in hand. Part of it reads:

I once thought I had knowledge great,
But now I find 'tis small.
I thought I'd religion too,
But now I find I've none at all—
For I have but ONE LONE WIFE,
And can obtain no more;
And the doctrine is I can't be saved,
Unless I've HALF A SCORE.

***

A TENFOLD glory—that's the prize!
Without it you're undone!
But with it you will shine as bright
As the bright shining sun.
There you may shine like mighty Gods

\textsuperscript{73}Smith, et al., History, III, pp. 28-9.

\textsuperscript{74}Smith, et al., History, VI, p. 411.
On June 27, 1844, Joseph and Hyrum Smith were shot in a jail in Carthage, Illinois. The church they established went on after them and continued to live (at first secretly and then openly) the sort of polygamous life that the Prophet had lived for the last thirteen years of his life. The church, by accepting the validity of this revelation, took to its bosom a dangerous weapon that would come close to destroying it in the next half-century. In fact, the doctrine and its repudiation are, even today, proof positive of the human origin of the whole system. In addition, serious theological difficulties were created by the acceptance of polygamy. For one thing, it created the problem of conflicting revelations and conflicting Prophets. As we shall see, the same sort of lies and deception that Joseph Smith lived with were inherited by all those who later accepted the mantle of the fallen Prophet.

We see in Mormonism the awesome spectre of a so-called Prophet of God speaking deceitful lies in the name of God while excommunicating men for speaking the truth. John Cook Bennett was a vile man, yet much of

Brodie, p. 344.
of what he said against the Prophet was true. Since Joseph Smith was a liar, he is shown to be of his father the devil, father of all lies (John 8:44). It is to be hoped that Latter-day Saints will seek out the facts of the matter so that God can deliver them from the bondage of this false Prophet, who spoke lies in hypocrisy, "having his conscience seared with a hot iron."

(I Tim 4:2.)
Chapter 3

NON-BRIGHAMITES AND PLURAL MARRIAGE:
ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AND DECEPTION

Some have argued that plural marriage was the creation of Brigham Young. We have demonstrated, however, that the practice of plural marriage began in 1831. Thus, it is impossible to consider plural marriage a Brighamite invention.

Further, it is possible to show that several non-Brighamite Mormon sects also adopted plural marriage in the 1840's and 1850's. The same sort of deception that accompanied polygamy in Nauvoo was an integral part of the practice of polygamy in these splinter groups. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine some of the relevant data and to draw conclusions based on that examination.

The Strangites were polygamous from their founding until the murder of their leader on Beaver Island. Evans noted: "James J. Strang taught and practiced it till his murder, and he professed till death that Joseph ordained him his successor." ¹

"Sidney Rigdon practiced it in his little

¹Evans, p. 39.
church. Thus, the Bickertonite Mormons were at least briefly polygamous. Sidney Rigdon, in 1885, declared:

This system was introduced by the Smiths sometime before their death, and was the thing which put them in the power of their enemies, and was the immediate cause of their death. This statement was made after Sidney's loss of power in Nauvoo.

Not even the Reorganization can completely escape the taint of polygamy and deception. William Smith, the brother of the Prophet Joseph, had a role in the creation of a series of irregular conferences which culminated in the formation of the New Organization. The conference held at Palestine, Illinois, in October, 1851, made an "open confession of polygamy as a system of faith and practice." Several important people there were polygamists, among them, William Smith.

---

2Evans, p. 39.
3Messenger and Advocate, II, p. 457.
4Dyer, p. 110. 5Dyer, p. 110.
6The following important Reorganized people had been present at the Palestine Conference which adopted plural marriage and the Revelation: James Blakeslee, later Presiding Bishop of the Reorganization; Jason Briggs, an important man in the formative period; William Smith, who had been considered for the Presidency of the Reorganization but had been passed over. Also present were E. P. Briggs, Edwin Cadwell, John Harrington, Aaron Hook, Henry Love, Alva Smith, Lyman Wight, Joseph Wood, C. F. Stiles, and Tra J. Patten. See Dyer, pp. 112-7.
The Palestine conference was ten months in advance of the time Orson Pratt publicly preached plural marriage in Utah. 7

Because of the implications of this decision, the Reorganization has tried to disassociate itself from the Palestine conference. They have dated the foundation of the New Organization in 1852. But, the problem is not solved that easily.

For as late as 1855, they were still praying for light 'on this important matter,' and received a supposed 'revelation' saying: 'That which ye have received as my celestial law is not of me.' 8

Thus, the New Organization had "received" the celestial law of marriage. Their later repudiation of it does not change that fact. The embarrassing nature of these facts will not allow the Reorganization Saints to speak historical truth any more than their brethren in Salt Lake. The Reorganization has created a suprahistorical myth of its own.

Jason Briggs, one of the founders of the Reorganization, apostasized in 1886 because he felt he was being forced to change the facts of history for religious reasons. He was a witness in the Temple Lot Case.

There he testified as follows:

I heard something about a revelation on Polygamy or Plural Marriage, when I was in Nauvoo,

7Dyer, p. 110. 8Dyer, p. 110-1.
in 1842. I heard there was one; there was talk going on about it at that time, and continued to be; but it was not called Plural Marriage, it was called sealing.

You ask me what I understood this Sealing to be, at the time the talk was going on. What I understood it to be was sealing a woman to a man to be his wife, to be his wife hereafter, his wife in the Spirit World.

I was asked in direct examination if I did not hear of the doctrine of Polygamy, etc., and I answered that I talked with members with reference to sealing, and I understood that the doctrine of sealing, was for eternity; it was sealing a man's wife to him for eternity, or wives either.9

Briggs also wrote a letter to J. T. Clark on February 13, 1863, in which he said:

I was at Nauvoo in 1843, the year it was found necessary to localize polygamy by a revelation. No, I have no doubt as to the authorship of that (so-called) revelation of July 12, 1843. It has all the ear-marks to identify it as the product of the mouthpiece of those days.10

In 1860, the first issue of The True Latter Day Saints' Herald was printed in Cincinnati. The names of William Marks, Zenas H. Gurley, and Wm. W. Blair are represented on the cover as the publishing committee of the New Organization.

This publication contained a lengthy discourse proving that polygamy was contrary to the laws and revelations of God. The author argued that the church had been guilty of deceit and hypocrisy in passing the

9Dyer, p. 111.
original revelation on monogamous marriage while secretly living in polygamy.\textsuperscript{11} (This was precisely the contention of Chapter 2 above.) The publishers of The True Latter Day Saints' Herald also felt that Joseph Smith had repented of his activities with regard to polygamy at the end of his life. William Parks wrote:

About the first of June, 1844, (situated as I was at that time, being the Presiding Elder of the Stake at Nauvoo, and by appointment the Presiding Officer of the High Council) I had a very good opportunity to know the affairs of the Church, and my convictions at that time were, that the Church in a great measure had departed from the pure principles and doctrines of Jesus Christ. I felt much troubled in mind about the condition of the Church. I prayed earnestly to my Heavenly Father to show me something in regard to it, when I was warranted in vision, and it was shown me by the Spirit, that the top or branches had overcome the root, in sin and wickedness, and the only way to cleanse and purify it was, to disorganize it, and in due time, the Lord would reorganize it again. There were many other things suggested to my mind, but the lapse of time has erased them from my memory. A few days after this occurrence, I met with Brother Joseph. He said that he wanted to converse with me on the affairs of the Church, and we retired by ourselves. I will give his words verbatim, for they are indelibly stamped upon my mind. He said he had desired for a long time to have a talk with me on the subject of polygamy. He said it eventually would prove the overthrow of the Church, and we should soon be obliged to leave the United States, unless it could be speedily put down. He was satisfied that it was a cursed doctrine, and that there must be every exertion made to put it down. He said that he would go before the congregation and proclaim against it, and I must go into the High Council, and he would prefer charges against those

\textsuperscript{11}The True Latter Day Saints' Herald, J, 1 (1860), p. 7.
in transgression, and I must sever them from the Church, unless they made ample satisfaction. There was much more said, but this was the substance. The mob commenced to gather about Carthage in a few days after, therefore there was nothing done concerning it. After the Prophet's death, I made mention of this conversation to several, hoping and believing that it would have a good effect, but to my great disappointment, it was soon rumored about that Brother Marks was about to apostatize, and that all that he said about the conversation with the Prophet was a tissue of lies. From that time I was satisfied that the Church would be disorganized, and the death of the Prophet and Patriarch, tended to confirm me in that opinion. From that time I was looking for a re-organization of the Church and Kingdom of God. I feel thankful that I have lived to again behold the day, when the basis of the Church is the revelations of Jesus Christ, which is the only sure foundation to build upon. I feel to invite all my brethren to become identified with us, for the Lord is truly in our midst.

WILLIAM MARKS.
Shabbonas, De Kalb Co., Ill., Oct. 23rd, 1859.

This document is historically untrue. Marks' conversation with the Prophet was conveniently close in time to the murder of the Prophet. The Prophet was spared the necessity of acting out his repentance. There were no witnesses to the event. The conversation is, therefore, beyond the realm of verification. Further, Marks did not see fit to publish this conversation until fifteen years after the event. He claims that he spoke to individuals at the time, but names no one who can even confirm that part of the story. When one remembers that Marks was a member of the publishing committee of

---

the New Organization and sees that his letter supported
the vested interests of the New Organization, one
becomes disinclined to grant any credence to it.
The letter seems to be a carefully perpetrated fraud.

Yet, Isaac Sheen, the Editor of The True Latter Day
Saints' Herald, declared:

The Salt Lake apostles also excuse themselves
by saying that Joseph Smith taught the spirit-
ual wife doctrine, but this excuse is as weak
as their excuse concerning the ancient Kings
and Patriarchs. Joseph Smith repented of his
connections with this doctrine, and said that
it was of the devil. He caused the revelations
on that subject to be burned, and when he volun-
tarily came to Nauvoo and resigned himself into
the arms of his enemies, he said that he was
going to Carthage to die. At that time he also
said, that if it had not been for that accursed
spiritual wife doctrine, he would not have come
to that. By his conduct at that time he proved
the sincerity of his repentance, and of his
profession as a prophet. If Abraham and Jacob,
by repentance, can obtain salvation and exaltation,
so can Joseph Smith.13

He is forced to admit that the Prophet taught the
spiritual wife doctrine, but adds that he repented.
Unfortunately for the Reorganization, however, such
a repentant Joseph Smith never existed. For this
reason, the Reorganized Church began gradually to
separate the Prophet from the Revelation. They were
working towards a total denial that Joseph Smith ever
lived or taught polygamy. However, before the Saints

13The True Latter Day Saints' Herald, I, 1, p. 27.
came to agree on this historically treacherous procedure, some prominent people made statements that destroyed the Reorganized house of cards in one swift blow.

