

question like this? If we go out when the stars of God are shining at night and look heavenward, who cannot believe? The mind of man is powerless to build, construct, or create a syllogism more powerful than the starry heavens of God. Who can see Saturn sailing through the evening skies and not believe? Who can see Jupiter in his pomp and power, "rolling on majestic wings," and not believe? Who can look upon the sun of our own solar system and not believe? Who can see this earth of ours, being rushed through the heavens at the rate of seventeen miles a second, and never going out of its place, and not believe?

It is a great deal easier to believe than not believe. Those who ask us to believe there is no God, ask us to believe a million miracles which have brought forth the wonderful creation which we see about us in this great universe of ours; and Christ asks us to believe only one miracle, and that great miracle is God.

I think we can make our choice. I believe we can reason this thing out in our own minds, and let us remember that our faith in the things which are to be is because of the things that are. Faith is reasoning from the known to the unknown. So our faith does not call for absurdity. The credulity of the Hindu mother, my friends, demands of her that she take her sweet babe down to the holy river and

feed it to the crocodiles. The credulity of the children of Ammon, called faith, demanded that they take their babes and place them in the blistering hands of Moloch, the God of cruelty. The credulity of the Aztec demanded that he take his prisoners of war and oftentimes himself, to the sacrificial stone in devotion to the sun god. Our faith calls but for a reasonable service. It insists upon a living sacrifice; not a dead one. Our faith asks us to trust in the King of kings and the Lord of lords.

Shall we depend upon him, or not? Shall we place our faith in God? Shall we place our faith in that God who is the Master Mind of the world, or in chance?

Now, in all these things we are left to make our choice. I hope that our choice may be made with wisdom and direction, and that we may search out the ways of God, and finding them, walk fearlessly therein, for only by a fearless walk in the things of God can we come to the place that God has appointed. Let us feel in our hearts, as we so often sing,

God is marshalling his army,
For the rescue of his truth.

If we believe that in our hearts, we will move forward in faith, and God will go ahead of us, and in the end we will receive the crown of eternal life, which God has promised to those who have faith.

Joseph Smith, The Foe of Polygamy.

Sermon by Walter W. Smith, Sunday, November 7, 1920, At the Stone Church, Independence, Missouri.

Reported by Howard W. Harder.

The last two verses of the 59th chapter of Isaiah: "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever."

Here is a promise that three generations of those into whose mouths the Lord should put his word should be loyal and true to the same.

I also want to read to you from the 7th chapter of Matthew, beginning with the 15th verse: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

I think perhaps I owe you an apology. I feel that to any decent, respectable, and truthloving congregation of this size is due the apology of any minister who stands forth to speak on a subject so hackneyed and dirty as the one I essay to speak upon this evening. It is not my choice that this subject should be so necessary at any time. As a minister for Christ, I stand in defense of the truth, whatsoever it may be. Never under any circumstances, never under any pretext, never at any time is it right to defend the truth with an error. And anything that purports to be true, but which requires to be defended by a lie, carries with it its refutation, its own negation. Were it not for circumstances over which I and my friends have no control, there would be no occasion

for an address such as I am about to make this evening, on the subject, "Joseph Smith, the foe of polygamy."

For the comfort, assurance, and guidance of all that may hear me now speak, I want to say to begin with, what I believe you ought to know as a sort of guide or gauge of what I am likely to say, that Joseph Smith was not in any way responsible for the introduction, the practice, or the teaching of polygamy.

Now, I expect you will say to me, "You are rather a young man to make such a bold statement." And so I am. My experience with this church goes back only about twenty-six years, so I cannot bear you my personal testimony as to the character and conduct of Joseph Smith as a minister for Christ, who was assassinated on the 27th day of June, 1844, several decades before I was born; but the information concerning his life, the results of his ministry, his own public teachings, the witness of those who knew him best, are all available—they are not lost.

I want to say to you that Joseph Smith's only relation to polygamy was that of a relentless foe, who fought it without mercy until he was slain. Now you know my position, and I can prove my assertion.

