TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. JUNE, 1944 NO. 1.

Brigham Young's Plain Talk

(Journal of Discourses, 2:187)

I have but one fear concerning this people in the Valleys of the Mountains, I have but one trembling sensation in the nerves of my spirit, and that is, lest we do not live the religion we profess. If we will only practice what we profess, I tell you we are at the defiance of all hell. But if we transgress the law God has given us, and trample His mercies, blessings and ordinances under our feet, and treat them with the indifference which I have thought that some occasionally do, not fully realizing the obligations that they are under to their God, I have feared that in consequence they would be overcome, and that the Lord would let them be scattered and smitten. But only let them live their religion, and I have no more fears with regard to their being driven, and with regard to their enemies having power over them, than I have with regard to these mountains being blown over upon the city. I am willing to fight, or to go; to run, or to stay; or to do anything else that the Lord Almighty requires of me for His Kingdom's sake, and then to lay down my life for His cause. But I swear by the Gods of eternity that I will not suffer men in our streets, and in our houses, to corrupt this people and overthrow them, the Lord and good men being my helpers. * * *

What happened when I chastised a runaway officer? I did not say one rash word to him, nor chastise him half as much as he deserved; but I told him what he was, and how he looked to me; what he was sent here for, and what he should be, if he magnified his office. Before the meeting was out the word was, "Oh, we are again to be driven; here is a mob coming." Said I, "Get out of my way, or I will kick you out; what are you afraid of?" "Oh! of the Government of the United States?" I replied, "Let me die and go to my Father in heaven, before I stoop to that abominable wickedness; I never will stoop to it, so help me God."

What was the result of the course I then took? He was chastened, and our

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

Chief Justice who is now here told him in Washington, that he was chastened for his own iniquity, and said to him, "I expect they did not chasten you half enough."

Do you suppose that I am going to crouch down, and suffer this people to bow down continually to the rod of corruption? No. Come on with your knives, your swords, and your faggots of fire, and destroy the whole of us, rather than we will forsake our religion. Whether it is true or false is none of your business; whether the doctrine of plurality of wives is true or false is none of your business. We have as good a right to adopt tenets in our religion as the Church of England, or the Methodists, or Baptists, or any other denomination have to in theirs. Our doctrine is a Bible doctrine, a patriarchal doctrine, and is the doctrine of the Gods of eternity, and of the heavens, and was revealed to our father on the earth and will save the world at last, and bring us into Abraham's bosom, if we ever get there.

Are the officers of the Government the judges of our religion? It is none of their business whether it is true or false. I know whether it is true or not, and that is enough for me; you know, brethren and sisters, and that is enough for you. If they do not believe it, we do not trouble them with it. We say that we will meet you as friends, and as neighbors, as "flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone", but not, as the world meet you, upon the platform of corruption and iniquity.

Words of Heber C. Kimball

Joseph Smith Murdered by Acts of Apostates; How Zion's Army of 205 Marched

(Deseret News, Vol. 4:p. 249—Aug., 1853)

Judas, when he lost the faith, received the power of the devil, and betrayed the Son of God into the hands of murderers. Joseph Smith in like manner was betrayed into the hands of wicked men, who took his life. He was betrayed by apostates; by men whom we once loved when they were in our midst, and had the spirit of the Lord. We also would have been slain, if they could have got hold of us, but they were afraid to touch us; they knew it would be certain death to the man who lifted his heel against us. Just so now. I have got my old gospel preparation laid up drying, preparing himself for action. Do I fear? No. I dot not fear anything that lives in the earth, or that is in hell; Indians or anything else, never will disturb us, the Saints, from this time to all eternity, if we will do precisely as we are told. * * *

What do I care for what the world says? I care no more about it than I do for the squawking of a goose. It is none of their business if I have a mind to be a Saint, and keep the commandments of God; and as you have heard it said, so say I: The time will come in which you will dwell in peace and safety; and when the time comes that you will go back to Jackson county, you will be independent, and live without any opposition at all. Can the Lord do it? Yes. **All the people are in His hands, and he can turn the nations, as I can an obedient horse. They are governed and controlled by the Almighty as much as we are. What can they do against us? Why nothing whatever, but if we do not do right they will be A SCOURGE IN THE HANDS OF GOD TO SCOURGE US, JUST AS THE INDIANS ARE AT THIS TIME. There never would have been a disturbance if this people had done as they were told.** * * *

We live in the days of prophets, apostles, high priests, and servants of God who have the priesthood upon them, and I know it. Gentlemen, I have been a member of this church near 23 years, and passed through the whole of the difficulties, in Kirtland, Ohio, and Missouri. When Brother Brigham and myself, and others, with our families, left Kirtland to go to Missouri with Joseph Smith, we had to lay with our fire locks by our sides. When we arrived in Missouri, the devil contrived to raise the armies of the wicked against us there; and all the elders and male members that could be counted, from the western boundaries of Missouri to Nova Scotia, was not more than 205 men. We went up to Missouri to reinstate our brethren who had been driven out of Jackson county. We went up near 1000 miles with our fire locks in our hands. Was there any fear in us? No. It never entered into our hearts, from the day we started, to the time we returned again. I never saw the time but I could whip out twenty of the best men on earth.

I had a spirit on me as much superior to this earth, as the earth is superior to the degraded spirits of the wicked that dwell on its face. It was the spirit of the Lord that stood by me, and diffused strength into my body, and into my limbs, until the very hair of my head felt all alive. Did they fear us in that upper country? Yes, they ran as though they were never going to stop in the world. We felt perfectly able to clear out that country to Nova Scotia, and we could have done it with 205 men, if the Lord God had commanded us, as the Gideonites did in the days of old. Yes,—205 men with the spirit and power of God upon them, and their faces shining like the sun,—it cannot be told what they could accomplish; neither can we form any conception of it.

CHRISTIAN (?) PERSECUTION

A sample of Christian (?) persecution in the early days of Mormonism (November, 1838), is exhibited in the speech of Major General Clark, delivered at Far West, Missouri, while certain of its citizens were held as prisoners. Joseph Smith and a number of the brethren were marked to be shot; the rest of the Saints were permitted to leave the State.

Gentlemen: You, whose names are not on this list, will now have the privilege of going to your fields to obtain grain for your families—wood, etc. Those that compose the list will go from thence to prison, to be tried, and receive the due demerits of their crimes. But you are now at liberty, all but such as charges may hereafter be preferred against. It now devolves upon you to fulfil the treaty that you have entered into—the leading items of which I now lay before you.

The first of these items you have already complied with—which is, that you deliver up your leading men to be tried according to law. Second, that you deliver up your arms—this has been attended to. The third is, **that you sign over your property to defray the expenses of the war; this you have also done. Another thing yet remains for you to comply with; that is: that you leave the State forthwith; and, whatever your feelings concerning this affair, whatever your innocence, it is nothing to me. General Lucas, who is equal in authority with me, has made this treaty with you. I am determined to see it executed.**

The orders of the Governor to me, were, that you should be exterminated, and not allowed to remain in the State. And had your leaders not been given up, and the treaty complied with before this, you and your families would have been destroyed and your houses in ashes.

There is a discretionary power resting in my hands, which I shall try to exercise for a season. I did not say that you must go now, but you must not think of stopping here another season, or of putting in crops; for the moment you do the **citizens will be upon you.** I am determined to see the Governor's order fulfilled, but shall not come upon you immediately. Do not think that I shall act as I have done any more; but if I have to come again because the treaty which you have made is not complied with, you need not expect any mercy, but extermination; for I am determined that the Governor's order shall be executed.

As for your leaders, do not think, do not imagine for a moment, do not let it enter your mind that they will be delivered, or that you will see their faces again, for their fate is fixed, their die is cast, their doom is sealed.

I am sorry, gentlemen, to see so great a number of apparently intelligent men found in the situation that you are. And, oh! that I could invoke the Spirit of the **unknown God** to rest upon you, and deliver you from the awful chain of superstition, and liberate you from those fetters of fanaticism with which you are bound. I would advise you to scatter abroad and never again organize with bishops, presidents, etc., lest you excite the jealousies of the people, and subject yourselves to the same calamaties that have now come upon you.

You have always been the aggressors; you have brought upon yourselves these difficulties by being disaffected, and not being subject to rule; and my advice is, that you become as other citizens, lest by a recurrence of these events you bring upon yourselves inevitable ruin. — Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt, pp. 225-6.

THE WONDERFUL AMERICANS

The Americans are a wonderful people. They boast of a high ideology and their inconsistencies are such as to make the angels weep. They boast of their never ending natural resources, but which they cannot develop for lack of man-power now being used in the armed forces to destroy and kill. They boast of a democracy which in fact is governed by a bureaucracy. They ask the people to save their empty cans, paper, rags, etc., as being an absolute necessity for war aims, yet the most vital element — food — they destroy without compunction.

Finding 2700 jars of peanut butter in an Idaho town about one-third of an ounce short in weight, they legally destroy the whole lot and boast of the job. The product was food. The Government is spending billions to help feed Europe, Russia, China, etc. This peanut butter was good food; but because the processor made the mistake of one-third of an ounce in a 16-ounce container, instead of giving the contents away or selling it at a reduced price, the whole of it, including the glass containers, must be destroyed.

The Americans are a wonderful people! A few years ago, in order to beat the depression, the "Wonderful Wizards of Washington" had hundreds of thousands of cattle, sheep and hogs destroyed; wheat stacks were ordered burned, wheat and cotton crops were plowed under; and this while millions of people both in and out of the United States were starving and were without proper clothing. To bring the price of oranges to a higher level, the Government permitted the California orchardists to dump thousands of tons of citrus fruit to rot, protecting their plot with guns to prevent the poor from gathering the fruit for personal use. Farmers were paid for letting their lands stand idle, rather than cultivate it and raising foodstuff.

We are a wonderful lot of people—we Americans! Abortion is a grievous sin. To wantonly destroy the fruits of earth before birth is abortion; if after

birth it is a species of murder. What will America have to suffer for such sins? Having a large and ever increasing surplus of unmarried marriagable women we deny them the right to marry honorably in plural marriage and sic the army boys on them to destroy them with pollution and disease. Those having the courage to marry, we use their children in the armed forces of the country, and imprison their fathers for sireing them. We spend millions annually in combatting venereal disease, largely among women, and imprison pure women for seeking honorable motherhood in plural marriage. Our prosecutors yell their heads off about an isolated case of a polygamist marrying a fifteen-year-old girl, and yet for a fee, permit a soldier to marry a fourteen-year-old child!

Whoever heard of a more wonderful people than the Americans?

There not being a Federal law under which certain Latter-day Saints can be prosecuted for plural marriage or unlawful cohabitation, the Federal prosecutor decided to invent a law and is attempting the prosecution under the "Mann Act" as "white slavery" cases; also under the "Lindbergh Kidnaping Act", the penalty of the latter being either life imprisonment or death.

How wonderful is our conception of human rights

HUMBLE THINKING

(By Brann)

A valued correspondent submits an editorial in the "Boulder City News", March 23, 1944, on the above topic, and the Editor's reaction (in another editorial) after being informed by one who evidently knows. We pass the two articles on to our readers:

Editorial from "Boulder City News", Mar. 23, 1944)

If you want to do something a little out of the ordinary—something organized society in the form of the law may frown upon—you want to do it so much you will do it anyway—be smart, mix a little religion in it.

That's the easiest way to stump the law. For men will bow when you dramatically state it is for God to decide whether you were right or wrong. It's the easiest way to make them feel incompetent to judge.

The case of the Short Creek polygamists is an example. They wrap polygamy in religion, and they sound sincere. It isn't such an easy defense to break.

In the first place, it's doubtful if the Mann Act was ever intended to apply in such circumstances. Is polygamy technically immoral? And if the Mann Act doesn't apply, the Federal Government may as well quit. It's a matter for Arizona and Utah to settle.

Arizona had her little fling in 1936. All she could do was make a few religious martyrs. That after weeks and months of traveling through Nevada and Utah to get from Kingman to her own Arizona strip.

No doubt public sentiment in this country is overwhelmingly against polygamy. All other considerations aside, in a land where the sexes are almost evenly balanced, it simply isn't practical.

Add that to the fact that the Lord first made Adam and just one Eve—and he's been turning them out on a fifty-fifty average ever since, it doesn't look quite like He had changed His mind.

But where polygamy is once established the problem of breaking it up is a tough one. What to do with extra wives, children thus declared illegiti-

mate. It touches human sympathy.

Then there is just a little envy in every man for the chap who can get six or seven wives vieing for his favors. Especially right after he's had a fight with the one and only.

So all factors considered, established polygamy isn't one of those things to which you can say: "You can't do that as you were. Signed, "Uncle." It came gradually, and gradually through education, it can be stamped out.

(Editorial from "Boulder City News", April 8, 1944)

I stuck my neck out. I said a few foolish things about polygamy. I am "choosed" and chastened. In fairness I think you should be given the views of one of the sincere fundamentalists. Here they are:

"The article handed me 'against' polygamy has been read. It is apparent the writer knows little about this principle, the people referred to, nor the holy scriptures. I will endeavor to answer him paragraph by paragraph in the order given.

"Most of the men he refers to did not mix religion with their polygamy in order to stump the law. Every one of them were first good Latter-day Saints before they became convinced they should advocate or live polygamy. Not one of them entered polygamy and afterward became Latter-day Saints.

"Men who merely want to live sexually with more than one woman don't bother with Mormon polygamy. There's no need of it. In the language of Helen Hayes: 'It's the only fun which doesn't cost anything, whereas Mormon polygamists produce children who must be fed and clothed and educated.' That stumps Mr. Brann and all the shallow critics. That an unenlightened world doesn't understand such people does not affect the truth of the matter in the slightest degree.

"What he states about the Mann Act is correct. That law was passed to punish immoral men who transported women from one State to another for immoral purposes. Mormon polygamy cannot possibly be considered immoral. That the Mann Act does not apply to marriage is proven by the fact that the people (the States) have never surrendered to Congress the right to legislate concerning marriage. A Federal law concerning marriage could only apply to the District of Columbia or to a Territory. It has no application within a State.

"The Arizona fling of 1936 he refers to cost Arizona more than she realizes. When any society persecutes those living a Divine Law, even though they may in sincerity be rendering imperfect obedience, that Society retrogrades and cuts itself off from God. That has ever been the case. None successfully persecuted the children of Israel. And no nation has yet successfully persecuted the Disciples of Christ, from His day to this. Rome burned them and threw them to the lions, but Rome went down and Christianity filled the earth. Noah, Moses, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob (Israel), David, Peter, James, John, St. Paul and Christ were all polygamists. And the wicked Jews sought to invoke pagan laws against them because they were polygamists. The situation with them was not far different from the situation with the Utah polygamists.

"It is doubtful if sentiment in this country is, today, overwhelmingly against polygamy. Many magazines have recently advocated it as a national insurance. One bill has been introduced into Congress to favor it.

"The sexes are not equally balanced. There are more women now than men. Pit the disease-free, fertile, virile men against the women capable of motherhood and the women will greatly outnumber the men, so if we enforce mo-

nogamy we condemn millions of women to childless marriage and spinsterhood.

"Nor did the Lord make Adam and just one Eve. Adam came into the garden of Eden as a ressurrected, immortal being and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He also had Lillith and others on this earth. The Rabbinical scriptures tell us of Lillith. She was a red-head.

"When the children of Israel came out of Egypt they numbered about five women to one man. They were polygamists. So, where people obey God's law, He provides for them.

"We agree with him that it's a tough problem to break up established polygamy, tougher than this nation has the power to accomplish, for no people, no person, no nation can fight against God and win.

"Six Prophets of God, in addition to Holy Scriptures, have prophesied that polygamy will not stop; nor will it, but those who fight it and do not repent will go down, just as surely as that God lives.

"God said, through his Prophet Isaiah: 'In that day (the last days) seven women shall take hold of one man, saying: We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel if only we may be called by thy name to take away our reproach.' (Isaiah 4:1.)

"None will dispute that these are the last days spoken of by the scriptures. Genesis 25, states that barrenness is a reproach to women.

"Education will not stamp out polygamy, but will increase it. You cannot find a book in all the world's literature, worthy of surviving the ages, which has condemned polygamy, but all thinking men and women have favored it."

Enough, Enough—plenty. Girls, I'm converted. When do we start?

A PROPOSED PETITION

A Seattle, Washington, lawyer, nonplussed at the attempt of Utah to prosecute and imprison both mothers and fathers for bringing life into the world in honorable wedlock, has suggested the following petition to be executed by the accused women and submitted to the Nation:

APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATION

WE WOMEN of the states of Utah, Nevada, Arizona and California, we American mothers accused of "unlawful cohabitation" and for that reason disturbed and persecuted together with the fathers of our children by the state and federal authorities, we declare that by this prosecution an attempt is being made to deny to us and to other American women the fundamental human right of a woman to motherhood by a man acceptable to her as the father of her child. We herewith come to assert this our inalienable right. And we demand that all charges against us resulting from our family life be withdrawn and that we be permitted henceforth to raise our families in peace according to our belief and in accordance with the right of freedom of religion as guaranteed to use in the Constitution. LET NOT OUR NATION DISCOURAGE MOTHERHOOD AMONG ITS WOMEN BY DEGRADING AND DEFAMING ANY OF ITS MOTHERS FOUND FAITHFULLY ENGAGED IN THEIR VITAL TASK OF BEARING AND REARING THE NEXT GENERATION!

Dissolution

The moment a person decides to leave this people, he is cut off from every object that is durable for time and eternity, and I have told you the reason why. Everything that is opposed to God and His Son Jesus Christ, to the celestial kingdom and to celestial laws, those celestial laws and beings will hold warfare with, until every particle of the opposite is turned back to its native element, though it should take millions and millions of ages to accomplish it.—Brigham Young.

EDWARD MIDGARD 1812 Twelfth Ave., Seattle 22, Wash.

WRITER · PRINTER

PUBLISHER

C O P Y May 8, 1944

A Mothers' Day Letter
to The First Mother of the Land
The White House, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

For some weeks now I have sought to point out the true significance to our nation of this present persecution of some Fundamentalist families in Utah. Here is my latest comment. May I hope that you will be moved to discuss this matter with the President?

Sincerely,

Edward Midgard

Motherhood Verboten

Is it not preposterous, especially now when we are engaged in the most murderous war, to persecute and to punish American women who are faithfully performing the great national service of bearing and rearing children, simply because their form of family life does not and perhaps cannot conform to the prevailing idea of propriety? A nation thus making war on its own mothers, would such a nation deserve to survive? A judge thus delivering motherhood to be defamed and disgraced, will not history eventually record him alongside a Pilate?

I am referring to the present prosecution of a number of Mormon Fundamentalist families in Utah. Proud as we are of our Bill of Rights, when will we recognize that every fit woman of our nation is entitled to seek and to find life's fulfillment in motherhood? And let me add, motherhood by a man acceptable to her as father of her child. Lest we American Whites become a vanishing race, let us hope that a more genuinely cooperative family life of one sort or another has still a great future among us in spite of all prejudice against it.

American Motherhood Verboten: What a hopeful outlook for Hitler!

