

Joseph Smith; Who Was He?

DID HE TEACH OR PRACTICE POLYGAMY?

By

WILLARD J. SMITH

Detroit, Michigan

"He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him."—Solomon.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."—Paul.

LAMONI, IOWA

1904



WILLARD J. SMITH.

511 68

Herald Publishing House
Lamoni - - - Iowa

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

IN SENDING forth the second edition of this work, I have no apology to offer, other than to say: There seemed to be a general demand for it. And as we are not aware of any other published work which contains a compilation of the instructions and sayings of Joseph Smith, and those of the ministry associated with him, demonstrating clearly their attitude upon the subject of polygamy; and having received many complimentary remarks in regard to the general body of the work of the first edition; we therefore issue this new and enlarged edition, believing that the reader will find it helpful in removing prejudice and in clearing away the evil which has been heaped upon the honored name of Joseph Smith, through the deceit and double-dealing of Brigham Young and his compeers.

When writing the first edition, we wrote in haste; and, though having previously gathered largely the subject-matter of this volume, and having it in hand at the time we wrote, yet we omitted much of it as we were limited in space and desired to condense consistently with a plain statement of the case. We are convinced that a more full and complete compilation will be of greater utility, and therefore present additional statements and argument in this volume.

It is believed by the writer that this work will place within easy reach a compilation of facts and statements from Joseph Smith and the ministry associated with him condensed in one small volume, and gathered from various sources not easily accessible to the average reader; and though its general arrangement, phraseology, and argumentation might in various instances be improved, and thus the principles sought to be conveyed be more lucidly portrayed, the writer lays no claim to elegance of diction, but believes he has expressed himself sufficiently plain to establish the fact with all fair-minded people that whatever else may have been the failings of Joseph Smith the evidence does not warrant the conclusion that he either taught or practiced polygamy.

There are many people whose limited educational advantages preclude an extensive research into matters of a religious nature,

who are apt to listen to the oft-exploded stories circulated by both preachers and lay-members of the popular churches, whose ultimate design is to destroy the great work established in the latter days by the Palmyra Seer; and thus they hear but one side of the question, and that, too, the side told by the enemies of Mr. Smith and the cause of Christ as advocated by him and his associated ministry. We are therefore pleased to place within the reach of all a compilation of the sayings of Mr. Smith on the subject of marriage, from the incipiency of his wonderful work until his tragic death in 1844, associating therewith many statements from other eminent men of the Church, as also those out of the Church, bearing upon his life's work, and designed to throw light upon the attitude of Mr. Smith and the Church he organized, in relation to the marriage question.

We therefore cheerfully send forth this little volume on its mission and respectfully ask that all those who may peruse its contents may do so with prayer ascending from the altar of their hearts, to know the truth, the whole truth, and to accept the same for the love of it; so that when Christ shall come to redeem his people, they may be found of him in peace, and ever dwell with that unnumbered throng whose praises unceasing unto God and the Lamb shall reverberate throughout heaven's high dome as long as eternity shall endure.

THE AUTHOR.

JOSEPH SMITH—WHO WAS HE AND DID HE PRACTICE AND TEACH POLYGAMY?

CHAPTER 1.

THE above question, at first glance, may be thought by the casual reader to be very unimportant to us, hardly worthy of serious consideration; but upon more mature reflection, the thoughtful mind will agree with the writer that: Whereas, it is a question upon which hinge the peace and happiness of many of the human family, and a correct solution thereof is destined to assist in the formation of character of thousands of our fellow beings, the question is therefore not impertinent, but is one which all may be called upon sooner or later to decide for themselves.

The very eminent Honorable Josiah Quincy, in a work called *Figures of the Past*, on page 376, says:

It is by no means improbable that some future text-book, for the use of generations yet unborn, will contain a question something like this: What historical American of the nineteenth century has exerted the most powerful influence upon the destinies of his countrymen? And it is by no means impossible that the answer to that interrogatory may be thus written: Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet. And the reply, absurd as it doubtless seems to most men now living, may be an obvious commonplace to their descendants. History deals in surprises and paradoxes quite as startling as this. The man who establishes a religion in this age of free debate, who was and is to-day accepted by hundreds of thousands as a direct emissary from the Most High—such a rare human being is not to be disposed

of by pelting his memory with unsavory epithets. Fanatic, impostor, charlatan, he may have been; but these hard names furnish no solution to the problem he presents to us. Fanatics and impostors are living and dying every day, and their memory is buried with them; but the wonderful influence which this founder of a religion exerted and still exerts throws him into relief before us, not as a rogue to be criminated, but as a phenomenon to be explained. . . . Joseph Smith, claiming to be an inspired teacher, faced adversity such as few men have been called to meet, enjoyed a brief season of prosperity such as few men have ever attained, and, finally, forty-three days after I saw him, went cheerfully to a martyr's death.

Mr. A. M. Smucker sums up his character as follows:

But whether knave or lunatic, whether a liar or a true man, it can not be denied that he was one of the most extraordinary persons of his time; a man of rude genius, who accomplished a much greater work than he knew; and whose name, whatever he may have been whilst living, will take its place among the notabilities of the world.—Smucker, p. 183.

From Governor Reynold's History of Illinois, page 359, we extract the following:

In all the great events and revolutions in the various nations of the earth, nothing surpasses the extraordinary history of the Mormons. It may be veritable history, in a thousand years, that the standing and character of Joseph Smith, as a prophet, may rank equal to any of the prophets who have preceded him.

The above extracts from Messrs. Quincy, Smucker, and Reynolds might be multiplied almost indefinitely with similar statements from other writers; while on the other hand, there are those whose delight seems to reach its climax in casting contumely upon him, representing him as a fraud, impostor, fanatic, etc., all of which tends to influence men and women to either one side or the other.

That Joseph Smith was a remarkable man I presume will not be denied by any who have read his writings or know the history of his life-work. He certainly made some very extraordinary claims, among which was that he was a prophet of the Lord in the same sense that Samuel, Isaiah, John the Baptist, Peter, and Paul were prophets; and to pass by this claim with a sneer and a hiss is certainly not exercising good judgment, nor observing the apostolic injunction to "prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Men of brilliant minds may be found on either side contending for and against his claim of inspiration, hence it may thus be easily seen that to depend entirely upon human testimony would mean to lean upon a broken reed. Amid this conflicting testimony regarding the prophetic claims of Joseph Smith, it appears to me that the proper way to consider the matter is to ascertain what he taught as principles of truth and compare the same with the word of God—the Bible—for "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isaiah 8: 20.

Joseph Smith was born in the town of Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, on the twenty-third day of December, 1805. His parents moved from the state of Vermont to the state of New York when Joseph was about ten years of age. While he was in his fifteenth year he claimed to have had his mind exercised considerably in regard to religion, and while in secret prayer one day in a grove upon his father's farm he was visited by heavenly personages, who he claims gave him much instruction regarding his future life-work; and in answer to the interroga-

tion: "Which one of all the churches is right?" he was told that they were all wrong; that their creeds were an abomination in the sight of God. And again he declares that while yet in his seventeenth year an angel of light came to him and told him where "there was a book deposited written upon gold plates, giving an account of the former inhabitants of this continent, and the source whence they sprang;" and that he was the chosen instrument in the hands of God to bring these things to light. Accordingly, he claims that, on the twenty-second day of September in 1827, the angel of God delivered to him those ancient plates containing the history of prehistoric Americans—or aborigines of this country—and of God's wonderful dealings with them, and in February in 1830 copies of the translation of the plates were published and furnished the general public under the title of the "Book of Mormon." Some few believed his claims; and on the 6th of April in 1830 he organized a church with but six members, at Fayette, Seneca County, New York. This infant church grew very rapidly, so that in 1844, fourteen years after its organization, its membership was estimated at about two hundred thousand.

It is not necessary to delineate, nor dwell upon the circumstances, the trials, and wicked persecutions the Church endured during that time, as it will suffice to say they were harassed, persecuted, and driven from place to place, until on the 27th of June in 1844 Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum were ruthlessly slain by an armed mob at Carthage, Illinois. The president of the Church, Joseph Smith, being slain, the Church began to be riven and scattered into different

contending factions, as would-be leaders arose claiming the right of presidency or guardianship of the Church, and each had more or less of a following. Prominent among these factions was the one led beyond the Rocky Mountains, which consisted of about six thousand to ten thousand people. These continued the work of proselyting and to-day are quite numerous, numbering perhaps a hundred and twenty-five thousand or more.

As at the death of Joseph not more than ten thousand followed Brigham Young, and there were about two hundred thousand belonging to the Church, it is clear that many of the original organization followed none of these pseudo leaders; and many of them, together with others who had followed some of them, but recognizing their iniquity had cast them off, came together, in 1851, and from that time until 1860 were busily working to effect a "reorganization" of the Church whose priesthood as quorums had become disorganized through the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith. They believed that Brigham Young, James J. Strang, James Colin Brewster, William Smith, Joseph Wood, and others who claimed the right of leadership were usurpers, and that the law which had governed the Church in the days of the Seer, provided that the eldest son of Joseph Smith, the Martyr, should stand at the head of the Church as its president, and that he had been blessed and set apart to that end while his father was yet alive. Accordingly on the 6th April, 1860, Joseph Smith, the eldest son of the Martyr came to the Reorganization, and was accepted as its legal and rightful leader and President.

The greater portions of all the other sects into which the Church was broken have gradually dwindled away or become absorbed in either the Brighamite faction or the Reorganized Church, so that these two bodies constitute the two rival bodies contending for the lawful continuation of, or succession to, the original Church established by Joseph Smith in 1830. The Reorganization believes that the Brighamite institution is an apostasy from the original Church and teachings of Joseph Smith. They do not believe that Joseph Smith taught the doctrine of polygamy, or in any way counseled or abetted such a theory. Neither do they believe he ever gave sanction to or taught the doctrine of the Adam-god theory or the doctrine of blood atonement. The secret endowments of Brighamism, together with its polytheism and priestly theocracy, were things unknown to Joseph Smith and the original Church, and, as Fanny Stenhouse says:

Brigham himself, little as he perhaps imagines it, is the prince of apostates. He became an apostate Methodist when he left Methodism, and certainly he is now an apostate from Mormonism as Joseph Smith first taught it. The change from Methodism to Mormonism, as it was first presented to the world, was nothing near so great as the departure which Brigham has made from the original faith of the Saints. There have been many apostates from the teachings of Joseph in early days, but of all apostates Brother Brigham is the chief.

As it is affirmed by these Brighamites that Joseph Smith taught and practiced polygamy, I am anxious to learn whether or not the charge is true; and if the reader will follow me closely I think we can learn something about it. For, as Mr. Smith was a very active man and wrote thousands of pages, was

actively engaged in preaching, writing, and superintending the editorial department of the *Times and Seasons*, a weekly periodical, much of the time during the latter part of his life, surely if he taught and practiced polygamy some hint will be found in his writings or sayings which will confirm the statement: I begin with the Book of Mormon to see if it in any way teaches, countenances, or advocates that doctrine. On page 116 of the Lamoni edition, reprinted from the third American edition, I find the following:

For behold, thus saith the Lord, this people begin to wax in iniquity: they understand not the scriptures; for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son. Behold David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord. Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none: For I, the Lord God delighteth in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me; thus saith the Lord of hosts. Wherefore this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes.

This statement shows clearly that when those Nephites who came to this continent from Jerusalem, and who were descendants of Joseph who was sold into Egypt, began to practice polygamy, they sought to justify themselves in doing so by referring to the fact of David and Solomon having had many wives. But the Lord here says that in their practicing

polygamy they were committing "whoredom," and his commandment to them was: "There shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none." And he also tells them that polygamy is "abominable" before him. On page 115, this abominable practice is called a "crime" and the Prophet Jacob claims to have received the word of the Lord to proclaim against it. We therefore conclude that if Joseph Smith was during his life time consistent with the teachings of the Book of Mormon which he declares with the Bible contains the "fullness of the gospel," this polygamic theory is the illegitimate child of some one else who has departed from the faith, and caused the way of truth to be evil spoken of. The Book of Mormon from first to last discountenances and condemns polygamy. Polygamy is referred to about nine times in that book, and in every place it is shown to be displeasing to the Lord. One more example from it will suffice. On page 117 we read:

Behold the Lamanites, your brethren, whom ye hate because of their filthiness and the cursings which hath come upon their skins, are more righteous than you, for they have not forgotten the commandment of the Lord, which was given unto our fathers, that they should have, save it were one wife; and concubines they should have none; and there should not be whoredoms committed among them. And now this commandment they observe to keep; wherefore, because of this observance in keeping this commandment, the Lord God will not destroy them; and one day they shall become a blessed people.

Therefore, if Joseph Smith introduced polygamy into the Church during his life, he did so in plain opposition to the teachings of the Book of Mormon. And, as I have access to more than one hundred of

his revelations, I will show that if he introduced the doctrine of polygamy he did so in violation of that which he claimed to have been the revelations of God to him, and in violation of the principles governing in the Church which he organized April 6, 1830, and over which he presided.

CHAPTER II.

THE Book of Mormon being opposed to the doctrine of polygamy, Joseph Smith, if teaching or practicing it, arrayed himself in opposition to the expressed command of God as found in that book; and the only conclusion at which we can arrive is that if polygamy two thousand years ago was an "abomination" before the Lord, it is equally an abomination now. If it was wrong for the ancient Nephites to practice it, could it be right for Joseph Smith or any one else to practice it in the nineteenth century? Or who will explain by what peculiar metamorphosis "whoredom" may become transformed into virtue, or "an abomination" before God become enrobed in holy sanctity before him as a principle to be admired? Should it be alleged that God in any age of the world, among any people, commanded or sanctioned polygamy, we deny it, and challenge the proof. "Let them bring forth their strong reasons that they may be justified."

From a revelation given to Joseph Smith in February, 1831, I extract the following:

The elders, priests and teachers of this church shall teach the principles of my gospel which are in the Bible and the Book of Mormon, in the which is the fullness of the gospel; and they shall observe the covenants and church articles to do them, and these shall be their teachings, as they shall be directed by the Spirit; and the Spirit shall be given unto you by the prayer of faith, and if ye receive not the Spirit ye shall not teach.

If the Bible and Book of Mormon contain the fullness of the gospel, as the above extract from the

revelation to Joseph Smith declares, and the Bible and Book of Mormon combined being opposed to polygamy, and advocating as the principle to govern in the marital relation the doctrine of monogamy, or the one wife system, then whoever transcends that law is found to be a transgressor, and in open violation of the rules governing in the Church.

In the revelation from which we extracted the above paragraph, the Lord is represented as giving his law to the Church in a plain and definite manner, as follows:

And now, behold, I speak unto the church: Thou shalt not kill; and he that kills shall not have forgiveness in this world, nor in the world to come. And again, I say, thou shalt not kill; but he that killeth shall die. Thou shalt not steal; and he that stealeth and will not repent, shall be cast out. Thou shalt not lie; he that lieth and will not repent, shall be cast out. Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall *cleave unto her and none else*; and he that looketh upon a woman to lust after her shall deny the faith, and shall not have the Spirit; and if he repents not, he shall be cast out. Thou shalt not commit adultery; and he that committeth adultery and repents with all his heart and forsaketh it, and doeth it no more, thou shalt forgive; but if he doeth it again, he shall not be forgiven, but shall be cast out. Thou shalt not speak evil of thy neighbor nor do him any harm. Thou knowest my laws concerning these things are given in my scriptures; he that sinneth and repenteth not shall be cast out.

Joseph Smith, in giving the law of God to the Church, represents the Lord as saying: "Thou shalt love thy wife [not wives] with all thy heart, and shalt cleave unto her and none else." Where is the room for polygamy here? One is here commanded to love his wife and to cleave unto that wife, but to no other woman; and if so be that one should look

upon another woman with desire or lust to have her also, he is guilty of adultery; and if he repents not he shall not retain his place in the Church, but shall be cast out. Hence, according to this rule or law given to the Church, that body whose headquarters is established in "Great Salt Lake City" is cast off and excommunicated from the church of God. Thus far we think all can see that Joseph had not taught polygamy. We therefore proceed. In the same revelation, paragraph 16, Joseph represents the Lord as saying:

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

Note.—The law already given, which says, "thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shalt cleave unto her and none else," was the law to govern the Church; and Joseph thus giving the word of the Lord which says, "He that doeth according to these things shall be saved, and he that doeth them not shall be damned," simply advertises to the world his own damnation, if he was either teaching or practicing polygamy at that time. And as he was declaring to the world that he was a prophet of God, and no trace of polygamous teachings have yet been found in his writings, but contrariwise that which is diametrically opposed thereto, we are confident that as yet that system of iniquity had found no place in his heart. In a revelation to Sidney Rigdon, Parley P. Pratt, and Lemon Copley, given through Joseph Smith, March, 1831, we have the following:

And again, I say unto you, that whoso forbiddeth to marry, is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God unto man; wherefore it is lawful that he should *have one wife*, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation; and that it might be filled with the measure of man, according to his creation before the world was made.

In the foregoing extract Joseph presents as the word of the Lord the doctrine of but one wife for man. And, besides, he presents this order as that which was ordained in the courts of eternal peace in order to the filling of the earth "with the measure of man," as it was ordained before the world was made. If God then ordained the one wife system for the accomplishment of this wonderful feature of his grand work, polygamy was unknown in the divine economy, and Joseph is thus far exonerated from any connection with the abominable thing, being found strictly teaching the principles of monogamy. He gave to the Church the following as the law of God in 1831:

Let no man break the laws of the land, for he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land; wherefore be subject to the powers that be, until he reigns whose right it is to reign, and subdues all enemies under his feet.

Again, in 1835 he with Sidney Rigdon, Oliver Cowdery, and F. G. Williams, drew up a statement of belief relative to governments and laws in general, from which I copy the following paragraph:

We believe that governments were instituted of God for the benefit of man, and that he holds men accountable for their acts in relation to them, either in making laws or administering them, for the good and safety of society. . . . We believe that all men are bound to sustain and uphold the respective governments in which they reside, while protected in their inherent

and inalienable rights by the laws of such governments, and that sedition and rebellion are unbecoming every citizen thus protected and should be punished accordingly.

This was adopted by the conference of the Church in August, 1835, and I will doubtless be permitted to remind the reader that the law of the land allowed a man to have but one wife. All the States in which the Church existed and Joseph Smith lived to the time of his death had laws punishing bigamy and polygamy, as crimes against public morality.

In the above statement of belief indorsed and affirmed by the Church there is no room for the idea that Joseph either taught or practiced the doctrine of polygamy. But it seems that the enemies of the Church had, in their exceeding bitterness, hurled their unsavory epithets at it, trying to make it appear that the Church believed in a community of wives, whereupon the following was presented to the conference assembled, was acted upon and passed without a single dissentient, as one of the principles of the faith of the Church :

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 case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.

Not only did the Church of which Joseph Smith was acknowledged as the chief presiding head declare itself strictly monogamic, but it also declared polygamy to be a crime. We also insert the following as the only marriage formula known to the Church during the life-time of Joseph Smith. The man and woman who enter into this covenant agree before God

and the people present to repudiate any other matrimonial alliance, pledging themselves to each other and to keep themselves from all others during their lives. Therefore, the moment any man after thus obligating himself becomes infatuated with another woman and takes her as wife "number two," he violates that sacred pledge made with his wife before God and deals treacherously with her; thus he corrupts the covenant and debases himself—

And yet they say, Wherefore? Because the Lord has been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously, yet is she thy companion and the wife of thy covenant.—Malachi 2: 4.

But here is the marriage formula, or rule, which governed in the Church until the death of Joseph Smith. We quote the whole paragraph:

Marriage should be celebrated with prayer and thanksgiving, and at the solemnization the persons to be married, standing together, the man on the right and the woman on the left, shall be addressed by the person officiating, as he shall be directed by the Holy Spirit, and if there be no legal objections, he shall say, calling each by their names: "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 when they have answered "Yes," he shall pronounce them "husband and wife" in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by virtue of the laws of the country and authority vested in him: "May God add his blessings and keep you to fulfill your covenants from henceforth and for ever. Amen."

This marriage formula was adopted by the Church on the 17th of August, 1835, at a conference of the Church, and in 1842, on the 1st of October, Joseph Smith published it in the *Times and Seasons* with the following certificates, with their signatures, the pur-

pose of which will be seen in the reading of his words, which we herewith present:

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

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

"S. Bennett, George Miller, Alpheus Cutler, Reynolds Cahoon, Wilson Law, W. Woodruff, N. K. Whitney, Albert Pettey, Elias Higby, John Taylor, E. Robinson, Aaron Johnson."

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

To this certificate the names of nineteen women are attached, among which is that of Emma Smith, Joseph's Smith's wife, and Eliza R. Snow.

This John C. Bennett referred to above had formerly lived in Ohio, had been a member of the Masonic lodge called the "Pickaway Lodge" in Ohio, and had gone to Nauvoo, joined the Church there and became a member of the Masonic lodge at

that place. But because of his immorality and the doctrine of spiritual wifery which he secretly inculcated, he was cut off from the Church and expelled from the Masonic fraternity. Joseph Smith having taken the initiative in all this, it is strong presumptive evidence that he was not connected with the doctrine of polygamy or concubinage. Among the twelve names attached to the above certificate affirming monogamy to be the only rule of marriage practiced or known in Nauvoo at that time, are the names of Wilford Woodruff and John Taylor, who afterwards succeeded Brigham Young in the presidency of the Utah Church. We will call attention to this again, but for the present we pass on until we reach February 1, 1844, and here we find in the *Times and Seasons* for that date the following:

NOTICE.

As we have lately been credibly informed that an elder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, by the name of Hiram Brown, has been preaching polygamy and other false and corrupt doctrines in the county of Lapeer, state of Michigan, 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.

(Signed)

JOSEPH SMITH,
HYRUM SMITH,
Presidents of the Church.

Proceeding in our examination, we find another important statement in the *Times and Seasons* for March 15, 1844, which we herewith present:

NAUVOO, March 15, 1844.

To the brethren of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, living on China Creek, in Hancock County, Greeting:

Whereas, Bro. 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. And any man that is found teaching privately or publicly any such doctrine is culpable and will stand a chance to be brought before the high council and lose his license and membership also; therefore he had better beware what he is about.

HYRUM SMITH.

These extracts show that both Joseph and Hyrum Smith denied that polygamy was believed in or practiced by them down as late as March 15, 1844, only a little more than three months before they were killed; and as we have found their teachings always to have been in opposition to polygamy, is it fair to charge them with being in complicity with a system to which their life-work gives the lie?

Joseph Smith was a strong, well-proportioned, plethoric man, weighing two hundred and ten pounds and standing six feet high in his stocking feet. He was the father of eight children by his wife, Emma, whom he married in 1827, but where is his issue or the children born to him by any other woman? Echo answers, Where? It is therefore unreasonable to say he was married to or had marital relations with ten or a dozen other women, or more, and had no children by any of them.

As we have seen, Joseph was first, last, and all the time opposed to polygamy, adultery, and concubinage, and we have not been able to find one scintilla of evidence that he ever sought to condone or justify

such iniquitous doctrines. I therefore challenge the world to produce one line of evidence over the authentic signature of Joseph Smith connecting him with that system of polygamy which has been heaped upon his honored name by Brigham Young and his coadjutors.

In our next chapter we will examine some things in connection with that so-called "Revelation of July 12, 1843," which Brigham Young and company always sought to fasten on Joseph, making him their scape-goat to bear their crimes, and which will doubtless be of interest to those not having access to their writings.

CHAPTER III.

IN OUR examination thus far we have failed to find any evidence that Joseph Smith taught the doctrine of polygamy or the plural wife system. No trace of his having so taught can be found in any of his writings, sermons, lectures, or public speeches.

Of Doctor J. C. Bennett's career—which we referred to in the preceding chapter—Joseph Smith, through the *Times and Seasons* for July 1, 1842, said:

But like one of the most abominable and depraved beings which could possibly exist, he only broke off his public wicked actions to sink deeper into iniquity and hypocrisy. When he saw 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 it was because of the prejudice of the public, and that it would cause trouble in my own house. He was well aware of the consequence of such willful and base falsehoods, if they should come to my knowledge; and consequently endeavored to persuade his dupes to keep it a matter of secrecy, persuading them that there would be no harm if they should not make it known.

This J. C. Bennett was severed from the Church for his iniquity. His spiritual wife theory and doctrine of the sanctity of promiscuous intercourse between the sexes was the hatching of the “cocka-

trice eggs” which when “crushed breaketh out into a viper,” and “he that eateth of their eggs dieth.” Joseph’s prompt moving forward against this iniquity and severing Mr. Bennett from the Church for teaching these things, exonerated him from any complicity with, or having given sanction to the spiritual wife system. I also extract from the *Millennial Star*, volume 16, page 627, the following from the pen of Joseph Smith:

We have heard that it is reported by some, that some of us should have said that we not only dedicated our property, but likewise our families to the Lord; and Satan, taking advantage of this, has transfigured it into lasciviousness—a community of wives—which things are an *abomination in the sight of God*.

In this we have Joseph unmistakably declaring that the doctrine of having a community of wives is “lasciviousness” and an “abomination.” Does this sound as though he taught, practiced, or gave countenance to the doctrine of polygamy? Answer, ye cowardly teachers who skulk around in the dark peddling the stale trash of Mr. Smith’s avowed enemies, and heaping calumny upon his honored name; does the above sound as though he taught, practiced, or gave countenance to the doctrine of polygamy? Verily, it would take a long time to establish polygamy among any people with such teaching as the foregoing. No sane-minded man would seek to fasten polygamy upon any community by preaching doctrine diametrically opposed thereto; and thus far we have failed to find one sentence uttered by Joseph Smith upon that subject but what has been opposed to it.

On the eighth day of May, 1838, a list of questions, together with their answers, was submitted by

Joseph Smith, and published in the *Elders' Journal*, number 2. In this list the following question with its answer is found:

“Do the Mormons believe in having more wives than one?”
No, not at the same time. But they believe that if their companion dies, they have a right to marry again.—*Historical Record*, p. 439.

Mark well the phraseology: “*If their companion dies*, they have a right to marry again.” This amounts to an affirmation that one has no “right to marry” a second wife while the first wife is living. This forever seals the door against polygamy if Joseph Smith is to be taken as authority, and proves that he did not believe in or teach it, believing it to be an “abomination in the sight of God.”

But, notwithstanding all this, Brigham Young, on the 29th of August, 1852, declared before a special conference of the Mormon Church which was being held in the tabernacle in Salt Lake City, Utah, that Joseph Smith on the twelfth day of July in 1843 did, in Nauvoo, Illinois, receive a revelation from God authorizing the practice of polygamy. At the morning service Elder Orson Pratt delivered a lengthy discourse in vindication of the doctrine of polygamy, and in the afternoon Brigham Young said:

You heard Bro. Pratt state this morning, that a revelation would be read this afternoon, which was given previous to Joseph's death. It contained a doctrine, a small portion of the world is opposed to; but I can deliver a prophecy upon it. Though that doctrine has not been practiced by the elders, this people have believed in it for years.—*Supplement, Millennial Star*, vol. 15, p. 31.

After some further remarks along this line, some of which we will quote further on, the so-called "revelation," which consists of about three thousand two hundred and fifty words, was read to the conference by Elder Thomas Bullock, and the conference adjourned. The revelation being so long we can not publish it here, but we will furnish the reader with extracts therefrom, that the gist of it may be readily understood. But we will state, before proceeding further, that if Joseph Smith ~~did~~—as testified by Brigham Young—receive, teach, and practice this polygamic revelation, then he was a hypocrite, liar, and scoundrel; for, as we have seen, on the 1st of February, 1844, nearly seven months after the date of this polygamic revelation, he severed Hiram Brown from the Church for teaching polygamy in Lapeer County, Michigan, and calls it "false and corrupt doctrine." If, then, as Brigham Young affirms, Joseph was teaching and practicing polygamy himself at that very time, he was a base man for lying about it and attempting to hide his own iniquity by cutting Elder Brown off from the Church for teaching what he himself had received nearly seven months previous, as a revelation from God. On the other hand, if Brigham Young and his allies got up that revelation themselves, and, by wicked deceit and cunning palmed it off on Joseph Smith after he was dead, thus besmirching his character and covering his honored memory with shame, disgrace, and contumely, in order to give latitude and free scope to their own wicked, vicious propensities, a thousand years in the hot place should be but a breakfast spell for them! For

'Tis slander;

Whose edge is sharper than the sword; whose tongue
 Out-venoms all the worms of Nile; whose breath
 Rides on the posting winds, and doth belie
 All corners of the world; kings, queens, and states,
 Maids, matrons – nay, the secrets of the grave
 This viperous slander enters.

One thing is certain: either Joseph Smith or Brigham Young has lied about this matter. Brigham Young said: “The world has known, long ago, even in Bro. Joseph’s day, that he had more wives than one.” Joseph Smith, until his tragic death denied polygamy. Which one of these men is it who told the lie? We will see. Brigham Young said, as we have already quoted, in his introductory remarks before the reading of that polygamous document on August 29, 1852: “Though that doctrine has not been practiced by the elders, this people have believed in it for years.” Note the statement, please. The echo of his voice declaring that *the world knew that Joseph had more wives than one*, had scarcely died away until with bombastic effrontery he declared, “That doctrine has not been practiced by the elders.” Brigham Young and his defenders of polygamy have always argued and declared, when advocating the plural wife system, that it was practiced in Nauvoo by both Joseph and Hyrum Smith and other leading elders. Elder B. H. Roberts says:

In 1841 the prophet introduced the practice of this principle into the Church by taking unto himself plural wives. He also taught the principle to a number of the leading elders and they obeyed it.

But B. H. Roberts is an incompetent witness, as he testifies only to what he had heard. He never saw

Joseph Smith, and knew nothing of the Church before or at the time of Joseph's death; hence his declaration that Joseph taught the doctrine of polygamy "to a number of the leading elders and they obeyed it," is but—parrot-like—voicing the sentiment of his file-leaders. He simply testifies to what Brigham Young and others told him concerning the matter. But if the Mormon Church now teaches and affirms that Joseph and Hyrum Smith and other leading elders did obey and practice polygamy in Nauvoo, then they simply charge their president, Brigham Young, with telling a lie on the 29th of August, 1852, when he declared, "That doctrine has not been practiced by the elders." But if telling the truth when declaring before that conference in 1852, saying polygamy "has not been practiced by the elders," then both Brigham Young and the whole Brighamite institution lie when affirming that Joseph and Hyrum and other leading elders of the Church practiced it in Nauvoo. No matter which horn of the dilemma they choose they gore themselves to death with it, as a lie confronts them on either hand.

Brigham Young knew, as did scores of others who heard him, when making that declaration concerning the elders not having practiced polygamy, that he was telling a falsehood. He himself had been a polygamist for years, and had polygamous children born to him long before this public introduction of polygamy. Heber C. Kimball, John D. Lee, John Taylor, and many others among the leading Brighamite elders were at that very moment living in polygamy, having had their wives sealed to them by Brigham Young himself; and yet he had the hardi-

hood, because his statements were to be published to the world, to say that polygamy "has not been practiced by the elders."

As we have caught Brigham in a falsehood here, of what value is his testimony in fastening polygamy onto Joseph Smith? Would any court of justice accept him in evidence? Have we not impeached his testimony? If he would tell a lie in the first public introduction of polygamy in order to screen his elders before the world—as they had been constantly denying it up to that time—would he not tell a lie about Joseph Smith, knowing full well that he could thus screen himself the better, and more effectually fasten polygamy upon the Church with the sanction of the martyred Prophet than otherwise? He knew those people believed that Joseph Smith was a prophet of God, and that any document coming to them through Joseph Smith as a revelation from God would be more readily received by them than if they knew that the revelation came through Brigham Young; therefore, taking advantage of their unshaken confidence in the Palmyra Seer, after eight long years of cautious scheming and deception, this arch conspirator places the alleged revelation before the world as the legitimate offspring of Joseph Smith and the celestial, heaven-born messenger from the throne of God, to damn forever all those whose virtue and sense of decency sickened at the monstrosity of its teaching. Hear him:

You heard Bro. Pratt state, this morning, that a revelation would be read this afternoon which was given previous to Joseph's death. It contains a doctrine, a small portion of the world is opposed to; but I can deliver a prophecy upon it.

Though that doctrine has not been practiced by the elders, this people have believed in it for years. The original copy of the revelation was burnt up. William Clayton was the man who wrote it from the mouth of the Prophet. In the meantime, it was in Bishop Whitney's possession. He wished the privilege to copy it, which Brother Joseph granted. Sister Emma burnt the original. The reason I mention this, is, because that the people who did know of the revelation suppose it is not now in existence.

The revelation will be read to you. The principle spoken upon by Bro. Pratt, this morning, we believe in. And I tell you—for I know it—it will sail over, and ride triumphantly above all the prejudice and priestcraft of the day; it will be fostered and believed in by the more intelligent portions of the world, as one of the best doctrines ever proclaimed to any people. . . . This revelation has been in my possession many years; and who has known it? None but those who should know it. I keep a patent lock on my desk, and there does not anything leak out that should not. — *Supplement, Millennial Star*, vol. 15, p. 31.

There are several points in the foregoing, prominent among which is the statement that Brigham had kept this document securely locked up in his desk with "a patent lock" for years, and no one but himself ever dreamed that *he* had it. Even those who formerly knew of there having been such a revelation given "suppose it is not now in existence." Yet in the very next breath, after stating that the revelation had been in his possession for years, he asks: "And who has known it?" Then triumphantly affirms: "None but those who should know it." The word "those" can hardly be consistently applied to Brigham alone in the connection in which it is used. There were some others besides himself, then, who knew he had that screed of blasphemy securely fastened down with that "patent lock," and the "those who should know it" were not of the favored ones

who formerly knew of its existence! The favored few "who should know" were, therefore, Brigham's confederates in the plot; and as Brigham did not present the original revelation over Joseph Smith's signature, but what he called "a copy," declaring that "Sister Emma [Joseph Smith's wife] burnt the original," things look a little suspicious here; for, if Brigham had so persistently, during all those long, weary years, hid away and locked up that copy, and no one but himself knew anything about it, and he, being mum as an oyster all the time concerning it, not even revealing to those whom he claimed to have been sufficiently pure (?) to gaze with sacred awe upon this holy (?) thing and be intrusted with the secret of its birth in Joseph's day, but lets it "leak out" to other parties, takes them into his confidence, does it not look as though there was something wrong? Why keep this thing hid from those whom he claimed formerly "knew of the revelation," and manipulate the wires with Orson Pratt and others who knew nothing of the revelation ever having had an existence, and were, therefore, depending absolutely on Brigham Young's testimony regarding the genuineness of this "copy"? Were these men the proper tools and dupes of Brigham to foist this system of concubinage upon the people at the sacrifice of honor and virtue to gratify the propensities of the vicious and vile? And all of this upon the bare, unsupported statement of Brigham Young? Oh! for shame! And as we have only the word of Brigham Young in attestation of this pretended revelation as having come through Joseph Smith, and as we have already convicted him of lying the same hour, aye,

the very same minute in which he publicly proclaimed these things, perhaps upon a little further examination we may find the whole thing to be a lie.

Joseph Smith married Miss Emma Hale in the month of January in 1827. He lived peaceably with her until his tragic death June 27, 1844,—over seventeen years. In December, 1847, more than three years after Joseph's death, Mrs. Smith—"Emma"—married Major Lewis C. Bidamon, of Nauvoo, with whom she happily sojourned until her death, which occurred April 30, 1879. But not a great while before she died, she was interrogated by Joseph Smith, her eldest living son, in the presence of Major Bidamon and others; and in her dying testimony relative to these things, she positively denied—as always after Joseph the Martyr's death—having ever burned any revelation which had ever been given to Joseph Smith. In answer to the question: "What about the revelation on polygamy?" she answered:

There was no revelation on either polygamy or spiritual wives. No such thing as polygamy, or spiritual wifery, was taught, publicly or privately, before my husband's death, that I have now, or ever had any knowledge of. I know that he had no other wife or wives than myself, either spiritual or otherwise.

Of Mrs. Bidamon, the *Nauvoo Independent* had this to say when speaking of her funeral:

She was loved and respected by all her neighbors, for her charitable and kind disposition. She was a good and faithful wife, a kind and loving mother, as the expressions of her children and associates will verify. If such a record as she has left does not render a person worthy of a better life beyond, it is difficult to conceive how it can be done. . . . The assembly was large; almost every one knew Mrs. Bidamon, some intimately and for many years; some but for a few months, but it is safe to

say that the respect, esteem, and love with which she was regarded by all, are but a just tribute to the sterling virtues of the woman, wife, and mother, whom the community so soberly, so sadly, and so tenderly laid away to rest, on this beautiful May day, by the side of the father of waters, the mighty Mississippi.

John Taylor, editor of the *Times and Seasons*, in an editorial for January 15, 1845, wrote of her as follows:

Suppose we say a word concerning the "prophet's wife," Mrs. Emma Smith; she honored her husband while living, and she will never knowingly dishonor his good name while his martyred blood mingles with mother earth.

If, then, Mrs. Emma Smith-Bidamon was the sterling woman of integrity and virtue which these testimonies present her as having been, what becomes of Brigham Young's statement that she "burnt the original" revelation on polygamy? She in her testimony says that there never was any such revelation given by Joseph Smith; and she always denied having burned any revelation given unto him. And, besides, Brigham Young said, as we have previously quoted: "The world have known, long ago, even in Bro. Joseph's days, that he had more wives than one;" and surely, if the doctrine of polygamy was practiced by him to the extent that *the world knew it*, most assuredly it could not have been kept from Emma, with whom he was living all the time; and she testifies that, "I know that he had *no other wife or wives* than myself, either spiritual or otherwise." Ah, Brigham! these evidences prove that you lied about Joseph having received that so-called revelation; and you simply told that falsehood to the people to pull the wool over their eyes to give tone

to and make others responsible in the eyes of the world for your system of iniquity.

If Joseph obtained that fraudulent revelation and took unto himself many wives—and the world knew this, as you here affirm—tell us, Brigham, why did you keep it hid away from the Church and the world, under the cover of that desk with a “patent lock,” for more than nine long years before you presented it to the people? Why did you not proclaim it before? Brigham’s answer:

It would not do, a few years ago; everything must come in its time, as there is a time to all things.—*Supplement, Millennial Star*, vol. 15, p. 31.

But did God actually reveal it, and Joseph and others practice it before it was time that it should be revealed and practiced? And is it a fact that God in giving this revelation got in such a hurry about it that he seriously blundered and gave it before it was time to do so? and that this premature precocity, or abortive revelation, had to be laid away securely fastened under that “patent lock” for over nine years before you could proclaim it? And if you for years were practicing polygamy before it became “time” to proclaim it, and it was necessary for your elders while outside of Utah to constantly lie about it, positively declaring “no such thing was believed or practiced,” is not the god of that revelation—by reason of his blunder in giving it before it was time to do so—indirectly, at least, responsible for the lies of those elders when denying it? and is he not, therefore, *particeps criminis* with them?

But to continue our interrogations:

Is there any other reason, Mr. Brigham, why you

did not "proclaim" that revelation before the 29th of August, 1852? And the answer comes, as we quoted before: "A small portion of the world is opposed to it." Ah! just so! But hold! You told us the world knew that Joseph practiced it, and if the world knew it, and only "a *small portion* of the world" was "opposed to it," why defer its proclamation for nine years and more, and then, too, to proclaim it more than a thousand miles beyond the borders of civilization, when the great majority of the world favored it and only "a small portion of the world" were "opposed to it"? Was the "small portion of the world" who were "opposed to it" in 1843 any better prepared to receive it in 1852? If not, was the god of that revelation justified in keeping it locked up, after prematurely revealing it, and counseling the elders to lie about it, everywhere to positively declare "'tain't so," and after this nine years of stealth and lying, force it upon them anyway, damning everybody who rejected it? Ah, if there were only a small portion of the world opposed to it, and the "world knew that Joseph" practiced it, your keeping it hid for nine years from even the so-called "faithful ones," seems verily to be just a little too thin for intelligence to be blended with.

The fact of Mr. Young's statements being so very inconsistent and contradictory proves that he has misrepresented matters; and the fact of his not producing that revelation properly authenticated by Joseph Smith's signature; and the still further fact that Brigham's pretended "copy" was not brought to light for over eight years after the death of Joseph Smith--and over nine years from the time Brigham

claimed Joseph received it—and then with no other witness certifying to its correctness, nothing but the bare, unsupported statement of Brigham Young to vouch for it; and the so-claimed “original” destroyed, and hence, no chance for comparison, makes Brigham’s statement too much at variance with common sense to be believed by any people or person accustomed to doing their own thinking. We, therefore, reject this paradox of Brigham Young as being altogether too flimsy, irrational, and inconsistent for belief. It is absurd.

Having produced the testimony of Emma Smith—Joseph’s wife—which was given thirty-six years after Joseph’s death, at the time, too, when she knew the end was near, and that she was about to pass over the river of death—a time when if ever in her life there was one time above another when she would be more apt to tell the truth it would have been then—and she solemnly testifies against Brigham’s theory, and positively affirms that there was no such revelation ever given by her husband, and exonerates Joseph Smith from the charge of having any other wife or wives, either spiritual or otherwise, than herself; and that he never taught, believed, or condoned any such corrupt system of iniquity; and just here permit the question, please, and follow it to its logical sequence: After putting Brigham Young’s and Emma Smith’s testimonies side by side, which is the more entitled to credit and belief—that of the honorable, faithful, virtuous, law-abiding, “tender, affectionate Emma,” or that of the obnoxious, law-defying, polygamous, hypocritical Brigham?

Having thus arrayed Emma’s testimony against

Brighamism, and having shown that Brigham would prevaricate, or, to be a little more plain, that he would lie whenever it suited his purpose to so do, and having failed to find a single sentence of the authentic writings of Joseph Smith favoring polygamy, but finding that he wrote much against it, we are therefore forced by irrepressible, invincible logic to say to Brighamism: The preponderance of evidence is against you. And it gives rise to the suspicion that Brigham Young himself was the real father of that pretended revelation; and its birth was doubtless presumed by Brigham, and those who helped him, to be a necessity to cover up the crime and guilt of Brigham Young and his apostate priesthood, as their practice of polygamy had developed to such proportions that to lie about it was no longer availing to screen them; hence, the manufacture of that revelation, and the scheming plot of those wicked men to saddle it onto Joseph Smith, the better and easier to deceive the people therewith. Oh, for shame! Shame!!

CHAPTER IV.

WE WILL now take up that so-called revelation of July 12, 1843, for the purpose of examining a few points in it, which seem to us to prove that Joseph Smith was in no way responsible for it, had nothing to do with it, or any knowledge of it. I will, therefore, quote the first four paragraphs of it in order to notice a few things contained therein. They are as follows:

1. Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you, my servant Joseph, that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand, to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; as also Moses, David, and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines:

2. Behold! and lo, I am the Lord thy God, and will answer thee as touching this matter:

3. Therefore, prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same;

4. For Behold! I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory.

The reader will please bear in mind that Brigham Young said on the twenty-ninth day of August, 1852, that Joseph Smith before he died had more than one wife, and that this was known to the world; also that Wilford Woodruff, president of the Mormon Church, claims that Joseph Smith taught the doctrine of polygamy in 1841 and 1842. This latter claim is quite generally made by the Brighamites, and their

boast to-day is that some of the wives that were sealed to Joseph Smith as early as in 1841 are still living in Salt Lake City.