I am going to divide the evidence on this subject, that I have acquired during my short ministry, into three classes. And I want to say in the beginning that, owing to the insidious and untimely remarks of those who seem to be poorly informed, I have made it my business to make a very careful study of that which seems to some people to implicate Joseph Smith in the practice of polygamy. After a careful and prayerful and consistent reading of these documents I can say to you to-night that his only relation to polygamy was that of an uncompromising enemy.

We ought to divide this evidence into groups so that we can talk about it a little more plainly. I shall try not to

read you anything unless it be something that I could not do justice by quoting.

Personal Evidence.

Of course, there would be no necessity for any explanation if some one did not accuse Joseph Smith of being responsible for polygamy. Brigham Young presented in August, 1852, a document called by him a revelation. He presented it to the church, or that branch of the church which was then in the Salt Lake neighborhood of Utah. He told the people at the time he presented it that the document had been in his possession for a long time under lock and key, and that nothing leaked out that should not.

Brigham Young is reported by the *Deseret News* of July 1, 1874, to have said, in a sermon delivered June 21, 1874, in the Tabernacle at Salt Lake City, speaking of this doctrine of polygamy:

"While we were in England in 1839 and 1840 I think, the Lord manifested to me by vision and his Spirit things that I did not understand. I never opened my mouth to anyone concerning them until I returned to Nauvoo. Joseph had never mentioned this. There had never been a thought of it in the church that I ever knew anything about, at this time; but I had this to myself, and kept it to myself. . . . And when I returned home and Joseph revealed those things to me, then I understood the reflections of my mind while in England; but this was not until I had told him what I understood. This was in 1841. The revelation was given in 1843, but the doctrine was revealed before this."

Now this man Brigham Young says that he had a revelation in his possession which he had kept some seven or eight years and that he was now ready to present this to the church; to the people. This was in August, 1852. Mind you, if you are willing to accept the personal testimony of this man (he is not my witness) you should remember that in the same breath in which he testifies that Joseph Smith had been the author of this revelation he also testifies that he knows by the witness of the Spirit that the principle of polygamy is of God. Beware how you accept such witnesses. You should also remember that it is not the privilege of a man who introduces a witness to take parts of his testimony and deny the rest, for, if he is trustworthy and acceptable in testifying to the thing which you are bringing forth your witness to prove, his word must likewise be accepted by you on other points as well.

Perhaps that will be as much as I need to say concerning this man who is responsible for the introduction of polygamy, whoever may have been the author of the document he presents. However, he says that he himself was the first to speak of it.

I want to notice another side of this question, and I may have to read just a little to refresh my mind, because it is so exceedingly delicate that I do not want to risk making it any worse than it is.

The next witness I want to notice is one Zina D. Huntington Jacobs. She is not my witness. She is the witness of those who say Joseph Smith was responsible for this doctrine of polygamy, which I think is untrue. This woman, Zina D. Huntington, testifies that she was married to Joseph Smith in 1841. That is a very direct testimony, isn't it? On page 12 of *Representative Women of Deseret* you will find the following: "Sister Zina was married in Nauvoo, and had two sons, but this not proving a happy union, she subsequently separated from her husband. Joseph Smith taught her the principle of marriage for eternity, and she accepted it as a divine revelation, and was sealed to the Prophet for time and eternity, after the order of the new and everlasting covenant."

Also in *Pictures and Biographies of Brigham Young and His Wives*, page 32, you will find: "Sister Zina was married to Henry Jacobs in Nauvoo, and had two sons, but this not proving a happy union, she subsequently separated from her husband. Joseph Smith taught her the principle of marriage for eternity, and she accepted it as a divine revelation, and was sealed to the Prophet Joseph for time and eternity, October 27, 1841, her brother, Dimick Huntington, officiating."