Seattle 22, Wash. EDWARD MIDGARD

The American Way I believe in, it is that of finding a better way for the one we so far considered the best

EDWARD MIDGARD 1812 Twelfth Ave., Seattle 22, Wash.
WRITER · PRINTER
PUBLISHER

WHAT MATTERS IS MOTHERHOOD

Mother's Day, 1944

IN MATTERS OF FAMILY LIFE. a pernicious error seems to prevail. It is the belief that all would be well if only strict monogamy were maintained. But the real issue before us today is no longer the question how much in the way of desirable womanhood a man might be allowed to acquire and hold as his own. Chances are that before long no man will be secure in the possession of a woman the way men used to be. We men will just have to make the best of it and had better prepare now for the necessary adjustments. So let's quit worrying over occasional recurrence of outright polygamy and how plurality of wives is to be stamped out. Such solicitude is beside the point; it only distracts our attention from the essential wherein we fail miserably so far. What matters is motherhood. I mean the question of quality motherhood for every woman able and willing to be a good mother. Let us concern ourselves now with that problem without reservations. Or who wants to object?

The all-is-well stage in human mating and propagating may still be a thing remote under any form of family life. In the meantime, why not permit pioneers among us to exercise a little freedom of enterprise in this very important field of human endeavor? My "Major Need More Vision", my "Demand With Me Freedom of Individual Initiative Socially", my "Motion for Recognition of the Right to Motherhood" and my "Call to Excellence" are to go out (with your help, reader?) as efforts in that direction. It all comes to say:

Let me suggest that we begin with a new deal in the home.

EDWARD MIDGARD

The American Way I believe in, it is that of finding a better way for the one we so far considered the best

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*
—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious.
PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy.

Vol. 10. JUNE, 1944. No. 1.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

OPPOSING THE TRUTH

(Wilford Woodruff)

THIS opposition to the truth will continue until He comes whose right it is to reign and casts Satan into the place prepared for him where he can no more deceive the nations. Jesus is with his Father and his apostles are mingling with just and holy beings in the heavens where they can plead for their brethren. There are different degrees of glory to which men will attain. The number of men who will reach the highest is few, for there are not many who are willing to make in the flesh the sacrifice necessary to entitle them to it.—The Deseret Weekly, Oct. 11, 1890.

ANNIVERSARY NUMBER

The present issue of TRUTH is the beginning of Volume 10. Far and wide among Latter-day Saints the Magazine is being recognized as the one publication remaining true to its initial purpose—the proclaiming of truth to the world. TRUTH occupies prominent places in many libraries of the Saints and friends, and its acquisition for reference purposes is rapidly growing.

The recent effort of the Church, in league with City, County, State and Nation, to suppress the publication has thus far failed; this to the joy of thousands of our readers who proclaim the pleasing fact, of the literature entering their homes, TRUTH is first to be read and it is the one publication that is bound and preserved; it is the one publication that one can peruse for information on practically every subject involving the social and religious concept of mankind, and its range is constantly broadening.

The aim of the Publishers is to keep the fountain-head pure, that the Magazine shall not only continue to furnish truth in readable form, but to clarify and interpret it to the world. With consistent logic and fearlessness it is our aim to go on furnishing facts of paramount interest not otherwise easily available to the reading public. To assist in the work we have many sincere and talented contributors besides an ever increasing library of church and other works. May the good work go ahead to a successful conclusion.

June is the anniversary of the martyrdom of the Prophet Joseph Smith,

with his noble brother, Hyrum. This occurred on the 27th day of June, one hundred years ago, at Carthage in the State of Illinois, by an armed mob; and it occurred after the Governor had pledged the State's protection of the lives of these two men.

The Prophet had been arrested some fifty times in New York, Ohio, Missouri and Illinois, on charges ranging from teaching Daniel's prophecies to the crime of treason, but was never convicted of any crime. He was essentially a law-abiding native born citizen of the United States. Long slumbering beneath the apostacies of the primitive church, Joseph, selected before the foundations of the earth were laid, came to restore the Gospel for the salvation and exaltation of the human family. The first great revelation coming to him before he had reached his fifteenth birthday was a visit of the Father and Son. In this visit he learned that not one of the religious sects of the day was right, the Son saying to him, **"All their creeds were an abomination in his sight; that those professors were all corrupt; that 'they draw near to me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; they teach for doctrines the commandments of men, having the form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof.'"**

This glorious vision, and its recital was the queue for an outburst of jealous rage on the part of the pulpit pounding hypocrites of that day, inciting to acts of atrociousness, drivings, mobbings, imprisonment and other acts of persecution which continued until the martyrdom.

Joseph Smith, by pre-mortal appointment and ordination occupies the third position in the Godhead of earth. In taking his life the murder of a God was accomplished. The State sanctioning the deed and the nation permitting it to go unpunished must yet pay the penalty. The Jews have been paying for their folly in crucifying the Christ for two thousand years. Their sentence, as we understand it, is soon to end.

The tragedy of the nineteenth century, coupled with the rejection of the Gospel Joseph came to restore, is yet to be atoned for. Not only those who perpetrated the act of murder but those who now, professing to accept the Prophet's teachings and yet are fighting those adhering thereto, as accessory after the fact, are involved in the crime and must suffer the consequences.

Praise to the man who communed with Jehovah!
Jesus anointed that Prophet and Seer—
Blessed to open the last dispensation;
Kings shall extol him, and nations revere.

Hail to the Prophet, ascended to heaven!
Traitors and tyrants now fight him in vain,
Mingling with Gods, he can plan for his brethren;
Death cannot conquer that hero again.

Great is his glory and endless his Priesthood,
Ever and ever the keys he will hold;
Faithful and true, he will enter his kingdom,
Crowned in the midst of the Prophets of old.

Sacrifice brings forth the blessings of heaven;
Earth must atone for the blood of that man;
Wake up the world for the conflict of justice;
Millions shall know "Brother Joseph" again.

The month of June also marks the anniversary of the birth of two stalwart pioneer leaders, friends and

ranged for his martyrdom. Can the Church today—nearly a million strong—of ever varying intellects, religious traditions, ideologies, jealousies, and gossiping tendencies, claim freedom from like mistakes?

President Clark spoke eloquently of the Constitution, outlining the duties of the Saints in preserving its guarantees of human rights. We strongly commend the tenor of his remarks. The Constitution is our palladium of liberty. It came from heaven. Without it Mormonism could not have been established in this country. It will, in time, with some few changes, become the Constitution of the Kingdom of God. We reverence that document and hold that men should protect it to the limit of their powers and even, if necessary, with their lives. To Latter-day Saints it must ever be the authority by which their religious concepts may be maintained. **"We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, when, or what they may"**; but for the provisions of the Constitution these claims could not be maintained, and to the extent they are not maintained in law the Constitution is ravished and reduced to an empty symbol.

"Brethren", said President Clark, "let us think about that, because I say unto you with all the soberness I can, that we stand in danger of losing our liberties, and that once lost, only blood will bring them back; and once lost, we of this Church will, in order to keep the Church going forward, have more sacrifices to make and more persecutions to endure than we have yet known, heavy as our sacrifices and grievous as our persecutions of the past have been." **This is a strong statement. It should be heeded by the leaders and laity alike. And yet—oh, the irony in it all!—while this plea is being made the one group in the Church that is placing its all on the altar to protect the Saints in their religious liberties, is being persecuted and prosecuted by sanction and help of the very Church whose mouthpiece uttered that warning! This group has endured much and, we hope, is prepared to endure all things in the protection of human rights; yet the Church has ostracised them and has attempted to cast them out, branding them as wicked and apostate. This in face of the fact that the group is in full harmony with the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith and his prophet successors.**

The present Church regime, not satisfied with its action in casting out this group, branding them as apostates and unclean, with the ferociousness of a lion and the cruelty of a Nero, exults in the hope of heaping upon them greater sufferings. In this group now engaged in upholding the rights of the Saints are parents of large families for which they are toiling—at times beyond their natural strength They labor to feed, clothe and educate the children and make good citizens of them. Toil—honest, modest, and creative toil—show their marks, but from their countenances shines forth heavenly virtues among these sainted mothers. A dozen of them are among the victims of the inordinate efforts of the Church to destroy them; they have already spent time behind prison bars, and, with the smile of resignation, are prepared for more, if necessary.

While there is patriotic sense in President Clark's appeal for the protection of all constitutional rights, might it not be wise for the Church to face about and give whole-hearted cooperation to the efforts now on foot to protect the human rights provisions of the Constitution? It is only by the vindication of individual rights that the Constitution can be maintained.

President Clark made a special point of characterizing the present leader of the Church as God's Prophet and

and Joseph F. Smith, doubtless today many who think they have it do not possess it at all. Certainly there are many professing to act under the authority of the Priesthood who are doing so in unrighteousness, and we know what the Lord says of them. (See D. & C., 121:34-38).

Speaking on the subject of "Unity". President Clark, quoting the scripture, "If ye are not one ye are not mine", said, "We cannot be one unless we are in spirit, in belief, in knowledge, and in action. There is no other way". He showed with consistency that if the bishops are not one with their file leaders, the Stake Presidencies, there is a lack of harmony; likewise if the Stake Presidencies are not in harmony with the First Presidency of the Church, lack of harmony exists. There must, in order to have a fulness of unity, be a common knowledge and acquiescence in every order coming from the head. The President gave this revealing thought: "Among the general authorities ourselves, are we prepared to accept just what the Prophet of God says and do it, rather than to try to construe it to suit ourselves, to suit our own views?" The inference was that they are. And, if the Prophet he spoke of is Joseph Smith, who was the Lord's instrument in restoring the Gospel in its fulness, they should be.

Certainly the general authorities today are not accepting Joseph Smith's teachings on a number of points, among them: preaching the Gospel without purse and scrip, the Gathering, the United Order, and the order of Plural Marriage. The leaders must in all conscience know that they are not following their Prophet-leader who gave his life to establish such teachings. The speaker attempted to show how the Saints can be one. He said:

> **True, every man, every officer of the Church has a right to inspiration and revelation as to how he should conduct himself and how he should carry on his office and his duties. But when that inspiration and revelation comes, it will never be out of harmony with church discipline, nor with the revelations of the mind and will of God made known to His prophet on earth. The President of the Church, not a bishop of a ward, nor the president of a stake, lays down the rule for the Church. Whenever any Church officer gets any other impression than to follow the president of the Church, that impression is not coming from the right source.**

While the hypothesis laid down by President Clark, as a general rule, is correct, it involves the supposition that the President of the Church, himself, is always in strict harmony with heaven, or with **his** file leader, Joseph Smith, who is the head of this dispensation, and through whom all revelations must come to the Church. Joseph Smith is one of the three in the Godhead. Every authorized step he took came by authority of his head—God. We can and do accept his interpretation of the Gospel plan. But that situation may not continue to apply to successive Presidents of the Church. Men of lesser minds ascend to this office. Their minds often function in accordance with their mortal weaknesses and limitations. They often speak in accordance with the spirit of the times, and yet they may be, by the will of the people, the leaders of the Church. We should not think that because the inspiration that comes to man is not in strict harmony with the present discipline and rules of the Church, he is necessarily wrong. **For the Church to continue right in all particulars would transcend all precedents since the days of Father Adam.** Any association that is governed by the "common consent" rule of its members will, in time, get out of tune with the spirit that prompted the organization. As we have abundantly pointed out in TRUTH, the Church has frequently strayed from its moorings. In the history of the Nephites this fact is so clearly apparent that further comment on the point must be superfluous. It was the Church that crucified the Savior and those officers close to Joseph Smith ar-

ranged for his martyrdom. Can the Church today—nearly a million strong—of ever varying intellects, religious traditions, ideologies, jealousies, and gossiping tendencies, claim freedom from like mistakes?

President Clark spoke eloquently of the Constitution, outlining the duties of the Saints in preserving its guarantees of human rights. We strongly commend the tenor of his remarks. The Constitution is our palladium of liberty. It came from heaven. Without it Mormonism could not have been established in this country. It will, in time, with some few changes, become the Constitution of the Kingdom of God. We reverence that document and hold that men should protect it to the limit of their powers and even, if necessary, with their lives. To Latter-day Saints it must ever be the authority by which their religious concepts may be maintained. **"We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, when, or what they may"**; but for the provisions of the Constitution these claims could not be maintained, and to the extent they are not maintained in law the Constitution is ravished and reduced to an empty symbol.

"Brethren", said President Clark, "let us think about that, because I say unto you with all the soberness I can, that we stand in danger of losing our liberties, and that once lost, only blood will bring them back; and once lost, we of this Church will, in order to keep the Church going forward, have more sacrifices to make and more persecutions to endure than we have yet known, heavy as our sacrifices and grievous as our persecutions of the past have been." **This is a strong statement. It should be heeded by the leaders and laity alike. And yet—oh, the irony in it all!—while this plea is being made the one group in the Church that is placing its all on the altar to protect the Saints in their religious liberties, is being persecuted and prosecuted by sanction and help of the very Church whose mouthpiece uttered that warning! This group has endured much and, we hope, is prepared to endure all things in the protection of human rights; yet the Church has ostracised them and has attempted to cast them out, branding them as wicked and apostate. This in face of the fact that the group is in full harmony with the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith and his prophet successors.**

The present Church regime, not satisfied with its action in casting out this group, branding them as apostates and unclean, with the ferociousness of a lion and the cruelty of a Nero, exults in the hope of heaping upon them greater sufferings. In this group now engaged in upholding the rights of the Saints are parents of large families for which they are toiling—at times beyond their natural strength They labor to feed, clothe and educate the children and make good citizens of them. Toil—honest, modest, and creative toil—show their marks, but from their countenances shines forth heavenly virtues among these sainted mothers. A dozen of them are among the victims of the inordinate efforts of the Church to destroy them; they have already spent time behind prison bars, and, with the smile of resignation, are prepared for more, if necessary.

While there is patriotic sense in President Clark's appeal for the protection of all constitutional rights, might it not be wise for the Church to face about and give whole-hearted cooperation to the efforts now on foot to protect the human rights provisions of the Constitution? It is only by the vindication of individual rights that the Constitution can be maintained.

President Clark made a special point of characterizing the present leader of the Church as God's Prophet and

mouthpiece on earth, suggesting that the President's words are Scripture and should be accepted in totality. One of the difficulties in this conclusion is that the President has on numerous occasions, refuted the idea that he is actually a Prophet of God; and even if he were one, are the Saints justified in accepting his ipse dixit as the revealed word of God?

It is difficult to get around Brigham Young's statement:

> I am more afraid that this people have so much confidence in their leaders that they will not inquire for themselves of God whether they are led by Him. I am fearful they settle down in a state of blind self-security, trusting their eternal destiny in the hands of their leaders with a recklessness that in itself would thwart the purposes of God in their salvation, and weaken that influence they could give to their leaders, did they know for themselves, by the revelations of Jesus, that they are led in the right way.—Discourses of Brigham Young, 1st Ed., p. 209.

Speaking of the Prophet of God in his day, President Charles W. Penrose, a member of the First Presidency, said:

> President Wilford Woodruff is a man of wisdom and experience, and we respect him, but we do not believe his personal views or utterances are revelations from God; and when "Thus saith the Lord" comes from him, the Saints investigate it; they do not shut their eyes and take it down like a pill.

President B. H. Roberts, of the Council of Seventies, said:

> We believe in an inspired Priesthood for the Church, we believe in inspired teachers; but that does not require us to believe that every word that is spoken from the pulpit is the very word of God. Sometimes they (the leaders) speak merely from their human knowledge, influenced by passions; influenced by interests of men, and by anger, and vexation, and all those things that surge in upon the minds of every servant of God. When they so speak, then that is not scripture, that is not the word of God, nor the power of God unto salvation; but when they speak as moved upon by the Holy Ghost, their voice then becomes the voice of God.

Are these men right, or is President Clark right? Certainly the two positions do not agree. President Joseph F. Smith, speaking of the differences of opinion expressed on the subject of celestial marriage in 1909, stated in the Salt Lake Temple:

> The time has arrived in the history of this people when EVERY Latter-day Saint must stand on his own responsibility as a tub stands on its bottom; live the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to the dictates of their own conscience and get the reward; otherwise he must suffer the consequences.

Nor must it be forgotten that President Brigham Young once proclaimed from the pulpit in Provo that the time would come that the **leaders of this people would lead them onto the very brink of hell, when the "Mighty and strong" one would come to their rescue and set the house of God in order.**

Sometimes people get the very erroneous idea of greatness. In their egoism they become greater than their Maker,—a condition in itself that refutes prophetic claims. The present President of the Church is not entirely innocent of this mistake. A characteristic attitude is shown in a statement he made, published on "The Editor's Page" of the Improvement Era for April, 1944, p. 203:

> I realize that God's ways are not as man's. I endorse this with all my heart, and somehow or other, it is very seldom THAT I HAVE BEEN ABLE TO FIX THINGS FOR THE LORD TO DO, and have him do it my way. For example, some years after I became an apostle, I looked down the list of those in the quorum below me, and there was but one man THAT I HAD DECIDED the Lord ought to choose, but I am willing to admit that as the years came and went, I discovered that each man whom the Lord chose developed under the inspiration of the Lord so that I was thoroughly convinced that he was a far better man for the position, ALMOST WITHOUT EXCEPTION, than the individual whom I would like to have seen occupying the position.

While it must be remembered that the President made this statement while in his dotage, nevertheless it reflects the general tenor of his life. The Lord, **"almost without exception" has been right; and it is seldom I have been able "to fix things for Him". It must be remembered that no man or set of men are bigger than the Gospel.**

In early days men were chosen as members of the Quorum of Twelve by revelation from the Lord. That method has ceased in the present day—it ceased in the Mormon Church precisely as revelation ceased in the primitive church after the great apostasy. In Joseph Smith's day the Sectarians said "the canon of scripture is full, no more revelation is needed", while the present leaders of the Church, in action at least, say, "With our advanced knowledge, the Lord does not deem it necessary to reveal such matters in this day, compelling us to act upon our own judgment,"

An Apostle is supposed to be an ambassador or witness for Jesus Christ, and yet the Christ is estopped from having anything to do with the selection. A strange incident happened, as we are creditably informed, in the selection of Mark E. Petersen to fill the vacancy left by the demotion of Richard R. Lyman. Just previous to the presenting the authorities of the Church to be sustained by the officers present, and while the meeting was in session, a note was passed from member to member of the Quorum of Twelve, for their endorsement of Elder Petersen to fill the vacancy. The Quorum evidently registered acceptance, and Brother Petersen's name was presented and accepted. The Elder reporting this incident concluded the narration by saying, that with Elder Petersen in this quorum there are seven votes against five in favor of installing J. Reuben Clark, Jr., as President of the Church upon the death of Heber J. Grant which, as mortal time goes, cannot be far off. This procedure smacks of politics in the Church and is positively opposed to the heavenly order. We understand the order to be, "To be called of God as was Aaron." We appreciate, of course, that the precedent of selecting the president of the Quorum of Twelve to be President of the Church, except when that man is the worthy senior member of the Priesthood Council, is out of joint with the economy of heaven and will be changed. This fact was proclaimed by President Heber C. Kimball, in his day.