President Joseph Smith III wrote:

I believe that during the later years of my father's life there was in discussion among the elders, and possibly in practice, a theory like the following: That persons who might believe that there was a sufficient degree of spiritual affinity between them, as married companions, to warrant the desire to perpetuate that union in the world to come and after the resurrection, could go before some high priest, when they might choose, and there making known their desire, might be married for eternity, pledging themselves while in the flesh unto each other for the observance of the rights of companionship in the spirit; that this was called spiritual marriage, and upon the supposition that what was sealed by the priesthood, before which this pledge was made on earth, was sealed in heaven, the marriage relation then entered into would continue in eternity. ... From this, if one why not two or more, and plural marriage, or the plurality of wives was the growth.14

This statement does not mention Joseph Smith as the catalyst in this move from monogamous marriage to polygamous marriage, but he does make clear that the law of sealing and plurality of wives, both in theory "and possibly in practice," dates to the Nauvoo period, when none other than the Prophet Joseph was in control. The book in which these comments appeared was destroyed.15

Ebenzer Robinson, a member of the Reorganization beginning in 1863 and a high ranking Church officer

14Evans, p. 40. 15Evans, p. 40.
during the Nauvoo period, made a statement regarding polygamy in the Nauvoo period as well. It read:

To whom it may concern:

We, Ebenezer Robinson and Angeline Robinson, husband and wife, hereby certify that in the fall of 1843, Hyrum Smith, brother of Joseph Smith, came to our house in Nauvoo, Illinois, and taught us the doctrine of polygamy. And I, the said Ebenezer Robinson, hereby further state that he gave me special instructions how I could manage the matter so as not to have it known to the public. He also told us that while he had heretofore opposed the doctrine, he was wrong, and his brother Joseph was right; referring to his teaching it.

(Sgd.) Ebenezer Robinson
Angeline F. Robinson

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 20th day of December, 1873.

J. M. Smalley, Notary Public.

In spite of statements like these two, the Reorganization continues to this day to resist the truth. David Whitmer, one of three witnesses to the Book of Mormon, once said:

As time rolled on, many of the Reorganization saw that to continue to acknowledge that Brother Joseph received the Revelation would bring bitter persecution upon themselves as the public feeling at that time was very bitter—the leaders of the Reorganized Church, after a time, began to suppress their opinions concerning this matter. They would answer the question when asked about it, "I do not know whether Joseph Smith received the Revelation or not!" (This is something of a far cry from the positive and definite statements which are proclaimed today by the leaders of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.)

In short, David Whitmer scoured the Reorganized Church

16Evans, pp. 50-1. 17Dyer, p. 114.
for deception. ¹⁸

Even today, the Reorganization continues in the pattern of speaking lies in the name of Joseph Smith.

Aleah Koury said:

The alleged doctrine and document on the plurality of wives presented by Brigham Young in 1852 contradicted the strict laws of morality revealed to the church through Joseph. Joseph could not honestly sign a document bearing a doctrine that he had pronounced to be "false and corrupt," and contrary to the moral and constitutional law of the land, the church, and the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ.¹⁹

Thus, the Reorganization is shown to be just as guilty of lies and deception over this issue as the Brighamite Mormons in Utah.

¹⁸Evans, p. 37.

The compilation of the Journal of Discourses began in 1854 and continued until 1886. The series began when Brigham Young commissioned George Watt (the first man baptized in England "by authority") to record sermons stenographically and publish them to the world. These sermons of the General Authorities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (and other important Mormons) were published semi-monthly in the form of a sixteen page octavo sheet. They were later republished in book form—twenty-six volumes, each containing twenty-four numbers and 376 pages respectively.

In spite of its inherent value as a primary source document, the Journal of Discourses has become more or less a forgotten work in Mormon circles. In this century, Mormon leaders have managed (until recently) to keep it out of print. No doubt the stress of the Journal upon the absolute necessity of plural marriage was a factor in their decision not to reprint the sermons. For, Mormon leaders have been dogmatic in claiming that church doctrine has not changed since it was received. The Journal of Discourses demonstrates that to be a lie. For this reason, recent Mormon leaders have consistently played down the importance of the Journal of Discourses.
Some have gone so far as to claim it is not authoritative. The nineteenth century image had to be forgotten. And, it was well known how the Fundamentalist Mormons used the *Journal of Discourses* to lead others into a modern practice of polygamy, forbidden by the Church.

As late as 1954, the authorities were actually refusing Mormons access to the *Journal of Discourses*.

La Mar Peterson stated:

In 1954 upon learning that the Deseret Book Company had a microfilm of the 25-volume *Journal of Discourses* I asked for the privilege of reading from some of the volumes on their viewer. After checking "across the street" the management announced that the privilege of reading from the *Journals* could not be granted.

About this same time a young convert to the T. D. S. Church from Holland asked to see some of the *Journals* at the Church Historian's Office. When asked why he wished to see them he explained that his family in Holland (non-members) had been told of certain statements in the books concerning "blood atonement and other strange doctrines." He wished to reassure his family that the charges were untrue. He was denied access to the volumes and told that he was a troublemaker.¹

In 1955, an advertisement appeared in *Improvement Era*, a Mormon publication, announcing the publication of Volume I of a reprint of the *Journal of Discourses* edited by Bruce R. McConkie. It was to appear under the title *Sound Doctrine*. But, the volume suddenly disappeared. Even a tracer to the Copyright Office was unfruitful in tracking it down. The Office of the

¹Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *The Case Against Mormonism*, I (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm, 1967), p. 44.
Church Historian did not possess a copy. The Tanners questioned Mr. McConkie's secretary and the Church Historian's Office about the missing book. They received two conflicting explanations. The Tanners believe that the book was not a photographic reprint and that parts of the sermons had been modified to make them conform to modern Mormon doctrine. When it became known that General Printing and Lithography of Los Angeles, California, was bringing out a photolithographic reprint of the *Journal of Discourses* in 1952, the Mormon leaders ordered the plates for McConkie's *Sound Doctrine* reprint destroyed. They used the printed pages as packing material. They did not wish to appear ridiculous.

While I do not know that the Tanner's thesis can be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt, it is very likely that *Sound Doctrine* was not a photographic reprint. Mormons have long been addicted to the practice of re-editing even their four standard works. Indeed, there is an example in print of how the Mormons have tended to re-write (rather than reprint) the *Journal of Discourses*.

In 1954, Apostle John A. Widtsoe published a portion of the *Journal of Discourses* under the title *Discourses of Brigham Young*. He actually followed the methodology that the Tanners accuse McConkie of. Just two examples:

---

2 Tanner, *Case*, I, p. 46. 3 Tanner, *Case*, I, p. 46.
will be cited here, but they are sufficient to demonstrate the Apostle's methods. Brigham Young said:

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I command the Elders of Israel—those who have been in the habit of getting drunk—to cease drinking strong drink from this time henceforth, until you really need it. 4

Apostle Widtsoe's version, however, reads:

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I command the Elders of Israel—those who have been in the habit of getting drunk—to cease from drinking strong drink from this time henceforth. 5

Only four words have been deleted in Apostle Widtsoe's reprint, but those four words change the meaning of the whole statement. The change was made because of a Mormon doctrine called the Word of Wisdom. It would be damaging to the status of that doctrine to admit that a Prophet, Seer, and Revelator foresaw a time when alcohol would be necessary—even to the point of getting drunk. The Word of Wisdom declares that alcohol is never good.

In our second example, Brigham Young admitted that he was not a Prophet. He said that Heber C. Kimball was his prophet. In the Journal of Discourses, this passage read:

Wait patiently, brethren, until it is done, and put forth your hands willingly to finish it. I know what it will be. I am not a visionary man, 6

4Journal, 7, p. 337.
neither am I given to prophesying. When I went
any of that done I call on Brother Heber—le is
my Prophet, he loves to prophesy, and I love to
hear him. I scarcely ever say much about reve-
lations, or visions, . . . .

Apostle Widtsoe reprinted it as follows:

Wait patiently, brethren, until it is done, and
put forth your hands willingly to finish it. I
know what it will be. I scarcely ever say much
about revelations or visions, . . . .

Thirty-eight words have been deleted without any indica-
tion.

Yet, Apostle Widtsoe had the nerve to declare that
"no liberties have been taken, in this book, with the
words of Brigham Young." He claims to have corrected
only spelling or language errors, "which should have
been caught by the printer." It appears that Apostle
Widtsoe also corrected freely some doctrinal errors
which he feels the speaker should have caught. In short,
Widtsoe is guilty of false reporting. It is my belief
that he did so deliberately to protect what he imagined
to be the cause of God.

Since that time, the Deseret Book Store has sold
the reprint of the Journal of Discourses, rather than
seen to be suppressing it. But, the church sponsored
reprint, announced in 1955, has yet to appear. One would
think Mr. McCormie would have gotten back to the project
by now if the book was supposed to appear in 1955.

---
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In contrast to the modern flippancy exhibited toward the *Journal of Discourses*, Brigham Young said:

I say now when they, my sermons, are copied and approved by me they are as good as scripture as is conched in this Bible, and if you want to read Revelations, read the sayings of him who knows the mind of God. Also, I know just as well what to teach this people and just what to say to them and what to do in order to bring them into the Celestial Kingdom of God as I know the road to my office. It is just as plain and easy. * * * I have never yet preached a sermon and sent it out to the children of men, that they may not call it scripture. 10

On another occasion, Brigham said:

The "*Journal of Discourses*" is a vehicle of doctrine, counsel, and instruction to all people, but especially to the Saints. It follows, then, that each successive volume is more and more valuable as the Church increases in numbers and importance in the earth, and its doctrines become more abundantly developed and are brought into practical exercise by His peculiar people. Every step of its advancement is fraught with the greatest possible importance to the human family.

So Saint can afford to do without these precious precepts until they are able to exemplify them in their daily lives and conversation. 11

In fact, George Q. Cannon went so far as to include the *Journal of Discourses* among the standard works of the Church:

The *Journal of Discourses* deservedly ranks as one of the standard works of the Church, and every right-minded Saint will certainly welcome with joy every number as it comes forth from the press as an

10Brigham Young, cited by Prospectus to the *Journal of Discourses* (Salt Lake City: n. p., n. d.), pp. 3-4.

additional reflector of "the light that shines from Zion's hill." 12

Joseph F. Smith, later President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, also recognized the great importance of the *Journal of Discourses*. He said:

We regret that the circulation of the *Journal of Discourses* is so limited. Its importance would warrant a thousand-fold greater extension of this work. We anticipate a time, not distant in the future, when a copy of the present volume will be more precious than gold. It is even now almost impossible to obtain a complete series. 13

William Budge, the publisher of volume 10, declared:

The nineteenth volume of the *Journal of Discourses* is not a whit behind its predecessors in the simplicity of its contents, or the advanced character of the truths contained therein.