To one unacquainted with the inward corruptions of Brighamism, and unaware that it is held to be a virtue to lie to uphold the priesthood, the above would have considerable weight in establishing the claim that Joseph was thus implicated. But hold a moment! In this revelation God is represented as saying to Joseph: “Therefore *prepare thy heart to receive and obey* the instructions which I am about to give unto thee.” Now we submit for consideration the thought that if God instructed him to prepare his heart to *receive and obey* the instructions, etc., then Joseph’s heart had not previously been prepared for the same, neither had he yet *obeyed*, nor embraced it, nor in any way previously *received* it; and the natural and logical inference from the reading of the revelation itself is that such a thing as polygamy was averse to his religious ideas; hence the Lord is exhorting him to get ready for a change in this matter; to *prepare his heart to receive and obey* that which he now contemplated revealing to him, and this logically knocks the props from under the Brighamite assertion that Joseph Smith taught and practiced polygamy prior to July 12, 1843. But Elder B. H. Roberts, as also Joseph F. Smith, tells us that “the principle of plural marriage was first revealed to Joseph Smith in 1831,” and that “in 1841 the Prophet introduced the practice of this principle into the Church by taking unto himself plural wives. He also taught the principle to a number of the leading elders and they obeyed it.”

Either this revelation wherein the Lord is repre-

sented as counseling Joseph to prepare his heart to receive and obey the doctrine of polygamy is a fraud, or else B. H. Roberts and Joseph F. Smith testify falsely, as they declare that Joseph had already accepted and indorsed polygamy by "taking unto himself plural wives" in 1841. If the latter statement is true, what a blunder the Lord made when giving that revelation! For, according to the revelation, God had either forgotten all this, or else he had not been apprised of the fact of Joseph's heart having been already prepared to hear anything in favor of polygamy, and that he had, years before that time, entered into the practice of it, and had introduced it into the Church, and "a number of the leading elders" had also "obeyed it;" as the revelation represents the giver of it as saying practically: "Joseph, I am about to reveal to you something new—a new and everlasting covenant—and you must, under the penalty of damnation, prepare your heart to receive and obey that which I am about to reveal." We emphasize the thought that if the Lord was *about* to reveal to Joseph the doctrine of polygamy on the 12th of July, 1843, then B. H. Roberts and Joseph F. Smith—both of whom are polygamous Mormon elders—have told a falsehood in stating that "the principle of plural marriage was first revealed to Joseph Smith in 1831." If God made known or revealed the doctrine of plural marriage to Joseph Smith in 1831, then this so-called revelation which it is claimed was given unto him on the twelfth day of July, 1843, could not have been a revelation unto him at that time, as it was revealed unto him years and years before—ever since 1831. To "reveal" means:

To unveil; to make known; to disclose. And the purported revelation of July 12, 1843, says: "For behold! I reveal unto you [to Joseph Smith] a new and an everlasting covenant."

If the revelation was given in 1843, then they who testified that it was revealed in 1831 are branded by it as false witnesses, as they themselves accept of the revelation of 1843 as being an inspired document sent direct from the courts of glory; and, as we have seen, God is therein represented as saying: "I am about to give unto you"—Joseph Smith—a revelation of my will concerning polygamy; "and if ye abide not" this beautiful (?) system, "then are ye damned." It could not have been made known to him before, as the word "about," as used in this connection, signifies: *A nearness to the performance of some act*; as, "Paul was about to open his mouth."—Acts 17:14; or, "They were about to flee out of the ship."—Acts 27:30. And as the act specified as *about*, or near to be performed, was the revealing, or making known, the doctrine of polygamy—that God looked upon it with favor—it proves conclusively that if God was the author of that revelation, then he had never before revealed the doctrine to Joseph. And if by inspired counsel Joseph was told to prepare his heart to receive and also to *obey* the doctrine of polygamy, he is thereby exonerated from the charge of having practiced polygamy prior to the reception of the revelation of 1843. Brigham, therefore, stands condemned of lying by this abortive revelation, the authorship of which they have sought to fasten upon Joseph Smith; and unless they present some more plausible story regarding Joseph Smith being the

author of that fraudulent document which was first "burned up," then for nine years "locked up" in Brigham's sacred desk with a "patent lock" before it was sent forth on its mission of sin and iniquity, we shall be constrained to say to Brigham Young and his coadjutors: You lying rascals! Joseph Smith never saw that revelation; but you yourselves manufactured it for personal convenience to gratify your own hearts.

If, therefore, this abortive revelation of Brigham Young shows that Joseph Smith at the time it is claimed the revelation was received (July 12, 1843), had not accepted of the system of plural marriage, what importance can we attach to the testimony of those people who affirm that he was practicing it at that time, and had, by precept and example, been teaching it to the leading elders of the Church for years? On the other hand, if he "taught the principle to a number of the leading elders and they obeyed it," as affirmed by Elders Roberts and Smith, then what will we do with the statement of Brigham Young which he publicly made the twenty-ninth day of August, 1852—which we quoted in a previous chapter—that: "That doctrine has not been practiced by the elders"? Some one has certainly lied concerning this affair; and we pause to ask, Who is it; Brigham Young? or is it Joseph F. Smith and Brigham H. Roberts? Or are they all guilty of lying?

But, says one, does not that revelation, a little further along, show that Joseph Smith had other wives than Emma? Well, paragraph fifty-two says:

And let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given to my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me.

But hold! This statement of Joseph having already had other women given to him contradicts paragraphs three and four which we have already quoted. You see, the lord of this polygamous revelation was rather short-sighted, and accordingly got things mixed up. Unfortunately for him, his memory was somewhat impaired, as he had doubtless forgotten when dictating paragraph fifty-two, implicating Joseph with already existing polygamous relations, that in paragraphs three and four he had told him to prepare his heart to "receive and obey the instructions" which he was "about to give" or "reveal" unto him.

This polygamous revelation certainly bears the marks of deception and fraud,—this paragraph itself branding the whole thing as a clumsy imposition. For with what degree of consistency could the Lord tell him to prepare his heart to "receive and obey" the doctrine of polygamy, which he was "about to reveal" unto him, if he at that very moment knew all about that doctrine, and had already embraced it, and had received unto himself a half dozen or more concubines, or spiritual wives, represented in paragraph fifty-two as holy women who were "virtuous and pure" before God? What a refined, elevating and exalted (?) idea of purity and virtue is maintained in this pretended inspiration!

If the Lord was about to reveal unto Joseph, on July 12, 1843, the principle, or doctrine of polygamy, then, as we have seen, it could not have been

made known to him as the mind and will of God prior to that time; for had it so been made known before that time, it would not at that time have been a revelation to him for the reception of which he would need special preparation of heart. Hence, if Joseph had marital relations with other women than his lawful wife, Emma, prior to the 12th of July, 1843, he was guilty of adultery, and thus a transgressor of God's law. The scholar and orator of Mormonism, Orson Pratt, in his public defense of the doctrine of polygamy as published in the *Seer*, at Washington, District of Columbia, acknowledges that to have had more than one wife at the same time prior to the 12th of July, 1843, would have been a violation of the law of God as obtaining in the Church; and the persons so violating the law, or principle of monogamy, would have been guilty of adultery; hence, if Joseph lived with other women as his wives prior to that time, he would in no way be an exception to the rule; and no matter by whom those women were given to him, that would not change the matter so long as the monogamic principle or rule was in force; the law not having been repealed, the transgressor thereof would be an adulterer. But, notwithstanding God has said: "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else; and he that looketh upon a woman to lust after her shall deny the faith, and shall not have the Spirit; and if he repents not he shall be cast out," (which was the law obtaining until Joseph Smith's death.—See Doctrine and Covenants 42:7.) Yet this bungling thing, called a revelation, contradicts all this, and sanctions

adultery as pure and holy by affirming that those women with whom Joseph had previously lived, who were given to him to be his wives, were all *pure*, *virtuous*, and *holy* before God.

Mark it well: If Joseph held marital relations with any other woman than his lawful wife, Emma, prior to the receiving of that so-called revelation (or at any time thereafter) he was guilty of adultery; and if God gave that revelation of 1843, as he is represented by Brighamism to have done, then he sanctioned adultery as committed by Joseph with those women with whom he had lived as his wives prior to the time said revelation was given, and indorsed those concubines who had taken the place of Joseph's lawful and honorable wife, Emma, as creatures of supernatural grace and favor, and pronounced upon their heads the benediction of divine favor, saying: "Emma, it's all right;" you must "receive all those that have been given to my servant Joseph," for notwithstanding they have been your husband's companions in lust, still they are so nice, and so much to be admired because, as any one can see, they "are virtuous and pure before me!" Who is so blind as not to see that the god of this revelation virtually offers a premium on crime? Improper intercourse between the sexes is condoned, by the above, and the participants therein approbated as virtuous and pure before God!

But it is sometimes said by the enemies of the Church, that Joseph had already entered into polygamy, secretly, and that this purported revelation was gotten up by him as a necessity in order to excuse him in his guilt, which was becoming very apparent, and, hence, in order to throw a degree of sanctity

around his polygamic practice, he dodged under the cover of a pretended revelation. Let us see if this is a just criticism or rendering of facts. And in order that we may the more readily get hold of the matter, I quote one or two more paragraphs from this pretended revelation. Paragraphs 34 and 61 read as follows:

34. God commanded Abraham, and *Sarah gave* Hagar to Abraham to wife. And why did she do it? *Because this was the law*, and from Hagar sprang many people. This, therefore, was fulfilling among other things, the promises.

61. And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood: If any man espouse a virgin, and desires to espouse another, *and the first give her consent*; and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he can not commit adultery, for they are given unto him; for he can not commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else.

I have italicized some words to draw especial attention to them. You will notice from these quotations that if a married man desires to take a second wife, or more, the consent of the first wife must first be obtained, otherwise it would be illegal; for "*Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife, because this was the law.*" And, "If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the *first give her consent,*" then the way is clear according to the revelation. Now, as the instruction given here is that in order to take a second wife, the consent of the first wife must be obtained; and as Sarah is referred to as an example, as *she gave* Hagar to Abraham to wife, and all this "because it was the law," we have counsel, law, and example—according to this revelation—making it obligatory, in order to make number two a

valid wife, that *the consent of the first wife be obtained first*; and she—the first wife—must *give* the second wife in marriage to her husband, “because this is the law.” We will, therefore, ask Sister Emma—Joseph Smith’s acknowledged and legal wife—whether or not she gave her consent to his having any other wife than herself, and whether or not she gave any other woman to him? To which, in answer, she emphatically declares:

I know that he had *no other wife or wives than myself*, either spiritual or otherwise. . . . No such thing as polygamy, or spiritual wifery, was taught, publicly or privately, before my husband’s death, that I have now, or ever had any knowledge of. . . . There was no revelation on either polygamy or spiritual wives.

This looks a little suspicious. There is something wrong somewhere. Either Sister Emma has misrepresented the facts, or this purported revelation has been gotten up by some other parties, after Joseph’s death, who have made him their scape-goat to bear away the odium of its creation and existence. We have already seen that not one syllable can be found in any of the sermons, lectures, revelations or public speeches of Joseph Smith, hinting at such a base, soul-destroying system; but much can be shown over his authentic signature condemnatory of polygamy; and this fact bears up the statement of Sister Emma, as diamond truth, that she was Joseph Smith’s first, last, and only wife, and stamps that so-called revelation of 1843 as an infamous document gotten up, doubtless, by Brigham Young and his colleagues, who, eight years after Joseph was killed—having paved the way with their spiritual

wife doctrine, have entered, with ghoulish mendacity the grave of the honored dead, and attempted to fasten the responsibility of their corrupt system on the man who was chosen of God as a leader of his people—one who always set his face as a flint against adultery, polygamy, concubinage, and lust.

There is not one line in all the writings of Joseph Smith that is opposed to the strictest principles of morality and virtue. He ever taught that liars, thieves, murderers, adulterers, whoremongers, and all evil-doers would most certainly be punished of God for these sins; but this bungling revelation which seeks to justify and legalize prostitution and whoredom, and which Brigham Young and his compeers seek to saddle onto Joseph Smith, teaches that if a man will only engage in and practice polygamy, he is then at liberty to commit almost any crime and still be justified. Though he should swear like a pirate, or steal like a raven, or commit adultery every day; or if he should rob, cheat, and defraud his fellow man, or do any manner of evil save that of shedding innocent blood—not *human* blood, but *innocent* blood, which, of course, means that they should not kill each other—still he would be a pleasant child, and would come forth in the resurrection of the pure and the just in the morning of the first resurrection, and enter the celestial portals of eternal peace to companionate with the Savior, Peter, and Paul, and all the ancient apostles, prophets, patriarchs, and seers, and dwell in the presence of God while the years of eternity are rolling by. Lest some might think this statement to be an exag-

gerated one, I quote from paragraph 26 of this so-called revelation:

Verily, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife according to my word, and they are sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, according to mine appointment and he or she shall commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever, and all manner of blasphemies, and if they commit no murder, wherein they shed innocent blood—yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection, and enter into their exaltation.

These statements, with many others contained in that pretended revelation of July 12, 1843, are so opposed to and at variance with all the teachings of Joseph Smith as found in his writings and public speeches throughout his entire life-work, that one is forced, if even approximating fairness or force of logic, to abandon as altogether untenable the idea that he had anything to do with that revelation, or that he had any knowledge of it.

Another point to which I call attention is, that pretended revelation makes Joseph Smith ask the Lord wherein he “justified Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; as also Moses, David, and Solomon,” in their acceptance and practice of polygamy. But Joseph Smith was not a fool. He knew there was not one scrap of evidence anywhere in the Bible to show that either Isaac or Moses were polygamists. He knew that the Bible declares that “Esau was forty years old when he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite; which were a grief of mind [or bitterness of spirit] unto Isaac and to Rebekah.”—Genesis 26: 34, 35. He also knew that God had declared that “David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines,

which thing was abominable before me saith the Lord;" and that God called it a "crime." He had also declared, as elsewhere quoted in this book, that the doctrine of having "a community of wives" is an "abomination in the sight of God;" and yet that bungling revelation of Brigham Young's manufacture which he and his party seek to palm off upon Joseph Smith as a pretext for them to persist in their transgression, has Joseph asking God wherein he justified Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, David, and Solomon touching the principle and doctrine of their having had many wives. Oh, Consistency! Consistency! Thy name is not Brighamism. Joseph Smith's whole life-work, as also the dying testimony of the Elect Lady—his "beloved Emma"—throws the lie in the teeth of Brighamism, and proves that that pretended revelation of 1843 was the abortive child of Brigham Young; and that Joseph Smith was as far from giving such a blasphemous, fraudulent document to the Church or to the world as a revelation from God as the farthest fixed star is from a gambler's lamp at midnight. He never saw nor heard of that creature of infamy which was attributed to him by Brigham Young on the twenty-ninth day of August, 1852.

Another point to which I direct attention is the statement made in the fourth paragraph of this pretended revelation which makes the Lord to say: "For, behold! I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned," etc. This statement alone is strong presumptive evidence that Joseph Smith never had that sham revelation, as it clashes with the reve-

lations given to the Church by him, and is opposed to his teachings first, last, and all the time. The "new and everlasting covenant" had been given unto the Church years previous to 1843, the giving of which was but a recommitment of the divine plan, or gospel of Christ. Joseph Smith believed and taught that the "new and everlasting covenant" which was offered to the human family by Jesus Christ, and of which Paul speaks in Galatians 4: 21-31 and Hebrews 8: 6-13, had been broken, in consequence of which a universal apostasy had obtained, thereby necessitating a restoration of the gospel plan, or new covenant, that the bride, the Lamb's wife, might make herself ready, as declared by the Apostle John. The new and everlasting covenant has ever been, and ever will be the only gospel plan, as "it is the power of God unto salvation"; therefore, let us briefly examine Joseph's teaching regarding the new and everlasting covenant. In March, 1831, Joseph gave to the Church the following as a revelation from God:

Hearken, O ye people of my church, and ye elders listen together, and hear my voice, while it is called to-day, and harden not your hearts; for verily I say unto you that I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the light and the life of the world; . . . and even so *I have sent mine everlasting covenant* into the world, to be a light to the world, and to be a *standard for my people* and for the Gentiles to seek to it, and to be a messenger before my face to prepare the way before me.—Doctrine and Covenants 45: 2.

Again:

Wherefore, I say unto you, that *I have sent unto you mine everlasting covenant*, even that which was from the beginning, and that which I have promised I have so fulfilled, and the *nations of the earth shall bow to it*.—Doctrine and Covenants 49: 2.

Once more:

And your minds in times past have been darkened because of unbelief, and because you have treated lightly the things *you have received*, which vanity and unbelief hath brought the whole church under condemnation. And this condemnation resteth upon the children of Zion, even all; and they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the *new covenant*, even the *Book of Mormon* and the *former commandments* which I have given them, not only to say, *but to do* according to that which I have written, that they may bring forth fruit meet for their Father's kingdom, otherwise there remaineth a scourge to be poured out upon the children of Zion.—Doctrine and Covenants 83: 8.

I have italicized some words in these quotations to call attention to them.

The new and everlasting covenant had been given to the Church through Joseph Smith years before the polygamic revelation ever saw the light; and it is declared to be, in the revelations above quoted, “A standard for my [Christ’s] people” to which “the nations of the earth shall bow.” This, therefore, destroys the claim made in the polygamic revelation that *it* is a new and everlasting covenant designed of God to damn everybody who reject it. The new and everlasting covenant had already been given to the Church, and declared to be “even that which was from the beginning;” and this new and everlasting covenant enjoined the doctrine of monogamy—or the having of but one companion in wedlock at the same time; and it is also therein specifically declared that the nations of the earth shall bow to this covenant; and because they had “treated lightly” this covenant they were “under condemnation,” and should so remain until they should “repent and remember the

new covenant” which God had given them, “not only to say but to do according to that which I [God] have written.”

If, then, this covenant, which was to be a standard to God’s people “and for the Gentiles to seek to it,” and was to serve as a “messenger” before the Lord “to prepare the way” for his second coming, proscribes the doctrine of polygamy, and declares it to be an abomination before the Lord—a crime—urging that “there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none;” and, “Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else;” and was publicly proclaimed by Joseph Smith until the day of his death as the revelation of God through him to the whole world; where is there room for an unprejudiced, sane-minded person to indorse as coming through Joseph Smith a revelation which is directly opposed in almost every detail to the revelations and teachings given the Church through him during his whole life’s work? And this interrogatory is the more significant when taking into consideration the fact that that pretended revelation is designed to establish a system of concubinage, as a “new and everlasting covenant,” and damning all who would not abide the same, affirming as the word of the Lord that “If ye abide not that covenant [which makes it essential to salvation in the celestial realm to have a plurality of wives], then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory.”

It is utterly incredible that Joseph Smith ever saw or heard of that sham revelation. There is not one

scintilla of evidence, that would be accepted in any court of equity, connecting Joseph Smith with that base forgery. All the evidence which would be accepted by any court of justice contributes to show the absurdity and folly of the Brighamite claim that Joseph Smith received that revelation of July 12, 1843, or that he taught or practiced polygamy; and this absurdity becomes more and more apparent the further one proceeds in its examination. Not one syllable can be found where Joseph Smith countenanced, sanctioned, or condoned the doctrine of polygamy, aside from that sham revelation; and, as we have shown, this bungling thing is so unlike him in its verbiage—so unlike any revelation given to the Church, or anything written or spoken by him, and besides, its being opposed in all its essential features to everything he did give to the Church, or the world, and then its being kept securely hid away from the Church, caged up under that “patent lock” for more than eight years after Joseph’s death, and then when introduced, being neither in the handwriting of Joseph Smith, nor in the handwriting of any scribe or secretary employed by him, but in the handwriting of one of Brigham’s colleagues, and no witnesses to it attesting its genuineness as a certified copy of the original—not a thing but the bare, unqualified statement of the polygamist, Brigham Young, to give it validity, and it just seems to me, with this array of facts before us, that it requires more credulity and less brains than are generally needful for ordinary intelligence, to accept such an unreasonable inconsistency.

As we have already seen, the Book of Mormon and

the former commandments—or, in other words, the Bible and the Book of Mormon—contain the fullness of the gospel, and therefore constitute the “new commandment.” And the Lord said through Joseph Smith, as early as July, 1828:

And I will show unto this people that I had other sheep, and that they were a branch of the house of Jacob; and I will bring to light their marvelous works, which they did in my name; yea, and I will also bring to light my gospel, which was ministered *unto them*, and, behold, they shall *not deny that which you have received*, but they shall build it up, and shall bring to light the *true points of my doctrine*; yea, and the *only doctrine* which is in me; and this I do, that I may establish my gospel, that there may not be so much contention.—Doctrine and Covenants, 3: 15.

As the Lord here declares that the Book of Mormon “shall bring to light the *true points* of my doctrine; yea, and the *only doctrine* which is in me,” we have a standard by which to test this polygamic revelation; for if the Book of Mormon contains “the only true doctrine,” then if it condemns polygamy, this polygamic revelation is therefore pronounced to be a fraud. And, as Joseph Smith delivered this revelation which declares that the Book of Mormon contains “the only true doctrine which is in me” [Christ], the great preponderance of evidence is against his having received that polygamic revelation. Hearken, therefore, unto the words of the Book of Mormon:

Wherefore, I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord; for there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none; for I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me; thus saith the Lord of hosts.—Book of Mormon, p. 116.

This stamps the claim that that polygamic revelation is a "new and everlasting covenant," as a fraud; and when considered in the light of all of Joseph Smith's writings, the strong presumptive evidence is that it was gotten up by others, after Joseph Smith's death, who used the influence of Joseph's name to give sanctity to their iniquitous schemes, knowing that they themselves were lacking moral influence and power to foist such a system of iniquity upon the people as a revelation from God.

In an open letter to the President of the United States, by Charles Wesley Wandell, it being one of a series prepared by him on the Utah problem, we find the following statement:

These monstrous doctrines are all included in a mock revelation of Brigham Young's, ascribed to Joseph Smith; but which has never been traced back to him; and, indeed, can not be by any rule of evidence admissable in a court of law or equity.

In so far as polygamy is concerned, its first connection with the Mormons is traceable to Udney R. Jacobs' pamphlet and no further. This man, an elder in the Church in 1843, at Nauvoo, published a pamphlet in which he discoursed of the polygamy of the ancient patriarchs and kings of Judea, and defended the practice on both scriptural and physiological grounds. Joseph Smith, before the congregation and elsewhere, emphatically and unmistakably condemned this pamphlet and its doctrine; as he did also the libertinism of John C. Bennett and others, who were subsequently excommunicated from the Church on that account. —*Saints' Advocate*, vol. 3, p. 19.

To this we append the testimony of William Marks, who was, at the time of the assassination of Joseph Smith, the president of the church, or stake, at Nauvoo, and was also the president of the High Council. He says:

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 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.—*Herald*, no. 1, vol. 1, p. 25.

Joseph Smith is here represented as having said in June, 1844, just a few days before he was so cruelly murdered, that polygamy was a “cursed doctrine;” and that it “would eventually prove the overthrow of the Church unless it was put down,” and that he would “go before the congregation and proclaim against it”; and that President Marks “should go into the High Council,” and that he (Joseph) would “prefer charges against those in transgression,” and that Elder Marks must “sever them from the Church,” etc. Is it reasonable to suppose that he would do such a thing, or have talked that way, had he himself been guilty of practicing or teaching polygamy? Well, hardly! The reader will also remember that Charles Wesley Wandell testifies that Joseph did “before the congregation and elsewhere, emphatically and unmistakably condemn this pamphlet [of Udney R. Jacobs which advocated from both scriptural and physiological standpoints the

doctrine of polygamy] *and its doctrines.*” Mark it well, “*did condemn this pamphlet and its doctrines.*”

A. M. Smucker, who seems to have been bitterly opposed to Mormonism, when considering the statements made concerning Joseph Smith as a polygamist, says:

It is utterly incredible that Joseph Smith, who, great impostor that he was, never missed an opportunity to denounce seducers and adulterers as unfit to enter into his church, should have been concerned directly or indirectly in proceedings like these; though it is scarcely surprising that when such stories had been circulated by men whom the Prophet had thwarted or reprimanded, there should have been found some persons willing to credit them.—History of the Mormons, p. 174.

Now the facts in the case appear to be as follows: In consequence of the rapid progress the Church was making throughout the world—there being about two hundred thousand members in the Church at that time—the gospel net had gathered some of every kind. Some bad men had gotten into the fold, and by secret combinations, had perforated, or honey-combed the Church with their vicious inconsistencies, among which was the doctrine of spiritual wifeism and polygamy as advocated by J. C. Bennett, Hiram Brown, Udney R. Jacobs, and others; as also the rascality of Doctor Sampson Avard with his organization of Danites, etc., etc. These corrupting principles of doctrine found devotees among the “baser sort”—those who would “love to have it so”—and notwithstanding Joseph publicly proclaimed against these things and tried to stamp them out wherever they raised their deformed heads, yet his work of purifying the Church was prevented by the awful tragedy at Carthage jail. And after his death, these secret

maligners, or many of them, rallied their forces, and, following their file-leaders to the great Salt Lake basin, gratified their sensual propensities to the utter disgrace of the sacred name of Saints, which they unworthily bore, and thus brought shame and contumely upon the Church of Jesus Christ as organized by Joseph Smith. And that polygamic revelation was, without doubt, the disgraceful culmination of those secret combinations of gross sensualism, and was concocted and put in its present form by the scheming adroitness of Brigham Young and his confederates. That Joseph Smith was free from receiving or giving that so-called revelation is very apparent; and in our next chapter we will furnish testimony from the Brighamites themselves exonerating Joseph Smith from the odium of either teaching or practicing the corrupt system.

CHAPTER V.

HAVING introduced the testimony of Emma Smith—Joseph Smith's acknowledged legal wife—to rebut the statement made by Brigham Young that Joseph both taught and practiced polygamy, it is but fair to consider the evidence presented on the other side of the case, as there are those living in Utah to-day who claim they were Joseph Smith's wives, and if it can be proved that any woman other than Emma Hale became his wife, or was associated with him as such, then a strong link is forged in the chain convicting Mr. Smith of being guilty of the charge of practicing polygamy as declared by polygamists of Utah. We will, therefore, examine briefly the testimony of some of those who claim to have been Joseph's wives, and see what importance or credit may be attached to their testimony. We have not room in this little work to examine the statements of all of them, hence the examination of the testimony of some of the most prominent ones will doubtless suffice.

The claim is made by the Brighamites that Miss Louisa Beaman was sealed in marriage to Joseph Smith on the fifth day of April, 1841, J. B. Noble performing the ceremony. (*Historical Record*, p. 221.) If, therefore, this statement can be proved to be true it will settle the matter with regard to Joseph having been a polygamist, and further investigation will be unnecessary. We therefore proceed; and in the history of Joseph Smith, taken from his diary,

and published in the *Millennial Star*, volume 21, page 75, which was published by the Utah Mormon Church, we find that Joseph made the following entry for the eleventh day of May, 1843—two years, one month, and six days *after* it is said Miss Beaman became Joseph's plural wife:

"11th May, 6 a. m. Baptized Louisa Beaman, Sarah Alley, and others."

This is peculiar. Married to Joseph Smith as a polygamous wife two years, one month, and six days before she had been converted to the faith or baptized into the Church! Who is so blind as not to see the absolute inconsistency of this statement of Miss Beaman? And as she, after being baptized, followed Brigham Young to the Great Salt Lake Valley, and accepted the system of plurality, and became an ardent advocate of that unholy system of Brighamism, is it unreasonable, in the light of the fact that it was over two years after she claimed to have been sealed to Joseph before she was even baptized, to charge her with downright trickery and malicious lying in the matter? But, says one, Why not ask Mr. Noble about it? Very well, we will do so; and Mr. Joseph B. Noble swears he did "on April 5, 1841, seal to Joseph Smith the Prophet, Miss Louisa Beaman, according to the revelation on plural marriage." (*Historical Record*, p. 221.) This, at first reading, seems to establish Miss Beaman's statement; but just *how* Mr. Noble could on the 5th of April, 1841, seal Miss Beaman to Joseph Smith *according to the revelation on plural marriage*, when, according to the statement of Brigham Young himself, that so-called "revelation on plural marriage" was not given to

Joseph Smith until the twelfth day of July, 1843,—*two years, three months, and seven days after* Mr. Noble swears he sealed Miss Beaman to Joseph Smith—is a little puzzling. In order for Mr. Noble to have done that sealing “according to the revelation on plural marriage,” that revelation should have been—in fact must have been in existence as early as April 5, 1841. But in the Utah edition of the Book of Covenants the date of the revelation is given as July 12, 1843. Hence Mr. Noble in his haste and determination to fasten polygamy on Joseph Smith is two years, three months, and seven days ahead of the time claimed for the reception of the revelation. Hence Mr. Noble’s testimony but implicates him as being accessory to the crime of adultery, providing he told the truth about such sham work obtaining between Joseph Smith and Miss Beaman. But it rather looks as though this story of Miss Beaman having been sealed to Joseph Smith in 1841 has been gotten up since Joseph’s death, by these Mormon propagandists, in order to more successfully weave the web of polygamy around the propensities of those ecclesiastical leaders of Mormondom; and that both Miss Beaman and Mr. Noble were willing to testify to anything in order to deceive the innocent, unwary ones; that the Brighamite priesthood might thus the more easily dupe them into an acceptance of their system; and to this end the influence of Joseph Smith’s name was surreptitiously used by them in their craze for sensual gratification.

This becomes quite apparent when we consider that in 1892 when Mr. Noble was put on the witness stand in the Temple Lot Suit of Independence, Missouri, he

swore with regard to the doctrine of polygamy that he “never did preach it, or practice it much either, just occasionally, kind of cut around the corners” (see Abstract of Evidence, p. 368), and then on page 370, with regard to how many wives he himself had, he swore: “I could not begin to count how many I have had, I have never been divorced from any of them”; and, that “it would take angels to find them all”; and then after having sworn that it was in 1840, or in 1841, or probably in 1842, he was not sure which, that he sealed Miss Beaman to Joseph Smith— notwithstanding he had previously sworn positively, as before quoted, that it was on the fifth day of April, 1841, when he did the sealing between Joseph and Miss Beaman—he turns around and swears:

I never heard Joseph Smith teach the Church the doctrine of polygamy, or that a man could have more wives than one, either publicly or privately.—Abstract of Evidence, p. 368.

With all this array of contradictory testimony upon the part of Mr. Noble, of what value are his statements? Would any man living have confidence in such a man’s oath? If Joseph taught him polygamy in 1841, and he then and there sealed Miss Beaman to Joseph, did he not swear to a lie in 1892 when he swore that he never heard Joseph teach “*either publicly or privately*” “that a man could have more wives than one.”

To sum up this case briefly, the statements of Mr. Noble and Miss Beaman are the sole authority for the claim made that Joseph Smith entered into polygamy with Miss Beaman; and her testimony becomes invalidated by the fact of her being a party in the case of trying to establish the sanctity of the

system of polygamy, of which she is an active participant; and the still further fact that she was not baptized into the Church for over two years after the time on which she swears she became Joseph's polygamous wife. And as Mr. Noble first swears that he sealed Louisa Beaman to Joseph Smith, April 5, 1841, and then afterwards swears that it may have been in 1842, or possibly in 1840, and swears that he did all this "according to the revelation on plural marriage," and the date given by the Utah Church in publishing the revelation, so-called, was one year, three months, and seven days after Mr. Noble's last date, as the time of the reception of the plural marriage revelation; and then, as if to cap the climax, he swears he never heard Joseph Smith either publicly or privately teach the doctrine of polygamy or that a man could have more than one wife, what becomes of his testimony? Would any court on earth accept and indorse it? Verily, no! Further: When he swears that he himself never did practice polygamy much, and then swears he could not begin to count how many wives he has had—thinks it would take angels to find them all—and the still further fact that Miss Louisa Beaman was not baptized into the Church until May 11, 1843—two years, one month and six days after Noble's first date sworn to—and what evidence is there left upon which to base the claim that Miss Beaman was ever Joseph's wife in any sense? None whatever! And as Emma, Joseph's acknowledged wife, thirty-six years after Joseph's death testified a few months before her death—as she had always declared after Joseph's death—that "I know that Joseph Smith had no other wife or wives

than myself either spiritual or otherwise"; and as not one line among the thousands of pages written by Joseph Smith can be twisted or distorted to make him the advocate of polygamy, what becomes of the statement that Louisa Beaman was the wife of Joseph Smith? There must be better evidence adduced than any yet brought to convict Joseph Smith of teaching, practicing, or condoning the doctrine of polygamy.

Emily D. P. Young also declares she was one of Joseph Smith's polygamous wives. She takes her oath before Elias Smith, Probate Judge of Salt Lake County, that she was married or sealed to Joseph Smith, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, by James Adams, a high priest in the Church at Nauvoo, Illinois, on the eleventh day of May, 1843. (*Historical Record*, p. 223.) Then again in a sketch of her life found in the *Historical Record*, page 240, she says: "I was married to Joseph Smith on the 4th of March, 1843, Heber C. Kimball performing the ceremony." She also says:

This was done without the knowledge of Emma Smith. Two months afterwards she [Emma] consented to give her husband two wives provided he would give her the privilege of choosing them. She accordingly chose my sister Eliza and myself, and to save family trouble Brother Joseph thought it best to have another ceremony performed; accordingly on the 11th of May, 1843, we were sealed to Joseph Smith a second time in Emma's presence, she giving her free and full consent thereto.—*Crooked Paths*, p. 5.

Turning now to the history of Joseph Smith as recorded in the *Millennial Star*, volume 21, page 75, and published by the Brighamites themselves, Joseph is represented as recording the following in his diary for that eventful eleventh day of May, 1843:

11th May, 6 a. m. Baptized Louisa Beaman, Sarah Alley, and others. 8 a. m. went to see the new carriage made by Thomas Moore, which was ready for traveling. Emma went to Quincy in the new carriage. I rode up as far as the prairie. Emma returned on the 15th.

We learn from his diary that in the morning of the day that Emily D. P. Young claims she and her sister were married to Joseph Smith with Emma's "free and full consent thereto," Joseph was baptizing at the early hour of six o'clock; and at eight o'clock he went to see the new carriage; and then rode out as far as the prairie with Emma, she going to Quincy, and not returning until the 15th—four days after. This statement from Joseph's diary makes Mrs. Emily D. P. Young's testimony look a little thin, as Joseph was busy from six o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock, at which time he went to see the new carriage; and then he went with Emma part of the way to Quincy, after which he returned home, Emma remaining in Quincy for several days. Hence, the only time that his marriage with these two girls, Emily D. P. Young and her sister Eliza, could have taken place that day in the presence of Emma was before six o'clock in the morning, which at least seems very doubtful, even though there were no way of proving it untrue; but as Emma states that the whole claim regarding those girls or any other girls being Joseph's wives is positively untrue; and declares she never gave her consent to any such action, nor that she ever had any occasion either to comply with or to refuse any such proposition, and always most positively affirmed that "Joseph Smith had no other wife or wives than myself, either spir-

itual or otherwise"; and finding Joseph in all his writings and sayings on the subject most decidedly opposed to polygamy, being very pronounced in his views in this particular, we are led to conclude, because of the invincible array of logical testimony in his favor, that Emily D. P. Young's statement was made up out of whole cloth, which was doubtless furnished her by the corrupt priesthood of Brigham Young's selection. But just here let the reader please notice, in confirmation of the position we have above taken, that Emily D. P. Young actually lied when making her statement, that even Brigham Young himself shows her statement to be false, and is a standing witness of her perfidy, when he declared on the 29th of August, 1852, that Emma never had been converted to the doctrine of polygamy, and that she "burned the original revelation." Why should Brigham Young make such a declaration (when thousands of miles away from her home, and no probability that she would ever hear of his statement) that she had always opposed Joseph in the doctrine of polygamy, and even burned his revelation on that subject, if it is true that she made the selection herself of Emily D. P. Young and her sister Eliza to be Joseph's plural wives, and gave "her free and full consent thereto," thereby accepting and indorsing polygamy? Brigham knew that Emily D. P. Young lied, as do all those who knew her and Joseph Smith at Nauvoo.

Again: If Emma Smith made a selection of Emily D. P. Young and her sister Eliza, on the 11th of May, 1843, to be Joseph Smith's wives, and they were sealed to Joseph "in Emma's presence, she giving

her free and full consent thereto," how comes it that the god of that polygamous revelation, two months after the time above specified, or July 12, 1843, did not know anything about Emma's "selection" and "free and full consent"? Evidently the giver of that so-called revelation was circumscribed in his knowledge of things, if the above statement of Emily D. P. Young is true, for he knew nothing of it—did not know that Emma had made selection of two young lassies, and *had* "received" them within her domestic circle, and with "her full and free consent" had given them to her husband to be his wives; hence he gets after Emma with counsel, promises, and threats in that revelation—which was not given until two months after she had been converted to it—shades of Reason—a part of which is as follows:

And let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given to my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me. . . . And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law.

Shades of the martyrs! The god who gave that revelation had been blindfolded at least two full months—from May 11 to July 12—or else Emily D. P. Young has wilfully and maliciously lied. If she, Miss Young, told the truth, then the idiocy of the god who gave the revelation is made very apparent in his counsel to Emma to receive those who had been given to Joseph whom she had already received and actually selected and given to him. And if Emma Smith told the truth, as also scores of others whose testimony is absolutely unimpeachable, then this

so-called revelation is a lie, and a base fraud, and Emily D. P. Young has perjured herself in her attempt to foist a false system of marriage, under the garb of religious sanction, upon the innocent ones of her sex, and thereby desecrated the fair name of the Church of Jesus Christ, and brought shame and contumely upon the honor of the Palmyra Seer! At any rate, she stands opposed to the plain statements of this so-called revelation; and the revelation, as also Brigham Young, continuously asserts the absolute unreliability of her pretended veracity. How pertinent the oft quoted words:

“O, what a tangled web they weave
Who practice wholly to deceive!”

We invite your attention to the sworn testimony of this same Emily D. P. Young as taken in the Temple Lot Suit in 1892. She says:

I was born in 1824; was baptized into the Church when I was eight years old, in Independence, Missouri. I wrote my own history as published in the historical record; I have seen it in the record. . . . Yes, sir, my father was one of the first officers of the Church, and the presiding bishop,—first bishop of the Church. I heard my father preach a great many times; I never heard my father either preach or teach in public or private the practice of polygamy, it was not known in his day.

My father's name was Edward Partridge. . . . At the time I married Brigham Young, in November, 1844, I was at the same time sealed to Joseph Smith, sealed to him for eternity; I was sealed to Brigham Young for time, and to Joseph Smith for eternity. The manner that I was married to Brigham Young is what is known as marriage by proxy; that is what I considered it meant; that is, I was sealed to Brigham Young that day, during my natural life, and in eternity I was to be the wife of Joseph Smith. I was not married to Joseph Smith under the revelation on sealing, but I was married to him under the reve-

lation on plural marriage. I was married March, 1843; on the eleventh day of March, I think it was. I know I was married to him under the revelation of plural marriage. I was married to him on the eleventh day of May, 1843.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 363, 364.

The reader will please take notice that in her sworn testimony just quoted, she affirms that she wrote her own history as published in the *Historical Record*, and that she had seen it in the *Record*. And as she makes no attempt to correct the statements which she furnished the *Record* as facts of her life's history, she therefore virtually assents to and reaffirms her statements as there published. And in that history furnished by herself, we find Emily D. P. Young versus Emily D. P. Young in that she first declares that she was married to Joseph Smith on the eleventh day of May, 1843, the marriage being performed by James Adams; and in her next statement she affirms that Heber C. Kimball performed the marriage ceremony, and gives the date as the 4th of March, 1843. And now, in her oath taken in the Temple Lot Suit, she swears that it was not until November, 1844—more than four months after Joseph's death—that she was sealed to Joseph Smith for eternity, Brigham Young standing proxy for the Prophet Joseph. Married to Brigham for time, and to Joseph for eternity, four months and more after Joseph's death. This latter statement doubtless more nearly approximates the truth than any other statement of hers, and furnishes the key to the solution of the whole affair regarding Joseph's spiritual wives,—they were sealed to him after he was dead!

It is claimed that Eliza R. Snow, the Mormon

poetess, was also one of Joseph's wives. In a little work entitled *Representative Women of Deseret*, page 2, the following statement concerning Eliza R. Snow may be found:

Here [in Nauvoo] the Relief Society was organized by Joseph, March, 1842, and Sister Eliza was chosen for secretary. Eliza *was at this time* the wife of the prophet.

Andrew Jensen in the *Historical Record*, page 233, says:

Eliza Roxy Snow married to the prophet June 29, 1842, President Brigham Young officiating.

Can both of these statements be true? If Eliza Roxy Snow was married to Joseph Smith the 29th of June, 1842, as affirmed in the *Historical Record*, can it be true that she was Joseph's wife the previous March, as affirmed in *Representative Women of Deseret*? And if she was his wife in March, 1842, can it be true that she was not married to Joseph until the following 29th of June? And if it is true that Joseph entered into the practice of polygamy in 1842, what becomes of the claim that the revelation authorizing it was not given until July 12, 1843, and then with the instruction to Joseph to "prepare his heart to receive" it? Most decidedly there is something radically wrong here; somebody has been lying. We, therefore, ask, What say you, Eliza Roxy Snow? Are you guilty or not guilty? And to this interrogatory we find her answer published in the *Times and Seasons* for October 1, 1842—seven months at least after it is declared by *Representative Women of Deseret* that she was Joseph's polygamous wife; and over three months after

Andrew Jensen declares she was married to the Prophet Joseph, which is as follows:

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

This is signed by Emma Smith, who was president of the society, and by Eliza R. Snow, its secretary, and seventeen other leading women of Nauvoo. Hence, if Miss Snow told the truth, then both of the above statements regarding her being Joseph Smith's wife in either March or June, are false, and no confidence can be placed in either statement. If she lied when making that public statement October 1, 1842, then, having proved her to be a liar (especially in those things which affect the salvation of others), she could hardly blame the people for rejecting her testimony after, for:

"A liar ne'er can be believed,
By those who once he hath deceived."

And if she bore false witness when signing that certificate still one at least of the other statements is untrue. There is a falsehood in it somewhere; and as Joseph's wife, Emma, and Eliza R. Snow, and seventeen others, solemnly testified that they knew of no system of marriage in the Church other than that published in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, which is strictly monogamic, the strong presumptive evidence is that she then told the truth; and the facts in this case seem to be, as also in the

other cases referred to, that it became simply a matter of policy upon the part of the Mormon priesthood, after they reached Utah, to make it appear that Joseph Smith was implicated in, and gave sanction to, this abominable system of marriage, that they might the more easily fasten it on the people there; hence, to carry on their deeds of darkness, they had no scruples in affirming their slanderous statements concerning the Palmyra Seer, and thus lied when saying that Eliza R. Snow was the wife of the martyred Prophet.

Another point to which I direct attention is the statement of Eliza R. Snow as published in the *Deseret News*, of May 20, 1886, and is as follows:

It is a *fact* that Sister Emma, of her own free will and choice, gave her husband four wives, two of them are now living, and are ready to testify that she not only gave them to her husband, but that *she taught them the doctrine of plural marriage and urged them to accept it.*

Please notice the closing italicized sentence in this quotation, and then compare it with the statement of William Clayton's testimony regarding acceptance of the plural marriage system. Clayton testifies thus:

Hyrum said to Joseph, "If you will write the revelation on celestial marriage, I will take and read it to Emma, and I believe I can convince her of its truth, and you will hereafter have peace." Joseph smiled and remarked, "You do not know Emma as well as I do." . . . Hyrum then took the revelation to read to Emma. Joseph remained with me in the office until Hyrum returned. When he came back Joseph asked him how he had succeeded. Hyrum replied that he had never received a more severe talking to in his life, that Emma was very bitter and full of resentment and anger. . . . Two or three days after the

revelation was written, Joseph related to me and several others, that Emma had so teased, and urgently entreated him for the privilege of destroying it, that he became so weary of her teasing, and to get rid of her annoyances he told her she might destroy it and she had done so. — *Historical Record*, vol. 6, p. 226.