Mind you, this is the kind of evidence that is adduced by our enemies and those who would try to prove that the doctrine of polygamy originated in the teachings of Joseph Smith. Here is a woman who says that she was married to Joseph Smith. Now, let me give you just a little reference that will help you to appreciate the worth of this woman as a witness. What she was as a woman, I do not know. She may have been a good housekeeper, an altogether satisfactory nurse, but as a witness you can see how far she misses the mark. The records of marriages for Hancock County, Illinois, show that Henry B. Jacobs and Zina D. Huntington were married in Nauvoo on the 7th of March, 1841, John C. Bennett, mayor of Nauvoo, officiating. This woman testifies that she bore two sons, not twins, to Henry Jacobs between March 7 and October 27 that same year, got tired of marriage and was divorced! Shades of witnesses!! Then the story goes on that she married Joseph Smith in October of that year, but unfortunately for the situation, so far as the witness is concerned, she is recorded as the mother of a son born at Pisgah, Iowa, in 1846, whom she called Chariton, being the son of Henry Jacobs. She had not quit living with him yet, notwithstanding she testified that she was married to Joseph Smith in October, 1841. You can imagine what a witness like that is worth. I have quoted in every instance from those that are friendly to Zina D. Jacobs. Why, it almost makes me ashamed to think that I have to do this thing. If you all had these witnesses and had this matter before you, certainly you would not need anybody to preach a sermon on the subject.

The next witness I would like to introduce—not my witness, understand, but a witness for those who say that Joseph Smith was the author of polygamy—is Eliza Snow, the poetess. She herself says that she married Joseph Smith in March and June, 1842. I do not know why she was married twice, but fortunately for Joseph Smith and the friends of truth, Miss Eliza Roxey Snow is on record bearing date of October 1, 1842. If she was married in June, it is just a short time, and if in March, but a little longer time before she bore testimony with a group of other women that there was no law known in the church relating to marriage except the one published in Section 111 in our present Doctrine and Covenants, called the "Article on Marriage," as published in all the books of Doctrine and Covenants between 1835 and 1876, and in all of ours up to the present date.

Now, if this Miss Snow was married to Joseph Smith in March and June, or either one, 1842, she knew in October, 1842, some other rule of marriage than the one established in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, as everyone present may well know, for the rule laid down in the Book of Covenants says distinctly, "You both mutually agree to be each other's companion, husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves wholly for each other, and from all others, during your lives." And that was the rule published at the time she made her certificate, October 1, 1842, saying that she knew that was the only rule of marriage in the church. She made this affidavit to prove that the things being said by John C. Bennett were malicious and ungrounded lies. If Miss Snow was not

dead and was not a woman, I would like to ask her when did she lie. Certainly she perjured herself hopelessly one time or the other, and in either event her testimony is not worth the reading.

I could go on and give you a list of witnesses longer than there is any necessity of doing, and I could point out the very same kind of discrepancies, each and every one of whom attempted to say that Joseph Smith did teach and practice polygamy; and they seemed to glory in the fact that they had the wonderful and glorious privilege (?) of being a concubine to Joseph Smith. These women could not be wives of his, because the law of the land prohibited a man from having more than one wife, and the law of the church says that a man and wife must keep themselves wholly from all others and for each other, otherwise they are guilty of adultery; and those guilty of adultery shall be cut off unless they repent, which means a turning away from it.

I am sure I do not know why these people tell these stories about themselves. I have wondered about it a good many times. I have always had a great deal of respect for a statement once made by R. C. Evans in reference to these testimonies. He said that those who preferred to take the testimony of this class of people could take it if they wanted to, but he didn't care to associate with such people. Of course, he has since changed his mind, but he is at liberty to do that. And anybody else who wants to pick that kind of a crowd to go with, and accept that kind of testimony, may do so; and if they can be proud of it, they have a remarkable adjustment.

I want to give you some of the testimony of people on the other side. Emma Hale Smith, the lawful, wedded wife of Joseph Smith, was married to him in 1827 at Bainbridge, New York, lived with him until his death, bore his several sons, and bore his posthumous son, David H. Smith, five months after he was killed. She was a fine, God-fearing, truthful woman, loyal to the memory of Joseph Smith to her dying day. She said that she was knowing to the situation so well that she could say positively Joseph Smith never had any wife but herself; she even goes further and says "nor did he sustain such relations with any woman or women other than myself." And if anybody on earth would know whether a man was marrying a dozen or half dozen women and teaching other people to do it, his wife would surely know it, especially as she lived right in the same community where it is alleged to have been taught, and, according to the testimony of these people, she was present at such marriages and gave her consent thereto. Isn't it remarkable that anybody would testify to that kind of a thing when the people who should know, and did know, said such a thing did not happen?