It is impossible to give monetary value to the past volumes of this publication, and the best evidence that they are appreciated, is to be found in the fact that they are sought after by non-members as well as by members of the Church, and in contrast with many works of greater pretensions, book-stalls are searched in vain for even solitary copies. 14

And S. P. Richards announced:

It would be altogether gratuitous and uncalculated for, on our part, to write a commendatory preface to the *Journal of Discourses* of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles of this Church. To the Saints, their words are as the words of God, their teachings fraught with heavenly wisdom, and their directions leading to salvation and eternal lives. 15

---

The *Journal of Discourses* were stenographically recorded. They were a church publication. It may be assumed that the volumes represent accurately the doctrine of the Church of the time. And the *Journal of Discourses* contain some of the most significant statements ever made by Mormon leaders on the subject of polygamy. The pronouncements of men like Brigham Young, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow (all Presidents of the Mormon Church) and Apostles like Moses Thatcher, Orson Pratt and so forth cannot be ignored in a study of this nature. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to determine what the *Journal of Discourses* taught on plural marriage. All quotations will be taken from the fifth photolithographic reprint of the *Journal of Discourses*. Quotations will be extensive, but not exhaustive. Some statements will be passed over as irrelevant to this presentation. The treatment will be more or less chronological as published.

The first sermon to be publicly preached with permission on the subject of plural marriage was delivered by Orson Pratt on August 20, 1852, in the
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Tabernacle. Pratt said on that historic occasion:

It is quite unexpected to me, brethren and sisters, to be called upon to address you this forenoon; and still more so, to address you upon the principles which has been named, namely, a plurality of wives.

It is rather new ground for me; that is, I have not been in the habit of publicly speaking upon this subject; and it is rather new ground to the inhabitants of the United States, and not only to them, but to a portion of the inhabitants of Europe; a portion of them have not been in the habit of preaching a doctrine of this description; consequently, we shall have to break up new ground. 18

He, thus, admitted that the Mormon Church was already honey-combed with polygamy and that plural marriage was a doctrine of the Church.

Why the Church finally decided to publicly proclaim the doctrine is not clear. But, it seemed to have something to do with the times. It was at this same time that the New Organization with flirting with the doctrine of plural marriage. 19 Koury has established that polygamy and communalism were both common among religious sects of the period. 20

Continuing, Pratt stated that Joseph Smith alone had the keys which allowed plural marriage and that the revelation was given him on July 12, 1843. And he spoke of what would happen if the Mormons refused to live the Revelation:

Now, let us enquire, what will become of

20 Koury, p. 42.
those individuals who have this law taught unto them in plainness, if they reject it? A voice in the chamber, "they will be damned." I will tell you: they will be damned, saith the Lord God. Almighty, in the revelation He has given. Why? Because where much is given, much is required; where there is much knowledge unfolded for the exal- tion, glory, and happiness of the sons and daugh- ters of God, if they close up their hearts, if they reject the testimony of His word and will not give heed to the principles He has ordained for their good, they are worthy of damnation, and the Lord has said they shall be damned. This was the word of the Lord to His servant Joseph the Prophet him- self. With all the knowledge and light he had, he must comply with it, or, says the Lord unto him, you shall be damned; and the same is true in regard to all those who reject these things. 21

Mormons now say they accept polygamy in principle, but do not practice it. Orson Pratt did not leave that option open to a man. They not only must accept the law in principle, they must give heed to it and comply with it. These verbs require more than intellectual acquiescence. They demand action.

Two years later, Orson Hyde preached a sermon which argued that polygamy was practiced by no less a person than Jesus Christ Himself. He declared:

Gentlemen, that is as plain as the translators, or different councils over his Scripture dare allow it to go to the world, but the thing is there; it is told: Jesus was the bridegroom at the marriage of Cana of Galilee, and he told them what to do.

Now there was actually a marriage; and if Jesus was not the bridegroom on that occasion, please tell who was. If any man can show this,
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and prove that it was not the Savior of the world, then I will acknowledge I am in error. He say it was Jesus Christ who was married, to be brought into the relation whereby he could see his seed before he was crucified.22

This was a necessary theological adjustment. If polygamy was essential to exaltation, Christ would have to be married. (Incidentally, there is no evidence that the text in question was ever tampered with by councils or translators.)

Hyde also brought Abraham into the matter. In sermons to come, Abraham would play a critical role in the establishment of plural marriage.

I do not despise to be called a son of Abraham, if he had a dozen wives; or to be called a brother, a son, a child of the Savior, if he had Mary, and Martha, and several others, as wives; and though he did cast seven demons out of one of them, it is all the same to me.23

Hyde also made some preliminary attempts to answer I Timothy 3 and Christ's answer to the Sadducee in a polygamous fashion. He explained the text which requires a bishop to have but one wife as follows:

In olden times the might have passed through the same circumstances as some of the Latter-Day Saints had to in Illinois. What would it have done for us, if they had known that many of us had more than one wife when we lived in Illinois? They would have broken us up, doubtless, worse than they did. They may break us up, and rout us from one place to another, but by and by we shall come to a point where we shall have all the women, and they will

have none. You may think I am joking about this, but I can bring you the truth of God to demonstrate it to you. I have not advanced anything I have not got an abundance of backing for. There is more truth than poetry in this as sure as you live. 24

This sermon by Orson Hyde is one of the most important ones in the entire corpus on polygamy. And it was preached to the General Conference of the Church.

On October 6, 1855, Heber G. Kimball, a member of the First Presidency, spoke on plural marriage in the Bowery. He spoke to those persons who were not satisfied that plural marriage was divinely instituted and permanent.

If you oppose any of the works of God you will cultivate a spirit of apostacy. If you oppose what is called the "spiritual wife doctrine," the Patriarchal Order, which is of God, that course will corrode you with a spirit of apostacy, and you will go overboard; still a great many do so, and strive to justify themselves in it, but they are not justified of God. 25

According to the Fundamentalist Mormons, what Kimball describes here has happened in Salt Lake City. Gradually, the Mormon Church (which still believes in polygamy in principle) has shifted its emphasis to a point where, today, known polygamists are supposed to be excommunicated. They strive to justify their actions unto themselves, but they are not justified, according to the

Fundamentalists, by God. The Twelve have been corrupted by a spirit of apostacy and the Saints with them.

At any rate, Kimball continued:

The principle of plurality of wives never will be done away although some sisters have had revelations that, when this time passes away and they go through the veil, every woman will have a husband to herself. I wish more of our young men would take to themselves wives of the daughters of Zion, and not wait for us old men to take them all. Do cherish upon the right principle, young gentlemen, and God bless you forever and ever, and make you fruitful, that we may fill the mountain and then the earth with righteous inhabitants. That is my prayer, and that is my blessing upon all the Saints and upon your posterity after you, for ever. Amen.26

But, Kimball was wrong. Plurality of wives was done away with (at least officially) in the year 1890.

Brigham Young spoke along the same lines at the Bowery in Provo, Utah, on July 14, 1855. He declared at that time:

Now if any of you will deny the plurality of wives, and continue to do so, I promise that you will be damned; and I will go still further and say, take this revelation, or any other revelation that the Lord has given, and deny it in your feelings, and I promise that you will be damned.

But the Saints who live their religion will be exalted, for they never will deny any revelation which the Lord has given or may give, though, when there is a doctrine coming to them which they cannot comprehend fully, they may be found saying, 'The Lord sendeth this unto me, and I pray that He will save and preserve me from denying anything which proceedeth from Him, and give me patience to wait until I can understand it for myself.27

Plural marriage was defended as a revealed necessity, not a pleasant pastime. And it was not pleasant. The women were especially sickened by the practice. Jedediah M. Grant described the situation in these terms:

And we have women here who like anything but the celestial law of God; and if they could break asunder the cable of the Church of Christ, there is scarcely a mother in Israel but would do it this day. And they talk it to their husbands, to their daughters, and to their neighbors, and say they have not seen a week's happiness since they became acquainted with that law, or since their husbands took a second wife. They want to break up the Church of God, and to break it from their husbands and from their family connections.

Then, again, there are men that are used as tools by their wives, and they are just a little better in appearance and in their habits than a little black boy. They live in filth and nastiness, they eat it and drink it, and they are filthy all over.27

Indeed, complaints about the ugly nature of plural marriage grew to such an extent that Brigham Young made an unusual proposition designed to get the fine, chaste women of Zion to shut their mouths. He told them on September 21, 1856:

Now for my proposition; it is more particularly for my sisters, as it is frequently happening that women say they are unhappy. Men will say, "My wife, though a most excellent woman, has not seen a happy day since I took my second wife;" "No, not a happy day for a year," says one; and another has not seen a happy day for five years. It has been said that women are tied down and abused: that they are misused and have not the liberty that they
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ought to have; that many of them are wading through a perfect flood of tears, because of the conduct of some men, together with their own folly. 28

We might ask ourselves before proceeding if this intra-marital warfare is a sign of the divine institution of plural marriage. The answer is obvious. For we are told that the fruit which is produced by the Spirit include "love, joy, peace..." (Gal. 5:22) But we see no joy or peace and precious little love lost in the Mormon home of the period.

Brigham's proposition was an impossible one. He told the women to leave or shut up. It was not much of a choice. The women loved their husbands even though they were scoundrels. They were not really at liberty to go. Young, however, proceeds with his absurd proposition:

And my wives have got to do one of two things; either round up their shoulders to endure the afflictions of this world, and live their religion, or they may leave, for I will not have them about me. I will go into heaven alone, rather than have scratching and fighting around me. I will set all at liberty. "What, first wife too?" Yes, I will liberate you all..." 29

One wonders what quality of love these so-called Prophets had experienced. Whatever it was, it was most unlike the love of Jesus, for He gave Himself for unworthy people and gladly suffered their scratching and fighting in order to give them love. Young, however, fails to

demonstrate such egoist love. His love seems self-seeking. As such, it is lust buried underneath a mask. For he is aware of the consequences of his actions. He describes the reaction of the wives.

Now recollect that two weeks from tomorrow I am going to set you at liberty. But the first wife will say, "It is hard, for I have lived with my husband twenty years, or thirty, and have raised a family of children for him, and it is a great trial for me for him to have more women;" then I say it is time that you gave him up to other women who will bear children. If my wife had borne me all the children that she ever would bare, the celestial law would teach me to take young women that would have children.30

In other words, women are only cattle. Their only purpose is as objects of sexual gratification and reproduction. This is an anti-Christian concept.

Worse, this so-called Prophet, Seer, and Revelator can offer no improvement in status to women in the afterlife. Young contends that heaven is what you make it.

"But," says one, "I want to have my paradise now." And says another, "I did think I should be in paradise if I was sealed to brother Brigham, and I thought I should be happy when I became his wife, or brother Heber's. I loved you so much, that I thought I was going to have a heaven right off, right off, right here on the spot."

What a curious doctrine this is, that we are preparing to enjoy! The only heaven for you is that which you make yourselves.31

The women stayed, but the squabbles were not ended.
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The next year, Heber C. Kimball asked:

Do you suppose that Joseph and Hyrum and all those good men would associate with those ancient worthies if they had not been engaged in the same practices? They had to do the works of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in order to be admitted where they are;—they had to be polygamists in order to be received into their society.32

Kimball was declaring anew that the practice of polygamy was essential to exaltation. Today, Mormons no longer believe that. They now believe that monogamous celestial marriage is necessary for exaltation.