Note the discrepancy here. Eliza R. Snow says that Emma taught and urged the acceptance of the doctrine of plural marriage; and Mr. Clayton, of whom it was said, he wrote the revelation as dictated from the mouth of the Prophet, declares that Emma was so *bitter* against the doctrine of polygamy, that she burned the revelation. No such thing, then, as her having accepted the doctrine of plural marriage ever occurred, much less her teaching it, and urging others to accept it, as testified by Eliza R. Snow. Besides this, Brigham Young denounced Emma as “a wicked, wicked woman,” because of her rejection of the plural marriage tenet. Thus it is seen that both William Clayton and Brigham Young are shown to be in point-blank opposition to Eliza R. Snow, and besides, she in her testimonies contradicts herself. We therefore ask: Of what value is her testimony? She placed her name to that certificate with Emma Smith in October, 1842, affirming that no other system of marriage was known among the Saints than that found in the Doctrine and Covenants; and in 1852, and since, she tells us that she lied then, but asks us to believe her statement now as *true*. We leave Sister Eliza here with the reader to accept or reject her testimony as in his judgment is proper, while we pass on to notice the testimony of Lucy W. Kimball, who also claims to have been the Prophet’s wife. She says:

Shortly afterwards I consented to become the prophet's wife, and was married to him May 1, 1843. . . . I am also able to testify that Emma Smith . . . *gave her consent* to the marriage of at least four other girls to her husband, and that she was well aware that he associated with them as wives within the meaning of all that word implies.—*Historical Record*, vol. 6. pp. 229, 230.

But in her testimony, which was given under oath, in the case of the late Temple Lot Suit, she says in regard to her marriage to Joseph Smith :

Emma Smith was not present, and she did *not* consent to the marriage; she did not know anything about it at all. No, sir, she did not know anything about my marriage to her husband.

It was not known or acknowledged that I was his wife; I did not attend the funeral as his wife, of course I did not. I did not appear there as his wife, I never went by the name of Lucy W. Smith; I went by the name of Lucy W. Walker, and the Lawrence girls went by their maiden names. I was known here in Salt Lake City as Lucy W. Smith; the time never came for me to be known as Lucy W. Smith, until we came to Salt Lake City. I was married to Heber C. Kimball in 1845, in Nauvoo; do not think I can tell you the exact date. I was married in the Temple; Brigham Young performed the marriage ceremony. . . . There was not any love in the union between myself and Kimball, and it is my business entirely whether there was any courtship or not. It was the principle of plural marriage that we were trying to establish, a great and glorious true principle, and if we had established it, it would have been for the benefit of the whole human race, and the race will say so yet.—Plaintiff's Abstract, pp. 374, 375.

Query: If it was *not known* that she was Joseph's wife, how then can she explain her statement as testified to in the *Historical Record* that Emma Smith knew it and gave her consent to the marriage? Eliza Partridge also knew it, at least so Lucy W. Kimball has testified, and William Clayton must have also known of it if he performed the marriage ceremony.

How then could they have known these things and her testimony still be true when she testified that "it was not known"? But she probably forgot her statement published in the *Historical Record* that Emma Smith knew of and gave her consent to the marriage, when giving in her testimony in the Temple Lot Suit, for she there made solemn affidavit that "Emma Smith was not present, and she did not consent to the marriage; she did not know anything about it at all." Rather strange testimony this! Emma did know, and she did not know; she gave her consent, and she did not give her consent. Such inconsistent, paradoxical philosophy reminds us of Lorenzo Dow's caricature of foreordination:

"You shall and you shan't, you will and you won't,

You'll be damned if you do, and you'll be damned if you don't."

Then again, if she did not attend the funeral of Joseph Smith as his wife, did not appear there as his wife, pray how did she appear, seeing she declares that she "was at the funeral of Joseph Smith"? Aside from this peculiarity in her testimony, she solemnly avers that she never went by the name of Lucy W. Smith until after she had left Nauvoo and gone out to Salt Lake City. If it was true that Joseph Smith received that revelation on celestial marriage, and they were trying to establish the principle of plural marriage, and this buxom damsel was married to Joseph in harmony with said revelation, and in the event of their establishing plural marriage, "it would have been for the benefit of the whole human race," why was it that she did not go by the name of Lucy W. Smith while there in Nau-

voo? Why was it that she waited until years after this pretended marriage—until after she had gone out to Salt Lake City—before she went by the name of Lucy W. Smith, or affirmed that she became Joseph Smith's polygamous wife in Nauvoo?

According to her testimony, she was married to Heber C. Kimball in 1845—the year after Joseph Smith's death—and went by the name of Mrs. Kimball there in Nauvoo, and that, too, at a time when polygamy was denied by the Church just as strenuously as in Joseph's day, and it was just as necessary to deny or hide the fact of her having been married to Mr. Kimball as his polygamous wife, so far as keeping it from the world is concerned, as to hide the fact of her having been married to Joseph as one of his wives. If, because of her having been married to Kimball while in Nauvoo, she went by the name of Lucy W. Kimball prior to their going to Salt Lake City, why did she wait until *after* reaching Salt Lake City to let it be known that she had been married to the Prophet at Nauvoo?

She had been known as Heber C. Kimball's wife for years, and then sometime after getting out in Utah the time suddenly came for her to be known thenceforward as Lucy W. Smith! Why this sudden transition of name from Kimball to Smith years after Joseph Smith was killed, and while Kimball was still living, and Lucy W. was associating with him as his wife? If the time never came for her to go by the name of Lucy W. Smith until *after* they got out to Salt Lake City, what particular event transpiring was the reason of her becoming known there as Lucy W. Smith? Ah, the evidence is plain. "It was the prin-

ciple of plural marriage we [they] were trying to establish” as testified to above; and that they might the more easily engraft this wicked system in the hearts and minds of the innocent and virtuous among them, the story was hatched that Joseph taught and practiced it, and Lucy W. Kimball became the willing tool in the hands of that priesthood, to help carry out their scheme, and in accord with their dictation she comes before the world bearing false witness against the Palmyra Seer, endeavoring to connect him with plural marriage which they “were trying to establish.”

According to Brighamite theology, Mrs. Kimball may have become Joseph’s wife—may have been sealed to him—after the colony reached Salt Lake, some one standing proxy for Joseph there. As the time never came for her to be known as Lucy W. Smith until after they reached Salt Lake City, the time therefore came *then* because of her *then* marrying him by proxy years and years after he was dead, and the Brighamite calendar in the endowment house may have fixed the date as May 1, 1843, and the place, Nauvoo, Illinois. If, in conferring the endowments in the endowment house, scenes are enacted representing Eden as a place, and the days of Adam and Eve as the *time*, surely they could twist their theological calendar to represent the first day of May, 1843, at Nauvoo, in order to give a coloring of veracity to Lucy’s statement of having been married to Joseph at that particular time. Nor would this be any greater stretch of authority than the binding and sealing contract whereby a living woman may become an eternal companion, or wife, to some one deceased

whom she may elect, the deceased being bound by her own choosing, though, perchance, if living that he might have anything to say in the matter for himself, he would not employ her as a kitchen maid, let alone the idea of being tied up with her as his wife with whom he must associate throughout all eternity.

The very fact of Lucy W. Kimball not being known as Mrs. Smith until after she went to Salt Lake City, together with the vacillating nature of her testimony as found in the *Historical Record* and Abstract of Evidence, the one contradicting the other; and taking into consideration the teaching and practice of the Brighamite hierarchy; and all compared with public utterances of Joseph Smith, together with the action taken by him and the Church over which he presided which show him most anxious to utterly exclude all principles of immorality as attested by the standard books and writings of the Church, preponderates largely against the statements of Mrs. Kimball, a self-confessed practicer, advocate, and lover of the doctrine or principle of plural marriage.

The testimony of those people in the mountain fastnesses of Utah, who seek to fasten polygamy upon Joseph Smith, is wholly unreliable, and would be thrown out of any court on earth as altogether untenable and unworthy of belief because of its contradictory nature.

But we will examine the testimony of one more of these female jewels of Mormondom, who claims to have been sealed or married to Joseph Smith, as one of his wives, and then will close this line of the examination, having produced sufficient testimony to show that Brighamism as a whole is totally unreli-

able. True, there may be, and doubtless are, some good people among them, people who are honest, and who would testify truly relative to what they know; but they who have so testified are few and far between. But back to our direct examination.

Zina D. Huntington is the next to claim our attention; and we proceed to examine the testimony offered in support of her having embarked in the matrimonial ship with the Prophet of the nineteenth century. In *Representative Women of Deseret* we read of her as follows:

Sister Zina was married in Nauvoo [to Henry B. Jacobs] 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 all eternity after the order of the new and everlasting covenant.

In the *Historical Record*, page 223, we find the following:

Zina D. Huntington, afterwards the wife of President Brigham Young, sealed to the Prophet October 27, 1841, Dimmick B. Huntington officiating.—*Crooked Paths*, p. 5.

As before observed, the Utah edition of the *Book of Doctrine and Covenants* represents the Lord as saying to Joseph Smith on the twelfth day of July, 1843:

Therefore prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you . . . for behold! I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant, etc.

The reader will remember that according to this so-called revelation Joseph had not up to the 12th of July, 1843, received or obeyed this doctrine of plural marriage denominated the "new and everlast-

ing covenant," which the Lord is represented as saying, "I am about to give unto you"; and yet here we have—according to Brighamite testimony as above cited—"Sister Zina . . . sealed to the Prophet for time and all eternity, after the order of the new and everlasting covenant," one year, eight months, and fifteen days *before* this so-called "new and everlasting covenant" was given! There is no dodging the fact that either Brighamism lies when it says Zina D. Huntington was married to Joseph in 1841 after the order of the new and everlasting covenant, or else it lies when declaring that that new and everlasting covenant was given July 12, 1843. It is an impossibility for them to extricate themselves from this dilemma. A falsehood most decidedly confronts them in one case or the other; and I believe that the whole thing from first to last is a tissue of lies. Let us look at the probability of there being any truth in the statement that Zina D. Huntington was married to Joseph in Nauvoo, October 27, 1841.

The first house was built in Nauvoo, June 11, 1839. Zina D. Huntington was married to Henry Jacobs in Nauvoo; hence, after June, 1839. She had two sons by her husband, Mr. Jacobs; *after* which, this union between Zina D. and Mr. Jacobs was discovered to be an unhappy one, and she therefore "separated from her husband." She, now, being a poor, lone grace-widow, the Brighamites declare that Joseph then taught her polygamy, and on the 27th of October, 1841, she was married to the Prophet. This has been a sweet morsel to roll under the tongues of those whose determination and iniquity have been

taxed to their utmost tension to fasten polygamy upon Joseph Smith as its author. Who, but a determined enthusiast, is so blind as not to be able to see the absurdity in the idea of Miss Huntington marrying Mr. Jacobs in Nauvoo, after which she bears him two children—and no intimation given anywhere as to their having been twins—then separating from her husband, after which she is taught the doctrine of polygamy, and marries again, all within two years and four months from the time the first house is built in Nauvoo? To believe such a story is a little too large a stretch of the imagination, and taxes our credulity beyond its flexibility. But methinks some one might say: "It is not impossible, hence may be true." We, therefore, proceed to make it plain; and in searching the record of Hancock County, Illinois, we find in Book A, page 40, that Henry B. Jacobs and Zina D. Huntington were married in Nauvoo, March 7, 1841, by John C. Bennett, then mayor of Nauvoo. This shows her marriage to Henry B. Jacobs to be only seven months and twenty days before it is claimed she was married to Joseph Smith as his plural wife. Now notice: Married to Jacobs March 7, 1841; bears him two children; then separates from him and becomes converted to the principle of marriage for eternity, and marries Joseph Smith October 27, 1841,—all this in seven months and twenty days! Who now will dare to credit her story? Is there a sane-minded man living who will still declare in the face of the foregoing evidence of downright hypocrisy and falsehood on the part of those Brighamite teachers, that Zina D. Huntington was Joseph Smith's polygamous wife?

No one, in the face of the above facts, can indorse such a statement.

There are other women of whom it is claimed they were the wives of Joseph Smith; but why go to the trouble of running down such assertions coming from the Brighamite prevaricators, when all their assertions concerning Joseph being a polygamist are cut from the same elastic, moth-eaten web? Even among the dignitaries of the Mormon Church there were those who were acquainted with Joseph Smith who are not willing to acknowledge nor believe that Joseph actually practiced polygamy.

Apostle Franklin D. Richards, Historian of the Brighamite Church, with all the affidavits and array of evidence presentable by the Brighamite institution, does not believe them to be authentic; and, therefore, in a chapter furnished by him for a book entitled *What the World Believes*, page 600, he says:

It is well understood among the Latter Day Saints [the Brighamites are the Latter Day Saints referred to here] that Joseph Smith and many other prominent members of the Church married or had sealed to them several wives. Joseph Smith's first wife was Emma Hale, who was married to him January 18, 1827. Of the names or number of his other wives as also dates of their marriage to him, *we are not informed*.

The brackets and italics are mine.

If Apostle Franklin D. Richards, being the historian of the Church, having access to all the documents of the Church, and knowing the claim made by the Mormon Church that those females named by Andrew Jensen were Joseph's wives, in the face of it all says: "Of the names or number of his other

wives [that is, any others than Emma], as also dates of their marriage to him, we are not informed," how in the name of common sense and consistency can it be expected that others will accept this insufficient testimony as all-sufficient? Surely if Joseph had other wives than Emma Hale, a record of their names, and the dates when they became his wives, would have been kept. But Apostle Richards, the custodian of all the Church records, could find no such data, which is strong presumptive evidence that Joseph was not a polygamist.

We are glad that Mr. Richards had the manly quality in this instance at least of brooking the tide of the popular sentiment of the Brighamite priesthood with sufficient fortitude to speak his own convictions as above expressed. While he makes the statement that "It is well understood . . . that Joseph Smith . . . had several wives," the testimony by reason of which said understanding obtained is not vouched for by the record of events as they transpired in the days of the Seer; hence, Mr. Richards, in the face of the said understanding wherein it is claimed that Eliza R. Snow, Emily D. P. Young, Louisa Beaman, Lucy W. Kimball, Zina D. Jacobs, and others were the wives of Joseph Smith, yet "of the names or number" "as also dates" of Joseph's marriage to any other woman than Emma Hale, Mr. Richards had not been informed; hence the information furnished in support of the claim that Joseph was a polygamist is hereby virtually acknowledged by this one of Brigham's celebrated apostles as being of doubtful character. Further light may be gleaned from the following:

Not only is it deemed proper to take the widow of some good brother, but also to take fresh wives for your dead brother. There was a lady named P——, in Salt Lake in 1854, who had heard of, and loved Smith. He had been dead for ten years, but that is nothing to the wings of Mormon faith. She was desirous to be sealed to him, although I believe she had a husband still living in the States. Brigham consented to act as proxy, or agent for Joseph Smith, and accordingly the interesting ceremony was performed—Mrs. P——, good soul, gave up all her property to the Church, faithfully believing she had joined the numerous army of the Smiths in general under the special banner of the Prophet Joseph.—History of Mormonism, by John Hyde, p. 87.

One of the wives of Brigham Young—Mrs. Augusta Cobb Young—a highly educated and intelligent Boston lady with whom I am intimately acquainted, requested of her prophet-husband a favor of the most extraordinary description. . . . So when the lady of whom I speak asked him to place her at the head of his household, he refused; she begged hard, but he would not relent. Then finding she could not be Brigham's "queen" and having been taught by the highest Mormon authorities that our Savior had, and has, many wives, she requested to be sealed to him! Brigham Young told her (for what reason I do not know) that it really was out of his power to do that, but that he would do "the next best thing" for her—he would seal her to Joseph Smith; and though Brigham still supports her and she is called by his name on earth, in the resurrection she will leave him and go over to the original prophet.—Tell it All, by Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse, p. 252.

Eliza R. Snow . . . is only a proxy wife to Brigham, and will belong to Joseph Smith in the resurrection.—Ibid., p. 289.

Mrs. Augusta Cobb, left her home in Boston. . . . She begged to be released from Brigham as he was getting tired of her. She begged him to seal her to Jesus Christ, but he would not; he said the next best thing he could do was to seal her to Joseph Smith. She is Brigham's for life, and Joseph's for eternity.—History of Mormonism, by Ann Eliza Young, p. 504.

By marriage for the dead, living women are sealed to dead men, and vice versa, some one standing proxy for the deceased.—Mysteries and Crimes of Mormonism, by J. H. Beadle, p. 353.

Such being the principle of the Mormon faith, one can easily understand how and when these women mentioned by Andrew Jensen, became the wives of Joseph Smith. They were sealed to him *after he was dead!* It is claimed, as we have seen, that Eliza R. Snow was one of Joseph Smith's spiritual wives; that she was sealed to Joseph; and Mrs. Stenhouse tells us that Brigham Young was the man who stood proxy for Joseph. If, then, as Mrs. Stenhouse affirms, she is "only a proxy wife to Brigham," she was never the wife of Joseph Smith while he was alive; but after his death, Brigham kindly volunteered to perform the meritorious (?) act of helping him to "enlarge his kingdom," and sealed to Joseph a number of females to be his wives, while he—Brigham—figured in the beautiful drama as the proxy husband to raise up children for the martyred Prophet, the real object of the proxy wife business being that of begetting children for the poor brother who had only one wife, and probably not more than half-a-dozen children!

What do we learn from this investigation? We learn that Joseph Smith at no time taught polygamy; and that this cobweb hypothesis of Joseph Smith having been a polygamist was blown into existence by the crafty work of such carnal, ecclesiastical conspirators as Brigham Young, John Taylor, Orson Pratt, Andrew Jensen, and others who were associated with them in their abominable practices. It will therefore be necessary to introduce something better than this array of Brighamite testimony in order to prove that Joseph Smith practiced or taught polygamy.

Joseph was a strong, healthy, well-proportioned man, weighing two hundred and ten pounds, and was the father of eight children by his wife Emma; and according to the so-called revelation on polygamy, the object for which it was given was to enlarge one's kingdom by raising up multitudinous families, we therefore ask, Where are the children born to Joseph Smith by any woman beneath the sun save those born to him by his wife Emma? Surely there should have been at least one child born to him by some one of those women who the Mormon hierarchy affirm were Joseph's wives, if he lived with them as his wives from 1840 until the time of his death. Some of those same women had children by Brigham Young and others; but where are Joseph's children by any of those women? Echo answers, "Where?" The production of such issue would speak in louder tones than those of Sinai in confirmation of the Brighamite claim; but alas for Brighamism! no living soul can step up and truthfully say: "Joseph Smith, the martyred Prophet, was my father," save those children born to him by the "loving, tender, affectionate Emma." This is strong presumptive evidence in favor of the proposition that Joseph Smith was not a polygamist.

CHAPTER VI.

HAVING searched in vain for something reliable upon which to base the claim that Joseph Smith taught or practiced the doctrine of polygamy, and in the course of our investigation having found much that he taught the Church which is in plain opposition to that doctrine, I now call attention to some of his most pointed statements in opposition to polygamy, and supplement those statements with the plain declarations of other prominent ones of the ministry, some of which were recorded prior to, and some since, the death of Joseph Smith.

The Book of Mormon declares that polygamy is an "abomination" in the sight of God, calls it a "crime," and expressly states that "there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none." Joseph Smith, the translator of the Book of Mormon, was familiar with its teachings, and knew of this opposition to polygamy; and in 1828 he received a revelation stating that the said book should, when translated, "bring to light the true points" of the doctrine of Christ, and the "only doctrine" found in the divine economy, etc. In 1831 he gave a revelation to the Church, in which occurs the word of God to govern its members, saying, "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else."

Again in 1835, the expressed will of God through his properly accredited officers, while in conference assembled, according to the best wisdom and inspiration which God gave them, was:

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 case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.

Again, in 1838, the following was submitted by Joseph Smith:

Do the Mormons believe in having more than one wife? Answer.—No, not at the same time. But they believe that if their companion dies, they have a right to marry again.—*Historical Record*, p. 439.

In a letter written to the Church, and dated December 16, 1838, Joseph says:

We have heard that it is reported by some, that some of us should have said, that we not only dedicated our property, but our families also to the Lord; and Satan, taking advantage of this, has transfigured it into licentiousness, such as a community of wives, which is an abomination in the sight of God.—*Millennial Star*, vol. 16, p. 627.

Without quoting at length, we again pause to call attention to the fact that in 1842 J. C. Bennett's secret wife system was publicly denounced by Joseph Smith and thirty-one other leading men and women in Nauvoo, and Bennett was expelled from the Church because of teaching it and other false doctrine, and for his unbridled licentiousness.

Also on the 1st of February, 1844, Hiram Brown was severed from the Church for "teaching polygamy and other false and corrupt doctrines in the county of Lapeer, state of Michigan," and that the doctrine of polygamy was believed in or taught by the Church at Nauvoo was denied through the *Times and Seasons*, the official organ of the Church, by Hyrum Smith, March 15, 1844, a little better than three

months before the martyrdom of Joseph and Hyrum in Carthage, Illinois.

Besides all this, William Marks, a man who was fearless in the discharge of duty, and noted for his uprightness, and who was the president of the High Council and also president of the branch at Nauvoo, declares that a few days before the Prophet went to his death, Joseph Smith pronounced polygamy to be "a cursed doctrine," and declared that unless it "was put down" it would "prove the overthrow of the Church"; and pointed out to Elder Marks the methods to be pursued in the extermination of the evil. They were: First, that he, Joseph Smith, the President of the Church, would present accusations to the High Council against those of whom he had information that they were transgressors in the evil complained of, and that William Marks, the presiding officer of both the stake and the Council, should "sever them from the Church," unless they "made ample satisfaction." Second, that he, Joseph Smith, the Prophet and President of the Church, would "go before the congregation and proclaim against it," that it was a "cursed doctrine."

If Joseph Smith was the originator of that "cursed doctrine" and one of those "in transgression," the methods proposed by him for the purpose of putting that doctrine down, were the very ones calculated to betray his connection with such evil practice, if it existed. For, if he was known to President Marks and to others as the chief of sinners in such "transgression," those who had been misled by him into such evil belief and practice would have been the first and surest ones to denounce him and show his

connection with both teaching and practice. Can any sensible man believe from the statement of William Marks, which we have given at length on pages 57 and 58, that Joseph Smith would have done a thing so foolish as that? Not even a knave, shrewd as the world gives Joseph Smith the credit of being, would have shown such an exhibition of folly as that would have been. For a man who knew himself to be in transgression of the kind referred to, knowing that others knew it, proposing to go before a council over which a man like William Marks presided there to make charges against other men involved in like wickedness as himself is not to be believed. No man in the exercise of common sense would so far forget the commonest measures of safety to himself if he was guilty.

Again, no man would dare to go openly before a congregation and there declare against a doctrine and practice so evil as the ones referred to, himself being a guilty teacher and practicer of them, while he knew that he was a partner in their crimes, if they were guilty. Such action would be moral and religious suicide, if not worse. For, if they were guilty, all knew that the laws of the State had been infringed, and that open prosecution in the courts of the land would bring out the facts, and make punishment sure, for Joseph Smith as well as others.

Parley P. Pratt, under date of August, 1842, and published in the *Millennial Star*, volume 3, page 74, says:

But, for the information of those who may be assailed by those foolish tales about the two wives, we would say that no such principle ever existed among the Latter Day Saints, or ever

will. This is well known to all who are acquainted with our books and actions; the Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, and also all our periodicals are very strict and explicit on that subject, indeed far more so than the Bible.

We also extract from the *Times and Seasons*, for November 15, 1844, the following from a letter signed "An Old Man in Israel," which is very emphatic in its denunciations of polygamy, spiritual wifery, etc.

The saints of the last days have witnessed the outgoings and incomings of so many apostates that nothing but truth has any effect upon them. In the present instance, after the sham quotations of Sidney and his clique, from the Bible, Book of Mormon, and Doctrine and Covenants, to skulk off, under the "dreadful splendor" of "spiritual wifery," which is brought into the account as graciously as if the law of the land allowed a man a plurality of wives, is fiendish, and like the rest of Sidney's revelation, just because he wanted to go to Pittsburg to live. Woe to the man or men who will thus willfully lie to injure an innocent people! The law of the land and the rules of the Church do not allow one man to have more than one wife alive at once; but if any man's wife die, he has a right to marry another, and to be sealed to both for eternity; to the living and to the dead! There is no law of God or man against it! This is all the spiritual wife system that ever was tolerated in the Church, and they know it.

John Taylor, who was the editor of the *Times and Seasons* at that time, in commenting on the foregoing letter said:

For the communication of "An Old Man of Israel," and the letter of Elder Addison Pratt, from the islands of the Pacific Ocean, we bespeak a hearty welcome. They are genuine.

In the above we find this "Old Man of Israel," as also John Taylor, opposed to the plural wife system; and Joseph Smith had then been dead nearly five months. John Taylor also wrote on May 1, 1845,

over ten months after the death of the martyrs, as follows:

For once let us say that Cain who went to the land of Nod and taught the doctrine of a plurality of wives, and the giants who practiced the same iniquity, and Nimrod who practiced the common stock system, and the Jews who commenced crossing sea and land to make proselytes without revelation; and the Christian sects who have went all lengths to build up churches, and multiplying systems without authority from God, are all coworkers on the same plan. When the reward for every man's work is given this will be the everlasting answer to all sects, sorts, and conditions, from Cain down to Christian Israelites, "I never knew you."—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 6, p. 888.

On page 894, same volume, is an article copied from the *Gazette*, Kalamazoo, Michigan, written by E. M. Webb, then an elder of the Church, from which we extract the following:

The Latter Day Saints are charged by their enemies with the blackest crimes. Treason, murder, theft, polygamy, and adultery, are among the many crimes laid to their charge. . . . Mr. Rigdon's spiritual wife system was never known until it was hatched by J. C. Bennett, who was cut off from the Church for seduction. As to the charge of polygamy, I will quote from the Doctrine and Covenants, which is the subscribed faith of the Church and is strictly enforced.

He then quoted from Doctrine and Covenants section 111, paragraph 4, which is as follows:

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 case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.

Polygamy in the above statement of Elder Webb was called a crime, and classed with murder and treason, and the Doctrine and Covenants was cited

to show the antagonism of the Church to that principle, or crime, as also the other crimes mentioned in his letter.

In the *Millennial Star*, volume 6, page 22, Parley P. Pratt published an article under date of July 1, 1845, entitled, "Fragments of an address by P. P. Pratt," in which he says:

Again, beware of seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, as first introduced by John C. Bennett, under the name of "Spiritual Wife" doctrine; and still agitated by the Pittsburg Seer, and his followers under the same title. It is but another name for whoredom, wicked and unlawful connection, and every kind of confusion, corruption, and abomination. . . . "The Spiritual Wife Doctrine," of J. C. Bennett, and numerous other apostates, is as foreign to the real principles of the Church as the devil is from God, or as sectarianism is from Christianity.

If the spiritual wife doctrine was at that time only advocated by "apostates," and was as foreign to the real principles of the Church "as the devil is from God," and was nothing more than "whoredom," etc., what peculiar change was it which wrought upon this system of "wicked and unlawful connection," transforming it into a virtue that would damn all who would reject it? And if Joseph Smith received it as a revelation from God in July, 1843, how came Parley P. Pratt to speak so irreverently and condemnatory of it in July, 1845, two years after? Elder Pratt was one of the staunchest defenders of the faith of the Church that the early organization had; and his denying the sanctity of polygamy, etc., at that time, is strong presumptive evidence that it was not taught by the Church; and any one advocating such an unholy system then, as now, was properly branded by Elder Pratt as an apostate, one who taught the

“doctrine of devils,” and “every kind of confusion, corruption, and abomination.” This is another strong point in favor of the statement that Joseph Smith never taught the doctrine of polygamy.

On page 44 of the same volume, Wilford Woodruff, late president of the Brighamite Church, being the editor, called attention to the above address of Elder Pratt, and said:

I wish to say to all the Saints and officers throughout the land, that I have carefully perused an article published in the last *Star*, entitled “Fragments of an address by P. P. Pratt,” and it is strictly in accordance with my own views and principles, and I hope that all the elders, officers, and Saints, over whom I am called to preside, will consider the address made to them, and will act accordingly. Let no officer, or member of the Church, pretend to present any principle to any person whatsoever except it accord with the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ, with righteousness, truth, and virtue.

Thus we find Parley P. Pratt and Wilford Woodruff in 1845 condemning the spiritual wife doctrine as an abomination advocated only by apostates, and as “foreign to the real principles of the Church as the devil is from God.”

In harmony with the statement just considered of Messrs. Woodruff and Pratt, we find Orson Spencer, under date of May 1, 1848, publishing a letter in the *Millennial Star*, volume 10, pages 137 and 138, from which we extract the following:

How much vigilance is requisite in order to keep the wheat-field clean from tares. Without constant scrutiny the first you know, tares, rank and cumbersome, are springing up among the wheat. Noxious weeds frequently grow faster in the garden than the most precious plants, and poisonous fruit often wears a most enticing verdure. In all ages of the Church, truth has been turned into a lie, and the grace of God converted into las-

civiousness by men that have sought to make "a gain" of godliness, and feed their lusts on the credulity of the righteous and unsuspecting. In the midst of the general prosperity of the churches throughout the British Isles, we sometimes observe the stealthy tracks of beasts of prey. These animals come in the night and spoil the vines, and when the morning dawns, lo! the sight of their unhallowed tracks causes sorrow and mourning. Next to long hackneyed and bugaboo whisperings of polygism, is another abomination that sometimes shows its serpentine crests, which we shall call sexual resurrectionism. The teachers and abettors of such a doctrine have no need to hang out their colors in order to show their pedigree. And they have no need to preach it long, in order to make their "calling and reprobation sure." Such wandering stars as J. C. Bennett, and Higbees do not seem to be sufficient beacons to keep some restless and aspiring spirits from the maelstrom of pollution and apostasy. "Fools ever will be meddling," says Solomon. The doctrines of corrupt spirits are always in close affinity with each other, whether they consist in spiritual wifeism, sexual resurrection, gross lasciviousness, or the unavoidable separation of husbands and wives, or the communism of property. We have barely to say of such "false teachers," that "their damnation slumbereth not." Except they repent and break off their sins by righteousness their wickedness shall be made manifest, and all their righteousness which they have done will be remembered no more in their favor. Let the Saints keep a cautious eye upon teachers that promulgate marvelous things beyond the first principles of the gospel.

In an article entitled "Who is a liar?" published in the *Millennial Star* for January 15, 1850,—see volume 12, page 29,—and written by Elder Thomas Smith in reply to a Mr. Bowes who had made an attack upon the Latter Day Saint faith, among what Elder Smith enumerates as lies we find the following:

Twelfth lie.—Joseph Smith taught a system of polygamy.

Twelfth refutation.—The revelations given through Joseph Smith, state the following: "If any commit adultery, they

shall be dealt with according to the law of God." "He that looketh upon a woman to lust after her; or, if any commit adultery in their hearts, they shall not have the Spirit." "Thou shalt love thy wife, and shall cleave unto her and none else." "We believe that one man should have one wife."

Again: John Taylor, on the eleventh day of July, 1850, at Boulogne-sur-mer, France, while defending the doctrine of the Church in a public discussion with Messrs. C. W. Cleave, James Robertson, and Phillip Cater, in answer to the charge of polygamy being taught and sanctioned by the Church, said:

We are accused here of polygamy, and actions the most indelicate, obscene, and disgusting, such that none but a corrupt and depraved heart could have contrived. These things are too outrageous to admit of belief; therefore, leaving the sisters of the "White Veil," the "Black Veil," and all the other veils, with those gentlemen to dispose of, together with their authors, as they think best, I shall content myself by reading our views of chastity and marriage, from a work published by us, and containing some of the articles of our faith.

He then read from the Doctrine and Covenants, section 111, on marriage, a part of which we have already quoted, and now call attention to again, as the section quoted by Elder Taylor is so emphatic in its denunciation of polygamy. It is as follows:

Inasmuch as this Church of Jesus 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 case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.

This statement, coming from Mr. Taylor, shows conclusively that polygamy was not then a doctrine of the Church, and that the Church considered it a crime; and that if Mr. Taylor, or any one else in the

Church was practicing polygamy, he was doing so in violation of the expressed faith and doctrines of the Church, and, as we have seen, such were branded by the leading elders in the Church as apostates. Mr. Taylor here states that the theory of plural marriage, or polygamy, was "indelicate, obscene, and disgusting," and could not be tolerated or contrived by any but a corrupt and depraved heart, and was "too outrageous to admit of belief."

Orson Pratt, August 29, 1852, preached the first public sermon on polygamy, when Brigham Young and his compeers sought to fasten polygamy upon the Church as a principle of faith and doctrine, and Elder Pratt, in his introductory remarks, said:

It is quite unexpected to me, brethren and sisters, to be called upon to address you upon the principle 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; . . . consequently we shall have to break up new ground.—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 1, pp. 53, 54.

Let the reader please notice that this statement was made by the man who has been called the champion of polygamy, eight years, two months, and two days after the martyrdom of Joseph Smith; and Mr. Pratt then declared that in order for him to preach on the subject of "a plurality of wives" he "would have to break up new ground."

The next year after this public introduction of polygamy, this same man, Orson Pratt, made this statement:

Now in the early rise of this Church, the Lord gave no command unto any of his servants authorizing them to take more than one wife, but on the contrary, said unto them that they

should give heed to that which was written in the Book of Mormon; therefore they were under the strictest obligations to confine themselves to one wife, until a commandment came to the contrary, which the Lord did not see proper to give unto any of them until about thirteen years after the first organization of the Church. The Church, therefore, are still restricted, by the severest penalties, to one wife, according to the Book of Mormon, unless in individual cases where the Lord shall, by revelation, direct otherwise.—The *Seer*, vol. 1, p. 23.

Thus we have Orson Pratt's statement on the matter of polygamy being a new feature of the work in 1852,—it was breaking up new ground to preach it,—and in 1853, he declared the Church was still bound by the monogamic rule, was strictly restricted “by the severest penalties, to one wife,” the only exception being “in individual cases where the Lord shall, by revelation, direct otherwise.” Hence, according to Elder Pratt, no one had the right to take a second wife without a revelation from God. This is contrary to that pretended revelation of July 12, 1843, which teaches that if a man desires to take a second wife, and the first wife “give her consent,” no revelation is necessary, but with the consent of the first wife the way is clear, and he can go right ahead: hence we have Orson Pratt, one of the leading lights of Brighamism, versus this so-called revelation. Nor is this all; for if Orson was right in his statement that a separate revelation was necessary in each individual case, then as Joseph Smith gave the rule, which obtained as the law of the Church, that all revelations advocating principles to govern in the Church should be submitted to the various quorums of the Church, and would have to pass them all without “running against a snag” ere such revelation

could become operative, this rule would have to be observed in each individual case claiming a separate revelation. This statement of Mr. Pratt shows the vacillating nature of those men who sought to fasten polygamy onto the innocent and unwary ones.

Again: If Mr. Pratt told the truth when declaring that "the Lord gave no command unto any of his servants authorizing them to take more than one wife, until about thirteen years after the first organization of the Church," what becomes of all this array of Brighamite testimony that Joseph Smith and others taught and practiced it prior to the year 1843—had wives sealed to them as early as in 1841, etc.?

George Q. Cannon, who had frequently represented the territory (now state) of Utah in the legislative halls of our country, and was a staunch advocate of the doctrine of polygamy, on June 11, 1871, said:

A prevalent idea has been, that this prejudice against us owes its origin and continuation to our belief in a plurality of wives; but when it is recollected that the mobbings, drivings, and expulsions from cities, counties, and States which we endured, and our exodus to these mountains, all took place before the revelation of that doctrine was publicly known, it will be seen, that our belief in it has not been the cause of persecution. . . . Joseph and Hyrum Smith were persecuted to death previous to the Church having any knowledge of this doctrine.—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 14, pp. 165, 166.

H. B. Clawson, another one of their strong men, son-in-law of Brigham Young, speaking of the time they were driven out from Nauvoo, said:

Polygamy at that time was unknown among those of the Mormon faith. . . . The doctrine of polygamy was not promulgated

until they got to Salt Lake; not in fact until some little time after they arrived there.—*Salt Lake Herald*, February 9, 1882.

At an interview of the Chicago Commercial Party with Brigham Young at Salt Lake City in 1869, Brigham said to Senator Trumbull:

As to our institutions, we know we are right, and polygamy, which you object to, was not originally a part of our system, but was adopted by us as a necessity, after we came here.—*True Latter Day Saints' Herald*, September 1, 1869.

As we thus have Brigham Young acknowledging that polygamy was not a part of the doctrine originally taught by the church he claimed to represent, that it was a departure therefrom, was adopted by them as a necessity *after they got to Utah*, what becomes of the claim that it was taught and practiced years before that time by Joseph Smith and other leading elders? As Brigham thus acknowledged that it was adopted by the Mormon Church as a necessity, after they reached Utah, perhaps he was the author of that fraudulent revelation on polygamy, and the real founder of the system. Let us see! Brigham acknowledged himself to have been the author of the doctrine of polygamy, though it was not until years after he had securely fastened that principle of crime upon his people that he thus confessed. In a speech made by him June 21, 1874, he said:

While we were in England (in 1839 or 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 any one 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 that time, but I had this for myself, and I kept it to myself; and when I returned home, and Joseph revealed those things to me, then I understood the reflections

which were upon my mind while in England; but this was not until after I had told him what I understood—this was in 1841. The revelation was given in 1843, but the doctrine was revealed before this.—*Deseret News*, July 1, 1874.

In this Brigham acknowledges that the doctrine of polygamy was revealed to him—not to Joseph Smith—in 1839, or in 1840, while he was in England; and that he kept the matter quiet until he returned home. Then when Joseph revealed those things to him (this would, therefore, be the second time these things were revealed to him,—first, in England; and second, in Nauvoo, Illinois), he understood the reflections which were upon his mind while in England. Joseph, therefore, in revealing “these things” to Brigham in 1841 caused Brigham to understand, mark you, what the Lord had manifested unto him “by vision and his Spirit” in 1839 or 1840. “But,” says Brigham, “this was not until I had told him what I *understood*.” O Consistency! It took Joseph’s revelation to make Brigham understand what he (Brigham) already understood! And all this in 1841, while the revelation attributed to Joseph Smith is declared by Brigham to have been given in 1843. If the revelation was given in 1843, but the doctrine was revealed before that, to whom was the doctrine thus revealed before the revelation was given? Why, to Brigham, of course; hence, as Brigham here acknowledges that the revelation of the doctrine was given to him while he was in England in 1839 or 1840, and as we can find no trace of it in Joseph’s writings anywhere, does it not look a little dubious about Joseph’s having known anything of it? And as we have always found him arrayed against it, does not this confession

of Brigham Young fasten the revelation of that doctrine upon him and exonerate Joseph Smith therefrom? It certainly looks that way.

With this jumbled up mess of contradictions and absurdities from Brigham's own lips before us, in which he acknowledges that the doctrine of polygamy was given to him while he was in England, seeing he declares he talked with Joseph about it in 1841, and diligent search having been made among the writings and sayings of Joseph Smith for one single sentence corroborating this statement, or favoring the doctrine of polygamy, resulting in a complete failure—not one scintilla of evidence anywhere in all his writings or reported sayings connecting him favorably with that system—while on the other hand it is found where he calls it “false and corrupt doctrine,” “an abomination,” “licentiousness,” “a crime,” and a “cursed doctrine,” and besides, having expelled some from the Church because of their teaching such an accursed system, we ask: On which side does the evidence preponderate? Is there the remotest particle of evidence that will connect Joseph Smith with this unhallowed dogma and caricature of the doctrine of God? If so, where is that evidence? It is evidence we want; not blustering bombast, brazen effrontery, nor hypocritical cant, but evidence! Something commendable to intelligence; something that will stand the searching gaze of investigation and justice as administered by judge and jurors in the courts of our land to-day; and in the absence of such evidence, dear reader, let not the burlesqueing buffoonery nor dogmatic assertions of charlatan priests, nor sectarian demagoguery

clog the wheels of procedure in the realms of investigation; but when finding the fields of truth bedecked with beautiful gems of opal and gold, embrace it at whatever cost, though, like Nathaniel of old, you should find it where least expected. The claims of Joseph Smith are worthy of your consideration, and we trust you will not pass them lightly by, but in the faithful consideration of the apostolic injunction: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Perhaps we may not seem tedious in calling special attention to these and other statements of Brigham Young, in order to enable the reader more easily to see the consistency of the position taken by us, that Brigham Young, not Joseph Smith, was responsible for the abomination of polygamy obtaining among those claiming to represent Christ and calling themselves by the name of Saints. On the sixth day of April, 1845, Brigham Young said:

Joseph in his lifetime did not receive everything connected with the doctrine of redemption, but he has left the key with those who understand how to obtain and teach to this great people all that is necessary for their salvation and exaltation in the celestial kingdom of our God.—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 6, p. 955.

Without a particle of doubt, Brigham, at the very moment he uttered those words, was contemplating the introduction of the doctrine of polygamy into the Church, and used the above statement to prepare the way for that pernicious innovation; and after the introduction of this gross deception, on the 11th of September, 1853, he made the following statement with reference to the Church over which he was then the president:

If I have any knowledge touching the condition of this people at the present time; and the way they are taught, led, counseled, and dictated by those who go before them to open up the way, it is directly opposite of that we saw in the days of Joseph the prophet.—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 1, p. 78.

Just so! Joseph Smith taught the principle of monogamy; Brigham taught the doctrine of polygamy—just the opposite of what Joseph taught. How pertinent, therefore, the statement of Brigham to Senator Trumbull, that polygamy was not originally a part of the doctrine of the Church established by the Palmyra Seer, but was adopted by the Brighamites as a necessity after they went to Utah.

Lorenzo Snow, one of the successors of Brigham Young in the Presidency of the Utah Mormon Church, on being examined under oath on the subject of the revelation authorizing polygamy, in the Temple Lot Suit, said:

There was some talk in Nauvoo among the officers of the Church about the practice of plural marriage. There was considerable talk. I have no recollection of the practice being talked of publicly. . . . I did not teach when I went out that time that a man could have more wives than one. No, sir, that doctrine was not talked. It would have been considered that a person teaching such doctrine at that time would be liable to experience church discipline. . . . I never saw the ceremony of sealing performed in the days of Joseph Smith. I never knew anything about the practice of sealing during the days of Joseph Smith. He didn't tell me anything about it at the time I had this conversation with him. . . . Up to the time of the presentation of that revelation to the Church and its acceptance by the Church [in 1852—W. J. S.], the law of the Church on marriage was the same as you have read, and which I referred to in the 1835 edition of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, Exhibit E. That was the law of the Church up to the time of the purported revelation and its acceptance by the Church; yes, sir, that is

true. And a man that violated this law in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, 1835 edition, until the acceptance of that revelation by the Church [August 29, 1852.—W. J. S.], violated the law of the Church if he practiced plural marriage. Yes, sir, he would have been cut off from the Church. I think I should have been if I had. . . . You want to know why this principle of plural marriage was inserted [in the 1876 edition of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants] instead of the principle of single marriage?

Q.—Yes, sir, why did you take out one and put the other in?

A.—I can not tell you, for I did not do it, nor can I tell why.

Q.—Was it not because this taught or had changed the order in the Church?

A.—Well, it is a fact that the order of marriage was changed, but whether that was the purpose of the substitution or not, I do not know.