Joseph Smith, the Prophet, son of Joseph Smith the Martyr and father of Frederick M., was twelve years old when his father was killed, and he says that his father never practiced polygamy. (Do you think a twelve-year old boy isn't knowing?) Where there are jarrings and contentions between a father and a mother, do you think a young boy twelve years of age would not know it? Do you think he could live in a house where his father was keeping a harem and not know it? Yet, he bears an unflinching testimony as to the character of his father.

James Whitehead, private secretary to Joseph Smith, and lifelong friend, during his entire life and to his dying day bore witness that there was no such thing as a revelation on polygamy known at the time of which these people bearing testimony speak, and that if Joseph Smith wrote it or had anything to do with it, it was wholly unknown to him, and he was his private secretary from 1841 to the time of Joseph's death in 1844.

I have heard father Richard Lambert, sr., twice in my life say in unstinted words, that he was a member of the Nauvoo Legion and lived at Nauvoo and that there was not any doubt in the world but what the criticism of Joseph Smith was a gross misrepresentation and that there was no ground for the saying that Joseph Smith was responsible for polygamy.

I have spoken to a great many people and I have talked with those who were living at Nauvoo, not in great numbers, because they were thinning out by the time I came along; but I have talked to quite a considerable number, all of whom testify personally to knowing that Joseph Smith was not responsible for this doctrine.

Think of the ridiculous situation with which we are confronted. We meet people who testify that they were Joseph Smith's wives, but when we inquire deeply into the matter we find that the marriage ceremony takes place in Salt Lake City and that Brigham Young or some other person stood proxy for Joseph Smith. There is no way in the world to save a man's reputation from such calumny. It is really quite ridiculous.

Circumstantial Evidence.

The circumstantial evidence in the case is one that is rather difficult to deal with, because every person puts his own interpretation on what he considers a circumstance, and we sometimes hear this kind of a saying, "Well, where there is so much smoke, there must be a little fire"; or, "Where there is so much talk, there must be a little truth." "There must have been something or other to start this talk at Nauvoo, or else there would not have been so much to talk about." There was something. There certainly was something. To attempt to say that there wasn't any talk of polygamy nor any hint of it is only to weaken the cause of truth. There was talk about it. President Brigham Young says he talked about it and he told exactly where he got his cue—by a vision when in England. He said he came home and talked it to Joseph Smith, and if he had the temerity to talk to Joseph Smith about it he would doubtless have the courage to talk to others about the same thing.

Turn to *Times and Seasons*. There are a half dozen copies in town and anybody who wants to read it can easily borrow one. If you will turn to the issue of the first of February, 1844, you will find there a statement from Joseph Smith touching the preaching of polygamy. Isn't that strange? And it was just a few months prior to his death. A certain brother up at Lapeer, Michigan, had been teaching polygamy and other false and corrupt doctrines. This notice in the *Times and Seasons* says plainly that the brother is silenced and has been cut off and is cited to appear at a special conference to answer for his conduct. This notice appears over the signature of Joseph and Hyrum Smith.

A brother Richard Hewett, in March, 1844, called on Hyrum Smith and asked his views concerning some doctrines which were being taught to the Saints in Hancock County. Under date of March 15, 1844, we find this notice published in the *Times and Seasons* of same date, signed by Hyrum Smith, the presiding patriarch of the church:

"To the Saints residing on China Creek:

"Whereas Brother Richard Hewitt has called on me to-day, to know my views concerning some doctrines that are preached in your place, and states to me that some of your elders say, that a man *having* a certain priesthood, may have as many wives as he pleases, and that doctrine is taught here: I say unto you that that man teaches *false doctrine*, for there is no such doctrine taught here; neither is there any such thing practiced here."

(Continued on page 125.)

Saints. The truth will stand the test of opposition, and when the light is turned on, it but shines the brighter.

We trust that all who have been enlightened by its rays may continue faithful to their covenant.

M. A. McConley.

Mount Washington, Missouri, January 28.