When selected by the Lord as President of the Church the brother will be a High Priest Apostle, holding the higher order of the Priesthood. President Grant has never qualified under this requirement and, insofar as available records are concerned, Brother Clark cannot so qualify. Of one thing we are convinced, however, is that whom the Lord wants in that position His own choice and not that of man will prevail; and that the man who receives the honors must assume the tremendous responsibilities of the office.

A CRITIC ANSWERED

Truth is invulnerable. It needs no crutches nor lean-posts. It is independent of potentates, kings, angels—yes, and even Gods. It cuts through and lays bare all social, political and religious dogma, giving a true cross-section to the public gaze. Truth courts no apologies and makes no retractions. A valued reader of TRUTH has submitted to us the reactions felt by a sister to whom she submitted some copies of the magazine; and she has given us the privilege of expressing our views, as invited by the critic, on the points mentioned. We are pleased to have this opportunity and are ever ready to meet honest criticism and to clarify, as best we can, misunderstandings regarding our object and work. The comments referred to read:

It seems that their (TRUTH'S) quarrel is not with the Prophet Joseph Smith or most of his successors, but mostly with the present President. Then if they accept the Prophet Joseph and his revelations, why don't they accept all that he claimed to have received?

Section 56:4, "Wherefore I, the Lord, command and revoke, as it seemeth me good; and all this to be answered upon the heads of the rebellious, saith the Lord", which may mean those who make it necessary for God, because of rebellion, to revoke laws given for the benefit of His children, will be held responsible.

In 1834 (D. & C., 105:13, 17), When it was found that the Saints couldn't live the law of Consecration or the United Order, the Lord again released them, temporarily, and gave them the law of tithing.

Sec. 124:49: "Verily, verily I say unto you that when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might, and with all they have, to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them, and hinder them from performing that work; behold, it behooveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings."

Verse 53: "And this I make an example unto you, for your consolation concerning all those who have been commanded to do a work, and have been hindered by the hands of their enemies, and by oppression, saith the Lord your God."

Section 98:4: * * *And that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind, and is justifiable before me. Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land * * *"

Ask TRUTH to explain these quotations with the same understanding they use for the law of polygamy.

We are pleased to give answer to each problem. There are five specific propositions which we will discuss as presented:

1st. It is verily true our "**quarrel is not with the Prophet Joseph Smith or most of his successors, but mostly with the present President. Then if they accept the Prophet Joseph and his revelations, why don't they accept all that he claimed to have received,**" Time and again we have affirmed the fact that we accept every revelation given through the Prophet and his successors —every one of them; those published in the Doctrine and Covenants, and those not published in that book, of which there are many. Our principal criticism of the present President of the Church, is that he has permitted changes from Joseph Smith's revelations, causing the Saints to fall into error. The changes, obviously, have been made to bring our worship more in conformity with the wishes of the world, that we might be at peace with Babylon. Some of these changes involve Temple ordinances, which cannot be discussed here; they involve the changing of the Garments of the Priesthood, which the late President Joseph F. Smith said in his day, over his signature, must not be done, otherwise the Saints doing it would be excluded from the Temples. (A very definite change has been made in outlawing the Law of Celestial marriage, claiming the Revelation (D. & C., Sec. 132) did not mean that plural marriage is a necessary part of the Law. We have shown by his own words, that this principle must be lived, and yet the Church is trying to cut people off for attempting either to teach or to live it. It is for this reason we are not in harmony with the present course of the Church as directed by its leaders. We believe in all the Revelations given through the early leaders—bar none, and claim the Saints cannot receive the highest exaltation without accepting and living them.)

2nd. "Wherefore, I the Lord, command and revoke", etc.: Here Ezra Thayre, who had been appointed to travel in the ministry with Elder Thomas B. Marsh, was unable to start on his mission when the latter was ready. In answering the Prophet's in-

quiry the Lord rebuked Ezra Thayre for pride and selfishness, and Selah J. Griffin was chosen in his stead. The Lord said, He commanded and revoked, which he did in this case. He first commanded Brother Thayre to go with Elder Marsh, then revoked the command and appointed Brother Griffin to take his place. Certainly there is nothing in this case that is arbitrary or difficult to understand. Men are frequently given an opportunity to work in a special calling. They refuse, as Brother Thayre did, and another or others received the appointment.

In D. & C., Sec. 95 (verses 5 and 6) the Lord said: **"But behold, verily I say unto you, that there are many who have been ordained among you, whom I have called but few of them are chosen. They who are not chosen have sinned a very grievous sin, in that they are walking in darkness at noon day."**

Brother Thayre evidently was one who was called but not chosen. There is nothing in this revelation that we do not accept.

3rd. Joseph Smith, leading Zion's Camp from Kirtland to Missouri, while at Fishing River, was told by the Lord (D. & C., 105:2-6):

> Behold, I say unto you, were it not for the transgressions of my people, speaking concerning the Church and not individuals, they might have been redeemed even now.
>
> But behold, they have not learned to be obedient to the things which I require at their hands, but are full of ALL MANNER OF EVIL, and do not impart of their substance, as becometh Saints, to the poor and afflicted among them;
>
> And are not united according to the union required by the law of the celestial kingdom;
>
> And Zion cannot be built up unless it is by the principles of the law of the celestial kingdom; otherwise I cannot receive her unto myself.
>
> And my people must needs be chastened until they learn obedience, if it must needs be, by the things which they suffer. * * *
>
> (V. 9): Therefore, in consequence of the transgressions of my people, it is expedient in me that mine elders should wait for a little season for the redemption of Zion—

Here the Lord revokes no revelation. The Saints themselves accomplished the delay. Zion will be redeemed as soon as the Saints are prepared for the redemption. They had refused to live the law of the celestial kingdom and were therefore doomed to suffer under the power of Satan "for a little season". That "little season" is not yet ended, but the end is no farther away than the Saints, by their faith and actions, decree.

The law of Consecration—a prelude to the redemption of Zion—had been given. A branch of this law of Consecration is the law of Tithing. Not being able to live the complete law the Lord, in Sec. 119 (July 8, 1838) explained the law of Tithing—the paying in of a surplus and then tithing their interest annually. The Lord did not take from the Church the law of Consecration, but made it clear to the Saints that until they were prepared to live it and go on in progression, they must live the law of Tithing.

Consecration is still a law to the Saints—a law necessary to be lived as an entrance into the Celestial glory.

4th. The Lord had instructed the Saints to build a Temple at Independence, Missouri. In consequence of the extermination order issued by Governor Boggs and the activity of the mobocrats, the Saints were driven from Missouri and took up their abode in what afterwards became Nauvoo, Illinois. The work of building a temple in Missouri was, for the time, frustrated. It was on this occasion the Lord gave the revelation (Section 124) in which He said: (Verses 49, 51, 53):

> Verily, verily, I say unto you, that when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might and with all they have to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them and hinder them from performing that work, behold, it behooveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings. * * *
>
> Therefore, for this cause have I accepted the offerings of those whom I commanded to build up a city and a house unto my name, in Jackson county, Missouri, and were hindered by their enemies, saith the Lord your God. * * *
>
> And this I make an example unto you, for your consolation concerning all those who have been commanded to do a work and have been hindered by the hands of their enemies, and by oppression, saith the Lord your God.

The Saints were commanded to build a temple at Nauvoo, with other improvements, while the work in Missouri was postponed until a later date.

Many of the Saints have accepted this revelation as excusing them from living the law of plural marriage under the celestial order, or any other law that the enemy sought to hinder the Saints from living. We have gone into this question several times in TRUTH, showing the difference in the doing of a certain work and that of observing an eternal law. Baptism, for instance, is an eternal law. No person of the prescribed age can enter into the kingdom of God or into the Church of Christ without baptism. For many years in certain parts of Germany Mormon elders were prohibited the right to baptise converts, sometimes being imprisoned or banished for performing the rite. This fact did not excuse converts from baptism. Section 124 of the Doctrine and Covenants offered no relief, but converts were taken out late at night, in both Summer and Winter, and baptised under cover of secrecy and darkness. Many of the German Saints who are in Zion today were thus baptised.

In the early days in Utah the Priesthood leaders sought to stem the tide of apostasy, because of this revelation seeming in the minds of some to excuse them from living the full law. In one Editorial in the Deseret News, the official organ of the Church, there appeared the following, June 5, 1885:

NO RELINQUISHMENT

> Influences are at work whose object is to CREATE AN IMPRESSION IN FAVOR OF THE RENUNCIATION OR TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF THE THE LAW OF CELESTIAL MARRIAGE. Arguments are being used to that end, in a semi-private way, with a view to gaining converts to that idea.
>
> Perhaps such pleadings may influence a few people who are not in the habit of probing subjects to the bottom and are not particularly gifted with the power to analyze the motives by which men are actuated. Good Latter-day Saints, however, who have within themselves that needful reason for the hope that inspires them are not affected by the SHALLOW PRETEXTS OF SEMI-APOSTATES.
>
> To give a Gospel coloring to the position assumed by those who express themselves as ready TO SELL OUT WHATEVER HOLD THEY MAY HAVE ON THE WORK OF GOD, they complacently quote from the revelations contained in the book of Doctrine and Covenants. ATTEMPTS ARE MADE TO TWIST THESE DIVINE COMMUNICATIONS FROM THEIR PLAIN INTENT, in order that they may subserve ulterior purposes. In this connection reference is made to the following, to be found on page 218:
>
> "For verily I say unto you, my law shall be kept on this land.
>
> "Let no man think he is ruler, but let God rule him that judgeth, according to the counsel of his own will; or, in other words, him that counseleth or sitteth upon the judgment seat.
>
> "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."

It is argued—"If it is not necessary to break the law of the land in order to keep the law of God, why not renounce or abrogate celestial marriage?"

There is certainly a conflict between a law of God and an alleged law of the land. Those who understand and accept the revelation on celestial marriage to be what it purports to be, cannot CONSISTENTLY HOLD, on account of the foregoing quotation, that it should be SET ASIDE, in the face of the declaration—"My law shall be kept on this land." But if there really is a genuine law of the land in conflict with it, there is an apparent incongruity in the declaration as a whole.

What constitutes a genuine law of the land? This can be commensurately answered by stating the general proposition that the constitution is the "Supreme law of the land", and all statutes made in conformity with its provisions in letter and spirit, are genuine laws. Those which conflict with it, according to that proposition, are not. The Edmunds act is grossly unconstitutional, and therefore is not ESSENTIALLY A LAW OF THE LAND IN THE TRUE SENSE OF THE TERM, because it is an infringement on constitutional privileges, being ex Post Facto, a bill of attainder, and a curtailment of religious liberty.

If it were a constitutional law there would be no conflict between it and the revelation on Celestial marriage. There being a clash, THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE BUT TO SUSTAIN WHAT GOD HAS GIVEN.

It may be urged that the Supreme Court has decided upon the right of Congress to pass the Edmunds Act, and that settles the question of constitutionality. It settles it in a legal sense, but not as a MATTER OF FACT. NO STATEMENT FROM ANY SOURCE IN EXISTENCE COULD RENDER THE STATUTE REFERRED TO CONSTITUTIONAL IN FACT. And facts are stubborn things. THE TRUTH IS WHAT THE SAINTS ARE SEEKING AND WHAT THEY PROPOSE TO ACCEPT AND STAND BY.

The Lord anticipated the passage of uncontstitutional measures whose object would be to oppose his law and afflict his people, as will be seen by a later revelation from which we will now quote, as found on page 342 book of Doctrine and Covenants:—

"And now, verily I say unto you concerning the laws of the land, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them; and that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind, and is justifiable before me; therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my Church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land; and as pertaining to the law of man, whatsoever is more or less than these, cometh of evil. I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore you are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free; nevertheless, when the wicked rule the people mourn.

It will here be observed that the laws which are "constitutional, and supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges" are to be sustained. The Edmunds Act is INFAMOUSLY OPPOSED TO THE LIBERTIES AND PRIVILEGES of those against whom it is aimed. Therefore "it cometh of evil", being destructive of human freedom. If there be those among the Saints, professing adherence to the Church, who are desirous of sustaining and upholding that which "cometh of evil" they can do so and take the consequences. But they should not be so inconsistent as to put forth the FLIMSY CLAIM THAT THEIR COURSE IS SUSTAINED BY THE REVELATIONS OF THE ALMIGHTY. THEY HAD BETTER ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THEIR FAITH IN REVELATION HAS DWINDLED TO A FINE POINT, IF IT EVER EXISTED IN THEIR BREASTS AT ALL, UNTIL IT IS SCARCELY DISCERNIBLE. THEY SHOUD AT ONCE PROCLAIM THEMSELVES AS UNBELIEVERS IN THE CLAIM THAT THE REVELATION OF CELESTIAL MARRIAGE IF OF DIVINE ORIGIN, OR ELSE ADMIT THAT THEY DO NOT POSSESS THE COURAGE OF THEIR CONVICTIONS.

But we are not yet through with treating upon the quotations sometimes referred to by the WEAK-BACKED WHO NEED A RAMROD FASTENED PARALLEL WITH THEIR SPINAL COLUMN, and occasionally manifest a desire to see the stiffening taken out of others. A FAVORITE PASSAGE USED BY SUCH will be found on page 435 of the same work from which we have already extracted. Here it is:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, that when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men, to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might, and with all they have to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them, and hinder them from performing that work; behold, it behoveth me to resuire that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offering.

"And the iniquity and transgression of my holy laws and commandments, I will visit upon the heads of those who hindered my work, unto the third and fourth generation, so long as they repent not, and hate me, saith the Lord God."

"Therefore for this cause have I accepted the offerings of those whom I commanded to build up a city and a house unto my name, in Jackson County, Missouri, and were hindered by their enemies, saith the Lord your God.

It is a little singular THAT SOME PEOPLE WILL PERSISTENTLY REFUSE TO SEE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A CERTAIN SPECIAL WORK AND A PRINCIPLE OR LAW. The consistency of the Lord relieving a people from any such obligation as the building of a house when prevented by enemies from accomplishing it is self evident. WHEN IT COMES TO THE ABROGATION OF A LAW, A PRINCIPLE, A TRUTH, THE MATTER IS ENTIRELY DIFFERENT. THE REVELATION DOES NOT APPLY EVEN REMOTELY TO THE PRESENT SITUATION.

We will now take the Saints living in Idaho, to illustrate the extent to which the policy of abrogation under pressure will go, if applied after the fashion desired by some people we wot of. Our brethren of the north are oppressed UNBEARABLY, not only on account of the practice of plural marriage, BUT FOR THE BELIEF IN ITS RIGHTEOUSNESS. ACCORDING TO THE DOCTRINE OF COMPROMISERS BELIEF IN THE CORRECTNESS OF A PRINCIPLE WOULD HAVE TO BE GIVEN UP. BY WHAT PROCESS THIS SPECIES OF RELINQUISHMENT COULD BE ATTAINED DOES NOT, HOWEVER, APPEAR; THE OPERATION BEING TO ALL INTENTS, A MENTAL IMPOSSIBILITY.—Des. News, June 5, 1885.

The brethren frequently expressed themselves along this line. The Lord has never revoked an eternal law. He may revoke an appointment, rebuke a sin, but never revoke an eternal law. When the children of Israel refused to live the higher laws the Lord took Moses with the higher order of Priesthood out of their midst, leaving them with the Aaronic priesthood. Being deprived of the Melchisedek Priesthood their progress was stayed; they could not go on as they might have done had they faithfully received that which had been offered them. Joseph Smith told some of his associates, such as John Taylor, Brigham Young, and others that if this law of plural marriage was not established and accepted the Church could not go ahead any further.

In a revelation to John Taylor (September 26-7, 1886), speaking of plural marriage, the Lord said:

How can I revoke an everlasting covenant, for I, the Lord, am everlasting and my everlasting covenants cannot be abrogated or done away with, but they stand forever. * * * All those who would enter into my glory MUST and SHALL obey my law. * * * I have not revoked this law (of plural marriage) nor will I, for it is everlasting, and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof.—Supplement to New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, p. 62.

In the present dispensation there is going on the restitution of all things, "never again to be taken from the earth", as Daniel testified to; and while details and times may change the law goes on uninteruptedly. The law of Celestial or plural marriage is as essential and permanent as the law of Baptism, and no true Latter-day Saint will say the law of Baptism can be done away with and the Saints go on to their exaltation in the presence of the Father.

5th. Our critic quotes from D. & C., Sec. 98:4, wherein the Saints are told to befriend the Constitutional laws of the land. What is the constitutional law involved in the present controversy? It is a part of the first

amendment, a part of what is called the "Bill of Rights", and reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

* * *

Congress did try to evade this law in passing legislation prohibiting the practice of plural marriage by the Mormon people. The Morrill Act was passed in 1862, but the Saints, clinging to their constitutional rights chose to ignore this unconstitutional law. In 1879—some seventeen years later—the Supreme Court of the United States declared (in the Reynolds case), the Morrill law constitutional. But the Lord, in a revelation to President John Taylor, in 1882, said in effect, the Morrill law was not constitutional. He called George Teasdale and Heber J. Grant into the Quorum of Twelve, and Seymour B. Young into the Presidency of the Seventies quorum, provided the latter would enter into the law of plural marriage, which the Government had legislated against. In the revelation the Lord said: **"It is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood."** Elder Young proceeded to enter the law.

Men were being imprisoned, driven into exile and even killed for obeying the law of plural marriage and yet the Lord would take no action either in vacating the law or having its operations suspended . To those who cried unto Him because of persecution he comforted them thus:

> **Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and LEAP FOR JOY: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in like manner did their fathers unto the prophets.**

FRUITS OF PERSECUTION

"And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.

"And as he journeyed, he came near to Damascus: and suddenly there shined round him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Since the rebellion of Cain two potent influences have been felt in the world—one to build up and the other to tear down. One is the positive of life, the other the negative.

"My work and my glory", said the Lord, "is to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man"; it is Satan's work to prevent this. The two powers are in eternal conflict. Saul was moved upon by the latter power and was found persecuting the Saints. Many such examples are before us.

Korihor (Alma 30) being "possessed with a lying spirit", denied the existence of God and the coming of the Christ. He was brilliant in the things of the world—probably a leading lawyer, and he led many people astray. He was struck dumb by the power of God and his body destroyed.

Alma, accompanied by the sons of Mosiah, went about seeking to destroy the church of God. While prosecuting this evil work an angel from God stopped them by the way and spoke to them with a voice of thunder. These men fell to the ground with the fear of the Lord upon them, when the voice said:

> Arise. And I (Alma) stood up, and beheld the angel. And he said unto me: if thou wilt of thyself be destroyed, seek no more to destroy the church of God.
>
> And it came to pass that I fell to the earth; and it was for the space of three days and three nights that I could not open my mouth, neither had I the use of my limbs. * * * And now, for three days and for three nights was I racked, even with the pains of a damned soul.—Alma (Book of Mormon), Chapt. 36.