Q.—The order of marriage was changed, and the old order eliminated; is not that the fact?

A.—Well, it was changed or extended. It was changed from the one to the other.

Q.—It was changed from monogamy to polygamy, was it not?

A.—Yes, sir, you might say it was if it suits you. It was extended from monogamy to polygamy. . . . Yes, sir, it was the introduction of another system besides the original one, or it was the extension of the principle of one wife to more than one wife. . . . To my knowledge this purported revelation of 1843 was never brought before the Church for acceptance during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. It was never brought before the public in any way before the death of Joseph Smith; I do not think it was ever presented to the Church for acceptance until 1852, in Salt Lake. . . . No, sir, the Church never accepted the revelation on polygamy during the lifetime of Joseph Smith, for it was not during his lifetime that it was presented to the Church for acceptance. It was presented to the Church here at Utah and accepted. But it was not presented to the Church in the time of Joseph Smith.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 316-323.

Bathsheba Smith, wife of George A. Smith, who was one of Brigham Young's counselors, and first

cousin to Joseph Smith, testified under oath in the Temple Lot Suit as follows:

Yes, sir, when Joseph Smith preached from the stand in 1840, he preached that the ancient order would be restored, the order of Abraham, and if polygamy was what Abraham practiced, why then he preached polygamy. He did not say that the ancient order meant polygamy; did not talk about polygamy; did not say anything at all about polygamy, and I never heard Joseph Smith teach polygamy, nor did I ever hear him say anything about it, either publicly or privately. I never saw him sealed to anybody, and I lived in Nauvoo from 1840 up to the time the Church left there. I knew Emma Smith; I believe she was his wife, but I did not see them married. She was held out there as his wife; lived in the same house with him. . . . There was nobody else held out as his wife while I was living in Nauvoo, nor down to the time of his death. I was in Nauvoo at the time of his death; did not attend the funeral. I do not know of any member of the Church having more wives than one at Nauvoo, during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. I heard some little talk, not much before their death. I lived there from 1840 up to the time he died. I never heard of any such thing.

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

I heard of the John C. Bennett secret wife doctrine; the Church authorities denounced that at the time, and they denounced Bennett for that doctrine, and cut him off from the Church, and preached against it,—preached against it publicly right there in the city of Nauvoo, at the time, Joseph Smith and the rest of them,—and particularly Joseph Smith,—he denounced him. His denunciation of the John C. Bennett secret wife system may have been published in the *Times and Seasons*, and I may not have read it, and I might have read it, and not remember it now. . . . There was a great stir in the Church at that time; the Church published him, and expelled him, and they preached against him from the stand, and against plural marriage, the secret wife system, secret marriages. The spiritual wife system was the system by which a man had two wives at the same time.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 361, 362.

I was going to pass this testimony by without comment, but I will call the reader's attention to the fact that this Mrs. Smith, and the rest of those who are from Salt Lake City, or from Utah, were introduced as witnesses whereby it was sought to convict Joseph Smith of being a polygamist, both in theory and practice. But it will take a long time to fasten polygamy onto Joseph Smith with testimony like the above. What plainer evidence does one want than the above testimony that Joseph Smith was opposed to polygamy and the secret or spiritual wife doctrine? Let notice be taken of the fact that she testifies that Joseph Smith was particularly active in his denunciations of the spiritual wife doctrine, that he "preached against it publicly," and that "the spiritual wife system was the system by which a man had two wives at the same time."

John Taylor, baptized into the Church in 1832, and who was an ordained teacher—whose duties make it incumbent upon the one holding such office to see that there is no evil in the Church, and that each member of the Church does his duty—swore as follows relative to his work at Nauvoo:

It was our duty in case we found anybody with more wives than one, to report them to the president of the teachers' quorum. There were twenty-four in the teachers' quorum. It was an organized quorum, and our instructions were if we found any case of that kind to report it to the president of the teachers' quorum, and the president would report them to Hyrum Smith. That was the instruction that Brother Hyrum Smith gave in the quorum. We were not to report these alone, but any other misdemeanor that we found in our wards, and they were all reported alike to the president of the quorum.

Now I don't mean to say that there was any such thing as

polygamy at that time taught or being practiced for that matter, but it was about that time that John C. Bennett's secret wife system came to be heard of, and it was talked around that there was such things as that; and that was the reason that the instructions were given us, for we were told to search it out and find what there was to it if we could. . . . During the time that I was a teacher, from 1832 up to 1844, there was no rule or law of the original Church that permitted the practice or principle of polygamy. There was no such law, I am sure. . . . No, sir, there was no polygamy. There was no talk of polygamy there at that time,—no talk of that kind that I ever heard. Joseph Smith and Hyrum Smith never taught polygamy, and there was no revelation on polygamy or celestial marriage, or anything of the kind. The Church was governed entirely as a monogamy church from 1832, at the time I became connected with it, up to the time of Joseph Smith's death.

There was a man by the name of Brown that taught that doctrine. He was notified by the Church authorities, tried, and cut off from the Church. That was about the same time of the Bennett transaction. There was another man by the name of Durfy who went to La Harpe, Illinois, and he told the people that he thought the time would come when they would practice polygamy, or the same doctrine with reference to plural wives that David and Solomon did. That was what Durfy taught. That was reported to Hyrum Smith, and Hyrum sat down on a well-curb and wrote a notice to him that such a doctrine was not to be taught in the Church. I saw that letter and it was a severe rebuke.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 190-193.

John H. Carter, baptized in 1834, ordained an elder and afterwards ordained to the office of high priest, and a member of the High Council, in his deposition in the Temple Lot Suit, testified as follows:

I was a member of the Church at the time Joseph Smith was killed, and I was there when Brigham Young took the lead, and was in the meeting when he was nominated and voted in, and so up to his death—the death of Brigham Young. I was acquainted with the doctrines, tenets, and principles of the Church under Brigham Young from 1846 up to the time of his death, for I lived

here in Utah all the time since 1850, and most of the time in Provo, and have heard Brigham Young preach there often. . . . Some of these doctrines that were taught by Brigham Young were never taught in the original Church prior to 1844, and if any man had taught them he would have been disfellowshipped from the Church very quick. That is, up to 1844 at the time that Joseph and Hyrum Smith were killed; the polygamy doctrine was never taught in the Church in early days up to 1844. I lived most two years with Joseph Smith in one place, and have heard him preach, and the rest of the elders,—Hyrum Smith, and Oliver Cowdery, and the rest of them; but I never heard the doctrine of polygamy taught by Joseph Smith or any of them, never in the world. . . . The doctrine, teachings, and tenets of the Church from 1834, at the time I became a member of the original Church, down to 1844, are found in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. Take out the revelation on polygamy, and you may take the balance. Polygamy was not taught from 1830 to 1844. . . . I never heard Joseph Smith teach it, either publicly or privately. But about the time that Brigham Young took the lead in the Church it was taught privately. It was not taught publicly in any of the books, or in any of the publications or papers of the Church, nor in the revelations that were received nor commandments that were given. It was not taught or countenanced in any way in any of the laws that were given to the Church, and the parties in the Church who preached the truth were not authorized to teach anything else than what was found in the standard books of the Church. . . . Yes, sir, I said that polygamy was not taught in the times of Joseph Smith; that is exactly what I said. Yes sir, I said it was not publicly taught—not by Joseph nor Hyrum Smith, not while they lived; at least I never heard them teach it, and I knew men that were cut off from the Church for teaching it at that time. . . . I have stated repeatedly that polygamy was not publicly taught during Joseph Smith's lifetime. . . . I think it was taught privately by some of the members, and practiced secretly by some. . . . The doctrine of polygamy was not taught by Joseph Smith, never in the world. I state that as a fact. If he did, I never heard him, and I never heard of it; and I don't believe he could have done so without my hearing of it. I was two years in Kirtland in the same place where he was, then I went to Missouri, and from

Missouri back to Illinois, and was there up to the time of his death; and I never heard him teach any such a doctrine; but I heard him denounce it, for I knew a man went into Wisconsin and taught it; and he wrote a letter to the president of that branch to cut that man off from the Church. That was just before they were killed, just a little time before.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 179-185.

Lyman O. Littlefield, president of one of the quorums of seventy in 1844, and who had resided in Nauvoo from 1841 to 1846, from thence going to Salt Lake City and ever after residing in Utah, and continuing in fellowship as one of the leading men of the Brighamite Church, though testifying that polygamy was taught and practiced secretly in Nauvoo, in his sworn testimony exonerates Joseph Smith from any complicity with that doctrine, as note the following extract affidavit:

Joseph Smith occasionally attended the meetings of the seventy where I presided, but not regularly. He attended sometimes for the purpose of instructing the quorum of seventy, not very often. He came to instruct the quorum in the laws of the Church, and the principles of the gospel. . . .

He did not give us any instruction on the question of polygamy. I did not say he did. He never did. Joseph Smith never said a word about it in my presence, and I told you that a long while ago. . . . Joseph Smith was the highest officer in the Church at that time, and the chief teacher in the Church. When I heard this question of plural marriage or polygamy advanced, I did not even go to see him about it to see whether it was correct or not. I took no pains to find that out at all. No, sir, I did not.

I talked with a good many other people about it. I never heard it preached to any congregation publicly or privately by any minister before the death of Joseph Smith.

Never heard it presented to the Church, and never heard of its being presented to the Church in the lifetime of Joseph Smith. Never heard it presented to the Church privately by anybody

prior to the death of Joseph Smith. I never heard it presented to the Church either publicly or privately prior to the death of Joseph Smith, by Joseph Smith or any of the authorities of the Church. I never heard it presented publicly or privately in his day by any of the authorities of the Church.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 326-329.

William B. Smith, brother of the Prophet, and who was a member of the Quorum of Twelve at the time of Joseph's death, separated himself from the Church in 1845 because of the principle of polygamy, which, with other corrupt and unauthorized doctrines, was sought to be fastened onto the Church. In his sworn testimony taken in evidence in the Temple Lot Suit at Independence, Missouri, in 1892, he said:

The reason of the separation was that the church I had absolved myself from had changed the doctrines in a manner that the teachings of the Church did not justify, in respect to several things, and especially in respect to the marriage relation. The first I ever noticed of the change in that regard was in 1845, at Nauvoo, Illinois; I refer to the practice of polygamy. The principal participants at that time were Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, John Taylor, Willard Richards, Orson Hyde, and Parley P. Pratt. They were the principal participants in that doctrine. . . . There were three or four propositions or doctrines that were introduced into the Church after the death of my brother in June, 1844, under the council of a part of the Twelve. One point was, and it had never been taught previous to that time, that Adam was God, and also that Moses was a man-god. Another doctrine was that of "blood atonement," meaning that if a man disobeyed the propositions of that council, meaning the remaining Twelve, he had to pay for it by the forfeiture of his life and atone for the sin by the shedding of his own blood, or allowing it to be shed by others. That was blood-atonement for you, and it had never been taught in the old Church, nor had the Adam-god doctrine ever been taught in the old Church. . . . Another point was the marriage question in regard to the plurality of wives that was taught after

the death of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, my brothers. These new doctrines that I spoke of was what caused the separation between me and that body of people, and neither of them was taught previous to 1844, nor for some time after 1844.—Abstract of Evidence, pp. 92-94.

In a public debate held in France in 1852, John Taylor bore testimony regarding Joseph Smith as follows:

I testify that I was acquainted with Joseph Smith for years. I have traveled with him; I have been with him in private and in public; I have associated with him in councils of all kinds; I have listened hundreds of times to his public teachings, and his advice to his friends and associates of a more private nature. I have been at his house and seen his deportment in his family. I have seen him arraigned before the tribunals of his country, and seen him honorably acquitted, and delivered from the pernicious breath of slander, and the machinations of falsehoods of wicked and corrupt men. I was with him living, and with him when he died, when he was murdered in Carthage gaol by a ruthless mob, headed by a Methodist minister, named Williams, with their faces painted. I was there and was myself wounded: I at that time received four balls in my body. I have seen him, then, under these various circumstances, and I testify before God, angels, and men, that he was a good, honorable, virtuous man—that his doctrines were good, scriptural, and wholesome—that his precepts were such as became a man of God—that his private and public character was unimpeachable—and that he lived and died as a man of God and a gentleman. This is my testimony; if it is disputed, bring me a person authorized to receive an affidavit, and I will make one to this effect. I therefore testify of things which I know and of things which I have seen.—Orson Pratt's Works, p. 24.

Elder John Pack, being called upon, then testified as follows:

Our honorable opponents have seen proper to speak evil of Joseph Smith. I was acquainted with him almost from the commencement of his religious career, and I speak that which I

know, and not my opinion. I know that Joseph Smith's character was good—as good as any man's! Those statements made about him are false. Joseph Smith was a just, honorable, and upright man, and I know it; neither do I know any evil of him. I know that he was persecuted for his religion, and the Saints have always been persecuted. I know that religious men have generally been at the head of these persecutions. I have seen the Saints persecuted when blood has stained their paths. . . . These things that I have spoken are true; I bear my testimony to them before God and man. I know Joseph Smith was a good, virtuous, honorable man; and, as Mr. Taylor offered, so do I—bring forth your officers and I will make oath to it.—*Ibid.*, p. 24.

Elder Curtis E. Bolton then bore the following testimony:

I testify that I personally knew Joseph Smith. I have lived with him in his family; was with him morning, noon, and night, early and late. I saw him in most trying situations, with friends and enemies; and in all the time that I remained in his family, I never saw the slightest act, nor heard one word, unbecoming a man of God—a just, upright, pure, prayerful prophet of God; and in these matters I consider myself as good a judge as any man in this hall, or in this city. I have been as well educated as any man in this hall, or in this city, and am as well brought up; and if any man doubts my word, let him apply to me, and I will furnish him with most satisfactory references, either in France, England, or America. Concerning the character of Joseph Smith, if my word is doubted, as my brethren have offered to do, so do I—bring a person empowered to receive an affidavit, and I will swear to the truth of what I have said.—*Ibid.*, p. 25.

We pause here to epitomize, and find that in addition to all that Joseph himself wrote and said against polygamy during his lifetime, a tithe of which, perhaps, we have not presented, we have the testimony, as presented in this chapter, of Brigham Young, John Taylor, Lorenzo Snow, George Q. Cannon, H.

B. Clawson, Orson Spencer, Thomas Smith, Orson Pratt, E. M. Webb, Parley P. Pratt, William Marks, Bathsheba Smith, John Taylor, a teacher in the Church, John H. Carter, Lyman O. Littlefield, William B. Smith, Hyrum Smith, "An Old Man of Israel," and a number of others comprising some of the best citizens of Nauvoo, all testifying against polygamy having been a doctrine of the Church during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. And besides this, we have presented affidavits and testimony from those who were intimately acquainted with the Prophet, and they all testify that he was a good, virtuous, honest, prayerful man of God, and if any virtue at all can be attached to their testimony, Joseph Smith is exonerated from having taught or practiced polygamy. It therefore remains for his accusers to break down the testimony we have offered in the defense of Joseph Smith, "or else hear and say it is truth." We might present other testimony, but why do so? Surely the above, if unimpeached, is sufficient to establish our contention; and as not one line in all the writings of Joseph Smith can be found advocating the doctrine of polygamy, is it fair to judge him by what his enemies say of him? Would you, dear reader, be willing to be judged by that rule? If not, remember the golden precept: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

CHAPTER VII.

AS WE have seen in the preceding chapters that Brigham Young and his confederates were the ones who introduced the doctrine of polygamy, and fastened it upon the Church, causing shame and disgrace to attach thereto in consequence, and that President Snow and Orson Pratt asserted that it would have been contrary to the law of the Church to have practiced polygamy prior to its public acceptance in 1852—would have been adultery—no matter what degree of sanctity may now be claimed for it by those people since that date, by such admissions they certainly charge adultery upon their leaders, or upon many of them, as quite a number of them began practicing it before that time. Brigham Young was in the practice of polygamy before 1852, Lucy Decker Seely and others were sealed in marriage to Brigham Young, and children were born in polygamy long before the public announcement and acceptance of that doctrine; hence, whatever associations existed in that relation before the 29th of August, 1852, was contrary to the avowed faith of the Church, and all persons embracing it did so in violation of the law that obtained before the death of Joseph Smith, and consequently, as acknowledged by Messrs. Snow and Pratt, were guilty of adultery.

John Taylor, Brigham Young's successor in the apostate Mormon Church, while openly disavowing polygamy in a public discussion in France in 1850, then and there declaring polygamy to be "too out-

rageous to admit of belief," calling it "obscene and disgusting," and "such that none but a corrupt and depraved heart could have contrived," was at that very moment a polygamist, having no less than seven wives, the names of whom we herewith furnish: The name of his first wife was Lenora Cannon, G. Q. Cannon's aunt; second wife, Elizabeth Keighn; third wife, Mary Ann Okey; fourth wife, Anna Valantyne; fifth wife, — Valantyne, sister to Anna; sixth wife, Harriet Whitaker; seventh wife, Sophia Whitaker.

That these women were John Taylor's wives and living in Salt Lake City in 1850, has never, to my knowledge, been denied; although in April, 1876, an attack was made upon him by the Reverend C. P. Lyford, through the public press, and a certificate furnished by Mr. Lyford, affirming that at the time Elder Taylor held that discussion the above-mentioned seven women were his wives; and although Elder Taylor was in the city at the time, and the attack was published twice, charging him with lying and crime, yet he dared not, could not, make answer to the same! And the whole Mormon fraternity eulogize Elder Taylor as an exemplary character,—an excellent man of God! In the Life of John Taylor, by B. H. Roberts, the following statement occurs regarding him:

There was a beautiful harmony in the character of his mind and the lineaments of his person. If the habitation was splendid, the inmate was worthy of it. His noble form and bearing were but the outward expression of the spirit within. A universal benevolence, powerful intellect, splendid courage, physical as well as moral, a noble independence of spirit, coupled with implicit faith and trust in God, a high sense of honor, unimpeachable integrity, indomitable determination, and a pas-

sionate love of liberty, justice, and truth marked the outlines of his character.—See *Outlines of History*, by B. H. Roberts, p. 457.

Quite a difference between this statement which they send out to the world and the photograph John Taylor drew of himself when declaring that only men of “corrupt and depraved hearts” could even “contrive” such “indelicate, obscene, and disgusting” principles as he was guilty of practicing. But as Mr. Roberts extols Elder Taylor as a man of unimpeachable integrity, with a “passionate love of truth,” in the light of his testimony in 1850, what becomes of the theory that polygamy was then a principle of faith which God had revealed through Joseph Smith to damn for ever all those who rejected it? Did Mr. Taylor tell the truth? We answer, Yes, and No. As a representative of the Church, he told the truth, as polygamy had not at that time been adopted even by the Utah Mormons, as a body, nor was it so adopted by them for two years after Mr. Taylor’s discussion. But as the language used by him at that time was evasive, calculated to convey the idea to those people that he as an individual was not a polygamist, abhorred it, he certainly told an untruth, for at the time he had seven women whom he claimed as his wives.

Having called attention to these facts, it will be said by some that we have acted unwisely in introducing a witness and then breaking down his testimony! It is the facts we are after, solid facts, and not merely to make out a case. If Mr. Taylor was speaking representatively of the Church founded by Joseph Smith (and the proposition they were discuss-

ing related to the divine calling of Joseph Smith and the Church he organized), then his testimony was true, and has not been broken down, neither indeed can be. Elder Taylor was in France telling the people of the gospel as restored in these latter days, and when it was charged on the Church as organized by Mr. Smith that polygamy was tolerated therein and believed by the people constituting said Church, he rightly represented the Church in speaking of the position it occupied with regard to the marital relation, believing that polygamy is so indelicate, disgusting, and obscene that none but a corrupt and depraved heart could admit of its belief. In Mr. Taylor's denial of polygamy at that time, he rightly represented the doctrine and laws of the Church as found in its standard works; and we can, therefore, say that he acted deceitfully and hypocritically in preaching a thing and practicing contrary thereto. According to the law which obtained in the Church he was an adulterous hypocrite and should have been dealt with.

But do not forget that at that time there had been a gross departure from the original church as established by Joseph Smith in 1830, and Mr. Taylor was one of the leaders in said apostasy; and that polygamy, growing out of the spiritual wife system of J. C. Bennett, was privately and secretly practiced and condoned by those leaders as an individual matter, and not by church legislation; that when it reached such enormous proportions that it could no longer be well hidden from the Church at large, and from the world, a document was arranged by these men, to which was given the reverential title of "a revelation

from God," and that to make it acceptable with the people over whom they held rule they attached the name of Joseph Smith to their fraudulent screed, and thus, in the eyes of the world, sought to drag him down into the mire of pollution.

Should it be said that these men whose testimony we have adduced in the preceding chapter were a class of morbid fakes, and that, whereas they denied polygamy until 1852, they also lied about it in the days of Joseph Smith, and screened him in it by their testimony, we answer, It is only through the testimony of Brigham Young that the odium of polygamy was ever attached to the name of Joseph Smith. And, as we have seen, his testimony is of such a vacillating nature that it would not be taken by persons desirous of getting at the facts in any case. Besides this, we have shown that Brigham acknowledged that the doctrine of polygamy was given to him while he was in England in 1839 or 1840. And as we have made diligent search in Joseph Smith's writings for one line that would associate him with the establishment of the doctrine of polygamy, and have failed to find anything of the kind, we challenge the world to produce any chain of evidence, either positive or circumstantial, that would be received by any court of justice on earth which will convict Joseph Smith of any complicity with that doctrine. We therefore hurl it back in the teeth of his accusers that they themselves represent the "class of morbid fakes" who continually affirm that falsehood. If Joseph Smith taught or practiced polygamy, we ask, Where and when did he teach it, and with whom did he practice it? And we demand

that the evidence be produced or the case be given over as a hopeless task.

The statement of Joseph Smith's wife, Emma, having been frequently quoted, notwithstanding we furnished the reader with what the people of Nauvoo said of her at the time of her demise, representing her as a woman of sterling qualities, also quoted John Taylor's estimate of her in 1844, as a woman of integrity, yet we present one more testimony along this line, as we think it pertinent to the case, coming from the man with whom she lived as a partner in life for nearly thirty-three years,—Major Lewis C. Bidamon. In a letter written by him, dated at Nauvoo, June 10, 1879, which we here reproduce, some things of interest may be gathered. The letter was published in the Lake City, Iowa, *Graphic*, August 22, 1879, and is as follows:

NAUVOO, June 10, 1879.

My Dear Mrs. ——,—Yours of the 3d inst. was cordially received and contents noted. In answer must say that I do not believe that Joseph Smith, so-called prophet, was a polygamist, and I form my own opinions from the most reliable seers [source].

His widow, my dear wife, always declares that there never was such a revelation by him, and the report is as false as perdition; and, furthermore, she was of that nature that she would not have lived with any man that practiced polygamy any more than a rat would remain in a burning barn. I will relate a circumstance that took place under my own observation many years since, when Joseph, the son of the Prophet, was about seventeen years old: There came some six men from Salt Lake City, Mormons of the Brigham stamp, to my house and requested to see young Joseph. I called him into my office where they were. They acted very cordially toward him, inviting him to visit his friends at Salt Lake, stating that he had many friends there. Joseph remarked with emphasis that he wished to have

nothing to do with a people that practiced such pernicious and damnable doctrine, named polygamy. They allowed that his father taught it, but he told them that it was false, and asked them if they believed when his father said "Thus saith the Lord" what he related was true. They answered verily we do. Then Joseph related a circumstance that took place under his own observation, (like this) his father had heard that there was an attempt among some of the brethren to practice the plural wife system and he then stated from the stand, "Thus saith the Lord, when that nefarious practice is attempted to be established, God Almighty would demolish the Church and he would quit all control thereof."

To establish the fact more permanently, I will refer you to the Book of Mormon, page 116, English edition, second book of Jacob, and also Book of Doctrine and Covenants, English edition, page 124, Joseph, Alexander, and David H. Smith have bearded the lion (Brigham) in his den at Salt Lake, and told him that he was teaching false doctrine, and that their father never taught nor would tolerate such infamy. I, myself, never belonged to any church, and can look on impartially on all sides.

Yours with due respect,

L. C. BIDAMON.

In connection with the foregoing I present a part of a letter written to me by Mr. James O. Whittemore on the 25th of February, 1885. It had been repeatedly told me that Mr. Whittemore was a relative of Joseph Smith, and that he knew all about him, knew that he did teach and practice polygamy and was a very bad man. I therefore wrote to Mr. Whittemore concerning the matter, and the following is a part of the letter I received in response:

TAWAS CITY, Michigan, February 25, 1885.

Mr. W. J. Smith, Dear Sir:—Your late letter is received making some inquiries as to my recollections of Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism. . . . My father, mother, and myself visited Nauvoo, Illinois, where we were his guests for a short time. Mr. Smith had some years before visited at our

house in Pontiac, Michigan. Nauvoo was situated on the east bank of the Mississippi, on bluffs and terraces commanding a fine view of the river. It had just been taken possession of by thousands of Mormons driven from their homes in Ohio and immigrants from other states and foreign lands. Nauvoo was at that time the scene of great activity, new arrivals were coming in, and the walls of a handsome temple of cut stone were going up, under the master hands of skilled workmen from all parts of the world. "The Nauvoo Legion," a very large and complete military organization, of which Joseph Smith was the commander, held its review and parade on the Fourth of July, and it was a very striking sight to my youthful eyes. My recollections of the people are very favorable as of an industrious, orderly, and intensely religious community. They held the Bible and Book of Mormon in equal reverence as I understood, considering the latter as supplementary to the former, and as a new revelation in the same general line. I was most impressed with the very literal view they took of some Bible doctrines. They believed the prayer of faith and laying on of hands could heal the sick, though I saw no instances of its being tried. . . . Their Sabbath congregations were immense and were held in a grove provided with seats and a large platform upon which were arranged the dignitaries of the Church, whose acknowledged head and chief, there as everywhere, was Joseph Smith. He was a tall, fine-looking man of portly presence, commanding air, and very agreeable manners. He was a man of remarkable shrewdness and force of character, as was shown by the fact that he was able, without the advantages of education, wealth, or powerful connections, to obtain such unquestioned control over so large a community, and to secure such perfect faith in himself and his pretensions. He was certainly master of the thousands in Nauvoo, and I saw no one dare question his authority. His house, a large blockhouse near the bank of the Mississippi, was thronged like the ante-rooms of a palace with comers and goers seeking advice and consulting with him on their private business as well as on the affairs of the community. It required promptness in dispatch of business and great executive ability to meet successfully all the wants of so new and so large a community. Joseph Smith had but one wife, Emma, with whom he seemed to be living happily. Polygamy was, so far as I knew or heard of,

unknown at that time among the Mormons. Mr. Smith was as far as I could see a man of good morals. He treated us very courteously, and took especial pains to show us everything of interest in the city and country about, and I shall always cherish a grateful recollection of his personal kindness to me. . . .

Yours respectfully,

J. O. WHITTEMORE.

Please notice in the above statement that Mr. Whittemore affirms that "Joseph Smith had but one wife, Emma, with whom he seemed to be living happily"; and that the reader may get an understanding of the estimate of Mr. Whittemore, by the general public, we herewith furnish an extract from The History of the Lake Huron Shore, illustrated, 1883, page 136. We furnish this to show that Mr. Whittemore was a man whose word would be taken wherever he was known:

Mr. Whittemore's public services appear throughout the history of the country to which he has been an organic part since it has had a being. He was appointed postmaster in 1856, when the office was established, and has held that office continuously to the present time, a period of twenty-seven years in March, 1883. He was the first register and clerk of the county and held the last-named office nearly twenty years. He has been probate judge since 1876, and had previously held the office one term. Iosco County has the most perfect and complete record of any county in the State, a fact due to the care and precision which characterize all of Mr. Whittemore's transactions. He is a gentleman of quiet and unassuming manners, correct and just in all his dealings, and although continuously in public office not even the slightest odium has ever been attached to his name, either by reason of his acts or long tenure of office. His hold upon the confidence and esteem of the people of the county is remarkably strong, and in all things he has ever acted for the highest interests of the public. Mr. Whittemore is a gentleman of more than ordinary ability and culture, and is a fluent and interesting writer. He is a leading member of the Con-

gregational Church, and has always been an earnest supporter of moral and religious efforts.

This will doubtless be sufficient to establish in the mind of the reader the worth of the testimony of Mr. Whittemore, and therefore do not forget that he testifies that "Joseph Smith had but one wife."

In the *San Francisco Examiner*, of March 5, 1899, a Methodist preacher by the name of Frederick C. Lee, says:

I will here state that polygamy constituted no part of Mormonism as originally set forth by Joseph Smith. In fact, the Book of Mormon expressly prohibits it in these words: "Wherefore I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people do like unto them of old. For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and concubines he shall have none."

It was not until 1852—twenty-two years after Mormonism had been established, and eight years after the mob murdered Smith in the jail at Carthage, Illinois—that Brigham Young came forward with a "revelation" granting him the right "to take as many wives as the Lord should give him," and it was also at an opportune moment (while statehood for Utah was being agitated) that Wilford Woodruff received a revelation that polygamy was not a part of Mormonism.

And yet there are so many who flippantly assert that Joseph Smith was a polygamist, that he both taught and practiced that doctrine. Why is this? Simply because they take the statements of Joseph Smith's persecutors, and do not take the trouble to hear or investigate both sides, but judging without proper examination show themselves to be unwise; for "He that judgeth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame unto him."—Solomon.

Honorable Heber M. Wells, governor of Utah, while commenting on the eligibility of Brigham H. Roberts

to a seat in the United States Congress, said last January:

Mormonism is alive and well, but polygamy is dead. Eastern people make the mistake always of associating the two together, as if they were synonymous. They are utterly distinct and separate.—Provo *Semi-Weekly Enquirer*, January 6, 1899.

Mark the distinction which is drawn between that which is here spoken of as original Mormonism—that which was taught before Joseph Smith's death,—and the doctrine of polygamy. Notice particularly that the Governor affirms that "they are utterly distinct and separate," and that people make a mistake in associating them together. And President Lorenzo Snow says: "Mormonism, contrary to the popular notion, does not mean polygamy."

A. M. Smucker in his *History of the Mormons*, on page 84, says: "They were accused of communism, and not simply a community of goods but of wives. Both these charges were utterly unfounded." Again on page 172, he says:

Of all the charges brought against Joseph Smith as regards a plurality of wives—and in especial reference to the spiritual wife doctrine—they [the Reorganization] allege what appears from his whole career to be most probable, that he was at all times most anxious to preserve the Church from taint, and to exclude adulterers, seducers, and persons of immoral lives.

A Methodist preacher by the name of Prior, speaking of his visit in Nauvoo, in 1843, says:

I sought in vain for anything that bore the marks of immorality, but was both astonished and highly pleased at my ill success. I could see no loungers about the streets, nor any drunkenness about the taverns. I did not meet with those distorted features of ruffians, or with the ill-bred and impudent. I heard not an oath in the place, I saw not a gloomy countenance; all were cheerful, polite, and industrious.—*Ibid.*, p. 155.

In chapter 30 of *New America*, by William Hepworth Dixon, editor of the *Athenæum*, and author of *The Holy Land*, William Penn, etc., published at Philadelphia, by J. B. Lippincott & Company, 1867, Mr. Dixon says:

This dogma of a plurality of lives has not come into the Church without fierce disputes and violent schisms. George A. Smith, cousin of Joseph, and Historian of the Mormon Church, tells me from the papers in his office, that about five hundred bishops and elders live in polygamy in the Salt Lake valleys; these five hundred elders having, as he believes, on the average, about four wives each, so that this very peculiar institution has come, in fourteen years, to effect the lives and fortunes, more or less, of ten thousand persons. . . . The existence of a second Mormon Church—of a great schismatic body—is not denied by Young, who, of course, considers it the Devil's work. Vast bodies of the Saints have left the Church on account of polygamy, twenty thousand, I am told, have done so, in California alone. Many of these nonpluralist Saints exist in Missouri and in Illinois. Even among those who fondly cling to their Church at Salt Lake City, it is apparent to me that nineteen in twenty have no interest, and not much faith, in polygamy. The belief that their founder, Joseph, never lived in this objectionable state is widely spread.

Prophets, bishops, elders, all the great leaders of the faith, assert that for months before his death at Carthage, the founder of Mormonism had indulged himself though in secret, with a household of many wives. Of course they do not call his sealing to himself these women an indulgence; they say he took to himself such females only as were given to him of God. But they claim him as a pluralist. Now, if this assertion could be proved, the trouble would be ended, since anything that Joseph practiced would be held a virtue, a necessity, by his flock. On the other side, a pluralist clergy is bound to maintain the truth on his hypothesis. For if Joseph were not a polygamist, he could hardly, they would reason, have been a faithful Mormon and a saint of God; since it is the present belief of their body that a man with only one wife will become a bachelor angel, a

mere messenger and servant to the patriarchial gods. So, without producing much evidence of the fact, the elders have strongly asserted that Joseph had secretly taken to himself a multitude of women, three or four of whom they point out to you, as still living at Salt Lake in the family of Brigham Young.

Still no proof has ever yet been adduced to show that Joseph either *lived as a polygamist or dictated the revelation* in favor of a plurality of wives. That he did not openly live with more than one woman is admitted by all—or by nearly all; and so far as his early and undoubted writings are concerned, nothing can be clearer than that his feelings were opposed to the doctrines and practices which have since his death become the high notes of his Church. In the Book of Mormon he makes God himself say that he delights in the chastity of women, and that the harems of David and Solomon are abominations in his sight. Elder Godbe, to whom I pointed out this passage, informed me that the bishops explain away this view of polygamy, as being uttered by God when he was angry with his people, on account of their sins, and as not expressing his permanent will on the subject of a holy life.

The question of fact is open like the question of inference. Joseph, it is well known, set his face against Rigdon's theory of the spiritual wife; and it is equally well known that he neither published the revelation which bears his name, nor spoke of such a document as being in his hands.

Emma, Joseph's wife and secretary, the partner of all his toils, of all his glories, coolly, firmly, permanently denies that her husband ever had any other wife than herself. She declares the story to be false, the revelation a fraud. She denounces polygamy as the invention of Young and Pratt—a work of the Devil, brought in by them for the destruction of God's new Church. On account of this doctrine, she has separated herself from the Saints of Utah, and has taken up her dwelling with what she calls a remnant of the true Church at Nauvoo.

The four sons of Joseph—Joseph, William [not a son, but a brother of Joseph Smith, Jr.], Alexander, David—all deny and denounce what they call Young's imposture of plurality. These sons of Joseph are now grown men; and their personal interests

are so clearly identified with the success of their father's Church, to the members of which their fellowship would be precious, that nothing less than a personal conviction of the truth of what they say can be honestly considered as having turned them against Brigham Young.

As it is, these sons of the original Seer have formed a great schism in the Church. Under the name of Josephites, a band of Mormons are now gathering round these sons of the Prophet, strong enough to beard the lion in his den. Alexander has been at Salt Lake while I have been here, and has been suffered to preach against polygamy in Independence Hall. . . .

The chief—almost the sole—evidence that we have found in Salt Lake City in favor of Joseph having had several wives in the flesh is an assertion by Brigham Young.

I was pointing out to him the loss of moral force to which his people must be always subject while the testimony on that cardinal point of practice is incomplete. If Joseph were sealed to many women, there must be records, witnesses, of the fact; where are those records and those witnesses?

"I," said Young, vehemently, "am the witness. I myself sealed dozens of women to Joseph."

I asked him whether Emma was aware of it. He said he guessed she was; but he could not say. In answer to another question, he admitted that Joseph had no issue by any of those wives who were sealed to him in dozens.

From two other sources we have obtained particles of evidence confirming Young's assertion. Two witnesses, living far apart, unknown to each other, have told me they were intimate with women who assert that they had been sealed to Joseph at Nauvoo. Young assures me that several old ladies, now living under his roof, are widows of Joseph; and that all the apostles know them, and reverence them as such. Three of these ladies I have seen in the Tabernacle. I have learned that some of these women have borne children to the second Prophet, though they have none to the first.

My own impression (after testing all the evidence to be gathered from friend and foe) is, that these old ladies, though they may have been sealed to Joseph for eternity, were not his wives in the sense in which Emma, like the rest of women, would use

the word wife. I think they were his spiritual queens and companions, chosen after the method of the Wesleyan Perfectionists; with a view, not to the pleasures of the flesh, but to the glories of another world. Young may be technically right in the dispute; but the Prophet's sons are, in my opinion, *legally and morally right*. It is my firm conviction, that if the practice of plurality should become a permanent conquest of this American church, the Saints will not owe it to Joseph Smith, but to Brigham Young.

Having quoted Mr. Dixon at considerable length, that all may see the conclusions at which he arrived after hearing all that could be said in favor of Joseph Smith having been a polygamist, we think it quite unnecessary to offer comment. We call attention once again to his statement that "no proof has ever yet been adduced to show that Joseph either lived as a polygamist or dictated the revelation in favor of a plurality of wives." And, further, we say that had Brigham been sufficiently honest to have told Mr. Dixon of their doctrine of sealing living women to dead men, he would not have concluded that these professed wives of Joseph Smith were his "spiritual queens," but were sealed to him by Brigham Young, perhaps "by the dozen," since the awful tragedy at Carthage, Illinois, as shown by Mrs. Stenhouse, J. H. Beadle, and others, whose testimonies are quoted on page 86 and of this book. And for Joseph's having taken wives in that kind of a way, surely he was not to blame, as he could hardly be expected to rise up in protestation against such foolish and unholy dogmas after he was dead! And if those "pure-minded" (?) and lovable females wanted Brigham to stand as Joseph's "proxy," I don't see how Joseph could be held responsible for it, for,

being dead at the time that this sealing women to him "by the dozens" took place, he had no voice in the matter. But such are the inconsistencies of Brighamism.

Mrs. Stenhouse, in photographing Brigham as she found him after years of experience with the Brighamite hierarchy, says:

He has outraged decency and riven asunder the most sacred social and domestic ties by his shameless introduction of polygamy. He has sacrilegiously defiled the temple of God, by teaching his followers to worship Adam as their divinity, and has robbed Christ of his birthright by proclaiming that men are the only saviors of their wives and that in respect to women the sacrifice of our Lord was of no direct avail.—Tell It All, p. 273.

Of the year 1853, when polygamy was first introduced into the Church in England, she says:

From that day [January, 1853] I learned to regard polygamy as an essential part of the Mormon faith, and such for many years the world has considered it; but when I first joined the Church such an innovation would have appeared to the European Saints beyond the wildest fancies of a dream.—Ibid., p. 141.

Proceeding, we quote Mrs. Stenhouse with regard to the doctrine of the Saints as presented in Europe by the elders before the introduction of polygamy by Brigham Young, and as to how she was influenced by it, etc. And we think that in all fairness the doctrine ascribed to the Church by the elders in their work in those early days should be attributed to the general opinions held and sustained by the Church, and advocated by Joseph until the day of his death, unless there can be good, substantial evidence offered in support of the idea that he changed his religious

views before his death, which can not be done. In speaking of those early days she says:

Whatever I might think of the new religion I was forced to confess that it brought into my father's house peace, love, kindness, and charity such as were seldom seen in many households of religious people. My sisters were completely changed in their manner of life. . . . I must confess that the change which had taken place in those nearest and dearest to me, affecting me personally, and being so evidently in accordance with the teachings of the Savior, led me to regard Mormonism with less antipathy.—*Ibid.*, p. 44.

Mormonism in England, then, had no resemblance to the Mormonism of Utah to-day. The Mormons were then an earnest religious people, in many respects like the Methodists, especially in their missionary zeal and fervor of spirit. The Mormon Church abroad was purely a religious institution, and Mormonism was preached by the elders as the gospel of Christianity restored. The Church had no political shaping nor the remotest antagonism to the civil power.

The reader must remember that at that time [1849] polygamy was unheard of as a doctrine of the Saints, and blood-atonement, the doctrine that Adam is God, together with the polytheism and priestly theocracy of after years were things undreamed of.—*Ibid.*, pp. 47, 48.

A person who has never attended a Mormon meeting can form no idea of the joyous spirit, which seems to animate every one present. I am not, of course, speaking of modern meetings, but of meetings as they used to be. Whence and whatever that "spirit" might be which moved the sisters and brethren when they met in early times, I can not tell; but I, and with me, ten thousand Mormons and seceding Mormons in Utah, can, from our own experience, testify that that "spirit" no longer visits the Tabernacle services over which Brigham Young presides, or the meetings of the Saints since they adopted the accursed doctrine of polygamy, and forsook the gentle leadings of their first love.—*Ibid.*, p. 57.

I have felt sometimes that entrancing state of ecstasy which thrilled the soul of the Seer in Patmos, as he listened to the melody of the angelic throng—the voice of many waters, and the

peal of mighty thunders, and the notes of harpers harping upon their harps; but never, even when surrounded by all that was best calculated to produce a sentiment of devotion in my mind—never did I experience so rapt a feeling of communion with the armies of heaven—as I felt in that unadorned meeting-room surrounded by those plain but earnest and united people.—*Ibid.*, p. 59.

Since those times when the spirit of enthusiasm and religious zeal animated the Mormon missionaries and teachers, and stirred up the Saints who listened to them to emulate in faithfulness the Christians of the early church, a great change has come over everything connected with the doctrines which were then taught and practiced.—*Ibid.*, p. 89.

Whatever explanation may yet be given to Mormonism in America, one thing I know—the facts of its early history in Europe are among the most pleasant reminiscences of my life.—*Ibid.*, p. 49.

The trials of a missionary life were to me a pleasure. I bore with gladness the cross, believing that hereafter I should exchange it for the glories of an eternal crown; and I think, even now, I should never have wearied of that life of devotion, so great was my faith in my religion, had the leaders of the Church remained steadfast to that simple gospel creed which we were at first taught was the evangel of the Latter Day Dispensation.—*Ibid.*, pp. 620, 621.

Such, dear reader, after all the withering blight of polygamous influences which for years had gnawed at the very vitals of this woman's soul, was the confidence still remaining in her heart in the work established by Joseph Smith. And if, as she says, that entrancing ecstasy of supernatural grace and favor associated with the teachings and early ministrations of the Church when first she heard its sacred message, remained therein until the introduction of polygamy by Brigham Young, in 1852, is not this of itself evidence that the doctrine was an innovation, a fraud, and neither taught nor practiced by the first

president of the Church? But alas! how soon did the gold become dim when the graceful folds of the holy banner of monogomy was trailed in the dust, and the filthy rag of concubinage and crime was raised in its stead by those tricksters of the Great Salt Lake Valley! As testified to above—the Spirit of peace which once brought holy and ecstatic bliss to the souls of those humble, trusting, honest-hearted children of God, was then no longer to be found in their tabernacle services because of their having left the gentle leadings of their first love. All this, to me, is strong presumptive evidence that Joseph was not a polygamist, either in theory or in practice. The reader will therefore pardon me for quoting once again the statement of Mrs. Stenhouse as found on page 614 of her book, in order that we may draw special attention to her testimony regarding Brigham Young, and the awful apostasy as represented in the Great American Desert. Said testimony is as follows:

Brigham himself, little as he perhaps imagines it, is the prince of apostates. He became an apostate Methodist when he left Methodism and joined the Mormons, and certainly he is now an apostate from Mormonism as Joseph Smith first taught it. The change from Methodism to Mormonism, as it was first presented to the world, was nothing near so great as the departure which Brigham has made from the original faith of the Saints. There have been many apostates from the teachings of Joseph in early days, but of all apostates, Brother Brigham is the chief.