Editors Ensign: Wife and I are members of the Mount Washington Branch. The Saints here have a new house of worship two blocks east of the car line. We are located between Independence and Kansas City. There is a noble band of Saints here. We number about one hundred and ten members. Many believe that the hastening time is upon us, and they are to give heed to the admonition to come up higher, that we be the children of God indeed as well as in name.

The sermons being preached by the ministry are both instructive and edifying. I feel that you who are isolated would love to hear a few thoughts from some of these splendid sermons. Bishop F. B. Blair preached to us last Sunday evening. Below are a few thoughts that were taken from his sermon, which are calling us to "put on the whole armor of God."

"No man can be a true disciple unless he has a desire to live aright." How beautifully this harmonizes with the word of God, which says, "For a man to rejoice, and to do good is life." And Jesus says, "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

The bishop further admonished us as follows: "To take up your cross is to abstain from all unrighteousness and worldly lust." Webster says lust means "to earnestly desire."

Dear Saints, shall we not learn to cease to "lust" after the things which "the Gentiles seek," and be true disciples of our blessed Master, who "hath no place to lay his head"? Are we so much more delicate and sensitive than he was, that we should require so much more wealth and pomp? He says, "Why is it that ye murmur among yourselves, saying, We cannot obey thy words because ye have not all these things, and cease to excuse yourselves, saying that after all these things do the Gentiles seek. Behold I say unto you, that your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need for all these things. Wherefore, seek ye not these things of this world; but seek ye first to establish his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."—Inspired Translation, Matthew 6: 36-38.

We believe that the gospel of Christ is not only the most perfect, but the perfect education, and that we should study to make ourselves approved, that we shall be made joint heirs of Jesus Christ, and inherit celestial glory. My prayer is that we will each choose to come up higher, making our calling and election sure.

A. V. Trego.

Independence, Missouri, February 8.

Editors Ensign: Uncle John Foss is still alive to his calling, which he received from his heavenly Father fifty-two years ago. And although now in my seventy-seventh year, I am trying to tell the angel message to the world. Of late, by invitation, I have been addressing a fair congregation at the mission in Armourdale, Kansas, and the good Spirit has greatly aided his humble servant in presenting the words of life and salvation.

Last Sunday night I spoke on the angel's message to a young boy by the name of Joseph Smith. At the close of the meeting several came to me and said, "That's what I've been wanting to hear." Some of the young men said: "You have done us young people lots of good with your course of sermons."

The officers in charge are filling their calling very well. They have a fine, orderly Sabbath school.

The president of the mission is a live wire, and seems to understand his high calling.

I was very much pleased to see the young people taking such an interest and an active part in the church work, and to see the little boys and girls playing their musical instruments.

J. C. Foss.

JOSEPH SMITH, FOE TO POLYGAMY.

(Continued from page 119.)

I have this to submit, that it is a most unusual thing that we find a situation like this, where a man has spent the last few days of his life in combatting in a most vehement manner such a gross evil and then after he is dead have the thing palmed off on him, the very thing that he was fighting. It reminds me of an argument I once heard in a class in philosophy. It was said that a certain prophet was a prophet because he prophesied. Then when they got through with that end of the argument, some one asked how they knew what he said was a prophecy; the answer was at once given, "Why, because he was a prophet!" On that basis, I can prove that any act was a good act, or was a bad act, just on that kind of evidence. I will say that John Jones is a very good man. How do I know? Because he does such and such good acts. How do I know that what he does is good? Why, because John Jones does it! First of all, let some one establish beyond the point of contradiction one single instance where Joseph Smith was in any way associated with polygamy, either in conversation, preaching, teaching, or writing, except as condemning it, then there will be another story to tell.