But some of you are taking a course to spend your lives for nought, while brother Brigham and I are becoming like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the Prophets. Why do you not be profitable to yourselves and put out your lives to usury? Do you understand me?33

The theological groundwork for an apologetic of plural marriage had been laid. About this time Orson Hyde preached another sermon on Jesus Christ as a polygamist.34 This was Hyde's favorite teaching as far as plural marriage is concerned. For Christ, above all persons, must be exalted.

In 1859, Orson Pratt preached another sermon which commanded the practice of plural marriage. He made the observation that plural marriage was rampant. It was:

. . . general throughout this Territory, with but a few exceptions. A great many families, not only
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in Salt Lake City, but throughout the settlements, have practically embraced this doctrine, believing it to be a divine institution, approved of God and the Bible. 35

Pratt was aware of the fact that the Book of Mormon explicitly condemned the practice of polygamy in Jacob 2:28-32. He claimed, however, that the phrase "unless I the Lord shall command them" was a sort of divinely inspired loophole which made provision for the modern practice of polygamy. 36

Pratt further said:

I can find a declaration of our Lord and Saviour that the divorcing of a wife was permitted in the days of Moses because of the hardness of the hearts of the people; but I cannot find any passage in the sayings of the Saviour, or the Apostles and Prophets, or in the law, that the taking of another wife was because of the hardness of their hearts. There is quite a difference between taking wives and putting them away.

This law of plurality, as I am going to prove, did not only exist under the law of Moses, but existed before that law, under the Patriarchal dispensation. And what kind of a dispensation was that? It has been proved before the people in this Territory, time after time, that the dispensation in which the Patriarchs lived was the dispensation of the Gospel—that the Gospel was preached to Abraham as well as unto the people in the days of the Apostles; so says Paul; and the same Gospel too that was preached in the days of the Apostles was preached to Abraham. 37

Therefore, Orson concluded:

If we can find out that, under the Gospel preached to Abraham, polygamy was allowed, the Gospel preached by Jesus, being the same, of course, would not
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condemn it. 38

In Volume 11, Amasa Lyman preached on polygamy, holding in derision those who disbelieved.

"We should have no objections to a plural marriage if only we could believe that it was right." How in heaven's name you would have to feel, to feel that it was wrong, I cannot imagine. 39

Lyman also used the argument that deception was the only possible apologetic in the early Mormon period. Neither the Saints nor the Gentiles were open to the doctrine during Joseph Smith's life, so deception was the price of obedience.

"Why did He not introduce it at the very commencement of this work?" Because He could not—because our ears were not open to hear it—our prejudices would not allow us to receive it. If I had been talked to about plurality of wives when I was baptized into the Church, the Lord may know, but I do not know what I would have done. I had to go wandering over the world preaching the Gospel years after, had to work longer than Jacob did for a wife to get myself in that state of mind that the Lord dare name the doctrine to me. We were not aware that any such thing as plural marriage had to be introduced into the world; but the Lord said it after a while, and we obeyed the best we knew how, and, no doubt, made many crooked paths in our ignorance. We were only children, and the Lord was preparing us for an introduction to the principles of salvation. "What, the principles of salvation connected with marriage?" Yes; because they are nowhere else. 40

And, since there are more women than men, Lyman concludes:

Women must be saved, if the task should devolve on a man to marry two or three of them, and treat them as honorable wives, bless them, and bless their children, provide for them, and teach them principles of purity.  

Brigham Young said:

If it is wrong for a man to have more than one wife at a time the Lord will reveal it by and by, and will put it away that it will not be known in the Church.  

Though Brigham did not intend it as such, this statement is the closest he ever came to true prophecy even though it negated all that he, as head of the Church, stood for. It was wrong for a man to have more than one wife and it was set aside by so-called Revelation to Wilford Woodruff. Meanwhile, Brigham added that damnation was the result of not entering into polygamy.

I did not ask Him for the revelation upon this subject. When that revelation was first read to me by Joseph Smith, I plainly saw the great trials and the abuse of it that would be made by many of the Elders, and the trouble and the persecution that it would bring upon this whole people. But the Lord revealed it, and it was my business to accept it.

Now, we are Christians and desire to be saved in the Kingdom of God. We desire to attain to the possession of all the blessings there are for the most faithful man or people that ever lived upon the face of the earth, even him who is said to be the father of the faithful, Abraham of old. We wish to obtain all that father Abraham obtained. I wish here to say to the Elders of Israel, and to all the members of this Church and kingdom, that it is in the hearts of many of them to wish

---
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that the doctrine of polygamy was not taught and practiced by us. It may be hard for many, and especially for the ladies, yet it is no harder for them than it is for the gentlemen. It is the word of the Lord, and I wish to say to you, and all the world, that if you desire with all your hearts to obtain the blessings which Abraham obtained, you will be polygamists at least in your faith, or you will come short of enjoying the salvation and the glory which Abraham has obtained. This is as true as that God lives. You who wish that there were no such thing in existence, if you have in your hearts to say: "We will pass along in the Church without obeying or submitting to it in our faith or believing this order, because, for aught that we know, this community may be broken up yet, and we may have lucrative offices offered to us; we will not, therefore, be polygamists lest we should fail in obtaining some earthly honor, character and office, etc."

On a later occasion, Brigham Young insisted that a woman would lose her crown by teaching her daughter to marry a Gentile. Then, on August 9, 1868, he declared that the doctrine of plural marriage "will work out the moral salvation of the world." In that sermon, the President also admitted that he originally was more than satisfied with a monogamous system of marriage:

I should have been in the beginning; the one wife system would not have disagreed with me at all.

---
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If the prophet had said to me, "Brother Brigham, you can never have but one wife at a time." I should have said, "glory, hallelujah, that is just what I like." But he said, you will have to take more than one wife, and this order has to spread and increase until the inhabitants of the earth repent and do what is right towards the females. In this also I say, glory, hallelujah.46

On October 8, 1869, President George A. Smith addressed an audience of approximately 10,000 persons in the Tabernacle.47 In that sermon, he addressed himself to the matter of the revelation:

And I know, furthermore, that he rejoiced in the fact that the law of redemption and Celestial marriage was revealed unto the Church in such a manner that it would be out of the power of earth and hell to destroy it; and that he rejoiced in fact that the servants of God were already prepared, having the keys to bear off the work he had commenced.48

He also declared there was nothing morally wrong with having a plurality of wives.49 He followed this with an unsuccessful attempt to explain away the text in I Timothy 3 mentioned already.50 He then concluded with a description of the heavenly city:

Those who denounce Patriarchal Marriage will have to stay without and never walk the golden streets. And any man or woman that lifts his or her voice to proclaim against a plurality of wives, under the Government of God, will have to seek an inheritance
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outside of that city. For "there shall in no wise enter into it, anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie, for without are sorcerers, whoremongers, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Is not the man that denounces Celestial Marriage a liar? Does he not work abomination? "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of (the polygamist) David, the bright and morning star."  

It is, therefore, clear that President George A. Smith felt that exaltation was impossible apart from the practice of plural marriage. And he felt that mere verbal opposition to plural or Patriarchal marriage was grounds for dismissal from the New Jerusalem. In short, he was teaching that plural marriage was at the core of the polytheistic Mormon system of exaltation. The present Mormon theology is not much different in that sense. The system of exaltation continues to be taught. Celestial Marriage continues to be important. The only difference is that Celestial Marriage is thought of today as monogamous. Then, it was decidedly polygamous.

In another discourse given that same year (1869), Wilford Woodruff (the very man who would later abolish the practice of plural marriage in the Mormon Church by means of the Manifesto) made some very interesting statements. First, he made the questionable assertion
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that polygamy was not a factor in the expulsion from Missouri. I think he would have a hard time proving that. All that can safely be said it that polygamy was not the only factor in the Missouri matters. But, plural marriage was a part of the life of the Church as early as 1831. It is not unreasonable to assume that the Gentiles may have had some degree of awareness of the practice by the Missouri period.

Second, Woodruff links plural marriage to the central issue of revelation and prophetic gifts. To do away with plural marriage would only be the abolition of "one feather in the bird."52 Nonetheless:

Do away with that, then we must do away with prophets and Apostles, with revelation and the gifts and graces of the Gospel, and finally give up our religion altogether and turn sectarians and do as the world does, then all would be right...53

It is ironic that he should be the man to do away with it just twenty-one years later.

And Orson Pratt discoursed on the subject of plural marriage and the Constitution "with the greatest pleasure."54 He also declared that the Lord "disapproved of anyone speaking against His servants for taking more wives than one, because it may not happen to suit their

---
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notions of things."\textsuperscript{55} In this same sermon, Pratt dated the revelation on plurality of wives in the year 1832.\textsuperscript{56} He proceeded to attack Emma Smith, the first wife of Joseph Smith, for the following reasons:

So in regard to the revelation on plurality; it was only a short time after Joseph's death that we published it, having a copy thereof. But what became of the original? An apostate destroyed it; you have heard her name. That same woman, in destroying the original, thought she had destroyed the revelation from the face of the earth. She was embittered against Joseph, her husband, and at times fought against him with all her heart; and then again she would break down in her feelings, and humble herself before God and call upon His holy name, and would then lead forth ladies and place their hands in the hands of Joseph, and they were married to him according to the law of God. That same woman has brought up her children to believe that no such thing as plurality of wives existed in the days of Joseph, and has instilled the bitterest principles of apostacy into their minds, to fight against the Church that has come to these mountains according to the predictions of Joseph.\textsuperscript{57}

Poor Emma! She was a woman torn between her religion and her love for her man. And these feelings were complicated by the fact that both were wrapped up in the same person. Her bitterness and her complaints were both understandable and justifiable. Even her lies regarding the existence of plural marriage were only intended to protect the good name of her children.
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Two days after Pratt's discourse, George Q. Cannon also addressed the General Conference gathered in the New Tabernacle on Celestial Marriage.\(^{58}\)

In rising to address you this morning, my brethren and sisters, I rely upon your faith and prayers and the blessing of God. We have heard, during Conference, a great many precious instructions, and in none have I been more interested than in those which have been given to the Saints concerning that much mooted doctrine called Patriarchal or Celestial Marriage. I am interested in this doctrine, because I see salvation, temporal and spiritual, embodied therein.\(^{59}\)

In this discourse, Cannon linked the restoration of the priesthood to the practice of plural marriage in two ways. First, the priesthood has a sort of leavening effect upon plural marriage (although ignorant plural marriage apart from the priesthood is seen as preferable to monogamy).\(^{60}\) Second, the husband and his wives work together to bring about the goals of the Priesthood.\(^{61}\) Thus, the Priesthood needs the institution of plural marriage to fulfill its aims.