Mrs. C. V. Waite, whose husband, Honorable C. B. Waite, served as chief justice in Utah in 1866, wrote a history of Mormonism, and Mrs. Fannie Stenhouse calls her “the best Gentile writer” who had up to that time undertaken such a task. On page 160 of her book she says:

It may be well here to remark, for the benefit of the tender-footed upon this subject, that polygamy is no part of the Mormon religion, so far as the same has any history, and can be distinguished from the personal edicts of Brigham Young. It is not only not permitted but explicitly condemned in the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, which are the Old and New Testaments of Mormonism.

On pages 172 and 176, of her book, she says:

Previous to the year 1852, it was also an orthodox principle of the Mormon religion, that a man should have but one wife, to whom he should be true and faithful. . . . But the greatest change of all in the Mormon religion, made by Brigham Young, was the introduction and establishment of polygamy. This was no part of the Mormon system of religion as originally established. On the contrary it was expressly repudiated by all the Mormon writers and speakers, previous to 1852 and in Europe for some years afterward.

Then, after presenting numerous examples from the books and early history of the Church condemnatory of polygamy, on page 180 she says:

Can anything be more explicit than this? Polygamy is not only expressly repudiated by the Church, but is classed by the side of fornication as a crime.

Thus we find that polygamy is contrary to both books of the Mormon Bible. That it is in fact, strongly condemned in those volumes.

It is, therefore, no part of the Mormon religion, as given to the world by Joseph Smith.

Contradistinguishing the Brighamite theology from the doctrine as taught by Joseph Smith, on page 172 she says:

The doctrines taught and practiced by the present head of the Mormon Church differ so much from the previously established tenets of the Church that they require a separate consideration.

The Honorable Josiah Quincy visited Nauvoo in

May, 1844. After speaking of Joseph Smith as an excellent man, one who seemed "endowed with that kingly faculty which directs, as by intrinsic right, the feeble or confused souls who are looking for guidance," on page 376 of a work entitled *Figures of the Past*, he says: "Polygamy, it must be remembered, formed no part of the alleged revelations upon which the social life at Nauvoo was based."

From the findings of the Kirtland Temple Suit in the Court of Common Pleas, Lake County, Ohio, February 23, 1880, as handed down by the Honorable L. S. Sherman, judge, we extract the following:

On consideration whereof, the Court do find as matters of fact . . . that the said plaintiff, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, is a religious society, founded and organized upon the same doctrines and tenets, and having the same church organization as the original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, organized in 1830, by Joseph Smith, and was organized pursuant to the constitution, laws, and usages of said original Church, and has branches located in Illinois, Ohio, and other states.

That the Church in Utah, the defendant, of which John Taylor is president, has materially and largely *departed from the faith*, doctrines, laws, ordinances, and usages of said original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and has incorporated into its system of faith the doctrines of celestial marriage and a plurality of wives, and the doctrine of Adam-God worship, contrary to the laws and constitution of said original Church.

We excerpt the following extracts from the decision of Judge Phillips in the Temple Lot Suit which was tried in the United States Circuit Court at Kansas City, Missouri:

Conformably to the Book of Mormon, the Book of Doctrine and Covenants expressly "declares that we believe that one man should have but one wife, and one woman but one husband."

And this declaration of the Church on this subject reappeared in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, edition of 1846 and 1856. Its first appearance as a dogma of the Church [the dogma of polygamy] was in the Utah Church in 1852.

Claim is made by the Utah Church that this doctrine is predicated of a revelation made to Joseph Smith in July, 1843. No such revelation was ever made public during the life of Joseph Smith, and under the law of the Church it could not become an article of faith and belief until submitted to and adopted by the Church. This was never done.

No more complete and caustic refutation of this claim made by Brigham Young can be found than in Exhibit "W," in this case, in a book entitled *The Spiritual Wife System Proven False*, issued by Granville Hedrick, the head of the Respondent Church, in 1856. He ridiculed the pretensions of Brigham Young that he had this revelation, unproclaimed, locked up in his private chest for nine years. . . .

When the present President of the Salt Lake Church, Wilford Woodruff, was on the witness stand, he testified that on the 15th of November, 1844, there was no marriage ceremony in the Church except that published in the [Book of Doctrine and Covenants] edition of 1835. He was then asked why the Church of which he is President, in the publication of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants in the Salt Lake edition of 1876, eliminated the section on marriage as found in the 1835 edition and in all editions thereof published up to 1876, and inserted in lieu thereof the claimed revelation on polygamy of July, 1843. "Answer. I do not know why it was done. It was done by the authority of whoever presided over the Church, I suppose. Brigham Young was the President then."

The Utah Church further departed from the principles and doctrines of the original church by changing in their teaching the first statement in the Article of Faith, which was, We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in his Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost. . . .

It is charged by the respondents, as an echo of the Utah Church, that Joseph Smith, the Martyr, secretly taught and practiced polygamy, and the Utah contingent furnishes the evidence, and two of the women, to prove this fact. It perhaps would be uncharitable to say of these women that they have

borne false testimony as to their connection with Joseph Smith; but in view of all the evidence and circumstances surrounding the alleged intercourse, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that at most they were but sports in "nest hiding." In view of the contention of the Salt Lake party, that polygamy obtained at Nauvoo as early as 1841, it must be a little embarrassing to President Woodruff of that organization when he is confronted, as he was in the evidence in this case, with a published card in the church organ at Nauvoo in October, 1843, certifying that he knew of no other rule or system of marriage than the one published in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and that the "secret wife system," charged against the Church, was a creature of invention by one Doctor Bennett, and that they knew of no such society. That certificate was signed by the leading members of the Church, including John Taylor, the former president of the Utah Church. And a similar certificate was published by the Ladies' Relief Society of the same place, signed by Emma Smith and Phœbe Woodruff, wife of the present President Woodruff. No such marriage ever occurred under the rules of the Church, and no offspring came from the imputed illicit intercourse, although Joseph Smith was in full vigor of young manhood, and his wife, Emma, was giving birth to healthy children in regular order, and was enciente at the time of Joseph's death.

But if it were conceded that Joseph Smith and Hyrum, his brother, did secretly practice concubinage, is the Church to be charged with those liaisons, and the doctrine of polygamy to be predicated thereon of the Church? If so, I suspect the doctrine of polygamy might be imputed to many of the Gentile churches. *Certainly it was not promulgated, taught, or recognized as a doctrine of the Church prior to the assumption of Brigham Young.*

I have emphasized some words in these quotations with a view of calling special attention to them, and not to change in any way the statements as given by Messrs. Sherman and Phillips. Thus the reader can plainly see that from a legal standpoint Joseph Smith is exonerated from having either taught or practiced polygamy.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE conclusion reached by Judge Phillips, that polygamy might with equal propriety be attached to some of the Gentile churches as to the Church organized by Joseph Smith in 1830, and continued in organization until his death in 1844, may almost take the breath away from some of the very pious ultra religious sectarian professors who claim to be sanctified from the ground up. With such it is all right to "give it to the other fellow, but for pity sake don't disturb the unanimity of our popular religious institutions. Give it to the Mormons, that's all right, for they have no friends in our popular circles; but you must not say a word about us, see?"

It seems to me that if the church of Christ is to be rejected by popular sentiment because of the odium of polygamy and its kindred evils having been fastened thereto, then to be consistent, the popular churches of to-day must, if examined in the same light, go down in the same whirlpool of inconsistency; for, surely, what will be found condemnatory of one, will, when examined under the same lens of investigation, be found odious in any other; and while we expect to show that polygamy has been practiced by some of the leading men in the early rise of some of the popular churches of to-day, and by some of them is still condoned and winked at when thought to best serve their interests in their proselyting propaganda, yet we have this to say, It was not the church of Christ as organized by Joseph

Smith in 1830 that accepted of or indorsed the doctrine of polygamy, but merely a faction of that Church which broke off therefrom; and in their apostate condition, as we have shown, to gratify their sensuality; and in consequence of the confused condition of the Church because of the disorganization of some of its leading quorums, the aforementioned apostasy added shame and disgrace to said confusion by reason of the public avowal and acceptance of the dogma of polygamy. Polygamy was never a principle of doctrine in the church of God indorsed by divine sanction.

That the reader may see the inconsistency of rejecting the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, which is strictly monogamic in regard to its doctrine of marriage, and which has been recognized by the tribunals of our country as the legal successor of the original church as established by Joseph Smith in 1830, I here present a few extracts from some of our best historians in regard to the early days of some of those churches which to-day disdain everybody called Latter Day Saint, because of polygamy, etc. And, if these statements, or historical extracts, should shock the moral sense and piety of some of the very good twentieth century Christians, and cause them to throw up their hands in horror, we reverentially exclaim: They are historical facts, just the same, for which the Latter Day Saints are not responsible, and which can not be denied successfully. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways, and if, because somebody has said naughty things about Joseph Smith, and said statements have been published by his enemies in various

cyclopedias, and therefore must be true, notwithstanding not one single sentence from the expressions of Mr. Smith either in public or private life can be obtained, or found in any of his writings, to give these published statements the semblance of truth, then do not stop or stumble, but keep up your courage and go straight ahead. Wade on through it all till you get the history and published statements of all the reformers, and behold recorded on the great historical tablet statements of leading men of religious thought as penned by their own hands during those times, and my opinion is, that if making an impartial examination, when through with the investigation, Joseph Smith will stand fully as high, if not much higher in the divine scale, than many whose names to-day evoke the admiration of thoughtless professors filled with religious zeal for the various sects bearing the names of said reverend divines.

BAPTISTS.

Of the Baptists, who to-day are numbered by many tens of thousands, the following is recorded in history:

But it is an evil with which the reformers had to contend, that the human mind once roused by grand objects, especially if uninformed, is apt to become wild and irregular. The peasants who at the beginning of the reformation had run into such extravagances for religious liberty, were indeed subdued; but their spirit lived and raged tremendously in 1533, in Westphalia and the Netherlands. A furious rabble came into the city of Munster, pretending to a commission from heaven to destroy and overturn all civil institutions, and to establish a new republic, and committed the most horrible excesses. Their principal teachers were John Mathias, a baker, and John Boccold, a journeyman tailor. Their chief tenets were that the office of Magis-

tracy is unnecessary, that the distinctions among men are contrary to the gospel; that property should be held in common, and that a plurality of wives is commendable. But their more peculiar doctrine, from which they were named, related to the sacrament of baptism. They declared it should be administered only to persons grown up to years of undertaking, and should be performed not by sprinkling with water, but by immersion. Hence, as the subject had once been baptized they were called Anabaptists.—Marsh's History, p. 280.

Of the term "Baptist," Webster gives the following definition:

One who administers baptism. This appellation is appropriately given to John, the forerunner of Christ. . . . As a contraction of Anabaptist, one who denies the doctrine of infant baptism, and maintains that baptism ought to be administered only to adults or believers by immersing the body in water.

Hence, as some of the Baptists with whom I have talked in the past have tried to make it appear that the term "Anabaptists" does not mean the Baptist Church, they doing this in an effort to escape the fact that those called Anabaptists taught "that a plurality of wives is commendable," etc., it would be perfectly proper for them to show who those Anabaptists are, and extricate themselves from the charge of being a continuation of that peculiar sect. Mosheim says:

In 1533 a number of Anabaptists proclaimed Munster to be the seat the of New Jerusalem. . . . The bold ring-leaders of this furious tribe were John Mathison, John Bockhold, a tailor of Leyden, one Gerard, with some others, whom the blind rage of enthusiasm, or the still more culpable principle of sedition, had embarked in this extravagant and desperate cause. They made themselves masters of the city of Munster, deposed the magistrates, and committed all the enormous crimes, and ridiculous follies, which the most perverse and infernal imagination could suggest. John Bockhold was proclaimed king and legis-

lator of this new hierarchy; but his reign was transitory, and his end deplorable; for Munster was, in 1536, retaken after a long seige by its bishop and sovereign, Count Waldeck, the New Jerusalem of the Anabaptists destroyed, and its mock monarch punished with a most painful and ignominious death.—Mosheim, Cent. 16, sec. 3, chap. 3, part 7.

Menno drew up a plan of doctrine and discipline of a much more mild and moderate nature than that of the furious and fanatical Anabaptists already mentioned, but somewhat more severe, though more clear and consistent, than the doctrine of some of the wiser branches of that sect, who aimed at nothing more than the restoration of the Christian church to its primitive purity. Accordingly he condemned the plan of ecclesiastical discipline that was founded on the prospect of a new kingdom, to be miraculously established by Jesus Christ on the ruins of civil government, and the destruction of human rules, and which had been the pestilential source of such dreadful commotions, such execrable rebellions, and such enormous crimes. He declared publicly, his dislike to that doctrine which pointed out the approach of a marvelous reformation in the church by means of a new and extraordinary effusion of the Holy Spirit. He expressed his abhorrence of the licentious tenets which several of the Anabaptists had maintained, with respect to the lawfulness of polygamy and divorce; and finally considered, as unworthy of toleration, those fanatics who were of the opinion that the Holy Ghost continued to descend into the minds of many chosen believers, in as extraordinary a manner as it did at the first establishment of the Christian church, and that it testified its peculiar presence to several of the faithful, by miracles, predictions, dreams, and visions of various kinds.—Ibid., sec. 3, chap. 3, p. 9.

Bockhold, or Bockelson, alias John of Leyden, who headed them, the Anabaptists at Munster, ran naked in the streets, married eleven wives at the same time, to show his approbation of polygamy; and entitled himself king of Sion, all which formed but a very small part of the pernicious follies of this mock monarch.—Ibid., in footnote to part 7.

Herm Kressenbrack, Histor Belli, Monastor, edited by Dan Gerdes in Miscellan, Groningens, Nov. tom 2, speaks also of

Bernard Pothman, an ecclesiastic of Munster, who had introduced the reformation into that city, but afterwards was infested with the enthusiasm of the Anabaptists, and who, though in other respects, he had shown himself to be neither destitute of learning or of virtue, yet enlisted himself in this fanatical tribe, and had a share in their most turbulent and furious proceedings.—*Ibid.*, note *d.*

The scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition, that were exhibited in Holland by this odious tribe, was likewise terrible. They formed the design of reducing the city of Leyden to ashes, but were happily prevented, and severely punished. John of Leyden, the Anabaptist king of Munster, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of Amsterdam, Deventer, and Wesel; in consequence of which, he sent bishops to these three places, to preach his gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of the year 1535, twelve Anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house at Amsterdam. One of them, who was a tailor by profession, fell into a trance, and, after having preached and prayed during the space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his clothes into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets in this state of nature, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, "Woe! Woe! the wrath of God! Woe to Babylon!" When, after being seized and brought before the magistrates, clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud: "We are the naked truth." When they were brought to the scaffold, they sang, danced, and discovered all the marks of enthusiastic frenzy. These tumults were followed by a regular and deep-laid conspiracy, formed by Vun Geelen (an envoy of the mock king of Munster, who had made a very considerable number of proselytes) against the magistrates of Amsterdam with a design to wrest the government of that city out of their hands. . . .

The disorders occasioned by the Anabaptists at this period, not only in Westphalia, but also in other parts of Germany, showed too plainly to what horrid extremities the pernicious

doctrines of this wrong-headed sect were calculated to lead the inconsiderate and unwary; and therefore it is not at all to be wondered, that the secular arm employed rigorous measures to extirpate a faction, which was the occasion, and the source, of unspeakable calamities in so many countries.—Ibid., note A, on part 7, chap. 3.

LUTHERANS.

The great reformer, Martin Luther, and his colaborer, Phillip Melancthon, with others associated with them in the work of the reformation, not only sanctioned the taking of a plurality of wives, at least in the case of Phillip, Landgrave of Hesse, but they made an argument in its favor, saying, that so far do we approve it . . . for the gospel hath neither recalled nor forbidden what was permitted in the law of Moses respecting marriage. But for fear this statement should be questioned, I here append the statement of Mr. Luther and his associates, as found in Hesse in Melancthon's own handwriting, and published in the first volume of a work entitled History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches, by James Benign Bossuet:

To the most serene Prince and Lord Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenlembogan, of Diets of Ziegenhain, and Nida, our gracious Lord, we wish above all things the grace of God through Jesus Christ.

1. We have been informed by Bucer, and in the instruction which your Highness gave him, have read, the trouble of mind, and the uneasiness of conscience your Highness is under at this present; and although it seems to us very difficult so speedily to answer the doubts proposed; nevertheless, we would not permit the said Bucer, who was urgent for his return to your Highness, to go away without an answer in writing.

2. It has been a subject of the greatest joy to us, and we have praised God, for that he has recovered your Highness from a

dangerous fit of sickness, and we pray that he will long continue this blessing of perfect health both in body and mind.

3. Your Highness is not ignorant how great need our poor, miserable, little, and abandoned church stands in of virtuous princes to protect her; and we doubt not but God will always supply her with some such, although from time to time he threatens to deprive her of them, and proves her by sundry temptations.

4. These things seem to us of greatest importance in the question which Bucer has proposed to us: your Highness sufficiently of yourself comprehends the difference there is betwixt settling a universal law, and using (for urgent reasons and with God's permission) a dispensation in a particular case; for it is otherwise evident that no dispensation can take place against the first of all laws, the divine law.

5. We can not at present advise to introduce publicly, and establish as a law in the New Testament, that of the Old, which permitted to have more wives than one. Your Highness is sensible, should any such thing be printed, that it would be taken for a precept, whence infinite troubles and scandals would arise. We beg your Highness to consider the dangers a man would be exposed unto, who should be convicted of having brought into Germany such a law, which would divide families, and involve them in endless strifes and disturbances.

6. As to the objection that may be made, that which is just in God's sight ought absolutely to be permitted, it must be answered in this manner. If that which is just before God, be besides commanded and necessary, the objection is true: if it be neither necessary nor commanded, other circumstances, before it be permitted, must be attended to; and to come to the question in hand: God hath instituted marriage to be a society of two persons and no more, supposing nature was not corrupted; and this is the sense of that text of Genesis, "There shall be two in one flesh," and this was observed at the beginning.

7. Lamech was the first that married many wives, and the Scriptures witness that this custom was introduced contrary to the first institution.

8. It nevertheless passed into custom among infidel nations;

and we even find afterwards, that Abraham and his posterity had many wives. It is also certain from Deuteronomy, that the law of Moses permitted it afterwards, and that God made an allowance for frail nature. Since it is then suitable to the creation of men, and to the first establishment of their society, that each one be content with one wife, it thence follows that the law enjoining it is praiseworthy; that it ought to be received in the Church; and no law contrary thereto be introduced into it, because Jesus Christ has repeated in the nineteenth chapter of Saint Matthew that text of Genesis, "There shall be two in one flesh": and brings to man's remembrance what marriage ought to have been before it degenerated from its purity.

9. In certain cases, however, there is room for dispensation. For example, if a married man be detained captive in a distant country, should there take a second wife, in order to preserve or recover his health, or that his own become leprous, we see not how we could condemn, in these cases, such a man as, by the advice of his pastor, should take another wife, provided it were not with a design of introducing a new law, but with an eye only to his own particular necessities.

10. Since then the introducing a new law, and the using a dispensation with respect to the same law, are two very different things, we entreat your Highness to take what follows into consideration.

In the first place, above all things, care must be taken, that plurality of wives be not introduced into the world by way of law, for every man to follow as he thinks fit. In the second place, may it please your Highness to reflect on the dismal scandal which would not fail to happen, if occasion be given to the enemies of the gospel to exclaim, that we are like the Anabaptists, who have several wives at once, and the Turks, who take as many wives as they are able to maintain.

11. In the third place, that the actions of princes are more widely spread than those of private men.

12. Fourthly, that inferiors are no sooner informed what their superiors do, but they imagine they may do the same, and by that means licentiousness becomes universal.

13. Fifthly, that your Highness' estates are filled with an untractable nobility, for the most part very averse to the gos-

pel, on account of the hopes they are in, as in other countries, of obtaining the benefices of cathedral churches, the revenues whereof are very great. We know the impertinent discourses vented by the most illustrious of your nobility, and it is easily seen how they and the rest of your subjects would be disposed, in case your Highness should authorize such a novelty.

14. Sixthly, that your Highness, by the singular grace of God, hath a great reputation in the empire and foreign countries; and it is to be feared lest the execution of this project of a double marriage should greatly diminish this esteem and respect. The concurrence of so many scandals oblige us to beseech your Highness to examine the thing with all the maturity of judgment God has endowed you with.

15. With no less earnestness do we entreat your Highness, by all means, to avoid fornication and adultery; and, to own the truth sincerely, we have a long time been sensibly grieved to see your Highness abandoned to such impurities, which might be followed by the effects of the divine vengeance; distempers, and many other dangerous consequences.

16. We also beg of your Highness not to entertain a notion, that the use of women out of marriage is but a light and trifling fault, as the world is used to imagine; since God has often chastised impurity with the most severe punishment; and that of the deluge is attributed to the adulteries of the great ones; and the adultery of David has afforded a terrible instance of the divine vengeance; and Saint Paul repeats frequently, that God is not mocked with impunity, and that adulterers shall not enter into the kingdom of God. For it is said, in the second chapter of the first epistle to Timothy, that obedience must be the companion of faith, in order to avoid acting against conscience; and in the third chapter of the first of Saint John, if our heart condemn us not, we may call upon the name of God with joy: and in the eighth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, if by the Spirit we mortify the desires of the flesh, we shall live: but, on the contrary, we shall die, if we walk according to the flesh, that is, if we act against our own consciences.

17. We have related these passages, to the end that your Highness may consider seriously that God looks not on the vice

of impurity as a laughing matter, as is supposed by those audacious libertines, who entertain heathenish notions on this subject. We are pleased to find that your Highness is troubled with remorse of conscience for these disorders. The management of the most important affairs in the world is now incumbent on your Highness, who is of a very delicate and tender complexion; sleeps but little; and these reasons, which have obliged so many prudent to manage their constitutions, are more than sufficient to prevail with your Highness to imitate them.

18. We read of the incomparable Scanderbeg, who so frequently defeated the two most powerful emperors of the Turks, Amurat II, and Mahomet II, and whilst alive, preserved Greece from their tyranny, that he often exhorted his soldiers to chastity, and said to them, that there was nothing so hurtful to men of their profession, as venereal pleasures. And if your Highness, after marrying a second wife, were not to forsake those licentious disorders, the remedy proposed would be to no purpose. Every one ought to be master of his own body in external actions, and see, according to the expression of Saint Paul, that his members be the arms of justice. May it please your Highness, therefore, impartially to examine the considerations of scandal, of labors, of care, of trouble, and of distempers, which are represented. And at the same time remember that God has given you a numerous issue of such beautiful children of both sexes by the princess, your wife, that you have reason to be satisfied therewith. How many others, in marriage are obliged to the exercise and practice of patience, from the motive only of avoiding scandal? We are far from urging on your Highness to introduce so difficult a novelty into your family. By so doing, we should draw upon ourselves not only the reproaches and persecution of those of Hesse, but of all other people. The which would be so much the less supportable to us, as God commands us in the ministry which we exercise, as much as we are able, to regulate marriage, and all the other duties of human life, according to the divine institution, and maintain them in that state, and remove all kind of scandal.

19. It is now customary among worldlings, to lay the blame of everything upon the preachers of the gospel. The heart of man

is equally fickle in the more elevated and lower stations of life; and much have we to fear on that score.

20. As to what your Highness says, that it is not possible for you to abstain from this impure life, we wish you were in a better state before God, that you lived with a secure conscience, and labored for the salvation of your own soul, and the welfare of your subjects.

21. But after all, if your Highness is fully resolved to marry a second wife, we judge it ought to be done secretly, as we have said with respect to the dispensation demanded on the same account, that is, that none but the person you shall wed, and a few trusty persons, know of the matter, and they, too, obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession. Hence no contradiction nor scandal of moment is to be apprehended; for it is no extraordinary thing for princes to keep concubines; and though the vulgar should be scandalized thereat, the more intelligent would doubt of the truth, and prudent persons would approve of this moderate kind of life, preferably to adultery, and other brutal actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all goes right with conscience. So far do we approve it, and in those circumstances only by us specified; for the gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses with respect to marriage. Jesus Christ has not changed the external economy, but added justice only and life everlasting, for reward. He teaches the true way of obeying God, and endeavors to repair the corruptions of nature.

22. Your Highness hath therefore, in this writing not only the approbation of us all, in case of necessity, concerning what you desire, but also the reflections we have made thereupon; we beseech you to weigh them, as becoming a virtuous, wise, and Christian prince. We also beg of God to direct all for his glory and your Highness' salvation.

23. As to your Highness' thought of communicating this affair to the emperor before it be concluded, it seems to us that the prince counts adultery among the lesser sort of sins; and it is very much to be feared lest his faith being of the same stamp with that of the Pope, the Cardinals, the Italians, the Spaniards, and the Saracens, he make light of your Highness' proposal,

and turn it to his own advantage by amusing your Highness with vain words. We know he is deceitful and perfidious, and has nothing of the German in him.

24. Your Highness sees, that he uses no sincere endeavor to redress the grievances of Christendom; that he leaves the Turk unmolested, and labors for nothing but to divide the empire, that he may raise up the house of Austria on its ruins. It is therefore very much to be wished that no Christian prince would give in to his pernicious schemes. May God preserve your Highness. We are most ready to serve your Highness. Given at Wittenberg the Wednesday after the feast of St. Nicholas, 1539.

Your Highness' most humble and most obedient subjects and servants,

MARTIN LUTHER.

PHILIP MELANCTHON.

MARTIN BUCER.

ANTONY CORVIN.

ADAM.

JOHN LENINGUE.

JUSTUS WINTFERTE.

DENIS MELANTHER.

I, George Nuspicher, notary imperial, bear testimony by this present act, written and signed with my own hand, that I have transcribed this present copy from the true original which is in Melancthon's own handwriting, and hath been faithfully preserved to this present time, at the request of the most serene prince of Hesse; and have examined with the greatest exactness every line and every word, and collated them with the same original; and have found them conformable thereunto, not only in the things themselves, but also in the signs manuel, and have delivered the present copy in five leaves of good paper, whereof I bear witness.

GEORGE NUSPICHER, Notary.

I also append a copy of the marriage contract of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, with Margaret de Saal, which will show that the second marriage of the voluptuous prince not only had the sanction and approval of those learned church reformers, Luther, Melancthon, et al, but that the royal wedding was

graced with the presence of Philip Melancthon, Luther's partner and counselor in his work of church reformation.

In the name of God, Amen. Be it known to all those, as well in general as in particular, who shall see, hear, or read this public instrument, that in the year 1540, on Wednesday, the fourth day of the month of March, at two o'clock or thereabouts, in the afternoon, the thirteenth year of the Indiction, and the twenty-first of the reign of the most pussiant and most victorious Emperor Charles V, our most gracious lord; the most serene prince and Lord Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenlembogen, of Dietz of Ziegenhain, and Nidda, with some of his Highness' counselors, on one side, and the good and virtuous Lady Margaret de Saal with some of her relations, on the other side, have appeared before me, notary, and witness underwritten, in the city of Rotenburg, in the castle of the same city, with the design and will publicly declared before me, notary public and witness, to unite themselves by marriage; and accordingly my most gracious Lord and Prince Philip the Landgrave hath ordered this to be proposed by the Reverend Denis Melander, preacher to his Highness, much to the sense as follows: "Whereas the eye of God searches all things, and but little escapes the knowledge of men, his Highness declares that his will is to wed the said Lady Margaret de Saal, although the princess his wife be still living, and that this action may not be imputed to inconstancy or curiosity; to avoid scandal and maintain the honor of the said Lady, and the reputation of her kindred, his Highness makes oath here before God, and upon his soul and conscience, that he takes her to wife through no levity, or curiosity, or from any contempt of law, or superiors; but that he is obliged to it by such important, such inevitable necessities of body and conscience that it is impossible for him to save either body or soul, without adding another wife to his first. All which his Highness hath laid before many learned, devout, prudent, and Christian preachers, and consulted them upon it. And these great men, after examining the motives represented to them, have advised his Highness to put his soul and conscience at ease by this double marriage. And the same cause,

and the same necessity have obliged the most serene princess, Christina Duchess of Saxony, his Highness' first lawful wife, out of her great prudence and sincere devotion, for which she is so much to be commended, freely to consent and admit of a partner, to the end that the soul and body of her most dear spouse may run no further risk, and the glory of God may be increased, as the deed written with this princess' own hand sufficiently testifies. And lest occasion of scandal be taken from its not being the custom to have two wives, although this be Christian and lawful in the present case, his Highness will not solemnize these nuptials in the ordinary way, that is, publicly before many people, and with the wonted ceremonies, with the said Margaret de Saal; but both the one and the other will join themselves in wedlock, privately and without noise, in presence only of the witnesses underwritten." After Melander had finished his discourse, the said Philip and the said Margaret accepted of each other for husband and wife, and promised mutual fidelity in the name of God. The said prince hath required of me, notary underwritten, to draw him one or more collated copies of this contract, and hath also promised, on the word and faith of a prince, to me a public person, to observe it inviolably, always and without alteration, in presence of the reverend and most learned masters Philip Melanethon, Martin Bucer, Denis Melander; and likewise in the presence of the illustrious and valiant Eberhard de Than, counselor of his electoral Highness of Saxony, Herman de Malsberg, Herman de Hundelshausen, the Lord John Fegg of the Chancery, Rudolph Schenck; and also in the presence of the most virtuous Lady Anne of the family of Meltitz, widow of the late John de Saal, and mother of the spouse, all in quality of requisite witnesses for the validity of the present act.

And I, Balthasar Rand of Puld, Notary public Imperial, who was present at the discourse, instruction, marriage, espousals, and union aforesaid, with the said witnesses, and have heard and seen all that passed, have written and subscribed the present contract, being requested so to do; and set to it the usual seal, for a testimony of the truth thereof.

BELTHASAR RAND.

—History of the Protestant Reformation by J. M. Spalding, pp. 484-494.

In this the great Martin Luther sanctioned the doctrine of a plurality of wives, and advised that it be observed on the quiet—secretly; otherwise the vulgar might be scandalized. No matter what the influences were which were brought to bear on Luther at that time, and which may be offered as an excuse to palliate his wrong in this particular, he and his company of associate ministers are here found submitting to and advocating the doctrine of polygamy either as their fully-matured thought on the marriage question, or else at the sacrifice of all principle, catering to the lust of a sensual prince. We choose to believe that Luther sanctioned polygamy because he thought it to be right, rather than that he was a coward, afraid to express his personal opinion in the matter, or that his ambition was to please an earthly potentate, as his whole life-work shows him to have been bold and fearless in the defense of what he understood to be right.

That Messrs. Luther, Melancthon, et al, submitted their matured thought in the matter seems to be evident from their statement above quoted, as they had deliberated on the matter and handed the result of said deliberation to Mr. Bucer in writing, and signed by Luther, Melancthon, and six other ministers of that special conference. What a sweet morsel it would be to sectarian priests were they to find such a document with the name of Joseph Smith attached! But thanks be to heaven's King, no such document was ever signed by him, nor was ever such a doctrine in any way sanctioned by pen or voice of the Palmyra Seer.

That the doctrine of a plurality of wives was

tolerated by the great reformer, and to prove that he not only sanctioned the same in the above epistle to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, I will quote other extracts from his writings. In 1522 Luther wrote a letter to the Knights of the Teutonic Order from which the following extract is taken:

My friends, the precept of multiplying is older than that of continence enjoined by the councils; it dates from Adam. It would be better to live in concubinage than in chastity. Chastity is an unpardonable sin; whereas concubinage, with God's assistance, should not make us despair of salvation.—History of the Protestant Reformation, Spalding, pp. 134, 135.

But even they are not the worst. Bigamy was quite common among them, at least for a time. They defended it, too, on scriptural grounds. Luther was appealed to on the subject. In his reply, he wavers and hesitates, wishes each individual to be left to the guidance of his own conscience, and concludes his letter in these remarks: "For my part I candidly confess, that I could not prohibit any one, who might wish it, to take many wives at once, nor is this repugnant to the Holy Scriptures. But there are things lawful, which are not expedient. Bigamy is of the number."—Ibid., p. 256.

Karlstadt said to Luther:

As neither you, nor I, have found a text in the sacred books against bigamy, let us be bigamists and trigamists—let us take as many wives as we can maintain. "Increase and multiply."—Do you understand? Accomplish the order of heaven.—Ibid., pp. 256, 257.

On the 1st of August, 1521, Luther wrote from the Wartburg a letter to Melancthon, from which the following is an extract:

Sin, and sin boldly; but let your faith be greater than your sin. It is enough for us, through the riches of the glory of God, to have known the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world. Sin will not destroy in us the reign of the Lamb,

although we were to commit fornication or murder a thousand times in one day.—Ibid., p. 132.

With respect to Patriarch Luther, it is notorious that he was in the habit of granting indulgences, of various kinds, to himself and his disciples. Thus, for example, he dispensed with himself and Catharine Boren from their vows of religious life, and particularly that of celibacy; and even preached up adultery in his public sermons.—End of Religious Controversy, p. 281.

In a foot-note to the above, Mr. Milner cites "Serm. De Matrim, t. v." as one of the sermons delivered by Luther in which he advocated the doctrine of adultery as justifiable, etc.

Luther's standard of morality was about as high as that of his good breeding. Saint Paul tells us that a Christian's "conversation is in heaven"; Luther's, on the contrary, was not only earthly, but often immoral and revolting in the extreme. He discussed in all their most disgusting details, subjects which Saint Paul would not have so much as "named among Christians." His famous "Table Talk" is full of such specimens of the new gospel decency.—Wine and women, the Pope and the Devil, are the principal subjects of which the reformer liked to treat, when alone with his intimate friends, in private and unreserved conversation. For fifteen years—from 1525 to 1540—he usually passed the evenings at the Black Eagle tavern of Wittenburg, where he met and conversed over the ale-jug, with his bosom friends, Melancthon, Amsdorf, Aurifaber, Justas, Jonas, Lange, Link, and Staupitz.—History of the Protestant Reformation by Spalding, p. 91.

We will not soil our pages with extracts from the "Table Talk," revealing the moral turpitude of Luther. Those who may doubt the truth of the picture we have drawn, or who may feel a curiosity in such matters, are referred to the work itself—a ponderous folio of fifteen hundred and thirty pages, besides an index, which alone would make a volume of considerable size. Luther's immorality was not, however, confined to private conversations at the Black Eagle; he unblushingly and sacrilegiously exhibited it in the very sanctuary of God's holy temple. His sermon on matrimony, delivered in the German language

from the pulpit of the public church of All Saints at Wittenburg, enters into the most revolting details upon a most delicate subject. The perusal of that sermon, even in the French language—under the veil of which the translator of M. Audin has wisely thought proper to leave it partially concealed—is enough to raise a blush on the cheek of modesty! He preached this sermon in 1521, immediately after his return from the castle of the Wartburg, where he had held his famous “conference with the Devil”; and it is worthy of such a master, if indeed the demon himself, who is said to have little taste for such matters, would not have blushed at the obscenity of his wanton disciple!—*Ibid.*, p. 92.

So notoriously immoral, in fact, were the early Lutherans, that it was then a common saying in Germany, to express a day spent in drinking, and debauch: “*Hodie Lutheranice vivemus*”—“To-day we will live like Lutherans.”—*Ibid.*, p. 258.

As for Luther, he was an apostate monk, living in concubinage with an unfrocked nun, and he has been judged by Protestant writers with merited severity. His life, after his apostasy, was that of a libertine entirely taken with the pleasures of the table, and animal pleasures, so much so that it had become a proverb, in occasions of self-indulgence, to say: “To-day we shall live ‘*a la Luther.*’” Benedict Morgenstern, a Protestant writer, records this fact. (*Tracte de L’Eglise*, page 21.) “The Table Talk of Luther can be still found in some libraries shelved among obscene books; it breathes such a cynicism, that it is impossible to quote from them. Every one knows that ignoble prayer, written in Luther’s own hand, the authenticity whereof has never been disputed, and whose conclusion runs thus: “Good drinking and good eating; behold the surest means of being happy.”—*Plain Talk*, p. 80.

When asked for some miraculous sign by which to prove that he spake in the name of God, he replied with a torrent of abuse, and the unlucky interloper was dismissed with the qualifications of being an ass, a Turk, a dog, a bedeviled hog.—*Ibid.*, p. 82.

John Calvin said of Luther:

Indeed Luther is very wicked. Would to God he had taken more pains in controlling his libertinism! Would to God he had better known how to acknowledge his vices!—*Ibid.*, p. 86.

Zwinglius says of him: "When I read one of Luther's books, I think I see a nasty swine grunting around and tearing up the sweet flowers of a fine garden. Luther can not speak of God and of holy things, but with procacity, great ignorance of theology, and impropriety."—Ibid., p. 86.

Luther says of Zwinglius: "Zwinglius dreams to be a Sun that illumines the world, but he gives no more light than dung would in a lamp." He also declared that Zwinglius "was satanized, insatanized, over-satanized, and that not the least hope could be entertained of his salvation."—Ibid., pp. 86, 87.

Zwinglius, according to his favorite disciple Bullinger, was expelled from his parish for his immorality. In spite of his being a priest, and a parish priest, he was publicly married after the fashion of Luther. "If you are told," says he in a letter, "that I have given in to pride, intemperance, and impurities, believe it, for it is true: I am a prey to these vices and many others."—Ibid., p. 87.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The Episcopal Church, or Church of England, was originated, or established, by Henry the Eighth, King of England, Thomas Cranmer, and others, under the head of the reformation movement, they beginning their attack on popery about the year 1526. Martin Luther had moved out in this direction some years before, and King Henry, being at that time an earnest Catholic, wrote a book in reply to Luther's arraignment of papal inconsistencies, and dedicated his book to the Pope; and as a reward for this written defense of the Roman Catholic religion, the holy father, Pope Leo X, conferred upon him and his successors, the title of "Defender of the

Faith." But a short time after he had so ardently defended Roman Catholicism against Luther's attack, he became enamored of his Queen's "maid of honor," a young and beautiful girl named Anne Boleyn; and, as related by Mr. Cobbett, "He, all of a sudden, affected to believe that he was living in sin because he was married to the widow of his brother, though as we have seen, the marriage between Catherine and the brother had never been consummated."

He applied to the Pope to divorce him from his Queen; but notwithstanding he was a great favorite with the Pope, his request was so full of injustice that the Pope could not accede to it, and did not grant it. The king—finding the Pope inflexible in refusing to grant him a divorce from his wife, Catherine, and to sanction an adulterous connection between him and Anne Boleyn—became furiously exasperated, and resolved on throwing off all papal restraints, and to make himself head of the Church in England—which he did by Acts of Parliament—and with the sword, the halter, and the gibbet at his command, as supreme head of the Church, being now both king and Pope, it meant death to disobey his commands or refuse his pretensions. Measures were therefore soon in sight to gratify his voluptuousness, that his greed for plunder and the indulgence of his animal propensities might have full sway. Of course it took some time for even the king to accomplish all this; but while thus waiting he was not to be hindered in the gratification of his lust with his beloved Anne, and, as stated by William Cobbett:

The king had had Anne about three years under his protection, when she became, for the first time, with child. There was

now, therefore, no time to be lost, in order to make an honest woman out of her. A private marriage took place in January, 1533. As Anne's pregnancy could not be long disguised, it became necessary to avow her marriage; and, therefore, it was also necessary to press onward the trial for the divorce.

Thomas Cranmer, as ecclesiastical judge, acting for the king, granted him a divorce from Queen Catharine in April, 1533, three months after this holy king had secretly married Anne Boleyn. Thus we see this sanctified Primate—and founder of the “only true apostolic church”—secretly practiced bigamy. Nor is this all; but what makes it worse is the fact that—

In Doctor Bailey's life of Bishop Fisher, it is positively asserted that Anne Boleyn was the king's daughter, and that Lady Boleyn, her mother, said to the king, when he was about to marry Anne, “Sir, for the reverence of God, take heed what you do in marrying my daughter, for, if you record your own conscience well, she is your own daughter as well as mine.” To which the king replied, “Whose daughter soever she is, she shall be my wife.”—Protestant Reformation, par. 67.

Nicholas Sanders, a native of Charlewood, county of Surrey, England, who had received his early education in the college of Wykeham, passed at Oxford in 1548, and was made bachelor of law in 1551, and in 1557 was promoted to the distinguished position of professor of canon law in his university, boldly states that Anne Boleyn was the natural daughter of Henry the Eighth! His testimony is as follows:

Thomas Boleyn was at that time at the court of Francis I, in the quality of ambassador, with the Chevalier Anthony Brun. As soon as he had heard of the love of Henry (for Anne) and his design, he took post, without having obtained the previous permission of the king, and came to England. He believed that there would be danger of his life, if any other except himself, in

proper person, should discover to Henry the secret of the birth of Anne. He met Norris the chamberlain, and begged that he would make his journey seem good in the eyes of the king, and would manage to obtain for himself a private audience. Having obtained this, he related to the prince (King Henry) that which had formerly taken place during his embassy in France; that in his absence his wife was brought to bed of Anne; that for this reason he had wished to repudiate her; that he would have done so, had it not been for the order of his majesty, who had commanded him to pardon her; to which he had consented, after his wife had owned to him that the king was the father of his last daughter (Anne).

Henry commanded him to be silent, and said, that there were so many persons who had had part in the good graces of his wife, that it could not be known who was the real father of Anne; whosoever it might be, however, that he wished to espouse her, and that he (Boleyn) should never speak of that which he had just now mentioned. Thereupon the king laughing left him on his knees.—History of the English Schism, p. 31.

Anne was born in England two years after the departure of Thomas Boleyn; thus it is simply impossible that she could have been his daughter. Henry in truth had fallen in love with the wife of Thomas Boleyn, and had sent him to France with the specious quality of ambassador, in order to have a more free intercourse with his mistress. Boleyn learned on his return the conduct of his wife, and he caused her to be called before the official of Canterbury, on the charge of adultery; she informed the king, who sent immediately the Marquis of Dorchester to Boleyn, to cause him to stop any further measures, to pardon his wife, and receive her again into favor.—History of the Protestant Reformation, vol. 2, pp. 484, 485.

These things are given as historical facts, and are not the mere statements of Mother Grundy, and never at any time have they been historically denied. It therefore makes all the difference in the world whose ox is gored. Could it be shown by authentic documentary evidence that Joseph Smith approximated any such abominable inconsistency as the

above, it would be heralded abroad by swift messengers and posted in all the public places in every city, town, and hamlet throughout the world as *prima facie* evidence that he was a monstrous impostor teaching and practicing the doctrine of devils. But, thank God, such abominations can not be established against the Palmyra Seer, but instead thereof it is the product of one of the harlot daughters of the church of Rome. Calling attention again to this holy (?) “defender of the faith”—the founder and head of the “only true apostolic church in all the world”—history informs us that he had no less than six wives, the names of whom and the dates of their marriage to this monstrous king can be obtained in almost every history of the Reformation; and yet I have known different ones of these sanctimonious churchmen—regardless of the fact of the founder of their Church having been a polygamist—to flaunt in the face of Latter Day Saints the statement that Joseph Smith was a polygamist; and this, with them, was the all-sufficient argument to condemn any and every one else to whom the gospel as taught by the Latter Day Saints commended itself to their best judgment as being the divine plan to save the race. Oh, Consistency!

William Cobbett, in his History of the Reformation, in paragraph 191, speaking of the death of this monstrous king, says:

Thus expired, in the year 1547, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and in the thirty-eighth year of his reign, the most unjust, hard-hearted, meanest, and most sanguinary tyrant that the world had ever beheld, whether Christian or heathen.

Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, the

king's chief adviser and chief judge in all ecclesiastical matters, for whom the claim is made that he was aided by the Holy Ghost to make "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church after the use of the Church of England," was also a polygamist, though his oath of celibacy bound him to have no wife at all. Cobbett says of him:

Black as many others are, they bleach the moment that Cranmer appears in his true colors. But, alas! where is the pen or tongue to give us those colors? Of the sixty-five years that he lived, and the thirty-five years of his manhood, twenty-nine years were spent in the commission of a series of acts, which for wickedness in their nature, and for mischief in their consequences, are absolutely without anything approaching to a parallel in the annals of human infamy. Being a fellow of a college at Cambridge, and having, of course, made an engagement (as the fellows do to this day) not to marry while he was a fellow, he married secretly, and still enjoyed his fellowship. While a married man he became a priest, and took the oath of celibacy; and, going to Germany, he married another wife, the daughter of a Protestant; so that now he had two wives at the one time, though his oath bound him to have no wife at all. He, as archbishop, enforced the law of celibacy, while he himself kept his German frow in the palace at Canterbury, having as we have seen in paragraph 104, imported her in a chest. He, as ecclesiastical judge, divorced Henry VIII from three wives, the grounds of his decision in two cases being directly the contrary to those which he himself had laid down when he declared the marriage to be valid; and, in the case of Anne Boleyn, he as ecclesiastical judge, pronounced that Anne had never been the king's wife; while as a member of the House of Peers, he voted for her death as having been an adulteress, and thereby guilty of treason to her husband. As archbishop under Henry (which he entered upon with a premeditated false oath on his lips) he sent men and women to the stake, because they were not Catholics, and he sent Catholics to the stake because they would

not acknowledge the king's supremacy, and thereby perjure themselves as he had so often done. Become openly a Protestant in Edward's reign, and openly professing those very principles for the professing of which he had burnt others, he now burnt his fellow Protestants because their grounds for protesting were different from his. As executor of the will of his old master, Henry, which gave the crown (after Edward) to his daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, he conspired with others, to rob those two daughters of their right, and to give the crown to lady Jane Gray, that queen of nine days, whom he with others, ordered to be proclaimed. Confined, notwithstanding his many monstrous crimes, merely to the palace at Lambeth, he, in requital of the queen's lenity, plotted with traitors in the pay of France to upset her government. Brought, at last, to trial and to condemnation as a heretic, he professed himself ready to recant. He was respited for six weeks, during which time he signed six different forms of recantation, each more ample than the former. He declared that the Protestant religion was false; that the Catholic religion was the only true one; that he now believed in all the doctrines of the Catholic Church; that he had been a horrid blasphemer against the sacrament; that he was unworthy of forgiveness; that he prayed the people, the queen, and the Pope, to have pity on, and to pray for his wretched soul; and that he had made and signed this declaration without fear, and without hope of favor; and for the discharge of his conscience, and as a warning to others. It was a question in the queen's council, whether he should be pardoned, as other recanters had been; but it was resolved that his crimes were so enormous that it would be unjust to let him escape; to which might have been added, that it could have done the Catholic Church no honor to see reconciled to it a wretch covered with robberies, perjuries, treasons, and bloodshed. Brought, therefore, to the public reading of this recantation, on his way to the stake; seeing the pile ready; now finding that he must die, and carrying in his breast all his malignity undiminished, he recanted his recantation, thrust into the fire the hand that had signed it, and thus expired, protesting against that very religion in which, only nine hours before, he had called God to witness that he firmly believed!—Cobbett's Legacy to Parsons, pp. 31-33.

We may also further say that when England assumed the dominion of India, she did not attempt by law to crush out polygamy which she found there, but the British Parliament and the British courts recognized it in India on assuming control and recognize it to-day. Not only do the British Parliament and the British courts recognize it, but the missionaries of all Christian churches in India recognize it, and do not attempt to overthrow it where the marriage has already been solemnized. In support of this fact I cite Allen's India, pp. 601, 602, which declares:

The Calcutta missionary conference, consisting of the missionaries of the different societies which have missionaries in that city and its vicinity, after frequent consultations and much consideration on the subject of polygamy as it exists in India, were unanimous in the following opinion:

1. It is in accordance with the spirit of the Bible and the practice of the Protestant Church to consider the state as the proper foundation of legislation in all civil questions affecting marriage and divorce.

2. The Bible being the true standard of morals, ought to be consulted in everything which it contains on the subject of marriage and divorce, and nothing determined contrary to its general principles.

3. Married persons being both Christians, should not be divorced for any other cause than adultery. But if one of the parties be an unbeliever, and though not an adulterer, wilfully depart from and desert the other, a divorce may be properly sued for. They were of the opinion, however, that such liberty is allowable only in extreme cases, and where all known means of reconciliation after a trial of not less than one year had failed.

4. Heathen and Mohammedan marriages and divorces, recognized by the laws of the country, are to be held valid. But it is strongly recommended that if either party before conversion have put away the other on slight grounds, the divorced party

should in all practicable and desirable cases, be taken back again.

5. If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with the Jewish and primitive Christian churches, he shall be permitted to keep them all; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the church. In no other case is polygamy to be tolerated among Christians.

We herewith append the names of the different societies constituting the Calcutta Missionary Conference, with the number of missionaries and native preachers of each at the time the foregoing resolutions were adopted:

NAME.	MISSIONARIES.	NATIVE.
Church Missionary Society	95	136
Society for Propagating the Gospel	44	76
London Missionary Society	55	173
Wesleyan Missionary Society	36	26
American Board of Commissioners	40	74
Baptist Missionary Society	33	86
Free Church of Scotland	21	23
Established Church of Scotland	4	5
Basle Missionary Society	27	35
American Presbyterian Mission	27	16
General Baptist Mission	8	13
American Baptist Mission	10	7

Here are twelve missionary societies, with over one thousand ministers, composed of various popular churches, in solemn assembly, unanimously declaring "after much consideration" that the practice of polygamy "is in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and primitive Christian churches." This we hurl back at those missionary societies, demanding the proof from the Bible, or authentic history, that the primitive Christian church practiced the doctrine of polygamy. There may have been instances in

which individual members or isolated branches practiced that doctrine, but it was in opposition to the practice and doctrine of the primitive Christian church, and is nowhere tolerated in the New Testament or early church history. The query arises, however, in view of the unanimous conclusion of the Calcutta Missionary Conference that polygamy was "in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and primitive Christian churches," Why should they exclude as "ineligible to any office in the church," the native Christian converts of India who practice that which was the practice of the primitive Christians? But such were the conclusions of the Calcutta Missionary Conference which was composed of the several orthodox (?) churches of Protestant Christianity the large majority of whose ministers fail not to hurl their cruel epithets at Joseph Smith, calling him a bad man, an impostor, false prophet, etc., because, forsooth, "Deacon Jones declared that his Aunt Jerusha Jane had heard her neighbor say that it had been reported to her that Joseph Smith taught that polygamy was 'in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and primitive Christian church.'" But, dear reader, it was the Calcutta Missionary Conference—representative men of the various popular churches—which, "after much consideration," placed themselves upon record as sanctioning polygamy; and now, to divert attention from their "unanimous opinion" as favoring polygamy as being in accord with the practice of the primitive Christian church, with an affected air of holy horror they cry out, Beware! Beware! Impostor Joe! Polygamy!

Thus it is the old cry of "Stop thief! stop thief!" introduced into their theological circles to hide from view that which they in India declared to be in accordance with the practice of primitive Christianity, but here in America is the veriest abomination of Satanic delusion! Thus the Calcutta Missionary Conference! But where, O where can be found the authentic statement of Joseph Smith as either teaching or sanctioning anything that might be construed as countenancing the doctrine of polygamy? Echo answers, Where?

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

At a General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church held in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, in 1895, the following report was given out regarding its last day's proceedings:

PITTSBURG, Pennsylvania, May 27.—The last day's session of the Presbyterian General Assembly opened this morning with a crowded docket. An overture from the Synod of India, asking for a reply to the memorial upon the subject of baptizing polygamous converts was considered. The Mohammedan was admitted to the Church, and he was allowed to retain both wives and house. A memorial was presented asking the General Assembly that final power be given the Synod of India in such cases. Doctor Thompson, of the committee on church policy, to whom it was referred, said there was no concrete case before the Assembly, and that the committee was indisposed to interfere until the judicial case involving polygamy was before it. Doctor Morrison, representing the synod trial cases and special legislation, held that the recognition of polygamous marriages by the Church in India was an absolute necessity. "Any other rule," said he, "would rule David out of the church."—*Kansas City Mail*.

Here we have the Presbyterian Church, in General Assembly, unmistakably sanctioning polygamy, as

much so as did Brigham Young on that memorable 29th of August, 1852. About the only difference in the two transactions is that Brigham claimed that God had directed that polygamy be enjoined upon the Church; and the Presbyterians indorsed polygamy as "an absolute necessity," as "any other rule would rule David out of the church." Oh, what a superabundance of love and sympathy for poor David!

Should it be said that polygamy was only indorsed by that Assembly for the benefit of the Mohammedan converts in order to retain them in the Church, we reply that it in no sense changes the matter, as the facts are. The Presbyterians claim to be the church of God, and if it is the church of God here in America, it is also the church of God in India, and, therefore, what is wrong here would be wrong there, and no amount of twisting can help them out of the difficulty, as the professed church of God here in America legislates in favor of polygamy for that special wing of the Church over in India. This rather suggests the idea that the strong arm of the civil law is the only barrier to the practice of polygamy by this Presbyterian, so-called, church of God, here in America; for, surely, if polygamy is right in India it would be no less a virtue here. Had a request similar to that one made of the Presbyterian General Assembly quoted above been made of the Latter Day Saints at any time prior to the death of Joseph Smith, and had Joseph Smith served in the same capacity as did these Reverend Doctors, Thompson and Morrison, in the above case, and returned the same or a similar verdict with his name attached thereto; or,

could anything of a like nature be found to-day as the incontrovertible act of Joseph Smith, what a shout there would be in the Philistine camp! How modern sectarianism would rejoice; and with *Eureka* emblazoned upon its banner, unfurl to the breeze in the sight of all the world their wonderful discovery. But please remember that the names above cited as giving sanction to polygamy are Doctors Thompson and Morrison, not Joseph Smith; and the professed church of God, the Presbyterians, not the Latter Day Saints.

Of John Calvin, the main pillar in the establishment of the Presbyterian Church, history says:

John Calvin.—Not content with burning Servetus, beheading Gruet, and persecuting other distinguished Protestants, Castallo, Bolsec, and Gentilis (who being apprehended in the neighboring Protestant canton of Berne, was put to death there) he set up a consistorial inquisition at Geneva, for forcing every one to conform to his opinions, and required, that the magistrate should punish whomever this consistory condemned. He was succeeded in his spirit, as well as in his office, by Beza, who wrote a folio work in defense of persecution.—End of Religious Controversy, p. 326.

Calvin's morals have been discussed on both sides. Beza and his other friends have held him up as a model of perfection; others, with Bolsec, have represented him as a monster of impurity and iniquity. The story of his having been guilty of a crime of nameless turpitude at Noyon, though denied by his friends, yet rests upon very respectable authority. Bolsec, a contemporary writer, relates it as certain. Before his work appeared, it had been mentioned by Surius in 1558; by Turbes, who lived in the reign of Francis I, by Simon Fontana in 1557; by Stapleton in 1558; by LaVacquerie in 1560 and 1561; by DeNonchi in 1562; by DuPrean in 1567; and by Whitaker before 1570. [*Apud* Audin, vol. 2, p. 256.] The learned and careful Protestant Galiffe, who had examined most thoroughly the archives of Geneva, uses this very plain language:

“The history of many of the reformer’s colleagues is very scandalous, the details of which can not enter into a work designed for both sexes.” The same writer tells us “that most of the facts related by the physician of Lyons (Bolsec) are perfectly true.”

In the introduction of his *Notices*, he bears the following testimony to the state of morals at Geneva in Calvin’s time:

“To those who imagine that the reformer had done nothing that is not good, I will exhibit our Registers covered with entries of illegitimate children” (these were exposed at all the corners of the city and country) “with prosecutions hideous for their obscenity, with wills in which fathers and mothers accuse their own children not only of errors, but of crimes with transactions before notaries public between young girls and their paramours, who gave them, in the presence of their relations, means of supporting their illegitimate offspring, with multitudes of forced marriages, where the delinquents were conducted from prison to the church, with mothers who abandoned their infants at the hospital, while they were living in abundance with a second husband, with whole bundles of processes between brothers, with multitudes (literally heaps, *tas*) of secret denunciations: and all this in the generation nourished by the mystic mania of Calvin!”—*Apud* Audin, vol. 2, p. 174.

Truly, if the Registers prove all this, we may conclude that Calvin stamped his own image upon his generation, and especially his heartlessness.—*History of the Protestant Reformation*, pp. 388, 389.

The partisans of Calvin have attempted, and for his credit I wish they had succeeded in their attempt, to rescue his memory from the crimes and disgrace of having the mark of infamy branded on his shoulder.

What must pass as an indisputable proof of the crimes imputed to Calvin, is that, after the accusation had been prepared against him, the church of Geneva, not only did not show the contrary, but did not even contradict the information, which Berthelier, commissioned by persons of the same town, gave at Noyon. This information was signed by the most respectable inhabitants of Noyon, and was drawn up with all the accustomed forms of the law. And in the same information we see

that this heresiarch, having been convicted of an abominable sin, which was always punished by fire, the punishment that he had deserved was, at the intercession of his bishop, mitigated into that of the *fleur-de-lis*. . . . Add to this that Bolesque, having given the same information, Berthelier, who was still living in the time of Bolesque, did not contradict it, as, undoubtedly, he would have done, had he been able to do so without going against the conviction of his conscience, and opposing the public belief. Thus the silence both of the whole town interested in the affair and also of his secretary, is on this occasion, an infallible proof of the disorders imputed to Calvin. (Card. Richelieu, *Traite*, p. convert. 2, pp. 319, 320.) They were at that time so uncontested, that a Catholic writer, speaking of the scandalous life of Calvin, advances as a fact well known in England, that "The leader of the Calvinists had been branded with the *fleur-de-lis*, and had fled from his native town; and that his antagonist, Whitaker, acknowledging the fact, merely replied by the following shameful comparison: Calvin has been stigmatized, so has Saint Paul, so have others also. I find also that the grave and learned Doctor Stapleton, born in 1536 [he was nearly thirty years of age when Calvin died in 1564], who had every opportunity of gaining information on this subject, having spent his life in the neighborhood of Noyon, speaks of this adventure of Calvin's in the terms of one who was certain of the fact."—*Promptuar Catholic*, par. 32, p. 133.—Quoted from *History of the Protestant Reformation*, pp. 469, 470.

Galiffe, a Protestant Calvinist, in his *Notices Genealogique* (t. 3, p. 21) published in Geneva in 1836, says of Calvin:

That name, famous for its criminality, raised the standard of the most ferocious intolerance, of the grossest superstitions, and most impious tenets. A terrible apostle, from whose inquisition nothing escaped. During 1558 and 1559 he caused one hundred and fourteen judgments to be given in criminal matters.—*Plain Talk*, p. 79.

Calvin was also an ecclesiastic. Convicted of infamous crimes against nature, he was publicly branded by the executioner.—*Ibid.*, p. 78.

Volmar, Calvin's first professor, says of Calvin:

Calvin is violent and perverse: so much the better, for he is the man we need to further our interests.—Frenndelfeld. Analytical Table of Universal History, 2, p. 369.

Bucer, formerly a monk in the Roman Catholic Church, but who had left her communion and renounced his vows of celibacy and married the maid of his choice, says of Calvin:

Calvin in all truth is a mad-dog; he is a bad man. . . . Be on thy guard, O Christian reader! against Calvin's books.—Plain Talk, p. 87.

Calvin took into his head once to perform a little miracle. Unfortunately he failed. He hired a man to play the dead, that he might resuscitate him. When he came to the spot, followed by a curious crowd to whom he had innocently promised this proof of his mission, God's justice had smitten the partner of his imposture, and poor Calvin was well nigh to die of fright, finding the wretch stiff in death. This is a fact well authenticated in history.—Ibid., p. 82.

Theodore Beza, Calvin's favorite disciple, says:

Calvin could never be trained either to temperance or to honest habits, or to truthfulness; he was always stuck in the mud.—Ibid., p. 87.

Of Theodore de Beza (of whom we find so many eulogies in Protestant writers), Heshussius (translation of Florimond, page 1048) exclaims:

How can any one wonder at the incredible impudence of this monster, whose lewd and infamous life is so well known over all France, through his epigrams worse than cynic? And still in hearing him you would say that he was a holy man, another Job, or a modern anchorite of the desert, even a greater man than Saint John or Saint Paul, he boasts so much, on every occasion, of his exile, his labors, his purity, and the wonderful sanctity of his life.

Schlusseberg, another writer of the same sect, remarks:

This obscene man, equal to a devil incarnate, kneaded with cunning and impiety, can do naught but belch forth satirical blasphemies.—Plain Talk, p. 88.

Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin, etc., agreed on only one good point of doctrine, and that was that all good works are useless, and certainly their lives prove that they followed the principle in earnest.—Ibid., p. 78.

JOHN KNOX.

This firebrand of sedition, who delighted in nothing but broils, and tumults, could not be content with barely following the steps of Luther, Zuingle, Farel, and less still those of his master Calvin, who had not long before delivered him from the galleys of the prior of Capua, where he had been three years for his crimes, unlawful amours, and abominable fornications; for he used to lead a dissolute life in several shameful and odious places; being also found guilty of the parricide and murder committed on the body of James Benton, archbishop of Saint Andrews, etc.—Bayle's Historical and Critical Dictionary, article Knox, edition London, 1738.

In the same article Bayle states that Moreri charged Knox with almost every crime against chastity, following in this respect the annalist Spondanus, who ad an. 1559, says that "Knox, a priest and an apostate monk, who was a debaucher of several women, and of his own step-mother, and a magician, returned to Scotland in 1559, well provided with instructions from Calvin;" and that in Scotland he everywhere caused tumults, sacrilege, and violence.—History of the Protestant Reformation, vol. 2, p. 490.

METHODIST.

In regard to the Methodist Church, here are a few historical extracts from its early teachings, and from the Notes of John Wesley, the founder of that institution. And such teaching! And O, those Notes! If Joseph Smith had been the author of either such

teaching or confessions, what an everlasting ado would be made over it; and that, too, by the very ones who laud Mr. Wesley and his associate ministry to the very zenith of glory. But forbearing further comment at this juncture we quote:

In the year 1729, Wesley was a modern Church-of-England man, distinguished from other students at Oxford by nothing but a more strict and methodical form of life. Of course, his doctrine then was the prevailing doctrine of that Church; this he preached in England, and carried with him to America, whither he sailed to convert the Indians. Returning, however, to England in 1738, he writes as follows: "For many years I have been tossed about by various winds of doctrine," the particulars of which, and of the different schemes of salvation which he was inclined to trust in, he details. Falling, however, at last, into the hands of Peter Bohler and his Moravian brethren, who met in Fetter-lane, he became a warm proselyte to their system; declaring, at the same time, with respect to his past religion, that hitherto he had been a Papist without knowing it. We may judge of his ardor by his exclamation when Peter Bohler left England: "O what a work hath God begun since his (Bohler's) coming to England; such a one as shall never come to an end till heaven and earth shall pass away." To cement his union with this society, and to instruct himself more fully in its mysteries, he made a journey to Hernhuth in Moravia, which is the chief seat of the United Brethren. It was whilst he was a Moravian, namely, "On the 24th of May, 1738, a quarter of an hour before nine in the evening," that John Wesley, by his own account was "saved from the law of sin and death." This all-important event happened "at a meeting-house, in Aldersgate-street, while a person was reading Luther's Preface to the Galatians." Nevertheless, though he had professed such deep obligations to the Moravians, he soon found out and declared that theirs was not the right way to heaven. In fact, he found them, "and nine parts in ten of the Methodists" who adhered to them, "swallowed up in the dead sea of stillness, opposing the ordinances, namely, prayer, reading the Scriptures, frequenting the sacrament and public worship, sell-

ing their Bibles, etc., in order to rely more fully on the blood of the Lamb." In short, Wesley abandoned the Moravian connection, and set up that which is properly his own religion, as it is detailed by Nightengale in his *Portraiture of Methodism*. This happened in 1740, soon after which he broke off from his rival Whitfield. In fact, they maintained quite opposite doctrines on several essential points: still the tenet of instantaneous justification, without repentance, charity, or other good works, and the actual feeling or certainty of this and of everlasting happiness, continued to be the essential vital principles of Wesley's system, as they are of the Calvinistic sects in general; till having witnessed the horrible impieties and crimes to which it conducted, he, at a conference or synod of his preachers, in 1744, declared that he and they had "leaned too much to Calvinism and Antinomianism." In answer to the question: "What is Antinomianism?" Wesley in the same conference answers: "The doctrine which makes void the law through faith. Its main pillars are, that Christ abolished the moral law,—that, therefore, Christians are not obliged to keep it,—that Christian liberty, is liberty from obeying the commands of God;—that it is bondage to do a thing because it is commanded, or forbear it because it is forbidden; that a believer is not obliged to use the ordinances of God, or to do good works;—that a preacher ought not to exhort to good works," etc. See here the essential morality of religion which Wesley had hitherto followed and preached as drawn by his own pen, and which still continues to be preached by the other sects of Methodists! We shall hereafter see in what manner he changed it. The very mention, however, of a change in this ground-work of Methodism, startled all the other Methodist connections. Accordingly, the Honorable and Reverend Mr. Shirley, chaplain to Lady Huntington, in a circular letter, written at her desire, declared against the dreadful heresy of Wesley, which, as he expresses himself, "injured the foundation of Christianity." He, therefore, summoned another conference, which severely censured Wesley. On the other hand, this patriarch was strongly supported, particularly by Fletcher, of Madeley, an able writer, whom he had destined to succeed him, as the head of his connection. Instead of being offended at his master's change, Fletcher says: "I admire the candor of an old man of God, who,

instead of obstinately maintaining an old mistake, comes down like a little child, and acknowledges it before his preachers, whom it is his interest to secure." The same Fletcher published seven volumes of Checks to Antinomianism, in vindication of Wesley's change in this essential point of his religion. In these he brings the most convincing proofs and examples of the impiety and immorality in which the enthusiasm of Antinomian Calvinism had conducted the Methodists. He mentions a highwayman, lately executed in his neighborhood, who vindicated his crimes upon this principle. He mentions other more odious instances of wickedness, which to his knowledge, had flowed from it. All these, he says, are represented by their preachers to be "damning sins in Turks and Pagans, but only spots in God's children." He adds, "There are few of our celebrated pulpits, where more has not been said for sin than against it!" He quotes an honorable M. P. [Methodist Preacher] "once my brother," he says "but now my opponent," who in his published treatise, maintains, "that murder and adultery do not hurt the pleasant children (the elected), but work even for their good," adding, "My sins may displease God, my person is always acceptable to him. Though I should out-sin Manasses himself, I should not be less a pleasant child, because God always views me in Christ. Hence, in the midst of adulteries, murders, and incest, he can address me with: Thou art all fair, my love, my undefiled; there is no spot in thee. It is a most pernicious error of the schoolmen to distinguish sins according to the fact, not according to the person. Though I highly blame those who say, let us sin that grace may abound; yet adultery, incest, and murder, shall, upon the whole, make me holier on earth and merrier in heaven!" It only remains to show in what manner Wesley purified his religious system, as he thought, from the defilement of Antinomianism. To be brief he invented a two-fold mode of justification, one without repentance, the love of God, or other works; the other in which these works are essential; the former is for those who die soon after their pretended experience of saving faith, the latter of those who have time and opportunity of performing them. Thus, to say no more of the system, a Nero and a Robespierre might, according to its doctrine, have been established in the grace of God, and in a right to the realms of infinite purity, without one

act of sorrow for their enormities, or so much as an act of their belief in God!—Millner's *End of Religious Controversy*, pp. 123-125.

On February 1, 1738, John Wesley wrote of himself as follows:

It is now two years and almost four months since I left my native country, in order to teach the Georgian Indians the nature of Christianity—but what have I learned myself in the meantime? Why (what I, the least of all suspected), that I, who went to America to convert others, was never myself converted to God. I am not mad, though I thus speak, but I speak the words of truth and soberness, if happily some of those who still dream may awake, and see, that as I am so are they. . . . This, then, have I learned in the ends of the earth; that I am fallen short of the glory of God, that my whole heart is altogether corrupt and abominable, and consequently my whole life; seeing it can not be that an evil tree should bring forth good fruit; that alienated as I am from the life of God, I am a child of wrath; an heir of hell; that my own works, my own sufferings, my own righteousness; are so far from making any atonement for the least of those sins, which are more in number than the hairs of my head, that the best of them need an atonement themselves, or they can not abide his righteous judgment; that having the sentence of death in my heart, and having nothing in or of myself to plead, I have no hope but that of being justified freely through the redemption that is in Jesus.—*The Testimony*, vol. 5, no. 8, pp. 57, 58.

On the 24th of May, nearly four months after the above was written, while sitting listening to one reading Luther's writings, he became gloriously converted, and the following is his own account of that wonderful transition:

I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, in Christ alone, for salvation, and an assurance was given me, that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death.—*Ibid.*, p. 58.

Such statements as the above might be multiplied almost without limitation, but the above will answer our purpose for the present. It will, therefore, be understood that I have not referred to the wrongs and inconsistencies of those men for the purpose of trying to palliate anything inconsistent in Joseph Smith; but merely to call attention to the fact that they who so flippantly charge Joseph Smith with misconduct, polygamy, and the like, merely upon the ground of Mother Grundy's stale stock in trade, should remember that people who live in glass houses should at least be careful how they throw stones. If it can be shown, incontrovertibly, that Joseph Smith taught or sanctioned the doctrine of polygamy, then, but not until then, should such a crime be charged against him. He may have made mistakes, and who has not? It is human to err. But when mistakes are charged against an individual, and that individual is innocent of them—has committed no such offense—it is then hard, oh, so hard to bear! "All things whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," is indeed a glittering gem in the great field of human experience that should be sought after and put in practice more extensively by the great majority of mankind; but, alas! how often it is forgotten, while vain ambition and selfish, jealous pride are sought for, catered to, and gratified at the expense of others, by those who should have been their friends instead of their slanderers!

But not to generalize any further, and in conclusion, permit me to say that we have proved that which we set out to prove, namely, that Joseph

Smith, neither in public nor in private, taught, practiced, condoned, encouraged, or sympathized with the dogma and practice of polygamy. Although he may have erred in some regards, yet this particular wrong should not be laid at his door, nor charged against him.

The doctrine of polygamy is not of God; nor was it ever in any age of the world commanded or sanctioned by our heavenly Father. True, it was permitted in the same sense as was divorce "for every cause" under the Mosaic economy—because of the hardness of their hearts and of national environments.

As a representative of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, I am authorized to say that it is our duty to so live that we do in no sense violate the laws of the land, and do keep all the laws of God; and for this reason, as a law-abiding people, desirous of the future prosperity of our country, and that we may bequeath to our children after us an heritage uncontaminated with the God-dishonoring dogma and practice of polygamy, we believe it to be our duty to seek out from among the people, good men, men of honor, to fill all public trusts, and to make such laws as shall promote peace and virtue, and secure to all their rights and bring happiness to the race.

John Taylor, in declaring his sentiments as Brigham Young's immediate successor, to a conference assembled in Salt Lake City, as reported in the *Salt Lake Tribune* for January 10, 1880, said:

The people of the rest of the country are our enemies. They do not understand us, we do not understand them. We should

pray for them, but we must not yield to them. They think we are foolish, and we think they are foolish; they think we are a pack of rascals, but we have the best of them, for we know they are a pack of rascals. God is greater than the United States, and when the Government conflicts with Heaven we will be ranged under the banner of Heaven and against the Government. The United States says we can not marry more than one wife. God says different. We had no hand in the business; Joseph Smith had no hand in it. Brigham Young had no hand in it. I had no hand in it. It was all the work of God, and his laws must be obeyed. If the United States says different the Saints can not obey it. We do not want to rebel against the United States. Rebellion is not on the program; but we will worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. We want to be friendly to the United States, if the government will let us; but not one jot or tittle of our rights will we give up to purchase it. I would like the good God in heaven to prevent them from making laws that we can not keep; but when adulterers pass a law forbidding polygamy the Saints can not obey it. Polygamy is a divine institution. It has been handed down direct from God. The United States can not abolish it. No nation on earth can prevent it, nor all the nations of the earth combined. I defy the United States; I will obey God. These are my sentiments, and all of you who sympathize with me in this position raise your right hands.

All hands, of course, went up as usual. Such are the sentiments of Brighamism always when honestly expressed—a veritable *imperium in imperio*. One mind absolutely holds dominant influence in both church and state affairs, and therefore as an institution is un-American and contrary to the free benevolent spirit of true Christianity, and contrary to the laws and constitution of the United States. And whether accepted by the few or many, its doctrines are unacceptable to a people whose fathers fled from Europe to escape the practice and abuse which has

ever been the twin sister of the barbarous relic of a political ecclesiasticism—a condition of bondage, serfdom, and slavery to the dominant power of the Brighamite institution, and inaugurate a system of laws which will uphold as a religious principle the polygamic relationship.

CHAPTER IX.

IN THE beginning, immediately after the creation of the first pair, was the law of marriage announced by our heavenly Father, said law having had its origin in the council of heaven, and was ordained of God "that the earth might be filled with the measure of man according to his creation before the world began." Not only this, but the law of marriage was intended to limit and regulate the intercourse of the sexes, that purity, affection, and order might be promoted among the sons and daughters of men, and that the sanctity of home, with its perennial streams and gushing fountains of love, might serve the human family in constituting the family tree a miniature heaven, where celestial favor and supreme joy should obtain throughout their probation in earth-life. By this law the marriage union was limited to two individuals—one man and one woman—and the Christ of God when speaking of this regulation, and referring to mankind in the beginning as having been made "male and female," said: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh." This law was undoubtedly calculated and ordained by our heavenly Father as the basic method for the promotion of peace and domestic felicity; and any infringement of this law is specifically condemned in the declaration that "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

In the light of the divine economy the marriage

union is as completely riven asunder by the action of supplementing a second wife as an additional appendage to the social institution under the guise and mask of religion, or by the permission of the rulers governing a tribe or nation whose laws condone or authorize it, as it would be if the said third party should in any other way come in between husband and wife with no pretended sanction of divinity or toleration of human law. In either case adultery is the result; and any person having sexual intercourse with any other woman than the wife of his youth, save that marriage contract has been broken by death or transgression, is guilty of adultery, no matter with what pretended sanction he clothes his action, as it is a violation of the laws of God governing the home. It is also a demonstrable fact that wherever, or among whatever people, polygamy or criminal intercourse is practiced to any great extent, the mental faculties become benumbed, the perception is darkened, and both moral and spiritual powers are prostrate at the feet of vice, immorality, and crime. Doctor Paley has said:

However it may be accounted for, the criminal commerce of the sexes corrupts and depraves the mind, and the moral character, more than any single species of vice whatsoever. That ready perception of guilt, that prompt and decisive resolution against it, which constitutes a virtuous character, is seldom found in persons addicted to these indulgencies. They prepare an easy admission for every sin that seeks it; are, in low life, usually the first stage in men's progress to the most desperate villianies; and, in high life, to that lamented dissoluteness of principle which manifests itself in a profligacy of public conduct, and a contempt of the obligations of religion and of moral probity. Add to this that habits of libertinism incapacitate and indispose the mind for all intellectual, moral, and reli-

gious pleasure.—Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, book 3, part 3, chap. 2.

All civilized nations regard polygamy as an infringement of every principle of morality, a violation of the rule given by our heavenly Father in the early morn of creation, a rule which was clearly taught by the Messiah eighteen hundred years ago; and, as a consequence of which, universal opposition obtains in civilized countries against it, those people or tribes only practicing it who are sunken in the dregs of immorality, vice, crime, and idolatry; and I believe I am safe in saying that among whatever nation, tribe, or people polygamy dominates the home, a cold-blooded selfishness supplants all the benevolent affections and finer feelings, while sexual enjoyments constitute the beau ideal of that society. Parental affection, with all other ramifications of kindred ties which under the heaven-ordained constitution of home produce such delightful associations, are relegated largely to oblivion, or blended in undistinguishable confusion and disorder, where impiety, treachery, falsehood, and perjury rear their unblushing fronts, and thefts, robberies, and murder follow in their train. Every generous impulse is shrunk and withered, while amidst the din of revelry the darkened visage of Crime rears its deformed head, and like a painted corpse, stalks through the land at noon-day alluring the virtuous and unwary into its lonely retreats where ghastly apparitions of departed joys deprive them of the least drop of consolation until every moral feeling is blunted and every moral principle is abandoned.

The great majority of people among all civilized

nations will agree with me in the above strictures of polygamy; and inasmuch as the Brighamite Mormons of Utah believe it to be a virtue instead of a crime, a God-appointed principle, a necessary requisite in the divine economy that men might be "exalted among the Gods" in the celestial realm of glory, I purpose to prove that there is nowhere in the sacred Scripture a specific warrant for the practice or any words of inspiration from God which condone or sanction it. I also purpose to show that we need not go to the Sulus or the Turks to find a positive demonstration of the dwarfish, demoralizing tendencies of polygamy; but that in the Great American Desert a complete exemplification of the above charges may be found. I shall call attention to the degrading influence polygamy has had upon those people who followed Brigham Young to the mountain fastnesses of Utah, showing the sacrilegious principles which they have indorsed since they apostatized from the original Church and adopted their doctrines of a plurality of wives.

To impress a picture of the mental anguish wrought in the minds of those upon whom the loathsome viper of polygamy has fastened its cruel fangs, destroying the sacredness of home, crushing out every spark of hope, and darkening the sunlight of existence, we submit the following:

Brigham Young performed the ceremony. He sat at the end of the altar and we three knelt down—my husband on one side and Miss Pratt and myself on the other. Speaking to me, Brigham Young asked: "Are you willing to give this woman to your husband to be his lawful wife for time and for all eternity? If you are you will signify it by placing her right hand within the right hand of your husband."

I did so, but what words can describe my feelings? The anguish of a whole lifetime was crowded into that one single moment. The painful meaning of those words, "for all eternity," withered my soul, and the unending contract which my husband had made with another woman was practically a divorce from me. . . . I was bewildered and almost beside myself, and yet I had to hide my feelings. Hope was for ever banished from my life. To whom could I look for sympathy among those who were around me? They were most of them men who had ruthlessly wrecked the lives and lacerated the hearts of hundreds of women before my turn came, and the sight of an unhappy wife was so common in their experience that it was more likely to awaken their anger than their pity. I felt this instinctively, and I resolved that they should never know how much my poor heart was torn. . . . I felt that day that if I could not get away by myself alone, and give expression to my overcharged feelings, I should certainly lose my reason. I was utterly miserable. It was only in the dead of night, in my own chamber, that I gave way to the terrible anguish that was consuming me. God and my own soul can alone bear witness to what I suffered in that time of woe. That night was to me such as even the most God-forsaken might pray never to know; and morning dawned without my having for a moment closed my eyes.—Tell it All, Stenhouse, pp. 454-458.

Can any one who realizes the degradation polygamy imposes upon the gentler sex, having his senses exercised with the gospel light, maintain that obnoxious principle to be ordained of God for the amelioration of the condition of the human family? Every principle in the divine economy is designed for the betterment of our condition; nor is there a single precept enjoined upon us which, by obedience thereto, does not bring peace and gladness to our souls; but on the contrary, we are made better thereby—better husbands, better wives, better parents, better children, better neighbors, better citizens, better physically, socially, morally, spiritually,

mentally, and in every way; and that which is degrading in its influence upon mankind, no matter what its pretended sanctity, is not of God. Polygamy is debasing, demoralizing, degenerating, brings leanness of soul, is uncharitable and cruel as the grave, and is therefore not of God.

That polygamy has brought upon the Utah Church moral degeneracy and spiritual leanness, I offer in proof the following:

Whence and whatever that "spirit" might be which moved the sisters and brethren when they met in early times, I can not tell; but I, and with me, ten thousand Mormons and seceding Mormons in Utah, can, from our own experience, testify that that spirit no longer visits the Tabernacle services over which Brigham Young presides, or the meetings of the Saints since they adopted the accursed doctrine of polygamy, and forsook the gentle leadings of their first love.—Tell it All, p. 57.

He [Brigham Young] has outraged decency and riven asunder the most sacred social and domestic ties by his shameless introduction of polygamy. He has sacrilegiously defiled the temple of God, by teaching his followers to worship Adam as their divinity, and has robbed Christ of his birthright by proclaiming that men are the only saviors of their wives and that in respect to women the sacrifice of our Lord was of no direct avail.—Tell it All, p. 273.

Surely the above statements show the demoralizing influence the introduction and practice of polygamy has had upon the Church. Prior to the acceptance of polygamy, divine testimony was given them in fulfillment of the promise Jesus made that, "If any man will do the will of the Father, he shall know of the doctrine"; and, like gentle zephyrs wafted over the burning sands of the desert to cheer the weary traveler, and crystal fountains of living water to cool his parched tongue, did the sweet influence of the

Spirit of God make happy and comfort those "plain but earnest and united people" who had obeyed the principles of the gospel as then taught, and whose chief ambition was to emulate the virtues of early Christianity; bringing to them that entrancing ecstasy which the pen of the most gifted can not describe, and which must be experienced in order to be understood. But when the doctrine of polygamy was pressed upon the Church by some of those very men who had declared, while in Europe, the gospel preached by them to be "Christianity restored," and "the evangel of the latter day dispensation," that "spirit" which had attested their teachings in Europe as being divine, and which had brought that wonderful transformation of character which produced love and happiness in their homes and sanctity of soul to the unregenerate, that splendid and entrancing glory which in awful majesty and grandeur "thrilled the soul of the Seer in Patmos," hath departed their Tabernacle services. "Ichabod"—the glory hath departed—is written in the gate-ways of their temples, and "crime" is inscribed by their master-hands throughout the warp and woof of that profligate system of degeneracy and iniquity. Lest some might think this language too harsh I will call attention to the language of Brigham Young:

I have many a time, in this stand, dared the world to produce as mean devils as we can. We can beat them at anything. We have the greatest and smoothest liars in the world, the cunningest and most adroit thieves, and any other shade of character that you can mention.

We can pick out elders in Israel right here who can beat the world at gambling, who can handle the cards, cut and shuffle them with the smartest rogue on the face of God's footstool. I

can produce elders here who can shave their smartest shavers, and take their money from them. We can beat the world at any game. We can beat them, because we have men here that live in the light of the Lord; that have the holy priesthood, and hold the keys of the kingdom of God. But you may go through all the sectarian world, and you can not find a man capable of opening the door of the kingdom of God to admit others in. We can do that. . . . We are not to be beat. We expect to be a stumbling-block to the whole world, and a rock of offense to them.—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 4, p. 77.

This being Brigham's estimate of his own men, we therefore ask, Who had a better right or a better chance to know the moral qualities and character of the men associated with him than Brigham himself? And as he gives us their moral status, we ask, in the name of consistency, can it be that such reprobates as above described are really "living in the light of the Lord"? If so, who beneath the shining blue can be living in darkness? Does the gospel of the Son of God make "cunning and adroit thieves" and "the greatest and smoothest liars in the world" of those who live in harmony with its precepts? or was such development of character the legitimate outgrowth of that system introduced among them by Brigham Young, which taught them to invade the sanctity of the home and ruthlessly destroy its affections by establishing therein a system of concubinage unknown to the gospel of the Son of God? In consequence of this transgression of the divine economy, step by step they became schooled in deceit, lying, and other crimes, their minds gradually becoming more and more darkened until vice and crime of every hue and shade became a virtue if only practiced in the name of the Lord. "If the light that be in you be dark-

ness, how great is that darkness," said Jesus; and "When the evil spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh to himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first." Nor will it do to try to excuse Brigham by saying that he was simply joking, for he affirms the reason such criminal characters were the representative men of Brighamism, was because they were living "in the light of the Lord" and had "the holy priesthood," and therefore expected to become "a stumbling-block" and "a rock of offense" to the whole world.

The gospel of the Son of God did not constitute them such a degenerate class as Brigham described them to be; it was the opening of the abominable channel of polygamy that did it—its odor creating such a stench in the nostrils of civilization that it became necessary, in order to hide it, to resort to downright trickery and lying about it; and while they were secretly practicing it they were constantly denying it in public—lying about it, and many of them are still doing it to-day.

Not only did the universal practice of lying to conceal polygamy obtain among them, but in its train came the awful doctrine of blood-atonement, that is, the doctrine of killing a man to save his soul, which the following extract from a Tabernacle sermon in 1856 by Brigham Young quite fully elucidates:

When will we love our neighbors as ourselves? In the first place, Jesus said that no man hateth his own flesh. It is admitted by all that every person loves himself. Now if we do rightly love ourselves, we want to be saved and continue to exist, we want to go into the kingdom where we can enjoy eternity and see no more sorrow nor death. This is the desire of every person who believes in God. Now take a person in this congregation who has knowledge with regard to being saved in the kingdom of our God and our Father, and being exalted, one who knows and understands the principles of eternal life, and sees the beauty and excellency of the eternities before him compared with the vain and foolish things of the world, and suppose that he is overtaken in a gross fault, that he has committed a sin that he knows will deprive him of that exaltation which he desires, and that he can not attain to it without the shedding of his blood, and also knows that by having his blood shed he will atone for that sin, and be saved and exalted with the gods, is there a man or a woman in this house but what would say, "Shed my blood that I may be saved and exalted with the gods"?

All mankind love themselves, and let these principles be known by an individual, and he would be glad to have his blood shed. That would be loving themselves, even unto an eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers or sisters likewise, when they have committed a sin that can not be atoned for without the shedding of their blood? . . . That is what Jesus Christ meant. He never told a man or woman to love their enemies in their wickedness, never. He never intended any such thing; his language is left as it is for those to read who have the spirit to discern between truth and error, it was so left for those who can discover the things of God. Jesus Christ never meant that we should love a wicked man in his wickedness. . . . I could refer you to plenty of instances where men have been righteously slain, in order to atone for their sins. I have seen scores and hundreds of people for whom there would have been a chance (in the last resurrection there will be) if their lives had been taken and their blood spilled upon the ground as a smoking incense to the Almighty, but who are now angels to the Devil, until our elder brother Jesus Christ raises them up—conquers death, hell, and the grave.

I have known a great many men who have left this Church for whom there is no chance whatever for exaltation, but if their blood had been spilled, it would have been better for them. The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid these principles being in full force, but the time will come when the law of God will be in full force.

This is loving our neighbor as ourselves; if he needs help, help him; and if he wants salvation and it is necessary to spill his blood on the earth in order that he may be saved, spill it. Any of you who understand the principles of eternity, if you have sinned a sin requiring the shedding of blood, except the sin unto death, would not be satisfied nor rest until your blood should be spilled, that you might gain that salvation you desire. That is the way to love mankind.—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 4, p. 220.

Again, on the 21st of September, 1856, Brigham Young declared:

There are sins that men commit for which they can not receive forgiveness in this world, or in that which is to come. And if they had their eyes open to their true condition they would be perfectly willing to have their blood spilt upon the ground, that the smoke thereof might ascend to heaven as an offering for their sins; and the smoking incense would atone for their sins; whereas, if such is not the case they will stick to them and remain upon them in the spirit world. I know, when you hear my brethren talk about cutting people off from the earth that you consider it strong doctrine; but it is to save them and not to destroy them. It is true that the blood of the Son of God was shed for sins through the fall and those committed by men; yet men can commit sins which it can never remit. . . . There are sins that can be atoned for by an offering upon an altar as in ancient days; and there are sins that the blood of a lamb, of a calf, or of a turtledove can not remit; but they must be atoned for by the blood of the man.—*Deseret News*, vol. 6.