Now, concerning the circumstantial evidence. What would you think of a man who was the author of a set of rules by which he organized a large and flourishing society, to perpetuate which he lived and gave his efforts, and finally his life—I say, what would you think of a man who would live and labor and work to break down the very thing he was living and working and dying to build up? Do you find that kind of thing? No. Read in the Book of Mormon the most clear-cut and forbidding denunciation of polygamy to be found in the written word, whether in the Bible or the Doctrine and Covenants. "*There shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none, saith the Lord.*"

In section 42 of the Doctrine and Covenants, Joseph Smith is the author of the statement that a man shall cleave unto his wife "and they twain shall be one." He is the acknowledged minister who first in this church used the formula that was written into the article on Marriage and became the law and governing rule of his church. It is said that at a marriage feast in Kirtland he asked the contracting parties if they both mutually agreed "to be each other's companion, husband and wife, observing the legal rights belonging to this condition; that is, keeping yourselves wholly for each other, and from all others, during your lives?" He is the author. Oliver Cowdery may have written the article but the contract of marriage was not his, so we are told in the History of Joseph Smith, but it was Joseph's own invention. If it was a revelation to him he doesn't say so, but that was the ceremony he used and when this Doctrine and Covenants was prepared it was written into the book. Can you imagine the author of a document like that subsequently aiding or abetting or consenting to anything so diametrically opposed to a doctrine which says one man shall not have more than one living wife

at the same time? Can you think of it? Can you think of a man making the bold attack that he made on John C. Bennett for his adulterous practices if he were conniving in even the most secret manner to do likewise?

One of the documents used most frequently is a letter written by William Marks bearing no date. We do not know just when he did write it. It is published in a periodical published at Saint Louis, called *Zion's Harbinger*, and this periodical bears the date of July, 1853. This is a letter that has been very much used and misused, and in the course of this which I shall read to you at considerable length, he said, "Now, Brother Marks, I want you to go into the high council and I will have charges preferred against all who practice this doctrine, and I want you to try them by the law of the church and cut them off if they will not repent and cease from practicing this doctrine, and," said he, "I will go into the stand and preach against it with all my might, and in this way we will rid the church of this damnable heresy."

What do you think of the probable standing of a man who is said by those who testified in favor of Joseph Smith's complicity with polygamy, to have been married to a half dozen women already and to have been the author of a document said to have been a revelation commanding the men to marry more wives than one? What do you think of the probability of a man talking to the president of the stake, the chief pastor in the church, saying to him: "I want you to go into the high council and I will have charges preferred against all who practice this doctrine"? What would he look like, coming into the stand and declaring openly and fearlessly against the doctrine of a plurality of wives, if he were guilty as charged? Why, that would be the most unheard of thing you could imagine!

Does anybody have any idea that Joseph Smith was a fool? Why, his worst enemies give him credit for being very cunning, and shrewd, and cunningness isn't one of the traits of fools. All those people who seek to fasten upon Joseph Smith the responsibility for the doctrine of polygamy, whether or not they believe in him as a prophet, whether they believe him true or false, all with one accord are willing to admit that knave he may have been, or prophet he may have been, but fool he was not. Can you imagine such an unseemly circumstance as a man who had just submitted himself to being married to a half dozen females getting up in public and preaching against the doctrine of a plurality of wives? It seems to me that circumstantial evidence would fade out very fast indeed and it would be very hard to fasten this doctrine upon him by circumstances if the circumstances that are known were to count; but it is easy, quite easy to raise a hue and cry when there is nobody around who knows anything about it.

Documentary Evidence.

I want to present just a few words under this subject. The only fragment of documentary evidence to be had is section 132 in the Utah Book of Doctrine and Covenants, already referred to, which document was presented to the people by Brigham Young at the special conference of the church in August, 1852. Of course, there was a large company of people at that time who were well acquainted with Joseph Smith and knew his handwriting, and who knew the handwriting of his clerk, who might easily come forward and say, "Let me see the manuscript." I imagine there were many people there who were still quite in love with Brother Joseph. Note the ingenious attitude of Brigham Young. He said he had this document in his desk for some years under lock and key, but these friends would naturally enough recognize that it was

not the handwriting of Joseph Smith, nor that of his secretary, so he said that Joseph Smith had William Clayton write the revelation, but why that was done nobody knows. After William Clayton is said to have written this so-called revelation, Bishop Whitney wanted to borrow it, so they say, to get a good look at it. It is very interesting, you know; and so he had a copy made; and then the original copy which Joseph Smith had written, from which William Clayton made a copy, from which Bishop Whitney made his copy, was stolen by Emma Smith and burned. See the circuitous route by which the original copy is loaned and lost.