In a sermon on the "Character and Condition of the Latter-day Saints," Brigham Young inseperably linked Celestial Marriage and plurality of wives. On that occasion (May 8, 1870), the President declared:
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I will say a few words on a subject which has been mentioned here—that is, celestial marriage. God has given a revelation to seal for time and for eternity, just as He did in days of old. In our own days He has commanded His people to receive the New and Everlasting Covenant, and He has said, "If ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned." We have received it. What is the result of it? I look at the world, or that small portion of it which believes in monogamy. It is only a small portion of the human family who do believe in it, for from nine to ten of the twelve hundred millions that live on the earth believe in and practice polygamy. Well, what is the result? Right in our land the doctrine and practice of plurality of wives tend to the preservation of life. Do you know it? Do you see it? What is our duty? To preserve life or destroy it? Can any of you answer? Why, yes, it is to perpetuate and preserve life. But what principle do we see prevailing in our own land? What is that of which, in the East, West, North and South, ministers in their pulpits complain, and against which gentlemen and ladies lecture? It is against taking life. They say, "Cease the destruction of pre-natal life!" Our doctrine and practice make and preserve life; theirs destroy it. Which is the best, saying nothing about revelation, which is the best in a moral sense, to preserve or to destroy the life which God designs to bring upon the earth. Just look at it and decide for yourselves.\(^{62}\)

By the seventies, signs of the conflict with the Federal Government over plural marriage begin to appear in the *Journal of Discourses*. For example, when Brigham Young was asked what the Saints' reaction was to the Edmunds Act, he replied:

> "What are you going to do with the anti-polygamy law?" I replied, "Nothing at all, we mind our own

\(^{62}\) *Journal*, 14, p. 43.
business, and I hope everybody else will. We have not meddled with it, and do not expect to; but we expect to live."  

In 1872, George A. Smith spoke of an anti-Mormon petition sent to Congress from some anti-Mormons in Utah.

The petition to Congress which has been read here today is a perfect wonder, I presume, to those who have heard it. It is astonishing to me, and doubtless to all who listened to it, and especially those who reside here, that such a statement could be got up by any individual whatever, that any imagination could be so tortured as to manufacture so unmitigated a tissue of utter and absolute falsehoods; and much more that persons could be found who would think so little of their reputation as to sign such a statement. We understand, however, that many of the persons whose names are on that petition did not see the original. Many of them thought they were simply signing a petition against the admission of Utah as a State, without bringing personal charges against a people among whom they have lived in perfect safety, and in a country where peace and order have prevailed, and where all have enjoyed the uniform protection which our Territorial laws and the general organization of society give. I regret exceeding that such a document should be made public; but as it is, with the list of names attached to it, it was published by order of the United States Senate, it was thought proper to read it to the congregation that all might have a chance to know what it was and judge for themselves.  

This sermon obeyed the first law of Mormon apologetics. Whenever accused, deny all and ridicule the paper while attacking the character of one's accuser. It is a vicious technique.

On October 7, 1874, Orson Pratt again addressed the

---
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semi-annual conference of the Church. He took as his text Acts 3:19-21, a text which speaks of times of restitution of all things. He asserted (without proof) that polygamy was the normal order of the Patriarchs. He then assumed that it was one of the things which needed to be restored before the return of Christ. And, his conclusion (totally unjustified) was that the Bible was a polygamous book.

He then proceeded to speak of the institution of plural marriage among Mormons:

Now, after having said so much in relation to the reason why we practice polygamy, I want to say a few words in regard to the revelation on polygamy. God has told us Latter-day Saints that we shall be condemned if we do not enter into that principle; and yet I have heard now and then (I am very glad to say that only a few such instances have come under my notice,) a brother or a sister say, "I am a Latter-day Saint, but I do not believe in polygamy." Oh, what an absurd expression! A person might as well say, "I am a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, but I do not believe in him." One is just as consistent as the other. Or a person might as well say, "I believe in Mormonism, and in the revelations given by Joseph Smith, but I am not a polygamist, and do not believe in polygamy." What an absurdity! If one portion of the doctrine is true, the whole of them are true. If the doctrine of polygamy, as revealed to the Latter-day Saints, is not true, I would not give a fig for all your other revelations that came through Joseph Smith the Prophet; I would renounce the whole of them, because it is utterly impossible, according to the revelations that are contained in these books, to believe a part of them to be divine—from God—and part of them to be from the devil; that is foolishness in the extreme; it is an absurdity that exists because of the ignorance of some people. I have been astonished at it. I did hope there was more intelligence among the Latter-day Saints, and a greater understanding of
than to suppose that any one can be a member of this Church in good standing, and yet reject polygamy. The Lord has said, that those who reject this principle reject their salvation, they shall be damned, saith the Lord; those to whom I reveal this Law and they do not receive it, shall be damned. Now here comes our consciences. We have either to renounce Mormonism, Joseph Smith, Book of Mormon, Book of Covenants, and the whole system of things as taught by the Latter-day Saints, and say that God has not raised up a Church, has not raised up a prophet, has not begun to restore all things as he promised, we are obliged to do this, or else to say, with all our hearts, "Yes, we are polygamists, we believe in the principle, and we are willing to practice it, because God has spoken from the heavens."

Now I want to prophecy a little. It is not very often that I prophecy, though I was commanded to do so, when I was a boy. I want to prophecy that all men and women who oppose the revelation which God has given in relation to polygamy will find themselves in darkness; the Spirit of God will withdraw from them from the very moment of their opposition to that principle, until they will finally go down to hell and be damned, if they do not repent. That is just as true as it is that all the nations and kingdoms of the earth, when they hear this Gospel which God has restored in these last days, will be damned if they do not receive it; for the Lord has said so. One is just as true as the other. I will quote this latter saying as recorded in the Book of Covenants. The Lord said to the elders of this Church, in the very commencement, as it were, "Go ye forth and preach the Gospel to every creature, and as I said unto mine ancient Apostles, even so I say unto you, that every soul who believes in your words, and will repent of his sins and be baptized in water shall receive a remission of his sins, and shall be filled with the Holy Ghost; and every soul in all the world who will not believe in your words, neither repent of his sins shall be damned; and this revelation or commandment is in force from this very hour, upon all the world," as fast as they hear it. That is what the Lord has said. Just so, in regard to polygamy, or any other great principle which the Lord our God reveals to the inhabitants of the earth.

Now, if you want to get into darkness, brethren and sisters, begin to oppose this revelation.
Sisters, you begin to say before your husbands, or husbands, you begin to say before your wives, "I do not believe in the principle of polygamy, and I intend to instruct my children against it."
Oppose it in this way, and teach your children to do the same, and if you do not become as dark as midnight, there is no truth in Mormonism.65

According to Pratt, either polygamy stands or Mormonism falls. By these unbending and unforgiving words of a Mormon Apostle, Mormonism itself stands condemned. The modern Mormon movement has become the "absurd" creature of which Pratt warned, devoid of polygamy and devoid of light.

On July 7, 1878, Joseph F. Smith (later the President of the Mormon Church) spoke on the origins and importance of plural marriage. He stated that the Revelation had been received in 1832, but was not written down until 1843.66 He claimed that it was written in its highly personal form at the special request of the Patriarch Hyrum Smith, who was hoping to use it to put Emma (the Prophet's wife) in her place. The speech also declared that the Prophet would have written the revelation in a different form if he had intended it to forth unto the world.67 We may, therefore, say with some assurance that Joseph F. Smith believed illogically
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in some sort of non-verbal or conceptual revelatory process. Such a vague belief transforms propositional revelation into ambiguous, undependable mysticism. Only by such a low view of inspiration can Mormons account for the massive and totally unscrupulous changes that have been made in the modern revelations, the Book of Mormon, and even the History of the Church.

Smith further declared that the principle was for the righteous only, since the unrighteous would automatically abuse the privilege.

...it is a principle that savors of life unto life, or of death unto death; therefore it is well for those who have embraced the Gospel to obtain knowledge in relation to this matter. It is a principle that pertains to eternal life, in other words, to endless lives, or eternal increase. It is a law of the Gospel pertaining to the celestial kingdom, applicable to all gospel dispensations, when commanded and not otherwise, and neither acceptable to God or binding on man unless given by commandmen, not only so given in this dispensation, but particularly adapted to the conditions and necessities thereof, and to the circumstances, responsibilities, and personal, as well as vicarious duties of the people of God in this age of the world. God has revealed it as a principle particularly suited to the nature of the work we are called to perform, that it might be hastened to its consummation. It is a righteous principle not an unrighteous one.68

On November 30, 1879, John Taylor (then the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints)

was preaching on the subject of temples. In that talk, he mentioned the subject of plurality of wives:

Our marriage system is one of the greatest principles that God ever developed to the human family, whether men believe it or not. But there are many who are not acquainted with these things as we are; they do not understand God nor his revelations; and they really, if it came to the point, should have nothing to say against us in relation to these matters. But they do not understand it, neither do they wish to understand it; because there are a great many very corrupt men devoid of principle, and they care not what becomes of their future if they can only accomplish their present objects.

Now, then, did we seek this principle? No, we did not. Did we ask God that we might have a plurality of wives? No, we did not. Was it a matter of our choice? No. The same God that revealed to Joseph Smith the first principles of the Gospel also revealed to him the doctrine of plural marriage; it was presented unto us as a doctrine to be believed in and be governed by. Could we help it? What had we to do with it? It is a command of God; and the question is, Shall I, after having embraced the Gospel of the Son of God, and entered into covenant with him to observe his laws and be governed by his revelations of his will; shall I, because of something that is distasteful to me set up my will and judgment against his, and say, "Why, I shall be despised, I shall be hated;" shall I, because of a feeling of that kind violate the laws of God? No, I cannot do it; neither can you who believe in the revelation. God gave it to his servant Joseph Smith and he declared it unto us.69

In another sermon on this same subject, Joseph F. Smith made remarks which complement those above:

... this doctrine of eternal union of husband and wife, and of plural marriage, is one of the most important doctrines ever revealed to man in any age of the world. Without it man would come to a

full stop; without it we never could be exalted
to associate with and become gods, neither could
we attain to the power of eternal increase, or the
blessings pronounced upon Abraham, Isaac, and
Jacob, the fathers of the faithful.

There are ... enough witnesses to these
principles to establish them upon the earth in
such a manner that they can never be forgotten or
stamped out. For they will live; they are destin-
ed to live, and also to grow and spread abroad
upon the face of the earth, to be received and
accepted and adopted by all the virtuous, by all
the pure in heart, by all who love the truth,
and seek to serve Him and keep His commandments;
they are bound to prevail, because they are true
principles.70

In just eleven years, the falsity of this prophecy
would be demonstrated by history itself.

George Q. Cannon told the Saints in Tooele City,
Utah (on October 31, 1880) that polygamy was essential.