In Missouri, in Joseph Smith's day, similar experiences were observed. One example:

Joseph and his brethren were on their way in "Zion's camp" to take relief to the persecuted Saints in Missouri, when mobs began to organize to stop their progress. We read:

> Fifteen of the most violent mobocrats, with Samuel C. Owens and James Campbell at their head, started to raise an army to meet and overpower the Camp of Zion. James Campbell swore, as he adjusted his pistols in the holster, "The eagles and turkey buzzards shall eat my flesh if I do not fix Joe Smith and his army so that their skins will not hold shucks, before two days are past." That night as twelve of these mobocrats were attempting to cross the Missouri river their boat was sunk and seven of them were drowned. Among the lost was Campbell, wnose corpse floated down the river several miles and lodged upon a pile of driftwood, where ravenous birds did indeed pick his flesh from his bones, leaving the hideous bare skeleton to be discovered three weeks later by one Mr. Puntle.—Life of Joseph Smith, Cannon, p. 171.

Many instances of God's displeasure against those fighting His cause have occurred. Determined efforts to thwart the will of God engaged in by those understanding His will, as with Alma, can hardly be expected to meet other fate.

I AM A PLURAL WIFE

(Contributed)

I am a plural wife. My husband has as many wives as you can count on the fingers of your hand and a score of children. As wives, we were joined to the husband of our choice by a Servant of the Lord, in one of the most beautifully worded ordinances that angel tongues might speak. There was nothing improper or indecent about it, and "in the presence of God, angels and these witnesses", we were pronounced "legally and lawfully man and wife, for time and for all eternity."

I believe in polygamy (more properly called "Celestial or Plural Marriage") because it is one of the fundamental principles of the Gospel, as restored by the Mormon Prophet, Joseph Smith. I live it, because with all my heart I believe it is necessary to my eternal salvation in the worlds to come, where I may enjoy the companionship of my beloved husband and my lovely children forever. But this is not all; my life here is made more joyous and complete with a richness of companionship far beyond the realms of the understanding of most of our fellow-men—my cup of happiness filled and running over because of it. No woman ever lived who had a more loving husband. My children idolize him, and he is so devoted to us that it is only natural we should reflect his love.

We accept our husband as our head in all things, capable of judging righteously in all matters that concern our mortal and spiritual lives. He makes mistakes in judgment at times, but he is humble enough to acknowledge them, and he has never betrayed our confidence in him.

His profession is such that many women would find reason to be jealous and distruct him in following it. But our confidence in his integrity has never permitted these things to manifest themselves in our lives. He neither drinks, smokes, nor does he use profane or abusive language. He is a scholar in every line and excells in most everything he does. He provides abundantly for an exceptionally

large family. And in all his responsibility and hardships he is ever kind and adoring.

It will be said that we are prejudiced in his favor. But it is singular that others see in him the same attributes and he is honored and loved by all who know him well; though he is hated by many because of his belief, and because they do not understand him. I know countless good men who are justly held in the same high esteem by their wives. Such men to us are like Gods among men.

It is our conviction that only such men should have wives and families and be privileged to perpetuate the race. In fact, the practice of plural marriages is predicated upon the righteous qualifications of the applicants. Of course, many who profess to be good may abuse its privileges, but that is true in all marriages.

When men and women do not live up to their professions in this law of marriage, it inevitably brings unhappiness and heartaches and poverty, and this sometimes happens. However, this is no reason in my mind to reject it as a way of living superior to the present monogamous marriages. For the history of monogamy is one of heartaches and loss principally affecting the women, to my understanding.

Statistics sustain me when I say, marriageable women exceed marriageable men, and, I am convinced, no generation ever passed when monogamy is enforced where thousands and hundreds of thousands of fine, love-hungry women did not go unmarried and disillusioned to their graves, or consigned to prostitution, because they could not marry a man possessing the ideals they demanded. Often when such a man is found he is already married, and the disappointed girl is doomed to celibacy, or marries a drunken sot, or some one else whom she cannot honor, love and respect.

Marriage was instituted to "multiply and replenish the earth". In all nations where monogamy is enforced the birth rate declines, divorces increase and there is one standard of conduct for the men and another for the women. Two or more women could marry one man and fill the measure of their creation. While, if a woman had more than one husband would it increase her fertility? Would it enlarge her soul or increase the happiness of her home life? Would it not rather divide her life into warring interests and confuse the parentage of her issue?

Our cause will be misrepresented and the follies of the weaklings proclaimed. But those who have lived up to their religious convictions will be extolled in the eyes of all good people, for the principles governing plural marriage are pure and holy and will make those who obey them pure and holy.

Our Savior said: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect." Our lives are dedicated to this end. It is marvelous how in this law our failings are so apparent that we are desirous of overcoming them; while our virtues are displayed that they may be duplicated by one another.

I have often observed how many little things I have learned from my sister wives that have added to the joys and comforts I can administer to my husband. This I know; because he cherishes and loves more than one woman in holy marriage, he understands our hearts' desires as no monogamist ever could. In fact, I am convinced he loves any one of us far better than the monogamist knows how to. In turn, our love for him and each other expands in proportion to the number we share it with, as the mother who has many children knows greater love than if she had only one to spoil. For myself, my capacity to love my husband increased

a thousand-fold when I gave him another wife.

In the meantime, we women naturally have our troubles. Many times we are vexed and aggravated by the conflicting views of more than one mother in the home, and often the children fairly distract us. However, every trial of this nature is overruled and outshone by the happiness we have in our husband and children. By the spirit of joy and peace that pervades our home and dominates our lives by day and by night. By the knowledge that we are cultivating the virtues of godliness and honorably filling the ful measure of our creation. There is truly an indescribable joy that comes with the assurance that your life is approved of God.

We are not ashamed of our manner of living . In fact, we would not hesitate to invite kings, or presidents or rulers into our home at any time; and bid them stay for awhile and depart and not honestly say: "The Spirit of God abides there." We are careful of those who come into our lives, because we strive to avoid injuring ourselves by associating with those whom we know to be spies and liars and evil in their very natures. But our house constantly resounds to the merry laughter of true friends and our table is often spread to provide for twice our own numbers. And our big home has often been a shelter for the wayfarer and the hungry and destitute.

All this the United States, the State of Utah and the "Mormon" Church has united to stamp out. And we wonder before God if the country won't be poorer and the spirits of her citizens more niggardly if they succeed. **Truly, if they do stamp out polygamy, it will be because they have stamped out our lives. For as long as we live we will know that we were acting within our Constitutional rights, with the approval of God and the heavenly hosts. And whether we live or die, the principles of eternal truth will go on forever and shall shine amid the dark halls of life as the sun from the azure sky. And when we are gone others who worship the True God will arise to take our place. But, in the meantime, the world will go back decades in its vaunted progression and the Spirit of God will depart from our oppressors.**

A POLYGAMOUS WIFE SPEAKS

Inasmuch as the women in polygamy are generally accused of being misled, oppressed, beguiled and defiled, the women themselves feel they should have something to say in defense of their actions. Having lived for more than ten years in the plural marriage relation, I feel partially qualified, from the standpoint of experience, to express our side of the question.

Plural marriage is, first of all, an essential part of our religion. We believe that the marriage relation continues beyond the grave and that our status in this regard is dependent upon this principle. However, we feel that the mere having of wives and children will save no man, but his actions and treatment of them, together with obedience to the other laws of the Gospel will be the basis upon which he will be judged.

The Lord intended women to be queens—not slaves; counsellors to their husbands—and not dictators. We view this principle also from a standpoint of temporal happiness and well-being. We enter into these marriages of our own free will and choice, because we find therein more satisfaction, peace and contentment than in any other relationship.

These women are refined, intelligent and well educated. They love each other and their husband with a love that is clean and undefiled, stronger than the ties of blood. They love each other's children and the children love them in return. They enjoy far

more personel independence than do their monogamous sisters. It is a joy to have a companion with whom to share sorrow and happiness, sickness and health; in times of distress, someone to lean upon and turn to for assistance; and in times of sickness, to know that your children are receiving a mother's loving care.

We are accused of licentiousness; yet any thinking person knows that if it was "women" a man wanted he would not have to marry them. A rather expensive gratification! In this enlightened day there are certainly no women who **bear** and **rear** children for the gratification of their own lusts!

We have our children because we want them ,and we feel that any number of women can be happier married to one good man than for one woman to be married to a man who mistreats her.

While the papers and magazines are full of stories of child desertions and infanticides and the abortion racket is reaching alarming heights, it is strange that this nation should take time out from war duties to prosecute a handful of honest, God-fearing women who desire motherhood and love and care for their children, and a few men with the moral courage to acknowledge and support the children they beget and their mothers. Why should a nation cry "Mad Dog! Mad Dog!" when her cities are so filled with infamy and crime? They could better borrow the example of purity and virtue of their polygamous sisters. The fact that known prostitution remains unchallenged, shows that our prosecutors care nothing for the purity for which they shout.

"By their fruits ye shall know them; for a good tree cannot bring forth corrupt fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Are not the fruits of licentiousness disease? If this relationship were immoral, it certainly would be showing after ten to twenty years in this principle! If the State records of prenatal blood tests were to be examined, you would find not one case of venereal disease among the polygamous mothers. Is this, then, the fruits of debauchery? Our children can and do compare favorably with any children in the nation for mental aptitude and physical beauty. Is this the product of lust? Many important positions in the state and nation are held by children of three and four generations of polygamous parentage.

Our nation at present is bewailing the current wave of juvenile delinquency. They will not find any such cases among the children of polygamous families; unless some persons wish to so classify the few girls who have entered this principle short of legal age. While we object to such cases being held up as an example of the whole, we feel that this is far preferable to having that girl roam the streets and patronize the red-light districts.

Our children, raised together, are of necessity unselfish and able to cooperate and work together, and are considerate of the rights of others. The fact that the children of these plural families, rather than feeling ashamed of their parentage, generally follow in their footsteps, shows that they find the example set them at home preferable to that of their school friends and outside associates.

Because our numbers are few in comparison to our opponents does not make our cause unjust. The world owes its greatest truths (scientific and religious) to the martyred blood of the "obstinate minority"—those who were willing to stand alone for their convictions. Christ's crucifixion between two thieves did not make of him a thief.

(Signed) M. H. K.

PROGRESS IN THE COURTS

A digest of the cases to date: Judge Symes decision to quash the indictments on conspiracy charges, published in the May TRUTH, is being appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States by the government. It is not yet known if the Supreme Court will entertain the appeal.

The motion to quash the indictments against nine defendants on charges involving the "Mann Act" and the "Lindbergh Act" has been denied by Judge T. Blake Kennedy of Cheyenne, and each of the defendants has been declared guilty. Date of sentencing is fixed for June 7th. It is expected the case will go to the higher court for final adjudication.

In the State cases before Judge Ray Van Cott: Motion to quash the indictments in the 15 unlawful cohabitation cases was over-ruled and defendants' cases were presented to the Court on the following stipulation agreed to between the prosecution and the defendants:

> That the said defendant on and between June 1, 1940, and the 1st day of March, 1944, at the County of Salt Lake, State of Utah, did cohabit with more than one person of the opposite sex, to-wit: (Naming them), and that the said association was based on the belief of the said defendants and the said women in the divinity of the Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (exclusive of the Manifesto). No testimony was offered concerning sexual intercourse of the defendants with said women.

The Court found defendants guilty and imposed the statutory sentence of an indeterminate term of from one to five years in the State penitentiary. A stay of execution was granted pending an appeal of the case to the Supreme Court of the State.

Information on further cases will be given in the July number.

SCANDAL

When cannibal savages after a fight
Make a feast of the bodies of those they have beaten,
The grisly repast yields a keener delight
From the knowledge that every unfortunate wight
Would have deemed it the deepest disgrace to be eaten.

Though the custom is fast dying out in Fiji,
As the influence of Western example increases,
In civilized countries you often may see,
A circle of friends in the highest of glee,
All busily picking some neighbor to pieces.

And the best of it is that the neighbor is not,
As in islands barbaric, a person deceased;
His flesh has been baked in no cauldron or pot;
They don't even trouble to serve him up hot;
For the victim still lives in the midst of the feast.

Some good-natured friend, p'r'aps, may make him aware
Of the nature of these hungry monsters' employment;
And though in reply he may stoutly declare
That such vivisection don't hurt him a hair,
Yet he writhes at the thought of their fiendish enjoyment.

Still one comfort remains. In the isles of Fiji
No possible vengeance is left for the victim.
He is cooked and defunct. But in Europe he's free
To seek satisfaction; and sometimes we see
That he wounds in exchange for the wounds which have pricked him.

Then beware, Mrs. Smith; beware, lovely Miss Brown;
Young Jones, whisper nothing that isn't quite true;
Be a little more careful of others' renown,
For Thompson in yonder recess has sat down
With Miss Green, and is quietly cutting up YOU!

—Mill. Star, 41:624.

MY PRAYER

Again I come before Thee Lord
In deep humility.
May I this consolation find
That Thou forgivest me
Of what I might have said or done
Displeasing in Thy Sight.
Help me to be a better Saint,
Fill Thou my soul with light.

I also ask Thee to forgive
Those who to me are dear;
And may they find that perfect love
That casteth out all fear.
May those who yet in darkness walk
In this the greatest day
Of light and revelation turn
And find the better way.

Forgive Thy weary, stumbling Saints
And help them to endure
The tribulation and the scorn,
Yet be found clean and pure.
Before Thy throne. Oh, Lord of Hosts
Most humbly do I bow
And pray that Thou wilt now on us
Thy Spirit True, endow.

Let Zion's foes confounded be
Those that the Saints betray;
But bless. oh Lord, those who in truth
Thy covenants obey.
Give us the strength to carry on;
May it not be in vain.
May we behold that glorious day—
The great millennial reign.

—Niels Hansen.

THE STANDARD OF ZION

O, Saints, have you seen, o'er yon mountain's proud height,
The day star of promise so brilliantly beaming?
Its rays shall illumine the world with its light,
And the ensign of Zion, exultingly streaming,
All nations invite to walk in its light,
And join to maintain the proud standard of right—
The Standard of Zion, O long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Our motto is peace, and the triumph of right;
And we joyfully hail the Millennial dawning,
When man can emerge from a long dreary night
And bask in the sunbeams of Zion's bright morning.
The white flag so rare, still floating in air,
Proclaims 'mid the mountains that peace is still there.
Let the Standard of Zion eternally wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Though earth and its treasures should melt in the fire—
The planets be riven with the trumpets' loud thunder,
The sunlight of Heaven wax dim and expire,
And the veil of eternity parted asunder,
Yet firm and unshaken the truth shall remain,
And the heirs of the priesthood forever shall reign,
And the Standard of Zion eternally wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

—Parley P. Pratt.

THERE WILL ALWAYS BE SOMETHING TO DO

(Edgar A. Guest)

There will always be something to do, my boy;
There will always be wrongs to right;
There will always be need for a manly breed
And men unafraid to fight.
There will always be honor to guard, my boy;
There will always be hills to climb,
And tasks to do, and battles new
From now till the end of time.

There will always be dangers to face, my boy;
There will always be goals to take;
Men shall be tried, when the roads divide,
And proved by the choice they make.
There will always be burdens to bear, my boy;
There will always be need to pray;
There will always be tears through the future years,
As loved ones are borne away.

There will always be God to serve, my boy;
And always the Flag above;
They shall call to you until life is through
For courage and strength and love.
So these are things that I dream, my boy,
And have dreamed since your life began:
That whatever befalls, when the old world calls,
It shall find you a steady man.

A friend is a man who knows all about you and still likes you.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. JULY, 1944 NO. 2.

Discourse by President George A. Smith

Delivered at the Adjourned General Conference, Held in the New Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, May 7, 1874.

Zion to Be Redeemed Through the Law of Consecration—Persecutions of the Saints—a Oneness Among the Saints Necessary—the Hearts of the Fathers to Be Turned to the Children, and the Children to the Fathers

Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord, and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.

This passage will be found in the 5th and 6th verses of the 4th chapter of the Prophet Malachi.

The Latter-day Saints were driven from their homes in Jackson County, Missouri, about forty-one years ago. A portion of the mob commenced the outbreak in June or July, and among their first deeds of violence was the destruction of the printing office, plundering the storehouse, and the tarring and feathering of Edward Partridge, the Bishop. This was followed by whipping and killing the people and burning their houses, and finally culminated , on the 13th of October in **driving some fifteen hundred persons from their homes, on the public lands which they had purchased and received titles for from the United States.** The people thus driven went into different parts of the State, the great body of them, however, taking shelter in the County of Clay.

The settlements in Jackson County were commenced on the principle of the law of consecration. If you read the revelations that were given, and the manner in which they were acted

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

upon, you will find that the brethren brought, before the Bishop and his counselors, their property and consecrated it, and with the money and means thus consecrated lands were purchased, and inheritances and stewardships distributed among the people, all of whom regarded their property as the property of the Lord. There were, however, at that period, professed Latter-day Saints, who did not see proper to abide by this law of consecration; they thought it was their privilege to look after "number one", and some of them, believing that Zion was to become a very great city, and that being the center stake of it, **they purchased tracts of land in the vicinity with the intention of keeping them until Zion became the beauty and joy of the whole earth, when they thought they could sell their lands and make themselves very rich. It was probably owing to this, in part, that the Lord suffered the enemies of Zion to rise against her.**

The members of the Church at that period were very industrious, frugal, and law-abiding, and there was no possibility of framing any charges or claims against them by legal means, and the published manifesto, upon which the mob was collected, boldly asserted that the civil law did not afford a guarantee against this people, consequently they formed themselves into a combination, a lawless mob, pledging to each other **"their lives, their property and their sacred honor" to drive the "Mormons" from their midst.** From that hour the heart of every Latter-day Saint has been occasionally warmed with the feeling—may I be permitted to live until the day when the Saints shall again go to Jackson County, when they shall build the Temple, the ground for which was dedicated, and when the Order of Zion, as it was then revealed, shall be carried out! And it has been generally understood among us that the redemption of Zion would not occur upon any other principle than upon that of the law of consecration.

Forty years and more have passed away since these events took place. **We have been driven five times from our homes; five times we have been robbed of our inheritances. Our leaders and presiding officers have been killed, and not in a single instance, in any State or Territory where we have lived, has the law been magnified in the protection of the Latter-day Saints, until we were driven into these mountains.** In 1834, Daniel Dunklin, the Governor of Missouri, said the laws were ample, and the Constitution was ample, but the prejudices of the people were so great that he and the other authorities of the State were powerless to execute the law for the protection of the Mormons. We have had one protector—our Father in heaven, to depend upin; but governors, judges, rulers, officers of any kind, high or low, have utterly failed to extend protection to the Latter-day Saints. God alone has been our protector, and we acknowledge his hand in every deliverance we have hitherto experienced.