We might produce many other extracts from the sermons of Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball, J. M. Grant, and other leading men of the Brighamite hierarchy, along this line, equally as blasphemous as the

above, breathing forth the same murderous spirit; but our space is limited, and we think the above statements quite sufficient to establish our contention.

This horrible doctrine of blood-atonement, if we can rely upon testimony at all, was not only taught by those people, but it was actually carried into effect. In fact, Brigham acknowledges in one of the above extracts that this awful doctrine was enforced and practiced under his own regime. Note carefully his statement: "I could refer you to plenty of instances where men have been righteously slain in order to atone for their sins." Who were those men to whom he could refer in such a "plenty of instances" who had been "righteously slain" "to atone for their sins," save it were those whose blood cries from the ground to-day for vengeance upon their assassins who in the sacred name of religion had piously cut their throats? And, then, ere the hearts of these victims had scarcely ceased their beating within the quivering flesh, these apostles and leaders of Brighamism, with blood dripping from their fingers, affirmed those men were righteously slain, and their blood had been spilled that the smoking incense thereof might atone for the sins of their soul. And who, knowing these things were taught as a religious obligation by the leaders of Brighamism, can but believe that the awful tragedy known as the Mountain Meadow Massacre was but the culmination and direct result of these murderous teachings? While in prison awaiting his execution, John D. Lee confessed to his having been the officer in charge of the Brighamite forces that performed the awful

tragedy; and a moment before his death, while seated upon his coffin awaiting the fatal ball to summon him into eternity, he affirmed that the horrible butchery was perpetrated under the orders of Brigham Young, and he gave the names of more than forty of his brethren who took part in that awful deed which for treachery and extreme cruelty stands unparalleled in our nation's history.

In 1860, Judge Cradlebaugh, in summing up the evidence in a famous murder case, concluded an address from the bench as follows:

Men are murdered here—coolly, deliberately, premeditatedly murdered. Their murder is deliberated and determined upon by church council-meetings, and that, too, for no other reason than that they had apostatized from your Church and were striving to leave the Territory. You are the tools, the dupes, the instruments of a tyrannical church despotism. The heads of your Church order and direct you. You are taught to obey their orders and commit these horrid murders. Deprived of your liberty, you have lost your manhood, and become the willing instruments of bad men.

No wonder that the Congress of the United States, when treating of the Mormon question, spoke of that institution as the “moral and political pestilence which makes Utah the scandal of the American people.”

CHAPTER X.

NOT only was this blood-atonement theory taught as a principle to be observed and carried out among those people, but those leaders advocated the theory that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost, but that Adam—whom they claim is now the God who reigns in heaven and “the only God with whom we have to do”—appeared unto Mary, and after the same manner that all other children are begotten, so was Jesus begotten, Adam being his literal father. They also teach that Adam helped to organize this world, and that he brought Eve, one of his wives, with him from the eternal world where polygamy is universally practiced, and that his tabernacle, or body, was begotten by his father after the same manner that the bodies of Cain and Abel were begotten. “That God, our heavenly Father, was perhaps once a child, and mortal like we ourselves, and rose step by step in the scale of progress in the school of advancement; has moved forward and overcome until he has arrived at the point where he now is.” That he has many wives, as also that Jesus Christ was a polygamist. They also teach that there are a great many gods, all of whom are polygamists, and rose to their exalted stations by virtue of having embraced polygamy in some other sphere, or world. That all men are gods in the embryotic state, and by obedience to the celestial order of polygamy they may develop into real gods having power to create and rule over worlds in the ages to come; and

that the glory of one's kingdom in the eternal world depends largely upon how many wives and children he has here; so that if a man should have eight or ten wives and forty or fifty children he has a pretty good start with which to begin operations in the glory-land; and the Gentiles, as also those who have died having but one wife, will become but mere angels, who, with all bachelor angels, will be the attendants, the plowmen, vine-dressers, hod-carriers, and, in fine, celestial boot-blacks to wait upon those divinely favored creatures who have been exalted to the station of gods by virtue of obedience to this system of polygamy.

Brigham Young, in a sermon preached in the Tabernacle in Great Salt Lake City, on the 9th of April, 1852, said:

When the Virgin Mary conceived the child Jesus, the Father had begotten him in his own likeness. He was not begotten by the Holy Ghost. And who is the Father? He is the first of the human family. . . . Jesus, our elder brother, was begotten in the flesh by the same character that was in the Garden of Eden, and who is our father in heaven. . . . Now, remember from this time forth, and for ever, that Jesus Christ was not begotten by the Holy Ghost.—*Journal of Discourses*, vol. 1, pp. 50, 51.

Orson Pratt, the renowned apostle of polygamy, says:

The fleshly body of Jesus required a mother as well as a father. Therefore, the father and mother of Jesus, according to the flesh, must have been associated together in the capacity of husband and wife; hence the Virgin Mary must have been, for the time being, the lawful wife of God the Father: we use the term lawful wife, because it would be blasphemous in the highest degree to say that he overshadowed her or begat the Savior unlawfully. . . . He had a lawful right to overshadow the Virgin Mary in the capacity of a husband, and beget a son,

although she was espoused to another; for the law which he gave to govern men and women was not intended to govern himself, or to prescribe rules for his own conduct. It was also lawful in him, after having thus dealt with Mary, to give her to Joseph her espoused husband. Whether God the Father gave Mary to Joseph for a time only, or for time and eternity, we are not informed. Inasmuch as God was the first husband to her, it may be that he only gave her to be the wife of Joseph while in this mortal state, and that he intended after the resurrection to again take her as one of his own wives to raise up immortal spirits in eternity.—The *Seer*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 158, 159.

If the above is not fanatacism gone crazy mad, then I am at a loss to determine what might be so considered. From these, and many other sayings of a like nature, it appears that the highest conceptions those people had of divine or spiritual things were all symbolized by and centered in the grossest sensualism. In the darkened condition of their minds, the gratification of the animal passions seems to have been the *summum bonum* of all spiritual development; and that blasphemous thing which they call a revelation from God, whence they derive the main support for all their abominations, and which they try to fasten onto Joseph Smith as being the giver, virtually tolerates and sanctions all this. Around it clusters every crime in the catalogue of sin, and to all those who take several wives in harmony with this revelation, that being the only condition upon which their salvation is stipulated, is assured celestial glory as a reward for faithfulness, and, although they should then “commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever, and all manner of blasphemies,” and should out-sin Manassas, Nero, or Theodosius, yet they will not be deprived of their

exaltation above all the angels and among the gods, for, notwithstanding all such wickedness as that, "yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection and enter into their exaltation."

That we may the more fully show that these are not exaggerated statements and that among the Brighamites polygamy is the primary source, or center, around which all manner of sin and iniquity clusters, we will refer again briefly to the document from which it derives its main support. Paragraph 26 of that revelation furnishes the following:

Verily, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife according to my word, and they are sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, according to mine appointment, and he or she shall commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever, and all manner of blasphemies, and if they commit no murder, wherein they shed innocent blood—yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection and enter into their exaltation.

The reader will please bear in mind that the "shedding of innocent blood" as above referred to—it being the only crime wherein they are restrained—does not prohibit them from killing a "nasty, vile apostate" or a "wicked Gentile," as innocent blood does not flow in their veins. This restraining clause does not prohibit them from murdering their fellow man, as the phrase "innocent blood" has direct reference to the blood of Jesus Christ which was shed for all men nineteen hundred years ago, and by committing the "unpardonable sin" one becomes *particeps criminis* with those who pierced him, and thus they "crucify unto themselves the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame." That this is what is taught in the revelation, so-called, from which we have just

quoted, I will refer to the succeeding paragraph (27) to prove. It is as follows:

The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which shall not be forgiven in the world, nor out of the world, is in that ye commit murder, wherein ye shed innocent blood, and *assent unto my death*, after ye have received my new and everlasting covenant, saith the Lord God; and he that abideth not this law, can in no wise enter into my glory, but shall be damned, saith the Lord.

Thus we discover that the "shedding of innocent blood" does not signify that they should shed no blood at all, for that would contradict their blood-atonement theory. Therefore, the shedding of innocent blood which is forbidden them, according to this revelation signifies the blasphemy referred to in the above paragraph wherein "assent unto" the death of Jesus Christ is given, which would imbrue their hands in his "innocent blood." But that "nasty apostates" should not be permitted to flourish in Salt Lake City, was the declaration of Brigham Young; and, "I say, rather than apostates should flourish here, I will unsheath my bowie-knife, and conquer or die," is one of his public utterances in which he was upheld by the voice of his Church. It was therefore not accounted as the shedding of "innocent blood" to rid themselves of apostates and those unruly characters who disregarded the counsel of the priesthood; hence, to cut their throats and thus spill their blood was precisely "what Jesus Christ meant," when he told us to "love our neighbor as ourselves." Therefore, "cut them off from the earth," was the counsel Brigham gave. Let their blood be "spilt upon the ground, that the smoke thereof might ascend to heaven," and that "the smoking incense

thereof" might appease the wrath of God, and an act of merit be accorded the man who perpetrated the foul and dastardly murder! Oh, Consistency, Consistency; surely thy name is not Brighamism!

In the nineteenth and twentieth paragraphs of that polygamic revelation we are informed that if a man marry a wife according to this "new and everlasting covenant," said woman being sealed to him by the president of the Church, they "shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights and depths," and if they do not "shed innocent blood,

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 their heads, which glory shall be a fullness and a continuation of the seeds for ever and ever.

Then shall they be gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue; then shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them.

Thus we perceive, according to Brighamism, that if an individual is but a good polygamist, no matter what sins he may commit, so long as he does not shed innocent blood,—though he should steal, rob, plunder, cheat, swear, gamble, lie, commit fornication and perjury,—yet when the golden streamers of light shall flash athwart the universe of God proclaiming that "Time shall be no longer"; when the mountains and hills shall melt like wax, and the earth shall reel to and fro like a drunken man, and be removed out of its place, and cleansed and purified from all deceit, wickedness, and sin, that Christ may reign supremely grand from the rising to the setting of the sun; then,

at that time, these sanctified adulterers, gamblers, and deceitful workers of iniquity shall topple over the battlements into the golden streets of the Holy City, and "pass by the angels and the gods, to their exaltation," because, forsooth, they had taken unto themselves many wives!

This so-called revelation, in order to establish the system of polygamy, gives full latitude to unbridled licentiousness of corrupt and depraved beings; and, as we have shown, no rule of conduct restraining the foulest deeds of libertinism is enjoined upon those who will accept the plural wife theory as being divine. And no matter what sanctity polygamists may now try to throw around that doctrine, or who is responsible for its origin and practice, that so-called revelation of July 12, 1843, hoists to the very highest pinnacle the filthy rag of sensual gratification, and then calling our attention thereto, proclaims it to be the silken folds of chastity and righteousness. But in the light of God's sacred truth, it is proven to be a travesty on Christianity, and its seductive influence is calculated to destroy the smiling hope of innocence. It demoralizes virtue and destroys the peace and happiness of home, leaving naught there to bedeck its sacred walls but the agonizing groans and scalding tears of heart-broken wives, mothers, and daughters, where the embers of youthful memories and happiness slumber beneath the hearth-stone of forgotten days.

Paragraphs one, two, and three of that revelation declare that God was about to reveal a new and everlasting covenant, and that "all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same,"

and if they "abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant, and be permitted to enter into my glory." The term "abide" means more than the mere act of accepting it in a general sense; it is used in the sense of fixedly and permanently adhering thereto, and obediently complying with all its requirements; this being the interpretation rendered in the revelation itself wherein it says: "No one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory." And further on it declares Abraham to have been a polygamist, and commands thus: "Go ye, therefore, and do the works of Abraham; enter ye into my law, and ye shall be saved"; the antithesis of which is: You can not be saved outside of obedience to the doctrine of polygamy. Thus it will be seen that it is made obligatory upon all who expect salvation in the celestial realms of peace to accept and obey this new and everlasting covenant, or be damned, "for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory." According to this revelation, celestial glory is given only to those who accept of the doctrine of polygamy. Polygamy is made the direct and only channel through which one can gain an entrance into the eternal City of Peace; and all those who obey it, by reason of such obedience, and a faithful adherence to that special obligation shall "pass by the angels, and the gods, which are set there, to their exaltation;" and "then shall they be gods." But the poor monogomist whose wife was not sealed unto him "for all eternity," will have nothing to commend him to exaltation, for their "covenant and marriage are not of force when they

are dead and out of the world," because, forsooth, it was not by God's word; had it so been, they would have been "sealed for time and all eternity." Thus that spurious revelation declares, and further affirms of all nonpluralists:

Therefore, when they are out of the world, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are appointed angels in heaven, which angels are ministering servants, to minister for those who are worthy of a far more, and an exceeding, and an eternal weight of glory; for these angels did not abide my law, therefore they can not be enlarged, but remain separately and singly, without exaltation, in their saved condition, to all eternity, and from henceforth are not gods, but are angels of God, for ever and ever.—Paragraphs 15-17.

Poor angels! Because they never had but one wife, or perchance no wife at all, they must remain eternally in single blessedness, deprived of the splendid privilege of associating with those deified polygamists!

But does it not appear that the god of that revelation had made a mistake in making one's salvation contingent on his having several wives, and then failing, himself, to furnish a sufficient number of females for the human family that all might be supplied with the required plurality? I believe the rule stands good the world over that the sexes are pretty evenly divided, the males being in the majority by a small margin. Besides, as a rule, they have the advantage of greater longevity. In the United States the relative percentage of males and females in the whole country has been pretty evenly maintained for the last fifty years, the majority being on the side of the male population, however. In the year of 1850 there were four hundred and eighty-three thousand

four hundred and forty-four more males than females in the United States, but that number was equivalent to two and one tenth per cent of the whole population. The excess of males in 1900 was nearly four times as great, numerically, as in 1850, being one million eight hundred and fifteen thousand and ninety-seven; but that was only two and two fifths per cent of the whole population. The excess of males is now greater than in 1850 by three and one tenth per cent. In the western division of the United States, which includes Utah, there are five hundred and four thousand one hundred and fifteen more males than females, or fifty-six and one fifth per cent males, and forty-three and four fifths per cent females. It therefore must be apparent to all that if A and B take two wives each in order that they may be saved in the celestial realm, then C and D can not obtain celestial glory at all, as A in marrying two wives takes, in addition to his first wife, the woman designed for C; and B, after marrying his second wife, also deprives D of his wife. C and D, not being able, therefore, to get any wives, can not go where God is, but are destined throughout all eternity to be nothing higher than common angels, to do the chores, run on errands, and to wait upon A and B who cunningly and adroitly deprived them of their glory and made slaves of them by taking their intended wives from them to enlarge their own glory. A and B, however, are not particularly to blame—they were simply looking out for themselves. But is it fair upon the part of the god of that revelation to make it obligatory upon man to have a plurality of wives in order to entitle him to an entrance into the

realm of celestial glory, and then not having furnished the necessary quota of females to supply the demand, damn him because he is not a pluralist?

The very fact of our heavenly Father being all-wise, and having ordained in his divine economy the relative equality of the sexes, preponderates very largely against this plural-wife theory and, of itself, shows the absurdity thereof, and proves the god of that revelation to have had but meager foresight and common sense on hand when he dictated it. The god of that revelation is not the God of the Bible; but, as elsewhere shown in this little volume, the power behind the throne and responsible therefor was none other than Brigham Young.

One more paragraph in that so-called revelation should be punctured a little as it seems to us to be directly antipodal to the teaching of Jesus Christ. The statement referred to is in paragraph 41 and reads thus:

And as ye have asked concerning adultery—verily, verily I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man and I have not appointed unto her [this privilege] by the holy anointing she hath committed adultery, and shall be destroyed.

Jesus taught that “He that looketh upon a woman to lust after her” was guilty of the crime of adultery; but here in this pretended revelation is a plain statement to the effect that if a man is only a polygamist, his wife might then be with another man, and still she would not be guilty of adultery, providing that privilege had been “appointed unto her by the holy anointing.” Elder Jones, being a polygamist, and absent from home on a mission, his

wife need not be deprived of male companionship and conjugal association; for, by receiving permission from and being anointed by the president of polygamy, she may have and be with another man, and yet not be guilty of adultery, because this privilege has been "appointed unto her by the holy anointing."

But we can not longer dwell upon this particular phase of the subject, as we think a sufficiency has been adduced to show the absurdity and the absolute inconsistency of the claim of divine inspiration for that pretended revelation of July 12, 1843. And while many who profess a belief in the restoration of the gospel accept as divine this so-called revelation because of the claim which is made by the Brighamite leaders that it was given to Joseph Smith whom they claim to have been a prophet of God, we think there is no need of additional argument to vindicate the honor of Joseph Smith, and that with all fair-minded people we have rescued his name from the odium of originating the scheme of salvation offered in that pretended revelation. But should it still be argued that Joseph Smith taught and practiced polygamy and therefore must be right, we will further say: If Joseph Smith taught or practiced polygamy, he did so in violation of the law of God and the constitutional law of the land, as the highest tribunal of the United States has declared polygamy to be unconstitutional. And as the Constitution existed long before the Supreme Court of the United States declared in harmony with the legislative and executive departments of the nation, it therefore follows that polygamy is not only now, but always has

been out of harmony with the spirit and intent of that instrument. And as God hath declared that he "raised up wise men to frame the Constitution," it follows that whatever principle may be found not in accord therewith is also out of harmony with the divine plan; hence, God has said in recognition of this fact: "He that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land." And in submitting to the Church his law in 1831 relative to the principle of marriage, he declared as follows: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart and cleave unto her and none else." The laws of the land at that time, as well as now, prohibited a man from having more than one wife at the same time—declared bigamy to be a crime, and if Joseph Smith or any other man at any time since the reception of those revelations above referred to—or at any time previous—practiced polygamy, either openly or in secret, they did so in violation of the law of God and the laws of our country.

The law of the state of Illinois, in which Joseph Smith lived in 1843, declared bigamy to be a crime punishable by the civil courts. The American people, through their legislative and law-making departments, declared that if a man had two wives at the same time and lived with them both as his wives, he was a transgressor of the law, and should be dealt with accordingly; wherefore, in view of this fact, seeing that God had declared: "Let no man break the laws of the land; for he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to break the laws of the land," is it reasonable, or is it in harmony with the character of God that he should give a revelation to Joseph

Smith, establishing polygamy, and thus authorize the Church in general to break those very laws he had so specifically counseled them to keep?

Again: If it is true that God "changes not," and that with him "there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning"; whereas he hath declared: "I am God and there is none else; I am God and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure" (Isaiah 46:9, 10), and in thus giving to the human family his counsel which was ordained from the beginning, and which should result in the accomplishment of his pleasure, he hath affirmed that "marriage is ordained of God unto man; wherefore it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation; and that it might be filled with the measure of man"; this being "according to his creation before the world began" (the counsel ordained in the divine economy, prearranged from the beginning), I repeat, if all this be true, is it not foolish and inconsistent to argue that this counsel of God which was ordained from the beginning as the unalterable decree of Jehovah, and which has ever been the expression of his will up to July 12, 1843, did at that time become reversed, and that the unchangeable God then changed, and his counsel as ordained in the beginning that man should have one wife and they twain should be one flesh was to be superceded by a complete reversal of his infallible decree, and that the establishment of another law in direct opposition to

all his previous counsel, in order to the propagation of the human specie had become pleasing and acceptable to him?

Again: If God raised up wise men to frame the Constitution of the United States, how comes it that he inspired men to formulate an instrument which would ultimately defeat the order of plural marriage or polygamy through the interpretation of those provided for therein to be its interpreters? Did he not foresee that they would declare polygamy unconstitutional? And was he acting deceitfully in 1831 when declaring that man should observe the monogamic rule of marriage and "love thy wife [not wives] with all thy heart and shall cleave unto her [not them] and none else," which is declared to be God's will and law "before the world was made"? We leave the reader here to judge of this matter without further argument, feeling assured that the right will be accepted by all unprejudiced, right-minded people; and pass on to consider the subject from other standpoints, and upon other grounds.

CHAPTER XI.

I BELIEVE that polygamy, whether considered from a moral, biblical, or physiological standpoint, is positively irreconcilable with the revelation of God's will to the human family, and that it is most decidedly opposed to the divine institution of marriage as ordained unto man in the beginning; and that it is morally, spiritually, and physiologically antagonistic to the best interests of the human race, and has for its basic principle naught but the vain philosophy and sensual gratification of wicked men. That nowhere in the sacred books of God can there be found a "Thus saith the Lord" to establish its practice, nor a single instance in the history of the world where any nation or people have risen in the scale of moral excellence or spiritual culture as the result of the practice of that principle. I believe, however, that marriage is ordained of God unto man, and that it is conducive to the general health and the happiness of the race; that thereby the intellect is vivified and enlarged and new strength is given to every power; and that it unites and harmonizes the interests of the sexes; and that both men and women are exalted and ennobled by proper marriage; but that excesses in this regard, as in any other principle, work disastrously and should be avoided.

As already observed, I believe marriage to have been ordained of God unto man, and that in the first marriage, in which God himself performed the ceremony, we learn the true nature of matrimony.

Unity, indissolubility, sanctity, — all are there. Unity, because a man should love his wife with all his heart and cleave unto her and none else. Indissolubility, because Jesus when asked by the Pharisees whether or not it was lawful for a man to “put away his wife for every cause,” replied: “Have ye not read that he who made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” Sanctity, also, for God himself blessed them, and said unto them: “Increase and multiply.”

Marriage, then, is a divine institution, the foundation of society, the guarantee of the happiness of woman, who becomes a miserable slave if deprived of the protection afforded her by this divine contract. Marriage is the legal and moral provision for generation among humankind, and should signify not only a union of hearts, but should at all times be the school of virtue where the flowers of Eden perpetually bloom. Thus hath God ordained that white-robed chastity should cement the union of civilization and break down the barriers of jealousy, mistrust, and oppression in the home.

When God created the world he made Eve to be a helpmeet, an associate companion to Adam, a counselor, an equal partner in life; and as Paul has so beautifully presented the true relation that should exist between husband and wife, we direct attention to his words:

Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.—Ephesians 5: 25-28.

There is an unrivaled beauty in these declarations, showing that pure religion and the most profound philosophy go hand in hand with each other, and setting forth the grand principles of married companionship in the same light. The same divine harmony and loving trust existing between Christ and his church should always exist in married couples, both husband and wife keeping themselves “for each other, and from all others, during their lives.” And if for an insufficient cause man divorces his wife and marries another, he is guilty of adultery, the criminality of the second marriage consisting in the fact that the first marriage was not legally dissolved; hence the one so doing has two wives at the same time, which Jesus declares is adultery. How beautiful, therefore, is Paul’s splendid analogy of the husband and wife, and Christ and his church!

Polygamy is evidently immoral, and is nowhere sanctioned by the scriptural law of marriage. God ordained marriage unto man, wherefore “it is lawful that he should have one wife,” and but one, except in case of death, or the transgression of the marriage vow. Professor Sawyer says:

In the marriage state, the intercourse of the sexes is laid under its natural restrictions and allowed its appropriate liberties. The promiscuous intercourse of the sexes is so brutal, and

contrary to the true interests of mankind, that it can not generally prevail, even in the rudest and most savage state of society. Nature and experience concur with the Scriptures in demanding the marriage state as the proper and only proper condition for this intercourse. Partners in marriage are the mutual servants and guardians of each other, and the common protectors and guardians of their offspring.—Sawyer's Moral Philosophy, p. 292.

The sexual constitution creates a necessity for some general plan of association by which the interests of the two sexes may be promoted to the greatest public extent. The law of equal love requires that this plan should be equally beneficial to both the parties. It does not allow that the interests of women should be subordinated to those of men; or those of men to those of women. The plan adopted by the Creator for the accomplishment of this object, is that of permanent voluntary unions, denominated marriage. By uniting two persons of the different sexes in a permanent partnership, marriage gives them common interests; and by the multiplication of these unions, so as to embrace the great mass of both sexes, the interest of those entire masses are concentrated in one common interest, which is the interest of the entire race.—Ibid., p. 276.

Exactly the opposite of all this is witnessed in the whole Mohammedan world. This alone accounts quite sufficiently for the decadent history of the faith which Mohammed planted. A religion which perpetuates the degradation of woman is doomed, and it is dying. Indeed every country is at this moment under a fatal blight where polygamous institutions flourish. This is the secret of the strange condition of Turkey and of Persia. Society is paralyzed by the absence of any sentiment in favor of the elevation of the female part of the community.—The *Christian Commonwealth*, London, 1895.

In Hindustan the wife is the slave of the husband, and their religious books declare positively that man is for his wife a divinity, and that she needs no other devotion than to be obedient and submissive to him. In Utah the exact counterpart of these conditions exist, Brigham Young and his coworkers frequently

urging that husbands were the only saviors of their wives; that a woman could not be exalted without a husband; and that all the women might receive celestial glory, it is said, the church authorities at one time became so urgent for the male members to "take more wives" that if a lady's under garment should be hung out or shaken on a pole there would be a dozen or more men running after and wanting to marry it. That polygamy was rampant in Utah is known the world over. The census returns of 1890 showed almost two and one half per cent of polygamous families belonging to the Mormon Church; and as we have shown in the above, polygamy is the same in every country where it is practiced, in that associated with it always are the most heinous and revolting crimes which seem to be the natural outgrowth of this most unnatural principle. The practice is against the laws of God and of man, and is unnatural, criminal, and revolting.

It is sometimes argued that polygamy is to the best interest of the race in order to rapid population, but this we think to be a mistake. That monogamy is better adapted to rapid and permanent population than is polygamy is shown by statistics and is conceded by the best writers of moral philosophy. Just to the extent that polygamy is practiced does the human family deteriorate, not only spiritually, but morally and physically as well. In harmony with this idea we present the following statement of facts:

The law that binds one man to one woman is indelibly written by nature, that whereas it is violated in general system, the human race is found to deteriorate in mind and form. . . . The

permanent union of one man with one woman establishes a relation of affections and interests which can in no other way be made to exist. . . . Thus in the history of the world we discover that wherever love is created, as it were, and sanctioned by that equality between the sexes which the permanent and holy union of one heart with another proclaims; there, too, patriotism, liberty—the manly and gentler virtues—also find their place; and wherever, on the contrary, polygamy is practiced and love disappears in the gross satiety of the senses, there we find neither respect for humanity nor reverence for home, nor affection for the natal soil.—Royal Path of Life, p. 424.

We are informed in history that the ancient Phoenicians, the Armenians, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Carthaginians, the Medes and Persians, and the Thracians practiced polygamy, and it is also historically true that all had laws and customs relating to women too revolting and indecent to mention. In Africa, from the Great Desert to the Cape of Good Hope, from the coasts of Senegambia to those of Zanzibar, among the Jalofs, the Foulis, the Mandingoes, the negroes of the gold coasts of Congo and of Angola, among the Jagoes, the Hottentots, and among all the other tribes, the status of women is most deplorable. Yet her moral degradation is not greater than in the civilized nations of Asia where polygamy is practiced. In Utah there is no particular difference from the polygamous customs of those heathen nations, the human heart being about the same everywhere. Among whatever people polygamy obtains, whether in Europe, Asia, Africa, or in America, its aim is to destroy in woman the last vestige of her moral nature, leaving only the physical being as the passive instrument of man's pleasure. Among whatever people polygamy is found, there

women are degraded—plunged in ignorance and chained in servitude where gross sensualism vitiates and destroys all the finer sensibilities of domestic felicity, and where all the sentiments which bud and develop under her influence are repressed or destroyed. Adultery and incest go hand in hand with each other, and are the legitimate associates of polygamy. In every age, and in every nation where polygamy is practiced, women are abased and dishonored, while incestuous marriages are freely practiced and condoned. Relationship forms no barrier to the polygamist, nor does the prospective future condition of his offspring restrain his unholy desire, self-gratification being the sole director in the affair, no matter how near akin the coveted prize might be.

Professor R. H. Rivers, D. D., President of the Wesleyan University at Florence, Alabama, says that marriage is designed “to prevent incest, a crime at once the vilest and most revolting to every chaste and refined mind. But however revolting, it prevails wherever polygamy prevails.”—*Elements of Moral Philosophy*, p. 293.

Thus we are informed in the history of different nations where polygamy is practiced that the one goes hand in hand with the other—incest and polygamy. With the Caribees, Chilians, Scythians, and Tartars, a man could marry his own daughter. At Siam, Egypt, and Peru, one might marry his sister, and among the Arabians, Persians, and Parthians a man might espouse his own mother. In Utah, a mother and daughter, or several sisters, may at the same time be sealed in marriage to a pluralist, divine sanction being claimed in justification of the prac-

tice. If, therefore, the law of consanguinity is set aside as the result of the practice of polygamy, and incestuous marriages are condoned and upheld by those who enter into the plurality system, is not this fact alone sufficient to sink the system into the lowest abyss in the minds of all virtuous people?

Nearly all civilized nations, by civil legislation as well as by religious laws, have fixed the degrees of consanguinity within which they refuse to sanction marriage, and this prohibition is based upon the fact that by causing the blood to "return to its source" the race becomes degenerated, and the foundation of society is invaded by destroying the respect children owe to their superiors. Physical diseases are transmitted and become more disastrous and sanguinary by reason of narrowing the circle in which the blood is made to flow, and mental imbecility is more widespread and frequent. Multiplied unions among the same families tend to the premature extinction of races. This fact has been clearly demonstrated in a remarkable work by Doctor Chateauneuf, *The Duration of Noble Families in France*. This learned statistician has proved that nearly all the old families of a portion of Europe have long since ceased to exist. His observations embrace France, Italy, England, and Spain. In Germany, Holland, and Switzerland the male descendants of William Tell have been extinct for nearly two centuries, a withering commentary upon the theory of intermarriages of families.

Doctor Bemis, of Kentucky, has shown that ten per cent of deaf mutes, five per cent of the blind, and about fifteen per cent of the idiots placed in the dif-

ferent establishments of the United States are the issues of consanguineous marriages. This fact alone should be sufficient to expose the enormity of the doctrine of polygamy and help the most illiterate to grasp and determine its true origin and source.

With this array of facts before us, facts which may be obtained by any one who will take the time and look up the statistics and read the conclusions of eminent physiologists who have carefully gone over the matter in detail, one would hardly expect that any people in enlightened America would be guilty of such flagrant violation of the commonly accepted laws of civilization and of open rebellion against the law of God given in the Mosaic code governing the marriage of near relations; but, as before observed, incest "prevails wherever polygamy prevails." We will therefore turn our attention to Utah, hoping, in their case, to find an exception; but, alas! there, as elsewhere, incest, polygamy, and concubinage are legitimized and practiced in the name of religion to the everlasting disgrace and shame of those people.

We are informed in history that Robert Sharky, a merchant of Salt Lake City in 1870, married three sisters, one of whom was divorced from her first husband to marry him; and that two of Brigham Young's favored wives, Clara Decker and Lucy Decker Seely, were sisters, the latter having been the widow of Doctor Isaac Seely, of Nauvoo, Illinois. Also Bishop Smith, living in Brigham City in 1870, had two of his own brother's daughters among the inmates of his harem, "sealed" to him by Brigham Young with a full knowledge of the relationship; and

that the marriage of near relatives at that time was so common that to remark on it, in many of the southern settlements especially, would of itself be considered remarkable. William Hepworth Dixon, in his splendid work, *New America*, says of this practice in Utah:

Incest, in the sense in which we use the word—marriage within the prohibited degree—is not regarded as a crime in the Mormon Church. It is known that in some of these saintly harems, the female occupants stand to their lords in closer relationship of blood than the American law permits. It is a daily event in Salt Lake City for a man to wed two sisters, a brother's widow, and even a mother and daughter. In one household in Utah may be seen the spectacle of three women, who stand toward each other in the relation of child, mother, and grand-dame, living in one man's harem as his wives. I asked the President, whether, with his new light on the virtue of breeding in and in, he saw any objection to the marriage of brother and sister. Speaking for himself, not for the Church, he said he saw none at all.

We may with propriety here submit an extract from the pen of Professor Sawyer in regard to the impropriety of incestuous marriages. He says:

Such is the constitution of human nature, that the intermarriage of near relatives is highly injurious in a physical point of view and produces a perceptible deterioration of the species. The children of such connections inherit the constitutional defects and diseases of their parents, to a degree which is not usual in other cases. If the intermarriage of near relations is pursued by successive generations, it produces a dwarfish stature, a feeble and sickly constitution, and an imbecility of mind approaching to idiocy. Such intermarriages, therefore, are evidently wrong, and are justly prohibited among civilized and Christian nations. The plan of restricting marriages to persons not nearly related, is necessary to preserve the species from becoming essentially deteriorated, and in this respect is of inestimable benefit.—Sawyer's *Moral Philosophy*, pp. 308, 309.

Therefore, if the causing of the blood to return to its source is unfavorable to both physical and moral development, producing both physical and mental aberrations, and thereby the race becomes degraded, degenerated, and morally bankrupt, what shall be said of those practicing a system which not only upholds it, but along with it advocates the doctrine of multiplying wives unto themselves, often taking, as before observed, a mother and daughter, or several sisters, all to be the wives of the same man at the same time? If the crime of incest is revolting and "prevails wherever polygamy prevails,"—goes hand in hand with it—is not this of itself sufficient in establishing the inconsistency of polygamy! No wonder that opposition obtains in all civilized countries against its practice, as it meets not the wants of the heart, of the family, or of civilized nations throughout the world.

Polygamy degrades the character of woman; produces rivalry between the different wives of the same husband, and their children; makes husbands tyrannical; is inconsistent with the nearly equal division of the sexes; and is unfavorable to population. It appears clearly, therefore, that polygamy is not adapted to the human constitution, and is unfriendly to human happiness. God did not institute it at the beginning, and has not done so since. Men have instituted it without divine authority, made full trial of it, and abandoned it throughout the civilized world on account of its disadvantages.—*Ibid.*, p. 301.

The only substitutes for marriage are temporary concubinage and polygamy. Both have been tried, condemned, and abandoned by the civilized world, as inexpedient and impracticable. Temporary concubinage does not meet the essential wants of men and women in respect to permanent companionships, does not make adequate provisions for mothers and children, imposes no salutary restraint on excessive and irregular appetites, and in consequence of its domestic failures, fails utterly of meeting the

general necessities of the state and church. So great are the disadvantages of any system of temporary concubinage, that if it could be generally introduced, and marriage superceded and given up, the population of the world, instead of regularly advancing, as it now does, would experience an immediate and rapid decline, which would continue and increase, till, in the course of a few generations the human race would become extinct. The general adoption of temporary concubinage would be the destruction of the human race.—*Ibid.*, pp. 293, 294.

No one who is aware how closely they are connected can deny the influence which the better or worse conditions of the domestic relations has on those of the society at large. The popular saying that a republic to be permanent must be founded on virtue, appears to be only a consequence of the more general principle that civil freedom is closely connected with morality, and that the one inevitably perishes with the other. Now there is no one custom more adverse to virtue in general, especially the domestic virtues, the chief source of all true patriotism, than that of polygamy. By this many explain the phenomenon that no nation practicing polygamy has ever attained to a true republican constitution, nor even that of a free monarchy. Nay, it may be confidently asserted, that it would be unable to maintain a government of this kind even if presented with it. Polygamy at once produces domestic tyranny, by making woman a slave and man a tyrant; and society at large thus becomes a combination, not of fathers of families, but of household tyrants, who, by the practice of tyranny, have been fitted to endure it. He who is tyrannical in authority will be abject in submission.—*Professor Heeren's Historical Researches*, p. 17.

Senator Brown of Alabama, in 1882, at the time when the Mormon question was being agitated in the legislative halls of our country, speaking of polygamy as practiced by the Brighamite Mormons, said:

I deprecate and denounce it as one of the greatest social evils. I do not believe it should be practiced anywhere. I am ready to unite in imposing such penalties as we can constitutionally impose within the United States upon those who do practice it, because of its immorality.—*Congressional Record*, vol. 13, part 2.

Senator Bayard of Delaware said:

Under the forms of law, the organic law of that [Utah] Territory, every principle of civil and religious and constitutional liberty for the preservation of which this government was ordained, has been displaced by an arbitrary, tyrannical, absolute government, based upon a supposed or a miscalled theocracy.—Ibid., p. 1152.

Francis Wayland, D. D., President of Brown's University and professor of moral philosophy, says of polygamy:

The number of births, of both sexes, under all circumstances, and in all ages, has been substantially equal. Now, if single individuals be not exclusively united to each other, there must arise an inequality of distribution, unless we adopt the law of promiscuous concubinage. But as the [sexual] desire is universal, it can not be intended that the distribution should be unequal; for thus, many would from necessity, be left single, and the other alternative, promiscuous concubinage, would very soon lead us, as we have already remarked, to the extinction of society. The manifest design of nature is to increase the human specie, in the most rapid ratio consistent with the condition of our being. That is always the most happy condition of a nation, and that nation is most accurately obeying the laws of our constitution, in which the number of the human race is most rapidly increasing. Now, it is certain, that, under the law of chastity, as it has been explained, that is, where individuals are exclusively united to each other, the increase of population will be more rapid, than under any other circumstances.—Elements of Moral Science, p. 295.

Note the beautiful harmony existing between the above statement of Mr. Wayland and the following statement of inspiration through the Palmyra Seer:

And again, I say unto you, that whoso forbideth to marry, is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God unto man; wherefore it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might

answer the end of its creation; and that it might be filled with the measure of man, according to his creation before the world was made.—Doctrine and Covenants 49: 3.

We learn from this statement of inspiration that one of the important objects of marriage is that the earth “might be filled with the measure of man,” as designed before the world began; and accordingly the divine mind, knowing the method whereby this result might be obtained in the best possible way, made it “lawful that he [man] should have one wife,” that thus the divine purpose in filling the earth with the measure of man as by him designed should be accomplished. And if in appointing and ordaining the monogamic rule as the best and only “lawful” method of populating and filling the earth with the measure of man, as prearranged and designed before the world was made, into what unfathomable abyss shall we consign any and all systems which assume that the Almighty has now changed his original plan and adopted that which is opposed thereto? If, in order to the accomplishment of the above specified result, it is “lawful” that man should have one wife, does not this restriction affirm, in a negative form, that it is unlawful to have a plurality of wives?

Inspiration here declares that the heaven-ordained method for filling the earth with the measure of man according to his creation before the world was made, was that man should have one wife; and according to Mr. Wayland, scientific investigation has demonstrated to a certainty that “where individuals are exclusively united to each other, the increase of population will be more rapid, than under any other circumstances.” Thus inspiration and moral science

are found to be in perfect harmony. Inspiration affirms and moral science demonstrates.

In consonance with the above may be found the concurrent testimony of all writers of note on moral philosophy. Doctor Paley, that great writer and author, says in regard to polygamy:

If to one man be allowed an exclusive right to five or more women, four or more men must be deprived of the exclusive possession of any; which could never be the order intended. This equality, indeed, is not quite exact. The number of male infants exceed that of females in the proportion of nineteen to eighteen, or thereabouts; but this excess provides for the greater consumption of males by war, sea-faring, and other dangerous or unhealthy occupations. It seems also a significant indication of the divine will, that he at first created only one woman to one man. Had God intended polygamy for the species, it is probable he would have begun with it; especially as by giving to Adam more wives than one, the multiplication of the human race would have proceeded with a quicker progress. Polygamy not only violates the constitution of nature, and the apparent design of the Deity, but produces to the parties themselves, and to the public, the following bad effects: contests and jealousies amongst the wives of the same husband; distracted affections, or the loss of all affection in the husband himself; a voluptuousness in the rich which dissolves the vigor of their intellect as well as active faculties, producing that indolence and imbecility, both of mind and body, which have long characterized the nations of the East; the abasement of one half of the human species, who, in countries where polygamy obtains, are degraded into instruments of physical pleasure to the other half; neglect of children; and the manifold and sometimes unnatural mischiefs which arise from a scarcity of women. To compensate for these evils, polygamy does not offer a single advantage. In the article of population, which it has been thought to promote, the community gain nothing (nothing, I mean, compared with a state in which marriage is nearly universal); for the question is not, whether one man will have more children by five or more wives than by one; but whether

these five wives would not bear the same or a greater number of children to five separate husbands. And as to the care of children when produced, and the sending of them into the world in situations in which they may be likely to form and bring up families of their own, upon which the increase and succession of the human species in a great degree depend, this is less provided for and less practicable, where twenty or thirty children are to be supported by the attention and fortunes of one father, than if they were divided into five or six families, to each of which were assigned the industry and inheritance of two parents. . . . Whatever may be said in behalf of polygamy, when it is authorized by the law of the land, the marriage of a second wife, during the lifetime of the first, in countries where such a marriage is void, must be ranked with the most dangerous and cruel of those frauds by which a woman is cheated out of her fortune, her person, and her happiness.—Paley's Moral Philosophy, vol. 1, pp. 319-325.

If the above statement of Mr. Paley approximates the real facts and result of polygamy, with what language is it possible to describe the ultimate result of its continuous practice? Surely any person possessing even ordinary perceptive faculties can discern that to the extent the law of chastity is violated the love of offspring diminishes; and polygamy, according to the statement of Jesus Christ, is naught but open adultery, and wherever practiced destroys the pure gem of chastity, and should therefore be dethroned. Another writer has said of this subject:

What domestic happiness can be expected in a house continually agitated by the ceaseless jealousy of several wives, and the interminable quarrels of their several broods of children? . . . How can filial love dwell in the bosoms of children, the progeny of one father by several wives or concubines? . . . The name of parent would signify no more in man than in the brutes. Man, instead of being social, would become nothing more than a gregarious animal, distinguished from his fellow animals by nothing else than greater intellectual capacity, and the more disgusting abuse of it. . . . No reason can be assigned, why

the intellectual, moral and civil happiness of the one sex is not as valuable in the sight of the Creator, as that of the other. Much less can any reason be assigned, why the one sex should be to the other merely a source of sensual gratification. But just as we depart from the law of chastity, as it has been here explained, woman ceases to be the equal and the companion of man, and becomes either his timid and much-abused slave, or else the mere instrument for the gratification of his lust.—Elements of Moral Science, pp. 297, 298.

Polygamy tends directly to the deep degradation of woman: it makes her a slave: her power and influence are gone, and her light is quenched. Polygamy must produce constant strife and discord in the domestic circle. Jealousies and constant wranglings exist among the wives of the harem, and vexations and distrust on the part of the husband. Mutual confidence is destroyed, and real conjugal affection is unknown. Polygamy tends to the degradation of the children. The masculine energy of the father, as well as the womanly tenderness of the mother, is needed in the rearing of children. If the mother's tenderness is wanting, the children become savage; if the father's energy is withdrawn, they become effeminate. It is impossible in the unnatural state of polygamy for the father to give the proper attention to the intellect, the morals, and the entire development of his children. Polygamy tends naturally to weaken the race. The tendency of licentiousness is ever in that direction. It enervates the race both in mind and body. Polygamy tends to produce unnatural crimes, and the grossest and most loathsome forms of licentiousness.—Ibid., pp. 289, 290.

While in Salt Lake City, and conversing with an eminent doctor there, who had gathered many facts in regard to this system [polygamy], he stated that nature strives to correct it, for the male children born in it are in the majority, and degenerate also, extremely liable to precocity in the direction of the social evil. . . . It is universally conceded that their children are much more liable to die than others, and if they live they are remarkable examples of natural depravity.—David H. Smith, in *The Bible versus Polygamy*, p. 14.