I say to my sisters, you expect to receive
exaltation in the presence of God. Will you
obtain it if you do not bring your will into
subjection to the will of God? No.71

President John Taylor addressed the Saints in San-
pete County, Utah, on Sunday, August 20, 1882. In that
discourse, he proclaimed:

We believe in celestial marriage, in celestial
covenants, in men and women being united for time
and all eternity. Are we going to suffer a sur-
render of this point? No, never! No, never!
We intend to be true to our covenants in time

and in the eternities to come. 72

Along these same lines, Apostle Erastus Snow argued that it would not be possible to set aside polygamy for reasons of political expediency. Such an action would constitute a total denial of one's religion. 73 Snow said on June 24, 1883 (at Parowan):

This new and everlasting covenant reveals unto us the keys of the Holy Priesthood and ordinances thereof. It is the grand keystone of the arch which the Lord is building in the earth. In other words, it is that which completes the exaltation and glory of the righteous who receive the everlasting Gospel, and without it they could not attain unto the fullness of celestial glory. Now, many may enter into the glory of God, and become servants in the house of God and in the celestial kingdom of God, who are not able to abide this new and everlasting covenant; but as we are told in the Doctrine and Covenants, with them there is an end to their exaltation. They may remain in their saved condition without exaltation, but they enter not into the order of the Gods. They cannot progress through the ceaseless rounds of eternity except they abide in the covenant, and abide the law that governs it, and the Lord will not be mocked in these things.

using. And the object of this special pleading and sophistry is to try to leave an impression upon the ignorant, those who know no better, that plural marriage was not introduced and sanctioned and practiced by his father, but that it has been an innovation of man, and does not belong to the system of religion which he believed and practiced and taught the people. And there are some among us who would fain take this view of the subject; not that there are many who believe it, but there are some who would like to believe it.\textsuperscript{74}

Snow goes on to state that he was apprised of the revelation in 1843.\textsuperscript{75} He states that he was given a plural wife at that time by the instruction of the Prophet through the mediation of the Patriarch.\textsuperscript{76}

On July 20, 1883, Wilford Woodruff addressed a group of Saints gathered at the Tabernacle. He said:

So I will say to our friends here—the strangers within our gates—that any man that marries a wife by any other authority than the authority of the Holy Priesthood must be attended to in this world. Father Abraham obeyed the law of the patriarchal order of marriage. His wives were sealed to him for time and all eternity, and so were the wives of all the Patriarchs and Prophets, he obeyed that law.

I desire to testify as an individual and as a Latter-day Saint that I know that God has revealed this law unto this people. I know that if we had not obeyed we should have been damned; the judgements of God would have rested upon us; the kingdom of God would have stopped right where we were when God revealed that law unto us. Why have we obeyed it? I obeyed it because I want my wife or wives with me after death; I want my wives and children with me in the morning of the resurrection;
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I want my wives and children organized in the family organization, that I may dwell with them and they with me, throughout all eternity, as well as with Father Abraham and other men who honored and obeyed that law. This is the position we occupy. We have obeyed the law because God has commanded us, and I bear record of its truth; and so far as I am concerned, if I can have my wives and children with me in the morning of the resurrection, so that I can dwell with them and with those Patriarchs and Prophets who obeyed that law, it will amply repay me for the trials and tribulations I may have had to pass through in the course of my life upon the earth.  

In spite of the fact that government pressure was increasing, D. H. Wells contended that polygamy was the cause of much happiness. By now, Wells was an important polygamous Mormon in his own right.

Meanwhile, John Taylor made a spirited defence of the principle in Davis County, Utah on December 9, 1883. He said:

If I were to ask this congregation if they believed plural marriage to be a part of our religion—and that it was revealed by God, and that we did not enter into it until He revealed it unto us—why this congregation would all say they believed in that principle. What? believe in plural marriage? Yes. Why do you believe in it? Because it is according to your preconceived ideas? No; but because God revealed it. That is why I believe
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78This is the same Wells who played an important role (as a non-Mormon) in the Bennett affair as an Alderman of the city of Nauvoo. See Times and Seasons, 3, pp. 871; 873-4.
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in it. That is why you believe in it.80

In volume twenty-five of the Journal of Discourses, there are three significant statements on plural marriage. Two are by President John Taylor, the third by Wilford Woodruff. The year was 1884. These statements are only six years before the Manifesto. The question before us is whether these three statements indicate any change from the consistent teaching of earlier volumes. Is there any indication of a spirit of compromise or accommodation? The answer would appear to be negative.

For instance, John Taylor spoke of the immutability of the principle of polygamy at the General Conference of October, 1884.

God has given us a revelation in regard to celestial marriage. I did not make it. He has told us certain things pertaining to this matter, and they would like us to tone that principle down and change it and make it applicable to the views of the day. This we cannot do; nor can we interfere with any of the commands of God to meet the persuasions and beseeches of men. I cannot do it, and will not do it.81

And President Taylor discussed the morality of plural marriage in a talk at the Assembly Hall in the Salt Lake Temple on February 10, 1884. He contended that plural marriage was more morally decent and pure

than monogamy because it made whoredom impossible.\textsuperscript{82}

And Wilford Woodruff told a group at the Assembly Hall (January 6, 1884) that plural marriage would persist because of divine sustenance. He made this declaration in no uncertain terms.

\ldots if the patriarchal law of marriage comes from the God of Israel, He will take care of it; He will protect and defend it, and He will uphold the people that carry it out. I say this in the name of Israel's God. And if it is not of God, who wants it? I don't, neither do this people.\textsuperscript{83}

Yet Woodruff would bring forth the Manifesto in six years time. In six years, this man would end the legitimate practice of polygamy in return for Utah statehood. This is one of the great ironies of history.

In volume twenty-six, the remaining statements are equally militant. There was to be no compromise on the issue of plural marriage—ever. George Q. Cannon especially wanted the Saints to really be aware that plural marriage was not a negotiable security.\textsuperscript{84} H. W. Naisbitt\textsuperscript{85} and Moses Thatcher\textsuperscript{86} continued to state that monogamy was not the original form of marriage and that it was a degenerate institution. This was not a new argument.
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John Taylor picked up another familiar theme and argued that persecution of Mormons in Missouri and Illinois preceded any Gentile awareness of polygamy.\textsuperscript{87} We have already seen that polygamy dates back to 1831, however, and that Gentiles may have had a pretty good idea of what was going on as early as Kirtland.\textsuperscript{88}

In conclusion, our examination of the \textit{Journal of Discourses} demonstrates that there was a consistent corpus of doctrine relating to plural marriage from 1852-1885. This teaching not only conforms with the known Church practice during that time frame, it conforms to the secret teaching and practice of the so-called Prophet Joseph Smith during the Nauvoo period and earlier. The same basic arguments appear more than once. References to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and Samuel abound. There are multiple references to Jesus Christ as a polygamist. But, the final court of appeal was always the revelation written down by Joseph Smith on July 12, 1843. The consistency of the public teachings enclosed in the \textit{Journal of Discourses} proves that at least four points were considered proven in the Mormon Church of the period. Some of these "proven" contentions are no longer accepted by the Church. Here are those

\textsuperscript{87}Journal, 26, pp. 150-1. \textsuperscript{88}v. Chapter Two above.
four points:

First, the Church taught that plural marriage began with Joseph Smith by means of revelation from God. There was a lack of consensus on the date of the revelation, however. This teaching is still a part of Church doctrine.

Second, the Church taught that the revelation was eternal and unchangeable. After the Manifesto, this teaching was not denied, but its emphasis was modified.

Third, the Church taught that exaltation was not possible apart from the practice of plural marriage. This emphasis was also modified. After the Manifesto, the Church continued to stress Celestial Marriage. It only changed the teaching so that it would work in a monogamous context.

Fourth, the Church felt that compromise of the revelation constituted a denial of one's religion en toto. This teaching has also been transferred into a monogamous context apart from any revelational justification.
Chapter 5

THE MANIFESTO AND POINTS FORWARD

In one sense, the publication of the Manifesto represented a revolutionary tear in the fabric of Mormon history. The entire history of Mormonism up to 1890 had been either secretly or publicly polygamous. Even non-Brighamite sects found it difficult to elude. Now, Wilford Woodruff set all that away with the stroke of a pen. The revelation of plural marriage had promised damnation for those who did not enter into the "new and everlasting covenant." The consistent witness of the General Authorities between 1852 and 1885 indicated that total exaltation was impossible outside the context of plural marriage. But, now Woodruff writes:

OFFICIAL DECLARATION

To Whom it may Concern:

Press dispatches having been sent for political purposes, from Salt Lake City, which have been widely published, to the effect that the Utah Commission, in their recent report to the Secretary of the Interior, allege that plural marriages are still being solemnized and that forty or more such marriages have been contracted in Utah since last June or during the past year, also that in public discourses the leaders of the Church have taught, encouraged and urged the continuance of the practice of polygamy—

I, therefore, as President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, do hereby, in the most solemn manner, declare that these charges are false. We are not teaching polygamy or plural marriage, nor permitting any person to enter into its practice, and I deny that forty or any other number of plural marriages have during that period been solemnized in the Temples or in any other
place in the Territory.

One case has been reported, in which the parties allege that the marriage was performed in the Endowment House, in Salt Lake City, in the Spring of 1889, but I have not been able to learn who performed the ceremony; whatever was done in this matter was without my knowledge. In consequence of this alleged occurrence the Endowment House was, by my instructions, taken down without delay.

Inasmuch as laws have been enacted by Congress forbidding plural marriages, which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of last resort, I hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws, and to use my influence with the members of the Church over which I preside to have them do likewise.

There is nothing in my teachings to the Church or in those of my associates, during the time specified, which can be reasonably construed to inculcate or encourage polygamy; and when an Elder of the Church has used language which appeared to convey any such teaching, he has been promptly reproved. And I now publicly declare that my advice to the Latter-day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land.

WILFORD WOODRUFF
President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.¹

Rulon S. Howells contended that the Mormons really stopped plural marriage with the arrival of the Manifesto.

He wrote:

In their practice of polygamy, the Mormons, at the time, were living according to the religious liberties granted to all Americans by the Constitution of the United States. However, when Congress later enacted laws prohibiting polygamy, the Mormons later accepted them, and since October 6, 1890, have neither sanctioned nor practiced polygamy. They had accepted polygamy as a commandment of God. It had served a worthy purpose. The government of the country to which they pledged allegiance and were citizens abolished polygamy.

¹Doctrine and Covenants, pp. 256-7.
The Mormons, always believing in upholding the law and again, by divine sanction, ceased its practice and were therefore "released" from their obligation to comply with the commandment to practice polygamy. The practice of polygamy was abolished by the Mormon Church in 1890 and is grounds for excommunication.²

Ignoring Howell's claim that plural marriage served a worthy purpose, let us consider his contentions regarding the abolition of plural marriage. He said it was set aside "by divine sanction."³ He was not alone in this assertion.

Dyer wrote: "The same God who had commanded them to live it had now commanded them not to live it."⁴ It seems that God changed His mind.