Several times the Church has made advances to organize the Order of Enoch as it was revealed in the Book of Covenants in part, and in the ancient history of the Zion of Enoch; these advances, however, the Saints did not seem prepared to receive. We have been gathered from many nations, and we have brought many notions and traditions with us, and it has seemed that with these notions and traditions we could not dispense. In 1838, an attempt was made in Caldwell County, Mo., the Latter-day Saints owning all the lands in the country, or all that were considered of any value. They organized Big Field United Firms, by which they intended to consolidate their property and to regard it as the property of the Lord, and themselves only as stewards; but they had not advanced so far in this matter as to perfect their system before they

were broken up and driven from the State. **I understand that three hundred and eighteen thousand dollars in money was paid by the Saints to the United States for lands in the State of Missouri, not one acre of which any one of us has been permitted to enjoy or to live upon since the year 1838, or the Spring of 1839; though at the time of the expulsion, the Commanding General, John W. Clarke, informed the people that if they would renounce their religious faith they could remain on their lands. He said that they were skillful mechanics, industrious and orderly, and had made more improvements in three years than the other inhabitants had in fifteen, and if they would renounce their faith they could remain. But they must hold no more meetings, prayer meetings, prayer circles or councils, and they must have no more Bishops or Presidents; and in view of their refusal to comply with these conditions, the edict of banishment, issued by the Governor of the State, was executed by this general with an army at his heels, and the Latter-day Saints were driven from their happy homes, and thousands of them scattered to the four winds of heaven.**

Since our arrival in these valleys, sermons have been preached from year to year, to illustrate to us the principle of oneness. We find that we are one, generally, in faith. We believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; we believe in the first principles of the Gospel—the doctrines of repentance, and baptism for the remission of sins, the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost and the resurrection of the dead; we readily receive, by the power of the Holy Spirit, manifested to us through the Prophets, the doctrine of baptism for the dead, the holy anointing and the law of celestial marriage. This principle came in opposition to all our prejudices, yet when God revealed it, his Spirit bore testimony of its truth, and the Latter-day Saints received it almost en masse. In order to make a step in the right direction, and to prepare the people to return to Jackson County, the principles of cooperation were taught and their practice entered into; and for the purpose of instructing and encouraging the minds of the people upon the benefits of united action, from the earliest settlement of this Territory to the present time, the presiding Elders of the Church have, every Conference, endeavored to impress upon their minds the necessity of making themselves self-supporting. We have looked forward to the day when Babylon would fall, when we could not draw our supplies from her midst, and when our own ingenuity, talent, and skill must supply our wants. The effect of all this instruction is, that we have made some progress in many directions, but not so much as could have been desired.

The cultivation of cotton was introduced in the South. Sheep-breeding has been extensively adopted, numerous factories have been erected to manufacture both the wool and the cotton produced. Several extensive tanneries have also been established for the manufacture of hides into leather, and various other kinds of business have been introduced with a view to making ourselves self-supporting.

Within a few years the railroad has been constructed through our Territory, and the expense of freighting has been greatly reduced. Mines which before the railroad was built, were perfectly worthless, have been developed and made to pay, and the minds of many of the people seem to have been impressed with the idea that we may expect some regular, general business to grow out of the production of the mines, and a great many have been led to neglect home manufactures, and to depend upon purchasing from abroad. Some settlements have, however, exerted themselves considerably to produce clothing, and many

articles within themselves. These circumstances are all clear before us. **You go through Utah County, today, and say to a farmer, "Have you got any sorgum to sell?" "No, haven't raised any for two or three years; sugar got so cheap, we could not sell it." "I suppose you have plenty of sugar?" "No, we are out of sugar, we haven't any money to buy it with." This is the position which our course of life has led us to, and which we already begin to feel.**

There is another principle connected with this matter which we should consider, and that is, when we as a community, in the valleys of the mountains, provide for our own wants, we are not subject to the fluctuations and difficulties that result from a money panic, or an interruption in the currency. When we came to this Conference a great many of us came with the determination to take such measures as should place us as a people on an independent footing, and hence we propose through our brethren, to go to work and organize a united order. There is at present a deficiency in our organization so far as our business relations are concerned. Of course, in every settlement, there are many industrious men, then there's some who are schemers; and as each man looks out for himself, that good principle which the Savior taught so strongly, that a man should love the Lord his God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself, is in a great measure forgotten, and a few gather up the property, while many of the laboring men, who do most of the work, come out at the end of the year behind, without a full supply of the necessaries of life. To avoid this, a United Order would organize a community so that all the ingenuity, talent, skill, and energy it possessed would inure to the good of the whole. This is the object and design in the establishment of these organizations. It is perfectly certain that there is in every community a sufficient amount of skill and energy and labor to supply its wants, and put all its members in possession of every necessity and comfort of life, if all this skill and energy be rightly directed. We propose to take measures to direct aright the labor that we have in our possession, and lay a foundation for comfort, happiness, plenty and the blessings of life within ourselves.

We, further, do not believe that Latter-day Saints, in the service of the Most High, can enjoy that high degree of respect in the presence of the Almighty to which they are entitled, when they are biting, devouring, shaving, skinning, and maneuvering, and out-maneuvering and getting the advantage of each other in little petty deals. We want to see these things cease entirely, for we know that we can never be prepared for the coming of the Savior except by uniting and becoming one, in temporal as well as in spiritual things, and being prepared to enjoy the blessings of exaltation.

The principles of life, which we now present for the consideration of the Latter-day Saints were carried out in times past, as we read in the Book of Mormon, among the Nephites and Lamanites, who each enjoyed over a hundred years of unity, peace, happiness and plenty, as the result of adopting this system of unity; and if we will unite in one, acting in good faith, every man esteeming his brother as himself, regarding not what he possesses as his own, but the Lord's, all carrying out these principles, the result is certain—**it is the enjoyment of the Spirit of the Lord, it is the light of eternity, it is the abundance of the things of this earth; it is an opportunity to provide education for our children, amusement and interest for ourselves, a knowledge of the things of the kingdom of God, and all sciences which are embraced therein, and an advance in the work of the last days, preparatory to the redemp-**

tion of the center stake of Zion.

Brethren and sisters, think of these things, and as the spirit of the Almighty was in your hearts when you received the laying on of hands and the baptism of the Holy Spirit, bearing testimony that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was true, seek with all your hearts, and know, by the same spirit, that the establishment of the United Order, is another step towards the triumph of that great and glorious work for which we are continually laboring, namely the dawning of the Millennium and the commencement of the reign of Christ on the earth.

This is the work of the Almighty. These principles are from God; they are for our salvation, and unless we remember and abide in them our progress will be slow. If we are slow to learn and progress, but try to carry out the purposes of God, He will not cast us off. He has been very patient with us these forty years, and he may continue to be so. But understand that the hearts of the fathers must be turned to the children and the hearts of the children to the fathers. A unity must exist, the Latter-day Saints must love one another, they must cease to worship this world's goods, they must lay a foundation to build up Zion and to be one, in order that they may be prepared for the great day that shall burn as an oven.

I bear my testimony to you of the truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, of the Book of Mormon, of the ministry of Joseph Smith and of his servants the Elders that were called of the Lord by him, Brigham Young and the Apostles and Elders who have borne these testimonies to the nations of the earth, and I say, brethren, give diligent heed to these things, lest by any means we should let them slip and come short of entering into rest.

May the blessings of Israel's God be upon you forever. Amen.—Journal of Discourses, 17:58-63.

FACTS THAT SHOULD AROUSE CONCERN

Fifteen members of the so-called Fundamentalist group were adjudged guilty of unlawful cohabitation in the Utah state courts, and before the imposition of sentence by Judge Ray Van Cott, Jr. (May 25, 1944) the following revealing address was presented to the Court by Claude T. Barnes, chief counsel for the defendants, after which the statutory sentence of from one to five years in the state penitentiary was pronounced by the court:

As an officer of this Court I am indignant at the suggestion, that perhaps we are all dupes and that the statute under which these men were convicted is but the instrumentality of vengeance of one religious sect upon another. No church, not even the dominant one that wins the respect of my heart, has a right to a special statute in its behalf; nevertheless, let us consider the facts that arouse my displeasure.

From the beginning of Utah's statehood unlawful cohabitation was a misdemeanor punishable by a maximum fine of $300 and six months in the county jail. Indeed two of the finest men, both Presidents of what we have designated as the "dominant church", one of whom is now living, paid fines for it as follows: September 9, 1899, $100, and 1905, $300. In ten minutes I could if necessary bring those records before you.

But in 1935 someone prevailed upon the Utah Legislature to make unlawful cohabitation a felony punishable by a maximum sentence of five years: an anomalous situation, that adultery, a grievous offense against one spouse, is a lesser crime than unlawful cohabitation, which is an offense against no one except that it is prohibited.

If this be a fight of sect against

sect I am indignant that it should seek to prostitute the judiciary and the bar. Strong men uphold the independence and fairness of justice.

There is another egregious unfairness about this matter. I have in my hand the record of 886 cases of sexual offenses, a large portion of them adultery, by respected citizens of Salt Lake City during the year 1943. I have fifteen pages here of names, dates, arresting numbers and other data; but did you or I ever hear of a single one of them? No, and rather than break the hearts of hundreds of homes I will unless challenged burn the list as soon as I leave court. They are all caught-in-the-act cases involving, frequently, fathers and mothers. I am not criticising the county attorney or my brilliant friend the district attorney, for like them I should hesitate before making homes unhappy. But these defendants have happy homes. Are they to be immolated? We know that because of their belief men were once mangled by dogs in the Colosseum at Rome, tied to posts and made living torches along the Via Appia, or covered with sulphureous pitch; crucified and burned on the colonades of St. Peter's, which was then the garden of Nero. Have we reached that stage of religious persecution? Have we reached the stage when 886 citizens are released with fines of from $5 to $50 and these men with a lesser offense are to go to the State prison for five years?

The people of this State do not want these men to serve time behind bars. There is another way: Your honor has under the 1943 law the discretion of suspended sentence and probation when "it is compatible with the public interest". It is compatible with the public interest.

This I know: The wrath of the bar will be aroused if it feels that its judiciary is in the slightest degree persuaded to be the instrumentality of religious vengeance.

LAWS AND MORE LAWS

Under the heading, "Eight Years of Chaos", AMERICA PREFERRED copies the following from the DAILY OKLAHOMAN of April 16, 1940:

"What is the law? That we have thirty thousand laws in these United States that never were enacted by the people's Congress and not to be found in the revised statutes was the grave assertion made by United States Federal Judge Vaught in his address on the Constitution of the United States at the Y. M. C. A. Monday evening.

"Those laws, according to Federal Judge Vaught, are the executive orders of federal bureaus.

"They have all the effects of acts of Congress. Citizens can be punished for violating those orders. They may be fined or imprisoned for violating those orders.

"Yet none of those orders have ever been enacted into law by the Congress elected by the people.

"Moreover, those one-man made laws are not to be found in the statutes. Citizens can only guess what they provide.

"No citizen, not even the attorneys who advise, can more than guess at what those laws are and what they provide.

"This is a far cry from the Jeffersonian dictum that 'the least governed people are the best governed people.'

"Instead of mere minimum of government, our country probably has more government than any other country on this earth.

"It is a disturbing fact that the Congress of the people has abdicated their powers or its powers shamefully.

"It has delegated to countless bureaus that which the constitution conferred upon the Congress and upon no one else. It has even become a more disturbing fact that any citizen, however law-loving and law-abiding, is likely to become a law violator at any hour.

"He does not know what these laws are and what they provide. His attorney cannot tell him what these laws are.

"Two developments equally GRAVE and equally DANGEROUS, may be the ultimate result of this multiplicity of bureaucratic regulations.

"The structure of law may become so top-heavy that it will fall of its own weight.

"Or large masses of the people may decide that since it is utterly impossible to obey all the laws, they might as well not obey any of them.

"We send men to Washington to make our laws, and they turn their job over to their political creatures. And that is bad."

Nevertheless we call it a Democracy!

MORMONISM NOT LICENTIOUS

On the occasion of a case of seduction and abortion coming to light in Salt Lake City, the Deseret News, Nov. 10, 1884, made the following comments. These sentiments expressed the views and principles of the Latter-day Saints in relation to those crimes.

Seduction and abortion are foreign to the sentiments and practices of the great body of the people of this Territory. The report of such a case as that which has come to light is horrifying to this community. The "Mormons" are vehemently opposed to any sexual intercourse outside of the marriage relation, and to the destruction of human life, foetal or matured. Sexual sins they look upon with the utmost aversion and count them as capital crimes. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has always inculcated chastity and classed it among the essential virtues. And its written standards as well as its living oracles have ever denounced, in the most positive language, any departure from the law which forbids illicit sexual relations.

Latterly President John Taylor has been more than usually outspoken against licentiousness, lasciviousness, and all those offenses against God and His Church which tend to pollute the body and poison the fountains of life. He has proclaimed the rule that the adulterer and the seducer shall not be permitted to enter the Temples of the Lord, nor have a standing in the Church of Christ. He has repeatedly warned the Bishops and others in charge of the Saints in an organized capacity, against permitting persons guilty of unchaste conduct to partake of the blessings of the House of the Lord, and made them responsible for the rooting out of iniquity in their several fields of labor. The leading Elders of the Church have supported the President in the stand he has taken on this question, and the rule has been established and enforced that no person who has committed adultery after receiving the covenants of the Lord's House shall be permitted to remain in or re-enter the Church.

Foeticide and infanticide are regarded by this Church as murderous and inexcusable. Those who are guilty of such crimes cannot have place among the Latter-day Saints. This has been announced by the highest authority in the Church, and it is well understood as the word of the Lord. Those who assist in or help to cover up such iniquities become parties to the sin, and will share in its responsibilities and consequences. Such offenses against God and society cannot be viewed with the least degree of allowance. They are to be shunned and condemned by all right-thinking

people, and must be looked upon with abhorrence and abiding disgust by every one professing to be a Latter-day Saint.

The necessity for the positive and outspoken teachings which have been delivered at the General Conferences during the past year or two, has arisen from the introduction into this Territory of persons from abroad, who have brought with them usages and customs which prevail among professedly respectable people in the United States and in Europe, and which are winked at, if not encouraged, by so-called ministers of religion, as well as by many medical practitioners. The greatest opponents of the system of marriage which God has revealed to the Latter-day Saints are, many of them, advocates of very limited family responsibilities. This is quite natural. It is the legitimate outcome of their theories. They are opposed to family increase, and therefore seek to check it in their own experiences. They array themselves against God's law for the multiplication of His children on earth, and become subject to that influence which leads to destruction. The work of Deity is to develop life; the work of the Evil One is to destroy and bring down to death. That the men and women who adopt the suggestions of Satan, and destroy human life in embryo or prevent its inception, should make war upon the God-given system of present and eternal increase, is not to be wondered at, it is as consistent as it is devilish.

The case which has caused such painful interest is not an outgrowth of "Mormonism", as some disingenious persons wish to make appear. It is antagonistic to "Mormonism" in every sense of the word. It is one of a kind common in the "civilized" world. There such things are also condoned. Seduction is among the practices called "sewing wild oats". The seducer, unless his vile acts produce a "scandal" that cannot be winked at, is not shunned in high society, but the "fast young man" is often lionized and admired. Abortion has an ugly sound, and when it is exposed is openly condemned. And yet reputable physicians admit that it is widely practiced, and that they are frequently beset by ladies of standing in church and society, for aid in the accomplishment of the hellish purpose of destroying their own imperfectly developed offspring. These are "Gentile", not "Mormon" sins. "Mormon" women are "vulgar" enough to have large families. They are "simple" enough to think that bearing children is a duty and privilege. They are so old-fashioned and unsophisticated as to believe that children are a blessing, and the more children the more blessings. "Mormonism" teaches that good men, under certain regulations, may have more wives than one, but that intercourse with the opposite sex outside of the marriage relation is a deadly sin, and that the practices of Gentilism in seducing women and destroying the consequences of such infamy, are damnable and hell-deserving, and not to be condoned, or excused, or palliated.

With the introduction of "Christian civilization" into Utah has come the long train of evils which mark its progress all over the world: Drinking saloons, gambling dens, the brothel, the assignation house, the arts of the libertine, the drugs of the abortionist, the appliances of surgical and medical science for the prevention and destruction of foetal life, the nostrums for the cure of secret diseases, and implements to aid indulgence in impure desire, and protect the debauchee from the consequences thereof. They have had a very slow growth in this community because the spirit and teachings and tendencies of the faith of the great body of the people are so diametrically and powerfully opposed to them. But they are here, and they have their advocates and supporters,

and the effects thereof begin to appear.

Let it be known and understood that this Church and its authorized exponents are uncompromisingly at enmity with such influences; measures and practices, and all who aid and abet them. We despise them as the very portals of hell. We have no fellowship for those who countenance them, or seek to cover them up, or save the perpetrators thereof from the just penalties for their diabolism. No man or woman can retain the Spirit of God or a real standing in His Church, who revels in these iniquities. The child murderer is guilty of innocent blood. Infanticide is murder. Foeticide is a crime in the same category. Death produced by drugs is just the same in effect and intent as death by blood-shedding. Any one who thinks to the contrary is blind and self-deceived. The deep damnation of the cowardly wretches who blot out the lives of unborn innocents no pen can picture. The y are fit to become angels to the devil, for their crime is devilish.

Wo be unto them who dabble in these pools of pollution! Their unseen sins cannot remain concealed. That which has been done in secret will be revealed upon the housetops. It will cry aloud in the ears of the universe, and will sound their death knell in the day of eternal justice. The curse of God will blight the hands that practice this infernal infamy, and every kingdom of glory will close its gates against the souls that are dyed with this crimson shame, while outer darkness will be their doom and misery be their portion. Let the Latter-day Saints beware of the insidious and Satanic influences of civilized Gentilism, and shun even the appearance of evil. They have come out from among them, now let them be entirely separate and touch not the unclean thing!—The Deseret Evening News, Nov. 10, 1884. Millennial Star, Vol. 46, pp. 785-7.

REDEMPTION OF ZION

"What have you accomplished?" was the sneering taunt of the apostate and of those weak in faith, met by the remnant of the little band on their return to Kirtland. "Just what we went for", the meek, though firm, reply of such men as Heber C. Kimball and Brigham Young.

And they were right. To them it was no failure. The trial of their faith was complete. Their offering, like Abraham's, had been accepted. They had been weighed in the eternal balance, and were not found wanting.

But what of Zion and her redemption?

Let the word of the Lord, the God of Enoch, the God of Joseph give answer:

"The Redemption of Zion Must Needs Come by Power."

Power dwells in unity, not in discord; in humility, not pride; in sacrifice, not selfishness; obedience, not rebellion.

Zion's Camp, if it failed at all in fulfilling its mission, failed for precisely similar reasons to those which had caused the expulsion of the Saints from Jackson County; reasons which, in ancient times, kept Israel wandering for forty years in the wilderness, within sight of their coveted Caanan, which they were not permitted in that generation to possess. Like Moses, these modern pilgrims beheld, as from Pisgah's top, their promised land: like Moses, on account of transgression, they were not permitted to "cross over". No doubt there were Calebs and Joshuas in the Camp, who were worthy. But the great event, in the wisdom of the Highest, was not then destined to be.

It was left for a future generation and its Joshua to go up in the might of the Lord and redeem Zion.

Yet not alone upon Zion's Camp must rest the responsibility of their failure to redeem Zion. It bears with at least equal weight upon those whom they came to succor.