Now, of course, Sister Emma was still living, so friends went to her and asked her if she ever at any time burned a revelation on polygamy. She says she did not, that she did not have anything to do with such document, that she did not even know there was such a revelation. So that little link between the original, which was burned, and this copy which was afterwards taken over to Bishop Whitney's office and copied again, which went to Utah, is broken.

These men were still living at the time the revelation was given to the church in Utah. A lot of people were anxious to know if this so-called revelation came from Joseph Smith, so they sought to interview them. Kingsbury said that he copied the revelation. What was it about? Well, it was about the eternity of the marriage covenant. Did it have anything to do with polygamy? Well, yes; I think it did—yes, I am sure of it. Was it the revelation published in section 132 of the Book of Covenants? Substantially, yes. Well, how long did it take you to write that revelation, Brother Kingsbury? After thinking it over for a while, he said it took him about an hour, not any longer. Then he was asked, Brother Kingsbury, what did you write it on? Foolscap paper. (Most of you have seen foolscap paper. It is a little longer than the ordinary sheet of paper and is folded in the middle, making four pages in all.) How much paper did it take, Brother Kingsbury? One sheet. How many pages did you write? Well, it covered all of the front page, at least. You are sure of that? Yes. You copied it yourself? Yes. All on one page? Yes. Substantially, such testimony was borne in the Temple Lot Suit by Joseph C. Kingsbury, in 1894.

These men went to Utah and subsequently bore testimony before God in the Temple Lot Suit that this was verily true, and their entire testimony is to be found in the records of the courts of Missouri. They testified right out in Salt Lake City while they were living. I will admit it was a long time after they were supposed to have copied the "revelation"—was about fifty years—but here is the marvelous thing about it, that this thing they have testified they copied in an hour and on one page of foolscap or a little more, is so long they would have had to use a half dozen pages to write it.

I haven't a copy of the Utah Book of Doctrine and Covenants with me, but any of you who happen to have one can immediately turn to section 132, and if there is any man or any woman living who can write a fine enough hand to write that document, section 132, on less than a half dozen sheets of foolscap paper they can do better than most copyists can do. There are over eleven pages (sixty-six paragraphs) of the printed book. That is the thing that this man solemnly before God testified he copied on one sheet of foolscap paper in an hour. Why, I doubt if there is a typist here who can copy it on a typewriter in less than an hour; and yet people come to us and tell us in all earnestness of feeling that they are really anxious to break off the shackles from our benighted eyes and show us the error of our ways in believing that Joseph Smith was a good and wholesome man,

and then drag that kind of evidence before us to prove that he was a polygamist, or the author of polygamy!

When anybody comes to you and asks you what you think about this question, if you feel as I do, you will say you do not believe that Joseph Smith had anything to do with the introduction of the doctrine of polygamy. I believe this because I have read everything I can find on the question. I have read the books published by the Utah Church, and I have in my library fifty-some odd volumes written against this church which I have been reading systematically. Every time I hear about a new one I waste some perfectly good money to see what this new author has to say. But the farther we get away from this situation, the more ridiculous and altogether unreliable is the testimony borne concerning it. If you read what I have read, if you will read what has been presented and will take the time to go to the bottom of the situation—and there has been so much written about it that it will take you some time—when anybody comes to you and asks if Joseph Smith was responsible for polygamy, you can say with all good conscience, void of offense towards God or man, "No, he was not responsible for polygamy."

I do not make any subterfuge about it or beat around the bush. You may say, Well, if he was responsible for polygamy, it doesn't make any difference. But I say he was not. His only connection with polygamy was that of a determined foe. Let me read to you from the same letter I quoted a little while ago. This letter is written by William Marks and published as I told you, in Saint Louis, in *Zion's Harbinger*, July, 1853. He said Joseph Smith came to him early in June and said to him: "Brother Marks, I have something to communicate to you. We retired to a by-place and sat down together, when he said: We are a ruined people. I asked how so? He said: This doctrine of polygamy, or spiritual wife system, that has been taught and practiced among us, will prove our destruction and overthrow."