John J. Stewart, on the other hand, claimed that the Manifesto only suspended the practice of plural marriage.⁵ He does not refer to the Manifesto as a revelation and he says of plural marriage:

The Church has never, and certainly never will, renounce this doctrine. The revelation on plural marriage is still an integral part of LDS scripture, and always be.⁶

The suspension of plural marriage was not a revelation-caused event, according to Stewart. It was merely "Church

³Howells, p. 141. ⁴Dyer, p. 104.
⁵Stewart, Brigham, p. 15.
policy."7

This confusion was not new in Mormon circles. It goes all the way back to 1890 and before. Lorenzo Snow declared in court that no revelation would be produced under state pressure. He said:

Whatever fame Mr. Bierbower may have secured as a lawyer, he certainly fail as a prophet. The severest prosecutions have never been followed by a divine revelation changing a divine law, obedience to which brought imprisonment or martyrdom.

Though I go to prison, God will not change His law of celestial marriage. But the man, the people, the nation, that oppose and fight against this doctrine and the Church of God, will be overthrown.8

But the Manifesto came precisely in response to such persecution. Who was the prophet after all?

The persecution was severe and methodical. Test oaths in both Utah9 and Idaho10 effectively reduced the political effectiveness of the Mormons. By the late 1880's, all prominent Mormon polygamists were on the run from Federal marshals. John Taylor spent the last year of his life in the underground, taking six new wives during that time.11 And that was not all. The Church was actually disincorporated and the Perpetual Emigra-

---
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tion Fund was confiscated. In 1888, the Territorial Legislature passed a section of the penal code forbidding unlawful cohabitation. The law did not require any overt sexual activity. It was only necessary to claim to have more than one wife. The code says:

To be cohabiting it is not necessary that the man actually dwell with the woman, nor is it necessary that he take his meals with his wife, to be living with her; nor is it necessary that they be under the same roof. And he need not pass a certain number of days and nights with his wife in order to be considered as living with her. If he sees her daily, or but a few times a year, he is living with her; he is cohabiting with her. If there has been no legal separation or divorce, whether one roof shelters them or not, if he holds her out to the world as a wife, supports her and recognizes her as a wife, they are living together. United States v. Snow, 4 U. S. 313, 319, 9 P. 697.

When a man lives and associates with two or more women as a husband with his wife, he is guilty of cohabitation. Holding more than one woman out to the world as his wife is sufficient to constitute the offense. United States v. Snow, 4 U. S. 313, 324, 9 P. 697, setting out approved instruction to jury.

Cohabitation contemplated by this section does not include sexual intercourse; the word does not even include necessarily the occupying of the same bed; therefore it is unnecessary to allege in indictments anything in regard to sexual intercourse, for sexual intercourse is not a necessary element in the crime here defined. United States v. Cannon, 4 U. 122, 128, 7 P. 369, aff'd 116 U.S. 55, 29 L. Ed. 561, 6 S. Ct. 276; United States v. Musser, 4 U. 153, 7 P. 369.


It is not the gist of the offense to "ostensibly" live with plural wives. Living with them

12Larson, p. 226.
secretly is just as much a violation of this section. United States v. Peay, 5 U. 263, 14 P. 342.

When a polygamist has a lawful wife living within the jurisdiction of the court, known and understood to be such, and he lives and cohabits with another woman as his wife, he is guilty of a violation of this section. The presumption that he cohabits with the legal wife is a legal one, and is conclusive, if it is a presumption at all. In other words, if they both bear his name and are known as his wives, he is regarded as cohabiting with them as a matter of law. United States v. Clark, 6 U. 120, 21 P. 465, overruling United States v. Clark, 5 U. 226, 14 P. 288; United States v. Smith, 5 U. 232, 14 P. 291; United States v. Harris, 5 U. 436, 17 P. 75.13

This code was an effective tool for controlling Mormon polygamy, formed specifically for that purpose.

No wonder that Wiford Woodruff wrote in his journal entry for September 25, 1890:

I have arrived at a point in the history of my life as the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints where I am under the necessity of acting for the temporal salvation of the Church. The United States Government has taken a stand and passed laws to destroy the Latter-day Saints on the subject of polygamy or patriarchal marriage, and after praying to the Lord and feeling inspired, I have issued the following proclamation which is sustained by my counselors and the twelve apostles.14

Expediency was the only possible course of action.

As a matter of fact, there is a good deal of evidence to support the theory that Woodruff acted only on the basis of expedient compromise and contrary to the supposed revelations of the Church. First, there is the testimony of Woodruff himself. He never claimed

13Utah State Penal Code, Section 76-53-2.
that God had spoken to him. He only claimed to have felt inspired or to have seen some light.\textsuperscript{15} He did not say that God had set it aside. He only advised the Saints to "obey the law."\textsuperscript{16} He had no other choice, since, "To be very plain with you, President Woodruff, our friends expect, and the country will insist, that the Church shall yield the practice of plural marriage."\textsuperscript{17} Woodruff showed the document to Frank J. Cannon, who had been representing the Mormons to Utah. Cannon's reaction was very plain:

\begin{quote}
I found it disappointingly mild. It denied that the Church had been solemnizing any plural marriages of late, and advised the faithful "to refrain from contracting any marriages forbidden by the law of the land."\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

It is clear that, from 1886-1890, the Church was in the midst of a total upheaval. The document later to be called the Manifesto appears to have existed in some form as early as 1883, but was not felt to have "come from the right source."\textsuperscript{19} In that same period, two revelations were received which contradicted the Manifesto. The first was given to President John Taylor on September 27, 1884. It said:

\begin{quote}
My son John. You have asked me concerning the new and everlasting covenant how far it is binding
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15}Frank J. Cannon and H. J. O'Higgins, Under the Prophet in Utah (Boston: C. M. Clark, 1911), p. 97.
\textsuperscript{16}Tanner, Mormonism, p. 235. \textsuperscript{17}Cannon, p. 100.
\textsuperscript{18}Cannon, p. 100. \textsuperscript{19}Tanner, Mormonism, p. 233.
upon my peop[le]

Thus saith the Lord All commandments that I give must be obeyed by those calling themselves unless they are revoked by my or by my authority, and how can I revoke an everlasting covenant; for I the Lord am everlasting & my everlasting covenants cannot be abrogated nor done away with; but they stand for ever. Have I not given my word in great plainness on this subject? Yet have not great numbers of my people been negligent in the observance of my law & the keeping of my commandment and yet have I borne with them these many years and this because of their weakness because of the perilous times & furthermore, it is more pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters. Nevertheless I the Lord do not change & my word & my covenants & my law do no & as I have heretofore said by my servant Joseph All those who would enter into my glory must & shall obey my law & have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed & would enter into my glory, they must do the works of Abraham. I have not revoked this law nor will I for it is ever-lasting & those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof, even so Amen. 20

The Church later denied that this revelation existed.

The First Presidency of Heber J. Grant made an official statement which said:

As to this pretended revelation it should be said that the archives of the Church contain no such revelation; the archives contain no record of any such revelation, nor any evidence justifying a belief that such a revelation was ever given. From the personal knowledge of some of us, from the uniform and common recollection of the presiding quorums of the Church, from the absence in the Church archives of any evidence whatsoever justifying any belief that such a revelation was given, we are justified in affirming that no such revelation exists. 21

Yet, Apostle John W. Taylor and Apostle Matthias

---

20Tanner, Mormonism, p. 242. 21Tanner, Mormonism, p.242.
cited the 1886 revelation in their defense at their trial at the Salt Lake Temple in 1911. On that occasion, Francis M. Lyman, Charles W. Penrose, Anthony W. Ivins, and David O. McKay seemed aware of the existence of the Revelation.22 Abraham H. Cannon also spoke of the 1886 Revelation as early as 1892.23 In fact, the evidence for the 1886 Revelation is so strong that Dean C. Jessee, in his Master's Thesis at Brigham Young University, was compelled to state that the revelation exists and is genuine.24

The 1889 edition of the Manifesto, which L. John Nuttal had very definitely rejected as being from the wrong source was later rejected by God. On December 19, 1889, this proto-Manifesto was laid before God. According to Apostle Abraham H. Cannon:

> The answer came quick and strong. The Word of the Lord was for us NOT TO YIELD ONE PARTICLE of that which he had revealed and established. He had done and would continue to care for His work and those of the Saints who were faithful, and we need have no fear of our enemies when we were in the line of duty.25

Twice in that same context, Cannon referred to this Word of the Lord as a Revelation.

22 Tanner, Mormonism, pp. 242-3.

23 Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, April 1, 1892, cited by Tanner, Mormonism, p. 243

24 Godfrey, p. 15.

No wonder there was mass confusion as to the validity of the Manifesto!

Linguistic considerations make it even more difficult to accept the Manifesto as a Revelation. First of all, it is the only item in the Doctrine and Covenants which does not have a Section number. It is an official declaration of the Church, not a revelation. There is nothing in the Manifesto that indicates the source of the decision it records was revelation. The Supreme Court is the Supreme Court of appeal. It is, therefore, not a revelation. It is a smoke-screen. The deception that was self-evident throughout all previous Mormon history continued with the Manifesto.

For instance, the Manifesto claims that the last known case of plural marriage authorized by the First Presidency (or even known of by the First Presidency) was in the spring of 1859. History does not bear out that claim. During that same period, the Utah Commission had enough evidence to speak of 41 marriages having been contracted where the husband was already married.26

Then, in 1896, Abraham H. Cannon took Lillian Hamlin as a plural wife.27

---


27P. J. Cannon, pp. 176-80.
Even Wilford Woodruff was inconsistent. On one occasion, he testified that the intention of the Manifesto was not just to stop future marriages. It was intended to stop all associations and unlawful cohabitation with wives already taken. But, on October 7, 1890, this same Wilford Woodruff said:

This manifesto only refers to future marriages, and does not affect past conditions. I did not, could not would not promise that you would desert your wives and children.

And, at the Smoot hearings, "they testified that they had resumed polygamous cohabitation to an extent unsuspected by either Gentiles or Mormons." President Joseph F. Smith stated that his five wives had borne him eleven off-spring since the Manifesto. Three other apostles and two Presidents of the Seventies also confessed to similar activites. Joseph F. Smith and Francis Lyman both admitted to be violating the laws of God. Approximately fifteen cases of known polygamy were brought before the hearings which demonstrated conclusively that Mormons as high as the Apostolate were still taking plural wives after the Manifesto into

---

33F. J. Cannon, p. 269.
the Twentieth Century. At this point in time, the Manifesto had not yet been published in the Doctrine and Covenants. It had been printed as a pamphlet and the pamphlet did not indicate that the Manifesto was a revelation. Joseph F. Smith called it an "oversight," but promised the Senators it would appear in the next edition. Then, he forgot that promise. Cannon even gives evidence that this "new polygamy" continued with the blessings of the Church until 1910—twenty years after the Manifesto. And, of course, it is true that plural marriage has never been completely wiped out. Nonetheless, it is true that after the trial of Apostle John W. Taylor in 1911, where he was excommunicated for taking plural wives after the Manifesto, that the atmosphere began to change in Utah. The reality began to catch up with the Revolution. In both 1911 and 1921, reports were printed which indicated that no one on earth had the power to perform plural marriages. The 1904 statement about excommunication was dug out and rehabilitated. From that point forward, the main concentration of Utah polygamists would begin to siphon out of the Church and into Fundamentalist groups.