What said the Lord concerning them?

"Behold, they have not learned to be obedient, * * * but are full of all manner of evil, and do not impart of their substance, as becometh Saints, to the poor and afflicted among them."

Is not the episode of the fowl, related by Heber, a tell-tale straw before the wind in this connection? Can a people honey-combed with selfishness build up Zion?

"And are not united according to the union required by the law of the celestial kingdom;"—

Again that injunction of unity, the secret of Zion's redemption. "Except ye are one ye are not mine."

"And Zion cannot be built up unless it is by the principles of the law of the celestial kingdom, otherwise I cannot receive her unto myself."

Wonderfully revealing, this. What is it but to say that the United Order, the Order of Enoch, the Order of Zion, is the order of the celestial worlds, where the Gods, a divine brotherhood, have "all things common?"

"Therefore it is expedient in me that mine elders should wait for a little season, for the redemption of Zion."

Is it marvelous that this should be; that a work of such magnitude should require preparation; that Zion, city of holiness, should be built up only by the pure in heart? Ah, reader, the redemption of Zion is more than the purchase or recovery of lands, the building of cities, or even the founding of nations. **It is the conquest of the heart, the subjugation of the soul, the sanctifying of the flesh, the purifying and ennobling of the passions. Greater is he who subdues himself, who captures and maintains the citadel of his own soul, than he who, misnamed conqueror, fills the world with the roar of drums, the thunder of cannon, the lightning of swords and bayonets, overturns and sets up kingdoms, lives and reigns a king, yet wears to the grave the fetters of unbridled lust, and dies the slave of sin.**

In her children's hearts must Zion first be built up and redeemed; "every man seeking the interest of his neighbor, and doing all things with an eye single to the glory of God." When the fig-tree of Israel's faith puts forth such leaves, then know that the summer is nigh.

"And this cannot be brought to pass, until mine elders are endowed with power from on high."

And yet were these same elders, unendowed, sent forth to redeem Zion? Surely the Lord did not design it then to be. Else, would he not have endowed them before-hand? This admitted, and what becomes of their "failure?"

Ah, there are many such failures in a sublime success. They are but steps in the stairway of triumph and victory.

What did Zion's Camp achieve? It cast the shadow of a coming event; struck the spark that shall kindle to a flame; fixed on the horizon of history a shining star, the herald of a glory yet to come.—From Life of Heber C. Kimball, pp. 77-79.

★ *Comment From a Virginia Reader* ★

★ How can people keep from laughing when they see a judge who takes himself seriously, trying a man or woman for bigamy and swearing the witnesses on a book that says the man that committed bigamy many times was the wisest man that ever lived? ★

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious.
PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy.

6

Vol. 10. JULY, 1944. No. 2.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

HUSBAND SHORTAGE

FOLLOWING World War I, as a result of war casualties and other factors, the surplus women in Europe was enormous. The excess of women in Poland was 38%; in Russia, 32%; in Great Britain, 23%; in France, Germany and Italy, 21 to 22%. "The situation was so bad", population experts tell us, "that there was serious discussion of giving polygamy legal status". Actually it went beyond the discussion stage. A French woman scientist said recently: "It is generally understood that about one in every ten marriages in France has been polygamous. Not legally so, of course. But men have illegal wives in addition to their legal ones, and often maintain two homes and two sets of children."
—Condensed from Collier's.

"MANN" AND "LINDBERGH" ACT CASES

June 7, the Hon. Judge T. Blake Kennedy pronounced sentences on eight men and one woman who had been adjudged guilty of infractions of the laws. Prison terms of from one year and a day to four years and a day were ordered. Mrs. Edna Christensen (Zitting) drew the short term and Heber Kimball Cleveland the long term. Others received from two to three year terms. A stay of execution was granted pending an appeal to the Circuit Court of Appeals sitting at Denver, Colo. The defendants are at liberty on bail bonds.

Our very deep reverence for American institutions and particularly for the Judicial department of the Government elicits hesitancy on our part in offering criticism of either the laws or their execution. But it is through constructive criticism that reforms take shape. Often times laws are unjust; these should be repealed or modified. And, at times, reasonable laws are rendered oppressive and obnoxious by the strained interpretations given them. Constructive criticisms tend to correct these errors.

In the cases at bar the fight is against the Mormon system of Celestial marriage which admits, as a vital element, plural marriage. The doctrine is scriptural and natural. It is sustained by the law book of the Christians, the Holy Bible; and it was reestablished in the present dispensation by revelations from God through His mouthpiece, Joseph Smith the

Prophet.

Modern so-called Christianity is opposed to this system of marriage and is attacking it with a viciousness comparable only to religious fanaticism. In the intermountain states, with Utah its principle base, the Mormon marriage system has prevailed since the Pioneers first entered the Salt Lake valley, nearly 100 years ago. This was then Mexican territory. The law was given in 1831 at Nauvoo, Illinois, as a Priesthood law, which it essentially is. It was observed by Joseph Smith and other leaders of the Mormon faith under cover of secrecy until 1852, when the Church officially adopted the law as a tenet of its faith. The Church is a quasi-democracy, when in order, all things in it being done by the "common consent" of its members. Its membership comprise all grades of faith, often being guided by the false traditions brought into it from other churches or by social usages.

The opposition against the system of marriage became so great that in 1890 the President of the Church was induced to issue a Manifesto absolving its members from further living in the principle. The Priesthood, of course, continued on, entirely independent of church edicts. With the introduction of this Manifesto prosecutions for infractions of the anti-polygamy laws almost entirely ceased for over fifty years, though it was general knowledge among both Mormons and non-Mormons that the system was being carried on to, however, a more limited degree.

There is no Federal law against the Mormon marriage system except as pertains to Territories under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The State of Utah has had prohibitory laws against plural marriage since admission to statehood. The state not seeing fit to enforce such laws and the Church being plagued by its former practices and by a continuance of the teachings of the law recently has reportedly assisted the Federal powers to begin a prosecution of the adherents to the system. There being, as stated, no Federal law under which prosecutions might be pushed, the officers proceeded to invoke the "Mann Act" and the "Lindbergh Act". **The "Mann Act" forbids the transportation of "any woman or girl for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery or for any other immoral purpose, or with the intent and purpose of inducing, enticing, or compelling such woman or girl to become a prostitute, or give herself up to debauchery or to engage in any other immoral practice."**

On this point a recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States (Decided May 15, 1944) is illuminating. Mortensen et al. v. United States, No. 559. A verdict of guilty brought in the Federal Court was reversed by the U. S. Supreme Court. We quote from the opinion:

> We do not here question or reconsider any previous construction placed on the Act which may have led the federal government into areas of regulation not originally contemplated by Congress. But experience with the administration of the law admonishes us against adding another chapter of statutory construction and application which would have a similar effect and which would make possible even further justification of the fear expressed at the time of the adoption of the legislation that its broad provisions "are liable to furnish boundless opportunity to hold up and blackmail and make unnecessary trouble, without any corresponding benefits to society.
>
> To punish those who transport inmates of a house of prostitution on an innocent vacation trip in no way related to the practice of their commercial vice is consistent neither with the purpose nor with the language of the Act. Congress was attempting primarily to eliminate the "white slave" business which uses inter-state and foreign commerce as a means of procuring and distributing its victims and "to prevent panderers and procurers from COMPELLING

thousands of women and girls against their desire to enter and continue in a life of prostitution.—64 Supreme Court Reporter, p. 1041-2.

The real intent of the law is clearly defined as being to prevent the transportation of women or girls from one state to another for the purpose of prostitution and debauchery, or to be induced or enticed, or compelled (which imports non-consent) to become prostitutes or give themselves up to debauchery. At the time of the enactment of this law in 1910 there was a well organized movement to transfer women from European centers and other places to populous centers in the United States, where they were forced to enter and even sold into prostitution and all the horrors of that life. It is a noted fact that during the discussion of this law in the halls of Congress the Mormon marriage system was in no sense attacked although it was in general usage.

As we view these matters: In the present cases, no act was committed by any of the defendants that came within the meaning of this "Mann Act". In no sense did any of these men transport women from one state to another for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery. Two of them, having temporary occupations in another state, were accompanied to such work by alleged plural wives, mothers of children and respected women in the community. Two others took their alleged plural wives, or had them taken, from one part of the state of Utah to another location in the same state. This latter place in southern Utah can be reached only through crossing the line into Arizona, the road so running in Arizona only a few rods, then veering back into Utah, where the parties resided. In none of the cases was there any evidence whatever of prostitution or intended prostitution.

In the case of Defendant Edna Christensen, alleged plural wife of Charles F. Zitting: She is charged with kidnapping under the "Lindbergh Act". Her crime (?) consisted in accompanying a lady from Utah into Mexico. This lady was about to become a mother and desired a legal marriage to the father of the coming child, which she could not obtain in Utah without her parents' consent, and which they had withdrawn after having given it. After the marriage the couple settled in Arizona. Two children were born to them. The father is a good provider, a kind and proud parent. His first wife had died. This girl nursed him through a sickness lasting about a year. While caring for him, looking after a flock of chickens and a cow, and attending school in the village, she had learned to care for him, ending in a trip to Mexico to be married.

The F. B. I. finally picked him up on the charge of kidnapping the girl. This involved the cases of Defendants Zitting and Christensen. We think there was no evidence of kidnapping as interpreted by the statute. The girl mature enough to know her mind, asked to be taken to Mexico. She asked Mrs. Christensen to accompany her. She desired motherhood and to give her coming offspring legal status. She is now 18 years of age, a happy mother, a dutiful wife and a good housekeeper. The real facts in this case in no sense involves polygamy or plural marriage. The defendant, Chatwin, received a two-year sentence; Edna Christensen who, in the goodness of her heart, helped the girl, is the mother of eight children, the youngest about ten months of age. She is a fine, virtuous woman and a splendid homemaker. **She is convicted of a felony and given a sentence by the Federal Court of a year and a day in the penitentiary. A few days after her sentence a man was convicted in the State Court of the murder of a companion during a drunken brawl. He was sentenced to serve one year in the County jail. One assisted in bringing life into the world, while the other de-**

stroyed life; the lady was adjudged the greater criminal.

What is the attitude of the Federal (Utah) judiciary and the State courts relating to the Mormon marriage system? One recent example is illustrative: On December 4, 1943, one John Zenz, a Mormon, was convicted of a Mann Act charge in the Federal Court at Salt Lake City. He had taken two wives from Utah to Las Vegas, Nevada, where he was employed as an automobile mechanic. Zenz, claiming a religious faith as prompting his marital relations and, with the consent and assistance of his legal wife, desiring to rear another family, was given five years in a Federal prison; and his legal wife, a woman of high standing in the community, convicted with her husband, was sent to a Reformatory in West Virginia for two years.

On the same day, in the same court, a William Harold Keaizer pleaded guilty of a Mann Act charge of transporting a certain woman over state lines for immoral purposes, and received a sentence of two years in a Federal penitentiary. The one, a hard working man of sober habits, adopting a life calculated to exalt womanhood and bring life into the world, was given the limit of the law—five years, his wife two years; while the other, a confessed law-breaker engaged in an occupation calculated to debauch and destroy womanhood, drew a sentence of only two years!

Some months after this occurrence the court records show that two men admitted guilt of Mann Act charges before the same Judge; their sentences were deferred until October 14, 1944. One, Clivy K. Griggs, being released without bail to Ray McCarty, and the other, Lewis Colmera Ford, was released, without bail, to George K. Miles. Zenz, a Mormon with a confessed plural wife whom he was supporting and treating as a wife, received a sentence of five years, while these two "white slavery" men were turned loose without bail in the custody of friends for some seven months before sentence is to be passed.

What think you? **How would Father Abraham fare in this court?**

In the case of the Chatwins: Admitting, for argument's sake, a technical infraction of the law on the part of the defendant, Christensen, we ask: Who was injured in the transaction? No force was employed. It was a willing acquiescence; an act that benefited rather than injured all parties concerned. It was done not to destroy life but to preserve and promote life, —to legitimize an unborn child; to establish a recognized legal wifely status **under our civil code,** and to remove any possible shadow on the mother and her coming child.

What think you of such application of the "Kidnapping Act"? Why send the real benefactors to prison leaving the children bereft of a parent's care and breaking up a happy home life. Does society demand such a sacrifice? Where lies any possibility of benefit to these people individually or to society? Where lies the blame for this situation?

One is led to wonder why the Church, once so insistent on the living of the Priesthood marriage system, suddenly becomes so hateful toward the divine principle? The Church uses polygamously born children in its public ministry, while damning the parents for bringing them into life. At the present time the nation is using polygamously born children in its armed service, in rank both low and high, while its paid agents and servants are sending men to prison for siring them; and this at a time when every civilized nation on earth is bidding for an increase of births.

How account for such actions and attitudes on any basis of consistency?

LIBERTY

In these days of spiritual skepticism and social and economic infidelity, when the greatest prize of life—LIBERTY—is being assailed and threatened with destruction, it is a comfort to the soul of man to find champions of the priceless gift; men whose words bear weight with the thinking public and who are courageous in their stand. Such leaders of men are entitled to support for, win or lose, they pit their weakness against mighty forces whose designs seem to be the overcoming of human reason, and the ultimate enslavement of the world.

We are thinking of the Most Rev. Duane G. Hunt, bishop of the Salt Lake Catholic diocese. In his baccalaureate address to a graduating class of approximately 300 candidates for degrees from the University of Utah, June 4, 1944, he held that a revival of religion is "obviously the only hope for salvation of our country".

The Bishop pointed out that no other generation of America has lived so completely under the spell of war as that of which the graduates are a part. He said, "If you are to be saved from totalitarianism, a spiritual victory must be won and you are called upon to win it." Declaring that man's God-given rights could not be taken away, the Bishop said **the Christian concept of justice placed God first, man second and the state third;** whereas totalitarianism, denying the existence of God, placed the state first and relegated man to the lowest place. **"Man is God's highest creation", the Bishop declared, "and it is in the atmosphere of religion alone that you catch a glimpse of the exalted dignity of individual man."**

Bishop Hunt defined God-given rights as that of life itself; to **worship God and obey His commands; to physical and spiritual security free from fear; to express himself freely in work and play; to own property, to marry or refuse to marry, and right of parents to possess their children in unbroken homes.** These doctrines, the Bishop said, which are stated in the Declaration of Independence, have been increasingly ignored. "Persons have become too much interested in the false principle of ethics that a good end justifies any means." (Report taken from the Salt Lake Telegram, June 5, 1944).

Coming at the present time when men and women are being tried as criminals, on the charge of conspiring against law and order in attending public gatherings and expressing their convictions in a God and advocating belief in His revelations and commandments, the remarks of Bishop Hunt must be inspiring and consoling. True Liberty offers man the privilege of "worshipping God and obeying His commands." This must be fundamental and admits of no counter argument. Anything less than this is not worth possessing. God comes first, as the Bishop declared. Ignore this fact and life—real life—ceases. It is the height of folly for man to speak of being law-abiding while placing God's law as secondary to man's. The men and nations who have done this have invariably gone down to defeat, and they always will.

True LIBERTY was expressed by the Prophet John Taylor in few words: **"There are two things I have always said I would do, and I mean to carry them out, living or dying. One is to vote for whom I please, and the other is to worship God as I please."** Thomomas Jefferson said: **"The rights of conscience we never submitted, we could not submit; we are answerable for them to our God"**; and Blackstone, the great Commentator on English law, declared: **"If ever the laws of God and men are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the latter."**

These rules are basic and cannot, with safety, be ignored.

HUMAN ASSETS

Social and religious life in Utah takes on the characteristics of an anomaly—"Something that is contrary to what it should be." We boast of our broad Americanism—of a Constitution that guarantees freedom of speech, of religion and of the press, yet the church, state and nation seems to be bending every effort to subvert this guarantee and destroy these God given rights. We boast of our high order of eugenics and seek to penalize those giving greatest attention to the science of stirpiculture. We deplore the constantly declining birth-rate yet proscribe those rearing large families of good quality. We spend millions fighting venereal diseases while castigating those whose blood has run pure throughout the generations. Here in the mountains life is a bundle of contradictions.

Two hundred and eighty-three children are credited to the fifteen defendants recently convicted, in the state courts, of Unlawful Cohabitation. These children are, for the most part, intelligently and physically strong. They possess a high spiritual development. They are such children as the rapidly declining European nations most desire, and for which premiums are paid by the governments. These large families, with no exception we can recall, are self-sustaining—none on public relief though by all the rules of the game they are of all classes entitled to it. A goodly number of these children are in the armed forces of our country, many holding high rank in the service, while their fathers are threatened with prison stripes for siring them. Place these fifteen fathers in jail and immediately 283 children and their mothers may have to go on public relief.

This manner of married life among the Mormons has been going on absolutely unmolested for the past fifty years; and all of a sudden the leaders of the dominant church, aided by a few public officials, become riotously indignant and start the wheels of persecution rolling. The crime wave in Utah today is probably greater and more deadly in its character than ever before in the history of the State, yet the officials take time off to re-establish an ancient blue law under which our most dependable citizenry are threatened with vicious persecution.

In the heyday of Federal persecutions when to be a full-fledged Mormon deprived a man of the right to jury service and of the voting franchise, when over 1300 men and a few women were suffering imprisonment for unlawful cohabitation, the act was a misdemeanor with a prison penalty of not more than six months, while now, through the efforts of the Church leaders new legislation has been enacted making the act a felony with a penitentiary term up to five years, and paradoxical as it appears, the man who fought hardest against the misdemeanor law, who regarded it as class legislation, unjust and outright persecution, and who paid fines for the breaking of the law, was foremost in inspiring and pushing to enactment the present measure.

We ask frankly, assuming these fifteen fathers with the virtuous and charming mothers of these 283 children are guilty of unlawful cohabitation, who is injured? Is it a crime for women to have children? Is motherhood in itself a crime? Is the great command to "multiply and replenish the earth" a hoax? If the law of God is worth the ashes of a rye straw why penalize good, sound, moral citizens for attempting to carry out that law in accordance with Bible teachings and modern revelation? Is it the function of the State to create paupers of well-bred children and disgrace their parents, for no other reason than out of jealousy or from religious prejudice?

TRUTH AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES

We have been asked why the TRUTH magazine is not in our Salt Lake City Public Library for the convenience of the public. The reason is that the library management has refused to accept it. We have made the offer, **as a gift**. It has been declined.

It is a pleasure to know that while our local institution, doubtless because of prejudice, refuses the magazine to its reading public, libraries outside of Utah give it a prominent place on their shelves.

The latest request for TRUTH is from the New York Public Library. This institution now has a full set of the magazines, Volumes Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, bound; together with other publications we are distributing. By permission we herewith present the letter of request from the New York Public Library:

The New York Public Library

Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE AND SHIPMENTS TO
The Director, The New York Public Library
FIFTH AVENUE AND FORTY-SECOND STREET
NEW YORK 18, N. Y.
SR

New York, June 9, 1944

The Secretary
Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dear Sir:

The New York Public Library is making a special effort to collect as complete a collection as possible of material pertaining to the Latter-day Saints. To this collection we should like to add your publication "Truth" if it is possible for you to present it to us, and we trust therefore, that you can place the name of the Library on your complimentary mailing list.