"There," you say, "certainly he was to blame for it!" But don't run too swiftly. "I have been deceived, said he," and the friends who want to break the shackles off us put in a period and stop right there. I have had to wrangle over that very point more than once with somebody who insisted that he had read it and that was the way it read. "I have been deceived, said he, in reference to its practice."

He told the brethren to let this thing alone. He had silenced one man for preaching it and now he had discovered that in some few places they were still talking about it. But if some one wanted to tell the truth, how easy it would be to tell it, instead of telling something else by using only half a sentence.

"I have been deceived, said he, in reference to its practice; it is wrong, it is a curse to mankind, and we shall have to leave the United States unless we can put it down and its practice stopped in the church. Now, said he, you haven't received this doctrine, and how glad I am."

Do you think that if he had been teaching it he would tell another man he was glad he had not accepted it? Really, I do not know where some people's conscience goes to, when they use in this way the plain printed statement of an honest man. William Marks meant to say that Joseph Smith was always opposed to it. He doesn't say anywhere that he ever had anything to do with it, other than to oppose it.

"Now, said he, you haven't received this doctrine, and how glad I am. I want you to go into the High Council and I will have charges preferred against all who practice this doctrine, and I want you to try them by the law of the church and cut them off."

If he was married to all the people that critics say he was, where would he have come out? Cut off with the rest of them, of course.

"If they will not repent and cease the practice of this doctrine, they should be cut off. And, said he, I will go into the stand and preach against it with all my might, and in this way we may rid the church of this damnable heresy."

There is no question about it being taught in Nauvoo by Brigham Young. Why, he tells us exactly how it started! He was the first one to get the tip on the situation, and that was while he was in England. He came home and introduced it to his friends, talked about it earnestly, and went into its practice in a rather clandestine manner.

Now, the situation is just this: If Joseph Smith did practice polygamy, he broke the law of God which God had given him, but the records show that Joseph Smith's attitude towards polygamy was that of an uncompromising foe, and all of the evidence brought to bear against him is just as poor as this I have furnished you; and if a man comes to me and asks me if I think Joseph Smith was responsible for polygamy, I have to say, "No, sir; I do not think he was."

I have read in the New York Library for weeks in years past and gone; but lately, when others have raised such a furore, I thought that perhaps I had missed something, so this summer I had a chance to again visit the same library and I did so; and when I had read everything others had seen and read on the matter, and everything in the vast collection of literature for and against this church, the best and most complete collection in all the world, I came to the conclusion that the evidence is not there.

The revelation on polygamy was not written in the lifetime of Joseph Smith. It was written some place else by somebody else, and the men who say they copied this, that, or the other document at Nauvoo, are mistaken. Whatever they did copy, they did not copy the revelation on polygamy.

Just one more item, and perhaps this last will be a sort of a stumbling stone to some of our kind friends who wish to help us. This matter came up squarely before judicial ears in 1894 when Wilford Woodruff and Eliza Snow and the others were still living. William Clayton, Joseph C. Kingsbury, and all of that crowd were still living, and their evidence was taken at great length. They said all they wanted to say, they were prodded and encouraged and refreshed in memory, and when they finished telling all they knew about it, the evidence was all laid before a fair, square, and impartial, good, old Presbyterian judge, who carefully and painstakingly went over it, and said that the evidence did not prove that Joseph Smith was guilty of introducing or practicing polygamy. And yet people tell us that they can go into the matter now, with all these people dead, and these people say that they find that he was a bad man and was the author of the polygamous revelation. They certainly must have a very high opinion of their own judicial minds. It ought to be refreshing to us when we know that a clear-minded man, after hearing all the evidence that the Utah people could bring in support of their contention, decided it did not prove.

I have come to the same conclusion: that he was a godly, upright, trustworthy man, a man of God, and that his only connection and relation with polygamy was to do all that he could to stamp it out and save the church from ruin, and in his effort to do it he went down to his death, and the church was rejected of God because those left alive did practice it.

Do not be afraid to say to all people that Joseph Smith was not responsible for polygamy, for he was not.