Thus we might continue to multiply evidence against the doctrine of polygamy, showing that it is

disadvantageous to the nations of the earth in order to rapid population; that it is subversive of human happiness and liberty, and trails in the dust the royal banner of freedom and the sacred rights of woman; and from a moral point of view is like a cankering fester or mountainous wave of pollution indulging the sensual passions of voluptuous men to the entire subversion of female chastity, which is the very cement of civilization and progress.

From the *Kinsman*, a magazine published in Salt Lake City, Utah, for June, 1900, in which the editor discusses the prevalence of prostitution and its causes, we extract the following:

To tell the truth, this tendency towards the social evil is a thousand times greater among the people who have been testing this method [polygamy] of preventing it than among any other class of people that I have ever known. The houses of prostitution in Utah are filling up with Mormon girls; and we are supplying inmates for such houses for all the surrounding country, including Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada.

A terrible charge this, a most revolting condition, and an avalanche of argument against the doctrine of polygamy, if only half true.

But leaving this line of argument, we will now direct the reader's attention for a few moments to the precepts enunciated by the great Teacher of mankind, and ascertain, if we can, whether he approved or disapproved of the doctrine of polygamy.

We are fully aware that polygamous Mormons teach that Jesus Christ was a polygamist; that Mary, and Martha, and probably Mary Magdalene were all wives of Jesus; but the absurdity of this claim will appear the moment we accept the idea that

Jesus Christ was what he claimed himself to be. That the life of Jesus was in beautiful harmony with the precepts and principles of doctrine which he taught, we think should be conceded by all; and that in his teachings he most assuredly taught against polygamy, we shall now presently see.

When the Pharisees came to Jesus and questioned him with regard to the lawfulness of divorce for any and every cause, Jesus answered them, saying:

Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.—Matthew 19: 9.

Doubtless there will be no question that Jesus here taught that a man was not justified in putting away his wife for any cause save that of adultery; but in case adultery was committed by either party, the other had a right to divorce the guilty one. But if any man put away his wife for any other cause than that herein described, and should then marry another woman, he is chargeable with the crime of adultery. The act alone of putting away or divorcing the innocent wife is not in and of itself adultery, but adultery consists in marrying a second woman during the legal existence and obligation of the first wife; therefore, if adultery is the result of marrying a second woman after the first wife is improperly put away, what else than adultery can it be to marry a second or third woman without any pretense whatever of divorcing the first wife? Thus Jesus in affirming that adultery is the result of a second marriage during the lifetime of the first wife, who had been improperly divorced from her husband, stamps the plural wife system as adulterous and wicked. For,

if "whosoever shall put away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery against her," it must be perceived that whosoever marrieth another woman without putting away the first wife is also guilty of adultery; because, as before observed, should a man put away his wife for any cause whatever, that, in and of itself, is not adultery, though it might be extremely cruel; but should he marry another woman during the lifetime of his illegally repudiated companion, by so doing he becomes an adulterer. There is no such a thing as dodging the issue that whosoever marrieth a second wife without putting away the first for the cause above specified is guilty of crime, and should be punished accordingly. The imputation, therefore, that Jesus Christ sanctioned, countenanced, or practiced polygamy, is shown to be a base slander upon the character and teachings of the Christ of God!

Marriage is a divine institution, ordained of God unto man, and it is therefore lawful that he should have one wife; but whenever he marries a second wife, save in the case of death or transgression of the wife of his youth, no matter what pretense of inspiration may be thrown around his act in thus marrying her, the above statement of the Son of God constitutes an invulnerable fortress against such action; and backed by all the authority of the courts of justice in the eternal realms, declares such a one to be an adulterer, against whom the Savior of men will be a swift witness when he shall come as the Lion of the Tribe of Judah to execute vengeance in the earth, and measure unto every man according as his works shall be.

CHAPTER XII.

IN CONSIDERING polygamy from a Bible standpoint, we will notice a few leading thoughts briefly, as our article is getting quite lengthy, and other pens much more able than ours have elaborated from this basis against the unscripturalness of this unnatural principle. We will therefore first observe that when God ordained marriage, two distinct objects are pointed out in the divine arrangement wherein this heaven-ordained principle was designed to bless the race. First, companionship is clearly and distinctly specified. "It is not good that man should be alone." "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." Thus we discover that the very essence of marriage is a duality; and therefore the Apostle Paul hath said: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband." If every woman is to have her own husband, polygamy is excluded, as it is impossible for the spirit and genius of this instruction to be carried out where the husband of Mary Jane is also the husband of Nancy Ann. In such a case, Mary Jane does not, can not have her own husband, as Nancy Ann has him; and Nancy Ann can not have him, because he belongs to Mary Jane. At best the husband is divided between the two; and should a man have twenty wives, each wife would have but her proportionate share—the twentieth part of a husband—and could not therefore have her own husband, as nine-

teen other women have an equal claim with her upon the precious fellow. Such a division of the affections is utterly at war with that "sweet egotism of the heart" called love, which is indeed the mainspring of all true marriages, and without which I question divine approval as ever sanctioning the union. Thus the one object of this holy association or companionship is a higher development of the whole man, male and female, and by this alone it is sanctified.

Another object in marriage is, it is the means designed by our heavenly Father for the peopling of the earth; and in order to its most rapid progress consistent with the general laws of physical well-being, together with our moral, mental, and spiritual development, the liberties of sexual intercourse implanted within the sexes, in order to the perpetuity and procreation of the race, were confined within the limits of the marriage relation of one man and one woman. Hence God said of Adam: "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helpmeet for him." "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it."

In the beginning, when God created the human specie, he created them male and female, the uniting together of which constituted a complete organization: "They twain shall be one flesh." Hence the statement: "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created."—Genesis 5: 1, 2. It took the male and female to con-

stitute the "Adam," proper, or the entire man; and through this divinely appointed union the work of God was completed, made perfect, and this arrangement was expressly designed for companionship, and for the propagation of the species; hence God commanded the Adam to be fruitful and multiply. If therefore the male and female constitute a complete man, does not the supplying of an additional female appear as an incubus fastened upon the perfected work of God? And if God designed by this union of one male and one female to perpetuate the race, is not polygamy in violation of the divine plan and opposed thereto, forming an alliance with some power antagonistic to that of God for the frustration of his purposes? We think so.

The method employed by our heavenly Father in order to the accomplishment of his design in filling the earth with its full measure of man, was that of monogamy—one man and one woman. If the race would generate faster and better under the practice of polygamy than it would under the observance of the one wife system, why did not our heavenly Father employ that method in the beginning for the accomplishment of his purpose instead of employing the principle of monogamy?

We are told in the Bible that God made them (Adam and Eve) one, "and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created"; and notwithstanding he had "the residue of the spirit," yet he made them one "that he might seek a godly seed"; and counsels all men, therefore, to "take heed to your spirit, and let none deal unfaithfully against the wife of his youth." If, there-

fore, in the beginning, when God joined Adam and Eve together and made them one, he began the propagation of the human family under the monogamic rule, that he might "seek a godly seed," do not all they who advocate the doctrine of polygamy as being the most rapid and better method of propagation virtually affirm that our heavenly Father did not understand what he was about, and that he simply started the whole matter of peopling the earth upon the basis of mere speculation rather than by the principle of omniscience? If polygamy had been the better method, why was it not adopted by the great Architect of the universe in the beginning? Certain it is, if the Bible be true, that the doctrine of polygamy was excluded from the divine economy in the beginning of the human race; and its first appearance recorded in sacred history being many hundreds of years after the divine institution in Eden, was then introduced by Lamech, one of the wicked descendants of Cain, and a murderer. (See Genesis 4: 19-24.) And when polygamy began to be practiced, insomuch that "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose" (Genesis 6: 2), it is affirmed that "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. . . . And the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth" (Genesis 6: 2-12). God therefore affirmed that his "spirit should not always strive with man," which logically implies that when those sons of God

began practicing polygamy, took them wives of all which they chose, the Spirit of God still plead with them; but finding them incorrigible, that their imaginations and thoughts were continuously evil, all flesh having corrupted itself before God, and that in consequence of this wicked practice of polygamy and other excesses and licentious doctrines, "God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth."—Genesis 6: 13.

If polygamy is not here stamped with God's disapproval, it seems to me that words will hardly explain wherein his displeasure of any system or theory might be expressed. If those "sons of God" were men holding the priesthood, as affirmed by some, and if polygamy was sanctioned of God, why did he destroy them and save Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, they being men who believed in and adhered to the monogamic rule?

Another instance wherein it became necessary to adopt measures for the repeopling of the earth, was by the flood, all flesh having been destroyed, save Noah and his wife, his three sons with their one wife each,—eight in all. Surely, if polygamy is adapted to the rapid development of a "godly seed" in the earth, it should have been employed to bring about these conditions: but, alas for polygamy, incompetency and crime are emblazoned upon its withered brow, and, void of divine approval, it was relegated to the darkened chambers of Satan's mystic vale, and the monogamic rule—the divinely established principle of one man and one woman, they twain

shall be one flesh—was again employed by the great Ruler of earth and sky for the accomplishment of his purpose.

After the flood, when man again began to fill the earth with iniquity, the Lord chose Abraham, a man who had but one wife, as the spiritual progenitor of the human family. But just here, no doubt, many will say: "He has blundered, has made a mistake. Abraham was a polygamist, and God approved of him while in its practice, and therefore polygamy is a divine institution." But we have spoken advisedly, and challenge one instance in which Abraham in the entire record was spoken of by God or the holy angels, or by an apostle or prophet to have had more than one wife at the same time. Hagar was never his wife; he never called her his wife, neither did God, angel, nor any inspired servant of the Most High speak of her as such. Abraham was not a polygamist, though he was guilty of very gross impropriety with Hagar, Sarah's Egyptian maid. But let it be remembered that thirteen years after this great impropriety, God appeared to him, and said unto him: "Walk before me, and be thou perfect" (Genesis 17:1); and that God did not sanction his association with Hagar is evident from the fact of his having commanded him to put her away, which was faithfully performed by Abraham. The history of the case is as follows:

"Now the Lord said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great. . . . And they went forth

to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came. . . . And the Lord appeared unto Abraham, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land.”—Genesis 12: 1-7. Ten years had passed away after this promise was made, and still “Sarah was barren; she had no child”; and thinking God had restrained her from bearing, she said unto Abraham: “I pray thee, go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her.” And Abraham hearkened unto the suggestion, and Sarah took Hagar, her Egyptian maid, “and gave her to her husband Abraham, to be his wife.”—Genesis 16: 1-3.

I call special attention to the fact that all this was the result of Sarah’s suggestion, perhaps through her eager desire for the fulfillment of the promise of God relative to the land of Canaan and Abraham’s seed, and that there is thus far no evidence anywhere that God had anything to do with this arrangement. Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham that she might thus, by proxy, raise up children unto Abraham; but Abraham never spoke of Hagar as his wife, but always referred to her as “thy maid.” Nor did Sarah again speak of her as the wife of Abraham, but afterwards referred to her as “my maid,” or “this bondwoman.” Besides this, the angel of the Lord when calling her said: “Hagar, Sarai’s maid, whence camest thou? and whither wilt thou go? And she said, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarai. And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Return to thy mistress, and submit thyself under her hands.”—Genesis 16: 8, 9.

If Hagar was Abraham’s wife, why did not the angel so recognize her when he found her alone in

the wilderness, and say unto her: "Hagar, Abraham's wife, return to thy husband," instead of calling her Sarai's maid with the instruction to return to her mistress? The angel calls her Sarai's maid, and Abraham, himself, when conversing with Sarah regarding Hagar, calls her "thy maid," and Sarah, after persuading Abraham to go in unto Hagar that she might obtain children by her, when seeing the great evil which has been done, confessed to him that it was wrong, and said: "My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid into thy bosom; and when she saw that she had conceived, I was despised in her eyes: the Lord judge between me and thee." —Genesis 16: 5.

Here Sarah acknowledges she had done wrong by giving Hagar to Abraham, and chides him for permitting it, virtually saying: "Why did you consent to this great evil? You being the head of the family, and a servant of the most high God, should have known better than to hearken to my unwise suggestion. My wrong be upon thee; the Lord judge between me and thee."

To prove that this great evil was not sanctioned by our heavenly Father, the history informs us that in process of time God visited Sarah, and she conceived, and unto Abraham was born a son whom they called Isaac, in fulfillment of the promise of God previously given; and this wonderful event, impressing more deeply and pungently upon Sarah's mind the wrong she had committed in giving Hagar to Abraham, said unto him: "Cast out this bondwoman and her son. But Abraham was sore displeased at the suggestion, and was rather inclined to disregard her

counsel, for "the thing was grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son," Ishmael, who had been born unto him of Hagar. "And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called."—Genesis 21: 10-12.

Note the phraseology, in that God commanded Abraham to hearken unto the voice of Sarah when she demanded that Hagar should be cast out; and instructed him to let it not be grievous unto him because of Ishmael, neither "because of thy bondwoman." Why did not God here call Hagar Abraham's wife, if, indeed, she was his wife? Why call her Abraham's bondwoman?

And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed. And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba.—Genesis 21: 13, 14.

Instead of God having sanctioned the action of Abraham or having recognized Hagar as Abraham's plural wife, he affirmed Sarah's confession relating to the matter as her "wrong," and instructed Abraham to stay the perpetuation of the evil association by hearkening unto the voice of Sarah to "cast out this bondwoman," to all of which the patriarch assented, which stamps in ruthless ignominy and shame that pretended revelation of July 12, 1843, which declares that Abraham was a polygamist. True, Keturah was also the wife of Abraham, but

not during the lifetime of Sarah. Sarah died eighteen hundred and sixty years before Christ, and it was not until seven years after, or in the year 1853 B. C. that he married the second time! (See Genesis 23:1, 2; 25:1.)

Another point to which we would direct special attention, is the fact that it is nowhere in the Bible either stated or implied that Isaac was a polygamist; but rather points him out as being opposed to polygamy, as it informs us that "Esau was forty years old when he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite: which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and Rebekah."—Genesis 26:34, 35.

But notwithstanding all this, that so-called revelation makes Joseph Smith ask of the Lord wherein he "justified Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; as also Moses, David, and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines." Can it be that this alleged revelation seeks to justify concubinage, as also polygamy? Surely it does; and not only that, but it also affirms that both Isaac and Moses not only had many wives, but that they kept concubines as well; and yet there is no evidence outside of this absurd forgery that either Isaac or Moses had more than one wife at any time, or that either of them kept a concubine. The absurdity of this falsehood is only equaled by the effrontery of the author of that revelation wherein he justifies a man's wife in having intercourse with another man, provided this privilege should be "appointed unto her by the holy anointing," as referred to elsewhere in this article. Polygamy justi-

fied, concubinage sanctified, and adultery appointed by the "holy anointing"! If this is not legalized whoredom, what words can we use to express such a condition? And yet we are asked to accept that absurd, inconsistent document as a revelation from God!

That Brigham Young, in his heart, did not believe in the doctrine of polygamy as a divine principle as set forth in that pretended revelation, I believe, and I submit the following as evidence of this statement:

When Ann Eliza—one of the women whom Brigham Young had married according to the customs and regulations of practical polygamists in Utah, under the sanction of that alleged revelation—sued him for divorce and alimony, Brigham went into court and swore as follows:

And the defendant further answering alleges, that at the town of Kirtland, in the state of Ohio, on the tenth day of January, A. D. 1834, this defendant being then an unmarried man, was duly and lawfully married to Mary Ann Angell, by a minister of the gospel, who was then and there by the laws of said State, authorized to solemnize marriages. And that the said marriage was then and there fully consummated, and that the said Mary Ann Angell, who is still living, then and there became, and ever since has been, the lawful wife of this defendant, all of which said facts the said complainant on the said sixth day of April, 1868, and for a long time prior thereto had full knowledge and information.

Brigham further swore that when he took Mrs. Ann Eliza Dee to be his nineteenth polygamous wife, she was at that time the lawful wife of James L. Dee, "never, as this defendant [Brigham Young] is now advised and believes, having been divorced from the said James L. Dee."

If Mary Ann Angell was, at that time, Brigham Young's only legal wife, what was the status of those other seventeen women who had been made to believe that they were also his wives, and had been deceived by him into polygamous marriages, as also the hundreds of other women sealed unto other leading lights of Brighamism?

This statement of Brigham Young is an acknowledgment on his part that all those women, other than Mary Ann Angell, unto whom he had been sealed and with whom he had lived and associated as his wives, and who had borne children unto him, were, in his estimation, no other than religious sports with whom he was hiding his illicit intercourse behind that alleged revelation.

This thought becomes strengthened when we consider that notwithstanding the alleged revelation teaches that the sealing of plural wives is for all eternity, Brigham claimed the right and the authority to divorce the parties to that "contract for eternity," which, for a money consideration, he would do wherever petty grievances obtained. Thus, under Brigham's regime, one might be sealed to any bright, young, virtuous girl, and after living with her for a short time he could send her adrift with her helpless child on the charity of a cold-hearted world, simply by paying Brigham Young ten dollars for untying the celestial knot. Splendid contract, that, for all eternity! In support of the truthfulness of this position, I cite the *Journal of Discourses*, volume 8, page 202, which reads as follows: "The teasers who come all the time after women, and soon get tired of them and want to divorce them, I make pay ten

dollars for each divorce, and that is my individual bank.”

Again, Brigham said in a sermon delivered September 21, 1856:

I wish my women to understand that what I am going to say is for them, as well as all others, and I want those who are here to tell their sisters, yes, all the women of this community, and then write it back to the States, and do as you please with it. I am going to give you from this time until the sixth day of October next for reflection, that you may determine whether you wish to stay with your husbands or not, and then I am going to set every woman at liberty, and say to them: now go your way, my women with the rest, go your way. 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. Let every man thus treat his wives, keeping raiment enough to clothe his body; and say to your wives, “take all that I have and be set at liberty; but if you stay with me you shall comply with the law of God, and that without any murmuring and whining. You must fulfill the law of God in every respect, and round up your shoulders to walk up to the mark without grunting.”—*Deseret News*, vol. 6.

CHAPTER XIII.

HAVING shown from the Bible that upon two separate instances wherein it was necessary to adopt measures the best adapted to rapid population, that monogamy was the method chosen of God in order to the accomplishment of the purpose designed by our heavenly Father in filling the earth with the measure of man, I will advert to one more instance of a like nature; and, if finding the principle of monogamy again employed for that purpose, surely we will then have a three-fold cord which may not be broken.

The Book of Mormon, in giving us the history of Lehi's coming to this country, informs us that in process of time wickedness began to be very general and grievous in the land; and that the Nephites began to indulge in many wicked practices, of which the doctrine of having many wives and concubines formed a part. And the word of the Lord came unto the prophet, "Saying, Jacob, get thee up into the temple on the morrow, and declare the word which I shall give thee, unto this people." And Jacob, doing as he was directed of God, says: "Because of the strict commandment which I have received from God, to admonish you according to your crimes," his soul being burdened because, "according to the strict command of God" he was constrained to tell them of their "wickedness and abominations, in the presence of the pure in heart." And in thus reprov- ing them for their sins, he declares against pride, the darkened path through which it leads, and says:

And were it not that I must speak unto you concerning a grosser crime, my heart would rejoice exceedingly, because of you. But the word of God burthens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold, thus saith the Lord, This people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures: for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son. Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord, wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: for there shall not any man among you have save it be *one wife*: and concubines he shall have none: For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me: thus saith the Lord of hosts.—Wherefore, this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes.—Book of Mormon, pp. 115, 116.

The above is proof positive that the one wife system is the only plan consistent with the divine mind, and that polygamy is a crime. Our heavenly Father here calls it “whoredom,” and “an abomination.” The one wife system was therefore the only method pleasing to God in colonizing ancient America, for which purpose God led Lehi from Jerusalem unto this land. Therefore, if polygamy is declared by our heavenly Father to be an abominable thing; that it is a system of whoredom; is a gross crime as declared in the above extract; how in the name of consistency any person can make the claim for it as having been transformed into a virtue and expect any one of ordinary intelligence who is accustomed

to doing his own thinking to accept it as such, is one of the mysteries I am not able to solve.

“But,” says one, “can’t you see the provision the Lord has made here for the introduction of polygamy, in that he hath said: ‘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’; showing that the people should observe the monogamic rule *unless* the Lord should desire to specially raise up seed, in which event he would command his people otherwise? That is to say, he would command them to take a plurality of wives, that he might raise up seed unto himself. Here is the loop-hole in the Book of Mormon for the introduction of polygamy.”

We will examine this argument and see whether or not it is the logical deduction from the words of the prophet. And as the whole argument hinges upon the use of the word “otherwise,” it will be well for us to ascertain what the meaning of that word is, and in what sense it is used in the above extract. I confess that I can not see where there is any proper grounds from which the above argument can be logically deduced, but rather think that the word “otherwise” makes the prohibition of polygamy more sweeping and emphatic than if it had not been employed, instead of leaving a loop-hole for the introduction of polygamy as it is sometimes asserted.

Note the phraseology of the prophet leading up to this particular statement: “I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph.” And

in order to the accomplishment of that specific object of "raising up a righteous branch" or "seed" unto himself, he declared: "I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people should do like unto them of old. . . . For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife: and concubines he shall have none. . . . Therefore, this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes." Thus we see that the law given of God for "raising up seed unto himself," was that of monogamy; and that when he had led that colony of people from Jerusalem for the purpose above specified, he gave them the monogamic rule in order to the accomplishment of that object. God having led the people out from Jerusalem by the hand of power, for the very important and specific purpose of raising up seed unto himself, after giving the monogamic rule in order to the carrying out of that object to its full completion which he had purposed to accomplish, he declares that "otherwise" (which is defined by Webster to mean, "(1) In a different manner; (2) By other causes; and (3) In other respects"), no matter what the circumstances or conditions by which they were surrounded might be,—in all cases, "they shall hearken unto *these things*," namely, to have but one wife. The word "otherwise," therefore, does not open the door for polygamy, but closes the door more effectually against it than if it were not used, and affirms that under all circumstances and conditions in life one should observe to have but one wife; and if the Lord should desire to raise up seed, he would command his people, as in Exodus, chapter one. He

always acts like himself. Another point to which we advert, is the fact that polygamy as practiced by David and Solomon, as also concubinage, is called an abomination before God. (See the foregoing quotation in the Book of Mormon.) And still that alleged revelation of July 12, 1843, the basis of Brighamite polygamy, declares:

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

This revelation makes God himself the giver of David's wives, as also the giver of all his concubines, and declares it was no sin upon the part of David, notwithstanding that in the Book of Mormon God calls it a *crime*, and says David's having had many wives and concubines, "was abominable before me saith the Lord." Did God tell the truth when in the Book of Mormon he declared polygamy and concubinage to be a crime, an abomination? If so, then the above quotation from that alleged revelation is false, as it is in opposition to God's statement in the Book of Mormon. And we remark: If God gave David his polygamous wives as declared in the above extract from that so-called revelation, then God becomes *particeps criminis* in that which he hath declared to be a crime and an abomination before him!

Having seen that polygamy is called a crime, an abomination, and that it is opposed to the revelations previously given to the Church as found in both the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants, I

direct attention to a few more passages of scripture, to ascertain to what extent, if any, polygamy was enjoined or condoned by our heavenly Father.

We have disposed of the case of Abraham, showing from the Bible that he was not a polygamist, and that God commanded him to cease the illegitimate relations existing between him and Hagar, the Egyptian bondwoman, and walk before God and be perfect; that polygamy as practiced by David and Solomon was an abomination before God; and that the Bible declares that Solomon's wives "turned away his heart" from serving the God of Israel. (See 1 Kings 11:1-14.) And so, by a parity of reasoning, if polygamy was abominable before God in the case of David and Solomon, so would it also be an abomination before him if practiced by any other man or set of men.

The law as given on Mount Sinai was prohibitive of polygamy. That law declared it to be an "abominable custom," and classes it with the sin of defilement with the beasts of the field (a most horrible thought), and with adultery, and lust, and all the abominations of the Egyptians, the Canaanites, and other nations, who, because of their defilements were cast out of the land. See Leviticus 18, wherein it is specifically stated that, "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another [marginal reading], to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her lifetime." And, "Moreover thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbor's wife, to defile thyself with her. . . . Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with woman-kind: it is an abomination; neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith. . . . Defile

not yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: . . . therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein.”—Leviticus 18: 18–30.

The taking of one wife to another, or multiplying wives, is here specified as one in the list of the “abominable customs” practiced by those wicked nations, which were enjoined upon Israel not to commit. Turning now to Deuteronomy, and reading the law that was given of God to govern the children of Israel, we learn that it strictly prohibited their king from having more than one wife, the inference being that he should be an example of purity unto the people. The instruction therein given was: “Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.”—Deuteronomy 17: 16, 17.

Here then is a law furnishing an absolute prohibition of polygamy. He shall not multiply wives unto himself, is the positive command. And notwithstanding Solomon had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines in violation of this divine command, and in consequence of which his heart was turned away from God, the counsel which he gives in the face of all his experience in polygamous relations was to the end that the law of God governing in this matter should be kept in that everywhere men should avoid these excesses, and: “Let thy fountain be blessed: and rejoice with the wife [not wives] of thy youth. Let her [not them] be as the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy

thee *at all times*; and be thou ravished always with her love.”—Proverbs 5: 18, 19. Surely there is no room for polygamy here. And in what beautiful harmony are the words:

Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue [or excellency] of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously [or unfaithfully, see margin] against the wife of his youth.—Malachi 2: 14, 15.

By referring to verses 11, 12, and 13, we learn that Judah had dealt treacherously, had profaned the holiness (or holy law) of the Lord, and thus committed an “abomination” in Israel; and notwithstanding they covered the altar of the Lord with their tears, yet he regarded not their offering, neither did he receive it, because they had dealt unfaithfully with their wives. But “the Lord, the God of Israel saith, if he hate her put her away”; notwithstanding he who doeth this “covereth violence with his garment, saith the Lord of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.”

Taking the above from the “law and the prophets,” and finding Jesus in Matthew, chapter 19, opposed to polygamy, as we have shown elsewhere in this article; and finding Paul affirming that in order that the law of God should be kept, “every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband”; and reading in Revelation that God hated the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which was the doctrine of polygamy; and knowing, as we have shown, that

polygamy is mentally, morally, physically, and spiritually antagonistic to the best interest of the human family; that it stands in the way of rapid population and progress; and is dwarfish and licentious in its tendencies, what good ground is left upon which to construct any argument in its defense? The Bible speaks of it as an *abomination*; the Book of Mormon calls it *whoredom*, a *crime*; in the Doctrine and Covenants God calls it a *crime*; the laws of nature itself call it a *crime*; and all civilized nations declare it to be a *crime*; and that it is morally, spiritually, and physiologically inconsistent with the nature and constitution of the human family, and brings about abnormal conditions wherever practiced. Therefore is it not absolutely inconsistent with reason and common sense to ask any one to adopt the system of a plurality of wives in lieu of God's positive law that two shall be one flesh, and man shall have but one wife, and concubines he shall have none? The following excellent statement of Professor Beatie on this subject may be very appropriately introduced:

When we reflect that the primitive institution of marriage limited it to one man and one woman; that this institution was adhered to by Noah and his sons, amidst the degeneracy of the age in which they lived, and in spite of the examples of polygamy which the accursed race of Cain had introduced; when we consider how very few (comparatively speaking) the examples of this practice were among the faithful; how much it brought its own punishment with it; and how dubious and equivocal those passages are in which it appears to have the sanction of the divine approbation; when to these reflections we add another respecting the limited views and temporary nature of the more ancient dispensations and institutions of religion—how often the imperfections and even vices of the patriarchs and

people of God in old times are recorded, without any express notification of their criminality—how much is said to be commanded, which our reverence for the holiness of God and his law will only suffer us to suppose were for wise ends permitted; how frequently the messengers of God adapted themselves to the genius of the people to whom they were sent, and the circumstances of the times in which they lived; above all, when we consider the purity, equity, and benevolence of the Christian law, the explicit declaration of our Lord and his Apostle Paul respecting the institution of marriage, its design and limitations; when we reflect, too, on the testimony of the most ancient fathers, who could not possibly be ignorant of the general and common practice of the apostolic church; and, finally, when to these considerations we add those which are founded on justice to the female sex, and all the regulations of the domestic economy and national policy, we must wholly condemn the revival of polygamy.—Elements of Moral Science, vol. 2, pp. 127-129.

We must lay aside our pen, as our limited space forbids further pursuance of this subject. Much more might be said on this line of thought with profit to the general reader; but the writer believes enough has been said in the foregoing to show the demoralizing tendencies of polygamy, and that it is absolutely without a single redeeming feature; that it is devoid of every ennobling principle of virtue; opposed to all right morals and advanced civilization; is positively un-American, and anti-Christian, and is of satanic origin; is a withering blight upon our country, and has brought shame and disgrace upon the fair name of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints such as no other evil could have done. And while with all our soul we deprecate this awful wrong, we still hope and pray that those who have been deceived by its seductive influences will

carefully consider the subject matter of this examination of polygamy, believing that such a course will materially assist them in obtaining further evidence relative thereto, and aid them in casting off those leaders who have caused so many hundreds of honest people to err in doctrine; and will likewise help them to accept of the light reflecting the Christ-life which is now made manifest through the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. I pray God's blessings upon all the honest in heart everywhere.

INDEX

- Abraham not a polygamist, 237, 238.
- Adulterers, Polygamists and, should be expelled, 15, 16.
- Adultery, Revelation sanctions, 47.
- Affidavits of Lorenzo Snow, 106, 107; Bathsheba Smith, 108; John Taylor, 109, 110; John H. Carter, 110-112; Lyman O. Littlefield, 112, 113; William B. Smith, 113, 114.
- Article on polygamy, Church, 18.
- Assassinated, Joseph and Hyrum Smith, 8.
- Attitude of Church concerning governments, 17, 18.
- Bachelor angels, 206, 207.
- Baptists and polygamy, 142-146.
- Bayard, Senator, on polygamy, 224.
- Brown, Senator, on polygamy, 223.
- Beadle, J. H., on sealing, 86.
- Beaman, Louisa, Testimony of, 61-64.
- Beatie, Professor, on revival of polygamy, 253, 254.
- Bennett's, J. C., secret wife system, 20; expelled from Church, 21.
- Bidamon, Major Lewis C., Letter of, 122, 123.
- Blood-atonement—crimes of polygamy, 193, 194.
- Bolton's, Curtis E., testimony concerning Joseph Smith, 115.
- Book of Mormon, Fullness of gospel in Bible and, 14; Monogamy taught in, 56; on polygamy, 11; true points of doctrine of, 56.
- Brighamism, Belief of Reorganization regarding, 10.
- Brighamite indulgences, 50; philosophy, 198.
- British Parliament and Christian Churches, 166-169.
- Calcutta Missionary Conference, 166, 167.
- Calvin's morals, 171-175.
- Cannon, George Q., on polygamy, 101.
- Carter, John H., Affidavit of, 110-112.
- Children, Joseph Smith's, 22.
- Christian churches, British Parliament and 166-169.
- Christ not begotten of the Holy Ghost, 198.
- Church organized, 8; rapid growth of, 8; scattered, 8, 9.
- Claims, Extraordinary, 7, 8.
- Clawson, H. B., on polygamy, 101, 102.
- Community of wives, 25; unfounded, Smucker, 127.
- Conclusions, 84, 85; legitimate, 48, 49; of A. M. Smucker, 59.
- Confession of Brigham Young, 102, 103; of John D. Lee, 195, 196.
- Consanguineous marriages, 219, 220.
- Covenant, Joseph Smith's teaching of a new, 52, 53.

INDEX

- Cradlebaugh, Judge, Statement of, 196.
- Crime, Polygamy a, 12, 252, 253.
- Crimes of polygamy, Blood-atonement, 193, 194.
- Deductions, 58, 59, 87, 88.
- Dixon, William Hepworth, Statement of, 128-131; on incest in Utah, 221.
- Doctrine of Book of Mormon, True points of, 56.
- Emma, Joseph Smith's wife, Testimony of, 33; John Taylor's tribute to, 34.
- Elements of Moral Science, Extracts from, 227, 228.
- Episcopalians and polygamy, 159, 160.
- Evidence insufficient, 53-55; lacking, 104, 105.
- Faction, Brigham Young and his, 9.
- Facts as they appear, 59, 60.
- Falsehood—Who told it? 28.
- Fullness of gospel in Bible and Book of Mormon, 14.
- Governments, Attitude of Church concerning, 17, 18.
- Henry the Eighth and Anne Boleyn, 159-165.
- Huntington, Zina D., Testimony of, 81-84.
- Hyde, John, on sealing, 86.
- Incest and polygamy go together, 218, 219; in Utah, William Hepworth Dixon on, 221; upheld and practiced in Utah, 220, 221.
- Indulgences, Brighamite, 50.
- Introduction of polygamy, Public, 26.
- Isaac not a polygamist, 241.
- Jesus Christ not a polygamist, 230.
- Kimball, Lucy W., Testimony of, 76.
- Kinsman*, The, Extract from, 229.
- Kirtland Temple Suit, Findings of Judge Sherman in, 137.
- Knox, Crimes of, 175.
- Lake Huron Shore, Extract from History of, 125, 126.
- Land, Laws of, to be kept, 17.
- Laws of land to be kept, 17.
- Lee, F. C., Statement of, 126.
- Lee, John D., Confession of, 195, 196.
- Legitimate question, A, 5.
- Letter of Major Lewis C. Bidamon, 122, 123; of J. C. Whittemore, 123-125; to President of the United States, An open, 57.
- Littlefield, Lyman O., Affidavit of, 112, 113.
- Lutherans and polygamy, 146-159.
- Luther and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, 146-152.
- Luther on polygamy, 156; Calvin's estimate of, 158; Table Talks of, 157, 158.
- Man of Israel, An old, 93.
- Marks, William, Testimony of, 57, 58.
- Marriage, formula and certificate, 19; two objects of, 232, 233.
- Marriages, consanguineous, 219, 220.
- Marsh's History of Baptists, 142, 143.
- Methodists and polygamy, 175-179.
- Mohammedanism, Polygamy and, 215.
- Monogamy ordained as the rule of marriage, 15, 17; ordained in Eden, 233, 234; ordained of God, 184; taught in Book of Mormon, 56.
- Mormonism does not mean polygamy, 127.
- Mosaic law, Polygamy condemned under, 250-252.

INDEX

- Mosheim's history of Baptists, 143-146.
- Nephi's arraignment of polygamists, 245, 246.
- Noah and his sons—one wife each, 236.
- Noble, J. B., Testimony of, 62-66.
- Object and design of marriage, 184.
- Organized, Church, 8.
- Otherwise, The word, loophole for polygamy, 247, 248.
- Paley on polygamy, 226, 227.
- Paul's argument, 214.
- Philosophy, Brighamite, 198.
- Polygamic revelation and Brigham Young's testimony, Orson Pratt versus, 100, 101.
- Polygamist, Jesus Christ not a, 230.
- Polygamists and adulterers should be expelled, 15, 16; in the United States Congress, 180-183; Nephi's arraignment of, 245, 246; punished in Noah's time, 236, 227.
- Polygamy a crime, 12, 252, 253; and Christianity, 191, 192; and Mohammedanism, 215; Baptists and, 142-146; Episcopalians and, 159-169; Demoralizing tendencies of, 184-187; condemned under Mosaic law, 250-252; Lutherans and, 140-159; Methodists and, 175-179; Presbyterians and, 169-175; at Nauvoo, Honorable Josiah Quincy on, 137; adverse to virtue, 222, 223; Book of Mormon on, 11; Church article on, 18; degrades women, 216; from a physiological standpoint, 212, 213; First historical account of, 235; George Q. Cannon on, 101; H. B. Clawson on, 101, 102; Incest and, go together, 218, 219; Joseph Smith opposed to, 89, 90; Hyrum Smith's reproof of, of March 15, 1844, 21, 22; condemned, 21; John Taylor on, in 1842, 20; Wilford Woodruff on, in 1842, 20; Mormonism does not mean, 127; not adapted to rapid population, 216; opposed, by John Taylor in 1845, 94; by E. M. Webb, 1845, 94; by P. P. Pratt, 1845, 95; by Wilford Woodruff, 1845, 96; by Orson Spencer, 1848, 96, 97; by John Taylor, 1850, 98; by Thomas Smith, 1850, 97, 98; by Orson Pratt, 1852, 99; 1853, 99, 100; Paley on, 226, 227; Professor Beatie on revival of, 253, 254; Public introduction of, 26; Senator Brown on, 223; Senator Bayard on, 224; Sawyer's statement of contrary to nature, 214, 215; Revelation of 1831 against, 17; Wayland, Francis, on, 224; What it produces, Brigham Young's statement of, 190, 191.
- Polygamous families, Number of, in Utah, 216.
- Pratt, Orson, versus polygamic revelation and Brigham Young's testimony of, 100, 101; Polygamy opposed by, in 1852, 99; 1853, 99, 100; Statement of, at Washington, D. C., 45; concerning Christ and the Holy Ghost, 198, 199.
- Pratt, P. P., Polygamy opposed by, in 1845, 95; Statement of, in 1842, 92, 93.
- Presbyterians and polygamy, 169-175; indorsing polygamy, 169.

INDEX

- President of the United States,
 An open letter to, 57.
 Prior, Methodist preacher,
 Statement of, 127.
 Pack's, John, testimony concern-
 ing Joseph Smith, 114,
 115.
 Phillips, Judge, Conclusions
 of, 140, 141; Findings of, in
 Temple Lot Suit, 137-139.
 Quincy, Honorable Josiah, on
 polygamy at Nauvoo, 137;
 Statement of Honorable
 Josiah, 5, 6.
 Question, A legitimate, 5; an-
 swered, 26; to Brigham
 Young and his answer, 34,
 35.
 Richards, F. D., church his-
 torian, Statement of, 84, 85.
 Reorganization, Beginning of,
 9; Belief of, regarding
 Brighamism, 10.
 Revelation, Polygamic, con-
 sidered, 39-47; justifying
 concubinage, 241, 242; of
 July 12, 1843, a new and
 everlasting covenant, 51;
 sanctions adultery — pre-
 mium on crime, 47; versus
 Book of Mormon, 248, 249;
 Pretended, a huge fraud,
 199, 200; teaches adultery,
 207; versus Constitution of
 the United States, 209; True,
 and science harmonious, 224,
 225.
 Revelation of 1831 against
 polygamy, 17.
 Reynolds, Governor, State-
 ment of, 6.
 Roberts, B. H., Incompetency
 of, 28, 29; Statement of, 28;
 Portraiture of John Taylor
 by, 118, 119.
 Sawyer, Professor, on incestu-
 ous marriages, 221.
 Sawyer's statement of polyg-
 amy—contrary to nature,
 214, 215.
 Science, True revelation and,
 harmonious, 224, 225.
 Sealing, John Hyde on, 86;
 Mrs. T. H. B. Stenhouse on,
 86; Ann Eliza Young on, 86;
 J. H. Beadle on, 86.
 Secret wife system, J. C. Ben-
 nett's, 20.
 Sherman, Judge, Findings of,
 in Kirtland Temple Suit,
 137.
 Smith, Bathsheba, Affidavit of,
 108.
 Smith, Emma, Statement of,
 48; Testimony of, 33; What
 her neighbors say, 33, 34.
 Smith, Hyrum, His reproof of
 polygamy March 15, 1844,
 21, 22.
 Smith, Joseph, Diary of, 66,
 67; and Hyrum Smith assas-
 sinated, 8; John Taylor's
 testimony concerning, 114;
 John Pack's testimony concern-
 ing, 114, 115; Curtis E.
 Bolton's testimony concern-
 ing, 115; opposed to polyg-
 amy, 89, 90; Statement
 of, to William Marks, 91;
 Statement of, concerning J.
 C. Bennett, 24; Children of,
 22; teaching of new cove-
 nant, 52, 53; Writings of,
 10, 11.
 Smith, Thomas, Polygamy op-
 posed by, in 1850, 97, 98.
 Smith, William B., Affidavit
 of, 113, 114.
 Smucker, A. M., Conclusions
 of, 59; on community of
 wives unfounded, 127; State-
 ment of, 6.
 Snow, Eliza R., Testimony of,
 71, 81; versus Eliza R.
 Snow, 75-81; versus Brig-
 ham Young and William
 Clayton, 74, 75.

INDEX

- Snow, Lorenzo, Affidavit of, 106, 107.
- Spencer, Orson, Polygamy opposed by, in 1848, 96, 97.
- Statement of Honorable Josiah Quincy, 5, 6; A. M. Smucker, 6; Governor Reynolds, 6; Joseph Smith concerning J. C. Bennett, 24; B. H. Roberts, 28; Brigham Young, August 29, 1852, 30, 31; Orson Pratt at Washington, D. C., 45; Emma Smith, 48; F. D. Richards, Church Historian, 84, 85; F. C. Lee, 126; Hon. Heber M. Wells, 127; P. P. Pratt in 1842, 92, 93; Brigham Young in 1845, 105; Brigham Young in 1853, 106; Prior, Methodist preacher, 127; William Hepworth Dixon, 128-131; from Fanny Stenhouse's book, 132-135; from Mrs. C. V. Waite's History of Mormonism, 136; of D. H. Smith, 228; of Orson Pratt, 198, 199; of Judge Cradlebaugh, 196.
- Statistics, United States, 205-207.
- Stenhouse's, Fanny, estimate of Brigham Young, 10; statement from her book, 132-135; on sealing, 86.
- Table Talks of Luther, 157, 158.
- Taylor, John, Affidavit of, 109, 110; comment of, 93; opposing polygamy in 1845, 94; 1850, 98; on polygamy in 1842, 20; portraiture of, by B. H. Roberts, 118, 119; seven wives of, 117-120; testimony concerning Joseph Smith, 114; tribute of, to Emma Smith, 34.
- Temple Lot Suit, Findings of Judge Phillips in, 137-139.
- Testimony of Emma, Joseph Smith's wife, 33; William Marks, 57, 58; J. B. Noble, 62-66; Louisa Beaman 61-64; Emily D. P. Young, 66-71; Joseph's diary 66, 67; Brigham Young versus Emily D. P. Young, 67, 68; Eliza R. Snow versus Eliza R. Snow, 75-81; Eliza R. Snow, 71, 81; Eliza R. Snow versus Brigham Young and William Clayton, 74, 75; Lucy W. Kimball, 75; Zina D. Huntington, 81-84.
- Test, The proper, 7.
- Treacherous dealing, 19, 252.
- Trumbull, Senator, Statement of Brigham Young to, 102.
- Waite's, Mrs. C. V., History of Mormonism, Statements from, 136.
- Wayland, Francis, on polygamy, 224.
- Webb, E. M., Polygamy opposed by, in 1845, 94.
- Wells, Honorable Heber M., Statement of, 127.
- Wesley, John, in history, 176, 179; Statement of, in 1738, 179.
- Whittemore, J. O., Letter of, 123-125.
- Woodruff, Wilford, Polygamy opposed by, in 1845, 96; on polygamy in 1842, 20.
- Writings of Joseph Smith, 10, 11.
- Young, Ann Eliza, on sealing, 86; No. 19, Brigham Young and, 242.
- Young, Brigham, and his faction, 9; and Ann Eliza No. 19, 242; authority of—contract for eternity, 243, 244; confession of, 102, 103; statement of his falsehood and perfidy, 29; question to and his answer, 34, 35; Fanny

INDEX

Stenhouse's estimate of, 10;
his position criticised, 35;
his statement of what polygamy produces, 190, 191;
statement of, August 29, 1852, 30, 31; statement of, to Senator Trumbull 102; state-

ment of, in 1845, 105; 1853, 106; versus Emily D. P. Young, 67, 68.
Young, Emily D. P., Testimony of 66-71; Brigham Young versus, 67, 68.