We shall be glad to have Vols. 1-7 complete; Vol. 8, Nos. 1-7; Vol. 9, No. 12 (May 1944) and succeeding issues, as well as title pages and indexes if published.

We shall be grateful for any assistance you can give the Library.

Very truly yours

Franklin F. Hopper
Director

By E. G. Freehafer

OBEDIENCE AND FREE AGENCY

We have heard some men talk about obedience to the laws of life and salvation as revealed by God and taught by his servants in these latter days, as though it seemed to them an impossible thing for a man to be as much a free agent in keeping the commands of God as in disobeying them. When a man yields implicit obedience to the requirements of heaven in all things, some pretend to think that he must necessarily lose his free agency and at once become a puppet for others to manipulate. The advocates of such an idea apparently entertain a very low estimate of human nature, for they would have us believe that to love sin and delight in its practice is the natural condition of the human family, nor do they appear to be willing to admit that a man may voluntarily, freely and without constraint love God and keep his commandments. But we contend that the idea that the sinner only is the free agent, is one that will not bear a moment's scrutiny in the light of truth; and further, that there are no fetters so galling as those that bind the sinner, no thraldom so terrible as that which unbridled passions impose, no taskmaster so exacting as the adversary of the souls of men. And again we would ask, is the drunkard as free a man as he who is temporate? Is the debauchee any more a free agent than he who avoids the haunts of vice?

If not, on what grounds can we assume that the ebedient man uses his agency any less freely than he who chooses to disobey? Because a man chooses to serve God and obey his laws, is he any less free in doing so than his unwise fellow who prefers to live without God in the world? Cannot a man as freely serve God as he can the devil, and tread the path to heaven as voluntarily as he can descend the road to hell? We think so, why not?

The fact that some who take no pleasure in righteousness, confound ideas when they talk about entire and unreserved obedience to God and his representatives destroying man's free agency, they really mean that he who keeps God's laws has no license to sin, but it is that license and not the power, permission and opportunity to choose between right and wrong that is withdrawn. A man is just as much a free agent in avoiding sin as in committing it, in doing good as in working evil.

Some also contend that obedience is derogatory to the nobility of our manhood, that the fact of our bending our wills to the will of another is bartering away our birthright. We fail to see it in any such light. If the being we obeyed were the inferior of man in wisdom, intelligence and power, there might be something unworthy of our manhood in stooping to his behests, or were his laws unadapted to our eternal natures, unworthy of our divine origin, crude, incomplete, immoral or degrading, we might rebel, though we fear the majority of mankind would not do so, for the behests of Satan are of this very description, and so great a number obey them uncomplainingly.

For ourselves we can see nothing unworthy of our manhood in tendering the gratitude of our hearts to the giver of all good for his unnumbered blessings, in praising his name therefor, nor in proving our gratitude by joyous obedience to his will. "Joyous obedience", because in our souls we long to manifest our faith and prove our gratitude to him for each and every gift our hearts rejoice in, and because the expression of his will gives us that opportunity; because we desire to show our faith by our works, and because we can best testify of our love for him by keeping his commandments. And for this cause we contend before all men that we feel as free in serving the Lord, ah,

far freer, than the most hardened man ever felt in living a life of sin; and we know that a true servant of the Lord is a freer man in the Sanctuary observing the laws of his Creator, than the man of the world in the whirl of unrestrained pleasure, the atheist amidst his vain philosophy, or the sot among his boon companions. A man to be free indeed, must be free from the thraldom of sin, a triumphant victor over his own passions, and a partaker of that freedom which the Gospel of Heaven alone endows.

Here an objector may interpose, and declare that he has not one word to say against a man being obedient to God, but it is this obedience to other men to which he is opposed; and were we to listen to him, we should probably hear him mutter something about oppression, slaves, deceivers, deceived, blind obedience, etc., and witness him make up in violent denunciations what he was lacking in reason and argument. To other men, as men, we believe in giving honor and obedience as our respect for them impels or the requirements of earthly laws demand. But to men clothed with the Holy Priesthood we give reverence because they are the representatives of our Father in heaven, and as we love to reverence him, we hearken to his words through his mouthpieces, and esteem it a privilege to honor those whom God delights to honor; and more happy still are we in our obedience when realizing that the power of God in such is blended with holiness of life, when our affection and our reason combine "to make this duty our delight". Nor are we ashamed to own that we consider ourselves greatly blessed in the privilege of hearing their instructions and of following their examples in all that makes man noble in time and Godlike in eternity.

This portion of the subject then hinges on the question, are they to whom we yield obedience of a truth the mouthpieces of God? For if we do know that they are so, then in honoring them we honor God, in obeying their words we obey him, or, on the other hand, in despising them we despise him, in rejecting them we reject him to our own condemnation.

Have we not on record the words of Jesus to his Apostles, when he said unto them, "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." And again, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." We have also the declaration of the Apostle Paul, "For God hath not called us into uncleanness, but unto holiness. He therefore that despiseth despiseth not man but God, who hath given unto us His Holy Spirit." And in this connection we would observe that the fact that others do not know that they to whom we yield obedience are the servants of the Most High, does not affect us. If we have received this knowledge from heaven, of which in all boldness and sincerity we bear testimony, then other men's ignorance is nothing to us, nor shall we be answerable therefor, if we shrink not from our duty. Inasmuch as we have heard the voice of the Lord, the testimony of a million that they did not hear it is no proof to us that he did not speak, and when God has himself borne record to us by his Spirit that these men are his servants, the question so far as we are concerned, is above and beyond the reach of human controversy.

This being so, it matters not to our free agency whether we obey the words of the Lord, as they come direct from the mouth of a living Apostle, or we gather them from the records of his teachings handed down to us after he has laid aside this mortality. He who believes in a living Priesthood endowed with the power of God, is no less a free agent than

he who takes the Bible alone as his rule of faith and practice, while the former has the immeasurable advantage of receiving the word of the Lord direct as his own individual circumstances may require.—Mill. Star, 34: 152-4.

SOUTH CAROLINA CONVENTION

The following is a copy of the Report of the Committee of twenty-one, which was adopted by the South Carolina Convention. The action of the Convention was confined to the adoption of this report:

"The Committee of Twenty-one, to whom was referred an act to provide for the election of deputies to a Southern Congress and the call of a Convention, with instructions to consider and report thereon, respectfully report:

"That they have considered the subject referred to them, and have concluded to recommend to the convention the adoption of the accompanying resolution and ordinance:

"RESOLVED BY THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED,

"That the frequent violations of the Constitution of the United States by the Federal Government, and its encroachment upon the reserved rights of the sovereign States of this Union, especially in relation to slavery, amply justify this state, so far as any duty or obligation to her confederates is involved, in dissolving at once all political connection with her co-states, and that she forbears the exercise of that manifest right of self-government from considerations of expediency only.

"AN ORDINANCE TO DECLARE THE RIGHT OF THIS STATE TO SECEDE FROM THE FEDERAL UNION

"We the people of the State of South Carolina in Convention assembled, do declare and ordain, and it is hereby declared and ordained:

"That South Carolina, in the exercise of her sovereign will as an independent State, acceded to the Federal Union, known as the United States of America, and that, in the exercise of the same sovereign will, it is her right, without let, hindrance, or molestation from any power whatsoever, to secede from the Federal Union; and that for the sufficiency of the causes which may impel her to such separation, she is responsible alone, under God, to the tribunal of public opinion among the nations of the earth".

—Deseret News, July 10, 1852, Volume 2, page 69.

A PUZZLED DUTCHMAN

A Wisconsin secular paper contained the following good story:

One who does not believe in immersion for baptism was holding a protracted meeting, and one night preached on the subject of baptism. In the course of his remarks he said some believed it necessary to go down into the water and come up out of it to be baptized; but this he claimed to be a fallacy, for the preposition "into" of the Scriptures should be rendered differently, for it does not mean into at all times.

"Moses", he said, "we are told, went up into the mountain, and the Savior was taken into a high mountain, etc. Now, we do not suppose that either went into the mountain, but unto it. So with going down into the water—it means only going down close by or near the water, and being baptized in the ordinary way by sprinkling or pouring." He carried this idea out fully, and in due season and style closed his discourse, when an invitation was given for anyone so disposed to arise and express their thoughts.

Quite a number of the brethren arose and said they were glad they had been present on the occasion; and they were pleased with the sound sermon they had just heard, and felt their souls greatly blessed. Finally a corpulent gentleman of Teutonic extraction, a stranger to all, arose and broke a silence that was almost painful, as follows:

"Mr. Breacher, I ish so glad I vash here tonight, for I has had explained to my mint some dings I never could pelief pefore. Oh, I ish so glad dat into does not mean into at all, but shust close py, or near to, for now I can pelief manish dings vot I could not pelieve pefore. We read, Mr. Breacher, dat Taniel was cast into the ten of lions, and come out alife! Now I nefer could pelief dat, for de wilt peasts would shust eat him right off; put now it is ferry clear to my mint. He was shust close by, or near to, and tid not get into de ten at all. Oh, I ish so glad I vash here tonight!

"Again, we reat dat de Hebrew children vas cast into de firish furnace, and dat dir alwaysh looking like a peeg story, too, for dey would have peen purnt up; but it ish all plain to my mint now, for dey were shust cast near py or close to de firish furnace. Oh, I vash so glad I vash here tonight!

"And dear Mr. Breacher, it ish said dat Jonah was cast into de sea, and taken into a whalesh pelly. Now, I nefer could pelief dat. It alwaysh seemed to me to pe a peeg feesh story, put it ish all plain to my mint now. He vash not into de whalesh pelly at all, but shust shumpt on to his pack and rode ashore. Oh, I vash so glad I vash here tonight?

"And now, Mr. Breacher, if you will shust explain a bassage of Scripture, I shall pe, oh so happy, dat I vash here tonight! It saith de vicked shall pe cast into a lake dat purns with fire and primshtone alwaysh. Oh. Mr. Breacher, shall I pe cast into dat lake if I am vicked? Or shust close py or near to shust near enough to pe comfortable? Oh, I hopes you tell me I shall pe cast only shust py a good vay off, and I will pe so glad I vash here tonight.—Millennial Star, Vol. XL:39.

MORMONISM AN ENIGMA

* * * "Mormonism is an enigma to the world. Why, the United States have been trying to solve the problem of 'Mormonism' for years and years; but with all their sagacity and intelligence they have not made it out yet; and they never will. Philosophy cannot comprehend it; it is beyond the reach of natural philosophy. It is the philosophy of heaven, it is the revelation of God to man. It is philosophical, but it is heavenly philosophy, and beyond the ken of human judgment, beyond the reach of human intelligence.. They cannot grasp it, it is as high as heaven, what can they know about it? It is deeper than hell, they cannot fathom it. It is as wide as the universe, it extends over all creation. It goes back into eternity and forward into eternity. It associates with the past, present and future; it is connected with time and eternity, with men, angels, and Gods, with beings that were, that are and that are to come."—John Taylor (April 7, 1872) J. of D., 15:25.

MINERAL FOR LIVESTOCK

A good mineral mixture for hogs is composed of 40 pounds of steamed bonemeal, 40 pounds of air slaked lime and 20 pounds of common salt. For brood sows one-third ounce of potassium iodide should be added to each 100 pounds of mineral mixture. A successful formula for beef and dairy cattle is made up of 30 pounds of steamed bonemeal, 30 pounds of air slaked lime, 30 pounds of common salt, 5 pounds of copperas, 5 pounds of sulphur and 2 ounces of potassium iodide.

THE POWER OF THE DEVIL

One night I was awakened out of my sleep by my wife making a noise as though she were nearly choking to death. I enquired the cause, and she replied that she had dreamed that a personage came and seized her by the throat and was choking her. I immediately lit a candle and saw that her eyes were sunken and her nose was pinched in as though she was in the last stage of the cholera. I laid hands upon her and rebuked the evil spirit in the name of Jesus, and by the power of the holy priesthood commanded it to depart. In a moment afterwards I heard some half a dozen children in different parts of the Bozier House crying as if in great distress. The cattle also began to bellow, the horses neighed, the dogs barked, the hogs squealed, the hens cackled and roosters crowed, and everything around seemed in great commotion. In a few minutes afterwards I was sent for to lay hands upon Sister Patten, the widow of David W. Patten, who was living in the room adjoining mine, and who was seized in a similar manner to my wife.

My wife continued quite feeble for several days from the shock.

One day while visiting Joseph, he took me for a walk by the riverside, when he requested me to relate the occurrence at Brother Bozier's. After I had done so, I also told him the vision of evil spirits in England, on the opening of the Gospel to that people. After I had done this, I asked him what all these things meant, and whether or not there was anything wrong in me. He said:

"No, Brother Heber: at that time, when you were in England, you were nigh unto the Lord, there was only a veil between you and Him, but you could not see him. When I heard of it, it gave me great joy, for I then knew that the work of God had taken root in that land. It was this that caused the devil to make a struggle to kill you."

Joseph then said the nearer a person approached to the Lord, the greater power would be manifest by the devil to prevent the accomplishment of the purposes of God.

He also gave me a relation of many contests that he had had with Satan, and his power that had been manifested from time to time since the commencement of bringing forth the Book of Mormon.

I will relate one circumstance that took place in Far West, in a house which Joseph had purchased, which had been formerly occupied as a public house by some wicked people. A short time after he had moved into it, one of the children was taken very sick. He laid his hands upon the child, when it got better. As soon as he went outside, the child was taken sick again. He again laid his hands upon it, so that it again recovered. This transpired several times, and Joseph enquired of the Lord what it all meant, when he had an open vision, and saw the devil in person, who contended with Joseph face to face for some time. He said it was his house, it belonged to him, and Joseph had no right there. Then Joseph rebuked Satan in the name of the Lord, and he departed and troubled the child no more.—Heber C. Kimball, Millennial Star, Vol. 45; 131.

THOUGHT OF MINE

I think that I should like to be
The hero of humility—
To look far up into the sky
And see beyond where birds can fly.

I'd like to think as birds and bees,
To read the thoughts of silent trees
That reach so stately to the sky.
Can't they have happiness, as I.

I think I too read thoughts of grief
That flutter through each tender leaf.
For God meant not that I should be
More human than a lovely tree.

—Anonymous.

TOPIC OF THE TIMES
(Is History Repeating Itself?)

Since the commencement of the present raid upon our religion remarks something like the following have been frequently made: "If the Latter-day Saints believe the revelation on plural marriage to be divine, and that they are obeying God's will in taking wives, why do they not come out boldly and avow their belief and practices, make no defense; but acknowledge everything in court."

Some have expressed themselves to the effect that they would admire the Latter-day Saints more if they would take this course. But I may ask, would this be wise for us to do under the circumstances?

There may be a difference of opinion upon this point even among Latter-day Saints; for I notice that some are ready to go into court and acknowledge all about their family relations. Probably some of these feel that others, who take a different course and who compel our enemies to bring forward proofs to convict, are not acting as manly a part as they should do.

While at some times and in some situations it might be proper and the more manly course to avow all that we believe and do, without any effort to compel our enemies to produce proof, the present time is not the occasion for such a policy to be pursued. Nothing would please them better than to have us all go into court and make the necessary acknowledgments to secure convictions. Nothing would please them better than to have the opportunity to scoop in and fill the penitentiary with "Mormon" victims. They would point to them as evidences of their success, and would give themselves great credit for achieving such results.

The duty that devolves upon us at the present time is to contest, in the best possible manner, this infamous Edmunds law. We cannot do this by going into court and pleading guilty. In fact it would be most unwise for us to do so. While it is in some respects very admirable to see a man willing to fully acknowledge his violation of that wicked law, it is still more manly under present circumstances to contest it. I notice that some prefer pleading guilty because it will save trouble. They do not want to have the trouble of a trial on their own account, and then they are averse to having their families or members of their families brought into court as witnesses. Therefore to save this trouble and annoyance to themselves and their families, they prefer to concede their own guilt. But if all were to take this course there would be no testing of the law.

This law is unconstitutional, and the day will come when it will be so declared. Its hideous features can only be brought to light by our people taking the course that has been recommended, that is, to contest it in every case that is possible. It would please our enemies immensely if the people accused would plead guilty and give them no trouble. They would get their fees then without having to earn tme, and they would claim great praise for their zeal and success in enforcing the law.

Considering the amount of excitement there has been over these prosecutions it is very remarkable how few victims have been secured. This is principally due to the vigorous manner in which these persecutions have been fought, and if we continue to pursue this policy our persecutors will find that they have not settled this question, and that, in fact, its settlement is as far off as ever.

The hope has been indulged in that, upon finding ourselves in a corner, and unable to escape from punishment in the penitentiary, the First Presidency would come forward and sur-

render the principle of celestial marriage and counsel the people to do so also. If our persecutors have not already become satisfied that this hope of theirs is utterly fallacious, they will become convinced of it before they get through.

This principle will be maintained; it will be believed in; it will be practiced by this people in the manner that God has commanded, and no agencies that can be brought to bear upon them will prevent this. I know that the feeling now is, both in Utah and elsewhere, that we are in a corner, and that this conflict which has been so long pending must now speedily be settled. It is thought we are powerless to prevent it. This is a very mistaken idea. The Lord will open a way in His own time and in His own season for the deliverance of His people. But it may be that He will suffer us to be tested and tried as we never yet have been in order to prove our integrity. Yet withal, of this we may rest assured, deliverance will come. The present administration of this law in this Territory will never stand calm, impartial criticism. The only justification that the judges and prosecution and those who are in sympathy with them have for the course which is now being taken, is that the end justifies the means, and that for the sake of the results sought for, constitutional methods can be set aside. There will be, most assuredly, a reaction in the country upon this question, and this will come very rapidly whenever it s learned that a door has been opened for us to escape from this persecution.

In the meantime, I hope all will take proper precautions to preserve themselves. No one should be deluded with the idea that it is more manly and honorable to give himself into the power of his enemies than it is to defend himself and to keep out of their clutches. Personally, I would rather go on a mission for any length of time, to any nation to which I might be sent, than to go to the penitentiary; for, as a missionary abroad, I could do more good than I could confined within prison walls. Yet if I felt it to be the will of the Lord that I should go to prison I trust I should not hesitate at going. I know this, that I did go to the penitentiary very willingly at one time. Judge Boreman appeared determined to force the executors of the late President Brigham Young to comply with his decree of court or go to prison for contempt. These executors were: Elders Brigham Young, Albert Carrington and myself. We were determined we would not comply with his decree, and we went to the penitentiary. Numbers of our brethren offered to furnish the means necessary to comply with the order of the court, but we refused to accept, and preferred going to prison and remaining there as long as the court chose to keep us confined rather than submit to its iniquitous decree. I feel so today. If I thought it was the Lord's will for me to go there I should go with pleasure. But I feel it is not His will; that it is my duty to keep myself free, at least until we can have a fair trial, which we cannot have at the present time.