The photographs contained on Pages 101 A-G constitute proof that plural marriage was taught in print as late as 1852. George Q. Cannon and Abraham H. Cannon were Apostles, so it is felt that this volume represents official Mormon doctrine.
While these ancient nations were monogamists, the fault of intercourse between the sexes, especially in the past of men, were very indefinite. This placed society is quite characteristic of the modern nations of Europe and America. While the Christian sees fit to day profess some respect for the patriarchs of Israel, they practically condemn their family relations as corrupt and immoral.

Plural marriage is unlawful, then is the whole plural marriage, through the bones of Israel, a future, and the entire faith of Christianity, without foundation.

God said to Abraham, "I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face; and God talked with him, saying, as for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations;" Gen. 17, 1-4.

Here we are informed that God talked with Abra- ham, told him to be perfect, bestowed upon him the blessings of a numerous posterity, and, as a sec- ond, future power and glory. If polygamy was contrary to his law, it is remarkable that God should have condescended to talk with and greatly bless a man who had, but a short time before, taken a second wife, while the first was living; a fact of which we are informed in the second and third verses of the previous chapter. If this was criminal, Sarah, the mother of all Israel, was involved in the transgression, for she gave Hagar to her husband for a wife; Gen. 16, 3.

The Lord told Joseph, the Servant, that he com- mandated, "And Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife," Dec. & Cor. 172, 32. This is also the testi- mony of Josephus, the Jewish Historian; Ant. II. 1. C. 16.

When Hagar was in distress, on account of difficul- ty with her mistress, the Lord did not permit her as a profane, cast off woman, but sent an angel to coun- sel and comfort her, by assuring her that her posterity should not be numbered for multitude; Gen. 16, 2-10.
After having repented and suffered for his sin, Bath-shenah was given him for a wife, and she bare Solomon; 1 Kgs. 14. The Lord appeared to this son of a plural wife in a dream, and bestowed upon him great blessings; 1 Kgs. 3. God gave him "Wisdom and understanding exceeding much," 1 Kgs. 4. 29. He was not remiss in plural marriage but for marrying strange wives, who led him into idolatry and wickedness; 1 Kgs. 11. Many chief men in Israel, to whom the Lord manifested his favor, were polygamists.

The following is sometimes quoted as an argument against plural marriages: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh," Mark 10. 7, 8. But "Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh?" 1 Cor. 6. 16, shows that it has no connection with the subject.

"A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife," 1 Tim. 3. 2, and let seducers be the husbands of one wife; verse 12, are supposed by some to limit officers in the church, and by inference all men, to one wife. But when the passages are taken in connection with the context, which is an enumeration of several qualifications necessary for bishops and deacons, there is but one reasonable construction—that these officers of the church should be married men.

The Latter-day Saints believe that all men should marry; DCC. 2 Cor. 6. 15—17. The Lord is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and can not look upon iniquity." Job. 1. 13; and says, "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation;" Deut. 23. 2. Yet the patriarchs had the twelve tribes of Israel none of the sons of four wives of Jacob; Gen. 35. 22—26.

Joseph, the first son of Rachel, the second wife of Jacob, received especial blessings; Gen. 29. 22—26. The Lord called to Samuel, the son of a polygamous father; 1 Sam. 34. 4—4. Solomon was the son of a polygamist, yet he was a child of promi-
It was then a dark period in the history of Israel, as is evident from the little history of the times, and from the opening chapter of the Book of Mormon.

The brilliant reign of Solomon had directly planted in Israel the sins of idolatry and sexual wickedness. His reign was the pride of Israel, and its effects were deep and lasting. It hastened the destruction of the ten tribes, as a people, some one hundred and twenty years before the exodus of Lehi, and at that time was about to culminate in the destruction of Jerusalem and in the Babylonish captivity.

With all his wisdom, Solomon had disobeyed two very important commandments, one especially to the kings of Israel: "Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away;" Deut. 17, 17. The other was to all Israel, that they should not marry into the idolatrous nations around them: "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son;" Deut. 7, 3, Ezek. chapters 16, 10.

Through disobedience to these injunctions, his heart had turned away from the Lord, and he had been led into idolatry and wickedness. At his death he not only left the influence of his personal example, but, also, a numerous family who, from their great wealth and high social position, must have exercised a powerful and lasting influence for evil, which, with other causes, resulted, in less than three hundred years, in the scattering of the ten tribes among the nations of Asia, and the occupation of their country by strangers, and in less than four hundred years, in the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the Babylonish captivity.

The sexual wickedness which had become prevalent in Israel, and the consequent lapse of the marriage relations, was, evidently, the reason why the Lord commanded that the children of Lehi should have but one wife, for he said to the Nephites, through his prophet Jacob, "This people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures; for they seek to excuse themselves in committing..."
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wherefrom, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son," 2 Ch. 32.

That is, they exceeded themselves with the example of these kings for breaking the special command of God to them, that they should have but one wife, and like those eminent persons, ran into excess and wickedness, as their fathers had done before them.

To manifest the evil effects of the bad example of their fathers was evidently the reason why the Lord commanded the Nephites, "For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none." 3 Nep. 27. Plural marriage would have been heredom to the Nephites, because the Lord had forbidden it.

That the prophet Jacob foresaw, prophetically, that at some future period this restriction would be taken off is evident from verse 30, 31; 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. That is, they were required to limit themselves to one wife, until the Lord should order it otherwise, and by implication, when he instructed them to take more than one wife, it would be justifiable.

In the thirtieth verse the Lord gives a reason for forbidding plural marriage among the Nephites. "For behold, I, the Lord, have seen the sorrow, and heard the mourning of the daughters of my people in the land of Jerusalem; yea, and in all the lands of my people, because of the wickedness and abominations of their husbands."

These teachings of the prophet Jacob cannot be presumed, even by opposers of plural marriage, to do away with the tenor of the Jewish Scriptures, for we are informed in 2 Nephi 3, that the record of the Jews and of the Nephites, should grow together unto the confounding of false doctrine in the latter-days.

The prophet Jacob could not have intended to condemn a principle on which is based the legitimacy of our Savior, of prophets and patriarchs, and indeed of the whole house of Israel. The words "multiply," and "greatly," in Deut. 17, 17, evidently imply

excess and unreasonable indulgence, as in the case of David and Uzziah, and in taking strange women, as in the case of Solomon.

The absurdity of the argument that these passages imply that a man should have but one wife, is evident from the previous verse, that the kings of Israel should "not multiply horses to themselves." 3 Nep. 27. No one would be so unreasonable as to suppose that the Lord designed to limit the kings of Israel to one horse.

The Lord gave Joseph Smith a very important revelation on this subject. It is contained in Sec. 132, Dec. 27, 1832. It is entitled a "Revelation on the Eternity of the Marriage Covenant, Including Plurality of Wives."

It commences by stating that the prophet Joseph Smith, Jun., inspired of the Lord, how it was that his servants anciently were justified in having many wives and concubines. The Lord did not answer his question at once, but tells him, in the third verse, to prepare his heart to receive and obey the instructions he was about to give him.

In the fourth verse the Lord said to him, "I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant." We find the general principle involved in that covenant, directly stated in the seventh, thirteenth and fourteenth verses:

"And verily I say unto you, that the conditions of this law are these: All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, covenants, associations, or expectations, that are not made and entered into, and sealed, by the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is sanctified, both as well for time and for all eternity, and that too most holy, by revelation and commandment through the medium of mine apostles, whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power, and I have appointed unto my servants that they hold this power in the last days, and there is never but one on the earth at a time, on whom this power and the keys of this Priesthood are conferred, are of no efficacy, virtue or force, in and after the resurrection from the dead; for all covenants that are not made unto this end, have no end when
men are dead. * * * And everything that is in the world, whether it be worldly or worldly, is of reason, or power, or things of name, whatsoever they may be, that are not by me, or by my will, with the Lord, shall be thrown down, and shall not remain after men are dead, neither in nor after the resurrection, with the Lord; for whatsoever things remain, are by me; and whatsoever things are not by me, shall be broken and destroyed." We find a strict application of this law to the marriage relations in verse 14 and 15: "If a man marry him a wife in the world, and he marry her not by me, nor by my will, and he be covenant with her so long as he is in the world, and she with him, their covenant and marriage are not of force when they are dead, and when they are out of the world; therefore, they are not bound by my law when they are out of the world. * * * And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife in the world, which is my last, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is sanctified, unto whom I have appointed this power, and the keys of this Priesthood; and it shall be said unto them, ye shall come forth in the first resurrection; and if it be after the first resurrection, in the next resurrection; and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights and depths—then shall it be written in the Lamb's Book of Life, that he shall commit no murder wheresoever my servant hath put upon them, in time, and through all eternity, and shall be in all things perfect and holy in all things. * * * And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry his wife in the world, and they shall pass by the angels, and the Gods, which are set there, to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon the heads, which glory shall be a fulness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever." The above quotations evidence, that only those who comply with the law will continue in the marriage relations after death; consequently only those who comply with the law can expect a continuation of posterity in the world to come, and the consequent glory and power pertaining to that condition.

The law of the Lord is very plain on this subject. Who can question his right to dictate the marriages of his sons and daughters, that they and their generations may be fitted for his presence? In verse 29, the Lord begins to answer the question in the first verse: "Abraham received all things, whatsoever he received, by revelation and commandment." * * * God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife," verse 35. That is, God commanded Abraham to receive Hagar and commanded his already covenant wife to give her handmaid to him. "And why did she do it? Because this was the law." The reason why Abraham was not under condemnation, is very forcibly expressed in the latter part of verse 35: "For I, the Lord, commanded it." In verse 36—39, the principle is well elucidated, that, in nothing did the ancients sin except in things which they received not of God.

In verse 40, the Lord says to Joseph, the Seer: "I gave unto thee, my servant Joseph, an appointment, and restored all things." And from the tenor of the Revelation, "all things" must include plurality of wives and the eternity of the marriage covenant.

This subject may be readily summed up as follows: If a man has a wife in the world to come, she will be a gift from the Lord, through the covenants he has ordained, and that man is justified in receiving all the wives the Lord sees fit to give him, through the authority he has appointed on the earth. Many elders of the Latter-day Saints have been commanded, as was Abraham, to enter into plural marriage, and disobedience becomes transgression. Hence it involves a religious principle, and becomes a matter of conscience. "Then shall love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else" (Hac II Cor. 42, 22) is sometimes referred to as an argument against plural marriage.
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If it would admit of this construction, it would not be found as an argument, from the fact, that the revelation of which it forms a part was given previous to that on the pluralism and necessity of the marriage relations, and consequently, before the church was prepared to revert to such a revelation. It evidently admits of the construction, that a man may have more than one wife, and yet cleave to none but his wife. That is, it forbids all sexual commerce outside of the marriage covenant.
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