President Taylor never did shrink from prison nor anything else that lay in the path of duty. He has shown this through his past life. It needs no proof today to convince the Latter-day Saints of this. But he feels that with the courts constituted as they are at present a man might as well ask for justice at the hands of pirates as to ask for justice in the courts of this Territory. Whenever his case can have a fair trial it will only take a little time to vindicate him and to clear away every charge of violating law that may be framed against him. His case alone is sufficient to prove the villainous character of the present persecution in this Territory. He is a venerable gentleman nearly seventy-seven years old. He has never broken any law of the United States. He mar-

ried his wives when there was no law prohibiting plural marriage. Knowing that he would be the subject of fierce attack, when the Edmunds law was passed he took every precaution to make himself secure against charges of deliberately violating it, and arranged his family accordingly. Not that he believed the law to be constitutional, for he has denounced it as infamous; not that he designed to put away his wives, for he would rather suffer death than do this; but to leave his enemies without the power to accuse him of obstructing or defying the law and setting an example of rebellion. Yet with all this, nothing would please these villains better than to have an opportunity of consigning him to a prison. The day will come when his case alone will stir up feelings of indignation in the breasts of honest men all the world over when they hear the facts recited.—George Q. Cannon from Juvenile Instructor, p. 220, July 15, 1885.

FREEDOM FOR ALL MEN PROCLAIMED

By the PROPHET JOHN TAYLOR

* * * There is no faltering, no trembling of the knees, no shaking in the feelings with us. God is our God; we are his peaple. This is the Zion of God; this is the kingdom of God, which our judges tell us the United States is making war against. I wonder if they tell the truth? No matter, I am a member of and an elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and I **dare acknowledge it before any power there is under the Heavens.** I belong to that Church; and I thank God, my Heavenly Father, for the privilege of being associated with these brethren and these sisters who are before and around me; and my feelings are today, and ever have been, like one of old, when she said: "This people shall be my people, their God shall be my God; where they live I will live also, where they die there I want to be buried;" and when they rise from and burst the barriers of the tomb and ascend into the presence of Jehovah, I expect to be with them, and to be one with them in time and one in eternity.

These are my hopes and my feelings, and I say Halleluiah, Halleluiah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and He will reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet (congregation said "Amen"), and this kingdom will go forth and roll onwards, **and woe to the man who attempts to stay the progress of Jehovah. He shall wither like grass before the breath of the Lord of Hosts** (congregation said, "Amen"), and the principles of eternal truth will be onward, onward, onward, until the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our God and His Christ, and he shall rule for ever and ever.

Men may try to forge chains for us, but we shall snap them asunder as Samson did, by the power of God. God being our helper, we will maintain the principles of eternal truth; we will maintain and cherish the principles of freedom and liberty of all kinds for all men, for every son and daughter of Adam; and we will never rest until the world shall be revolutionized with these principles, until all men everywhere shall proclaim themeselves free. It will not be only like the bell they sounded when they proclaimed the Declaration of Independence, and liberty throughout the land; but we will proclaim liberty to the world, salvation to the human family, freedom of thought and freedom of action, with power to worship God as they please, when they please, and where they please, all over the face of the wide earth. We will never rest until the shackles are knocked off from all men, and all men everywhere are free and equal. These are the designs of God, and God will consummate them, and no power can stop His hand.—J. of D., 14:252-2.

SOUND ADVICE

The following is in line with much that this paper has said. It was first stated by Roger Babson, and later by a prominent U. S. Minister of the gospel. Read and ponder:

1. Pay all your debts while you can.

2. Collect all that is owing you, while you can.

3. Get an acre of land somewhere within 25 miles of a city where you can grow enough to eat. Get this off the main highway so you won't be too much in line of starving, ravaging hordes from the city.

4. Learn to live simply—on corn meal and cabbage and soy beans, and prepare to raise most of this yourself.

5. Talk these things over with your neighbors and get them to help each other when the crash comes. Buy together, work together and if possible, sell together ever so often.

6. Keep, through all, a firm faith in Divine Providence and in the ultimate triumph of right. You may lose everything you have and be hungry, ragged and cold before the storm passes, but on the other side of it all is somewhere, sometime, a bright new day for humanity—the brightest the world has ever known.—From Progressive Opinion.

NINE REASONS FOR GOING TO CHURCH

By Theodore Roosevelt

1. In this actual world a churchless community, a community where men have abandoned and scoffed at or ignored their religious needs, is a community on the rapid down-grade.

2. Church work and church attendance means the cultivation of the habit of feeling some responsibility for others.

3. There are enough holidays for most of us. Therefore, on Sundays go to church.

4. Yes, I know all the excuses. I know that one can worship the Creator in a grove of trees, or by a running brook, or in a man's own house just as well as in a church. But I also know, as a matter of cold fact, that the average man does not thus worship.

5. He may not hear a great sermon at church. He will hear a sermon by a good man, who, with his good wife, is engaged all the week in making hard lives a little easier

6. He will listen to and take part in reading some beautiful passages from the Bible. And if he is not familiar with the Bible he has suffered a loss.

7. He will take part in singing some good hymns.

8. He will meet and nod or speak to good, quiet neighbors. He will come away feeling a little more charitable toward all the world, even toward those excessively foolish young men who regard churchgoing as a soft performance.

9. I advocate a man's joining in church work for the sake of showing his faith by his works.

PROGRESS IN THE COURTS

June 7th Judge T. Blake Kennedy of Cheyenne, Wyoming, sitting by appointment in the Federal Court at Salt Lake City, passed sentence on the six "Mann Act" and the three kidnapping cases, the defendants in which on a stipulation of facts he had previously declared guilty.

Sentences were awarded as indicated in another article herein. Appeal from the decision to the Circuit Court of Appeals are being prepared and the defendants are at Liberty on bail bonds.

Defendants' writ of Mandamus in the Supreme Court of the State compelling the District Judge to disqualify himself on the grounds of prejudice, in the Conspiracy cases, was denied; and the cases, involving 34 defendants, was set for September 5th, when a motion to quash the complaints will be heard.

If God gets His and I get mine,
Then everything will be just fine;
But if I get mine and keep His too,
Then what do you think the Lord will do?
I think He will collect—don't you?

Genius is one-tenth inspiration and nine-tenths perspiration.—Thomas Edison.

THE UNFINISHED PRAYER

"Now I lay",—repeat it, darling.
"Lay me", lisped the tiny lips
Of my daughter, kneeling, bending
O'er her folded finger-tips.

"Down to sleep"—"To sleep", she murmured,
And the curly head bent low;
"I pray the Lord", I gently added;
"You can say it all, I know."

"Pray the Lord"—the sound came faintly,
Fainter still—"My soul to keep;"
Then the tired head fairly nodded,
And the child was fast asleep.

But the dewy eyes half opened
When I clasped her to my breast,
And the dear voice softly whispered,
"Mama, God knows all the rest."

Oh, the trusting, sweet confiding
Of the child heart! Would that I
Thus might trust my Heavenly Father,
He who hears my feeblest cry.

—Anonymous.

LAUS INFANTIUM

In praise of little children I will say
God first made man, then found a better way
For Woman, but his third way was the best.
Of all created things, the loveliest
And most divine are children. Nothing here
Can be to us more gracious or more dear.
And though, when God saw all his works were good,
There was no rosy flower of babyhood,
'T was said of children in a later day
That none could enter Heaven save such as they.

The earth, which feels the flowering of a thorn,
Was glad, O little child, when you were born;
The earth, which thrills when skylarks scale the blue,
Soared up itself to God's own Heaven in you;

And Heaven, which loves to lean down and glass
Its beauty in each dewdrop on the grass,—
Heaven laughed to find your face so pure and fair,
And left, O little child, its reflex there.

—William Canton.

Where there's always uniform opinion, you'll find that part of the crowd isn't thinking.

THY WILL BE DONE

The following poem, "Thy Will Be Done", was written in the Civil War days by John Hay, who served as aide to President Lincoln during the Civil War. He was an American statesman, scholar and author, and a tactful and able diplomat, and filled many important positions, both at home and abroad. And was Secretary of State in the McKinley and Roosevelt cabinets, where he served until his death. (Thanks are due to Nautilus magazine, from whose pages this poem is copied.)

Not in dumb resignation
We lift our hands on high;
Not like the nerveless fatalist,
Content to do and die:
Our faith springs like the eagle
Who soars to meet the sun,
And cries exulting unto Thee
"O Lord, Thy will be done!"

When tyrant feet are trampling
Upon the common weal,
Thou dost not bid us bend and writhe
Beneath the iron heel.
In Thy name we claim our right,
By sword, or tongue, or pen;
And even the headsman's axe may flash
Thy message unto men.

Thy will! It bids the weak be strong
It bids the strong be just:
No lip to fawn, no hand to beg,
No brow to seek the dust.
Wherein man oppresses man,
Beneath Thy liberal sun,
O Lord, be there, Thine arm made bare,
Thy righteous will be done!

—John Hay.

THE RETURN

He went, and he was gay to go:
And I smiled on him as he went.
My son—'twas well he couldn't know
My darkest dread, nor what it meant—

Just what it meant to smile and smile
And let my son go cheerily—
My son . . . and wondering all the while
What stranger would come back to me.

—Wilford Wilson Gibson.

SIMPLE AS THAT

"Yes, I came face to face with a lion once", said the club liar "and I was alone and unarmed."

"Heavens, what did you do?" asked a new member, who didn't know his man.

"What could I do? I tried staring straight into his eyes, but he just continued crawling towards me."

"How did you get away, then?"

"I just left him and passed on to the next cage."

DEAR READERS OF TRUTH:

Shall TRUTH continue to be published? Its existence is threatened, and this threat goes to the question of FREE SPEECH, FREE PRESS, and FREEDOM OF RELIGION.

As a reader of the Press dispatches you are informed that the publishers of TRUTH have been indicted in the Federal Court, also in the State courts of Utah. The charge is Conspiracy to break the laws of the land through the circulation of the magazine which is alleged to be LEWD, LASCIVIOUS, AND IMMORAL literature. Every reader of TRUTH knows it is neither lewd, lascivious, nor immoral in fact. Since it has championed the original doctrines of the Mormon Church, which are constantly undergoing changes by action of the general authorities; and since the Church cannot successfully dispute our statements, it has interested itself in these suppressive court actions. The case may, for final adjudication, go to the Supreme Court of the United States; we expect it will.

Eminent lawyers throughout the United States are encouraging us to defend our sacred rights. The American Civil Liberties Union of New York City, says: **"From what we have seen of the indictment and several copies of the magazine 'TRUTH', it is our opinion that a serious issue of civil liberties is involved."**

With the thought in mind of defending our natural and legal rights we are appealing to all friends of liberty for funds.

President Roosevelt recently said:

"In the United States we regard it as axiomatic that EVERY PERSON shall enjoy the free exercise of his religion according to the DICTATES OF HIS CONSCIENCE. * * * In our inner individual lives WE CAN NEVER BE INDIFFERENT, and we assert FOR OURSELVES complete freedom to EMBRACE, to PROFESS, and to OBSERVE the principles for which our flag has so long been the lofty symbol."

We are fighting to maintain this right. It is YOUR fight; it is OUR fight. We are backing it with all we have. We owe it to ourselves and to our posterity to fight until we win. The immortal Prophet, John Taylor, said: **"There are two things I have always said I would do, and I mean to carry them out, living or dying. One is to vote for whom I please, and the other is to worship God as I please."**

Every dollar you can spare will be needed for this campaign for FREEDOM. Send what you can now; and as often as you can, send more. Let's keep America a good land to live in by protecting our common rights. Your contributions will be treated confidentially if desired. Send all remittances to TRUTH PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1153 Third Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Thank you.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. AUGUST, 1944 NO. 3.

Discourse by Apostle Moses Thatcher

Delivered in the Tabernacle, Logan, Cache County (Semi-Annual Conference), Thursday Afternoon, October 8th, 1885

REPORTED BY JOHN IRVINE

The Lord Is Teaching Us to Rely Upon Him and to Exercise the Faculties He Has Given Us—Nature of the Government of the United States—Elements of a Variety of Governments Enter Into It—Physical and Moral Courage—A Concubine Not a Term of Reproach—The Character of Abraham Vindicated—When the Saints Learn to Be Strictly Impartial, Judgment and Rule Will be Given Them—Not All Are Arrayed Against Us—Power of Secret Societies—Zion to Be a Place of Refuge and Safety—We Must Purify Ourselves That Liberty May Come.

There have been a great many very excellent things said at this conference, and in attempting to add thereto, I desire the assistance and aid which come through the faith and prayers of the Saints—that I may be inspired by the Spirit of God to utter such things as may tend to our edification and good. It will doubtless be somewhat difficult to make all hear unless a goodly degree of order is maintained. Of course I am aware that it is not an easy task for mothers to keep their nursing babes quiet in a crowded house like this and upon a warm day; but we hope to have as good order as possible under the circumstances.

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

I have rejoiced very much in the testimonies which have been borne during the meetings of this Conference, and they find in my heart a responsive chord. I do not feel that we are living in unprofitable times, and notwithstanding the trials, temptations and injustice with which we are surrounded, I view the present as times in which the Lord is teaching to His people very valuable lessons.

It has often been asserted, by our outside friends, that the union of this people was maintained by reason of the influence which their leaders hold over their minds. If this statement were true, and the influence exercised is unrighteous, the leaders of the people should be removed. But if the influence which they exercise over the minds of the people is for good, it ought to be maintained. As an Elder in Israel, I hold that the influence which binds together this people to be the spirit of God, and that the Almighty, the creator of the heavens and the earth, is not dependent upon one man or many men, and that the Lord will demonstrate to all the Christian world, that the religion which is called Mormonism is the religion of the heart for the masses of the people who have espoused its cause; and if, in the experiences of the past few months, and that which is yet in the future, the Latter-day Saints learn to rely on God, learn to receive for themselves heavenly communications for the guidance of their feet, though it may cost the exile of our leaders or the imprisonment of those who have worked as their servants, they will have received that which is of much value; and although it cost much, it will be worth more than the cost.

We can see now that a few who have relied upon others, who have sought the counsel of their file leaders and have depended upon that counsel when they can no longer reach those leaders, falter and fall by the wayside. **I believe that God intends that every man and every woman in His Church and kingdom shall exercise the faculties which He has given them, that in the exercise of their agency He designs to exalt them in eternal glory. So long therefore as the people rely upon their leaders they are not manifesting that degree of faith, they are not in a position to think and reflect for themselves as they should. I have known the time of the Presidency of the Church and of the Apostles taken up in frivolous matters that ought never to have gone beyond the family circle, at least ought not to have gone beyond the confines of the Ward organization. But times have changed. We approach not now so easily the Presidency of the Church. We receive not their counsels with that facility that we have done in the past. And although we miss their presence much—for this people love their leaders—in their absence the channel of communication between the heavens and the earth is open to this people as it never could have been under former circumstances. Men and women are now learning that their prayers can be heard, and that if they are not able to receive the counsels of their brethren, they can in all places and under all circumstances, receive the counsels of God, their Heavenly Father.**

Men, communities of men, governments, nations, powers, and principalities have never yet been able to build walls so strong, or make iron doors so thick as to prevent the prayers of a righteous man ascending unto his God, hence every man and woman who keep the commandments of the Lord can have a light and a lamp for their feet, and those who have oil in their lamps will not be uncertain as to the course they should pursue. The revelations of the Lord will inspire them and direct them in the ways of truth and right.

When we reflect on the growth of governments, civilization, the rights of men and the liberties which we so

much enjoy, to what source do we look as the one from whence they came? The great government of which we form a part—the most liberal, the broadest and the deepest in its foundation, the greatest government which God has ever smiled upon—except when he had administered according to His own will in the affairs of men—to whom is due its birth and expansion. To men who were willing to bow in obedience to the mandates of kingly governments? No! But rather to men who were inspired by God, their heavenly Father, to reach forward to a higher and a grander civilization and liberty. Had the Pilgrim Fathers and others who were unwilling to bow to the mandates of European powers not fled to the land of America, we should have had no government like this.

It was founded as a refuge in which the oppressed of every land and clime should find a resting place. Not Republican altogether, not Democratic wholly, not theocratic, not aristocratic, not monarchical, but a combination of them all. For this government, in the strictest sense, is not a republic, as I understand it. The laws of a republican government are enacted by a central power. Were the United States such a government, the laws which govern the citizens of all the States and Territories would be enacted by Congress, instead of by their several Legislatures. In the purest sense, democracy consists of a government in which the people are governed by laws enacted with their mutual consent and by their direct vote. We cannot consistently call the government of the United States theocratic only in so far as the people acknowledge the rule of God. If we pick up a coin, a $20 gold piece, we can see impressed upon its face the words, "In God we trust", and insofar as this is true, and expresses the sense and feelings of the people, this government is theocratic, but in no sense beyond that.

A Territorial government may be said to be in a large sense monarchical, in that the governor of the Territory has conferred upon him by act of Congress absolute veto power, and the legislators who are chosen by the people, may labor for sixty days, unite their profoundest thought in expressing the wishes and wants of the people, and they may frame laws by which the people might be governed according to their choice, but by a single stroke of the pen the Governor of the territory of Utah can veto every act of the Territorial Legislature. Is not this, then, monarchical, and is it not in a very strong sense a one-man power? It would seem to be at least autocratic.

And in the sense that the people of the Territories have no choice in the governor or in the judges who administer the laws, or in the marshals who enforce the process of the courts and in every other way wherein the government takes upon itself the government of the people, without the consent of the people, is it not an aristocratic government—the government of the many by the few? Thus, if my conclusions are correct, the government of the United States is theocratic insofar as the people trust in and obey the laws of God; it is republican in a partial sense; it is democratic in another sense; and it is certainly, so far as the Territories are concerned, monarchical and aristocratical. Thus we have a combination of the elements of a variety of governments entering into this great Union.

But, as was clearly shown this morning by Brother F. D. Richards, in the disposition of the people to have Congress enact certain proscriptive laws, we as a people are being deprived of many of the rights and privileges for which our forefathers contended, for which they pledged their sacred honor, and for which many of them devoted their lives. But, knowing the manner in which public opinion is manufactured in this great land of ours, I have per-

sonally a degree of charity and of sympathy, not only for Congress, but for the President, his Cabinet, and for the supreme judiciary of our nation.

It is no unusual thing to see men manifest physical courage. You can see it in all nature. Tread upon a worm and it will turn and sting you if it can. Men, for the love of the things of this world, will often face physical danger in every form. They will dig down into the bowels of the earth, navigate the raging seas, and penetrate, as it were, to the North Pole—they will face the cannon's mouth when it belches forth death and desolation in all its horrid forms; they will face death and destruction in all its horrid forms; they will face death and desolation in every shape; but when you call upon them to manifest moral courage, when you call upon them to stand up and maintain the right because it is right, when that right is unpopular, you appeal to something that gives but weak response.

I have seen men that would face danger in almost every conceivable form, shrink and cower before one breath of scorn. They could not bear it, and hence you see them make promises and apologies because of the influences that surround them. **Now, this is a popular government, and it would take a very courageous President to do justice to the Latter-day Saints. Why? Because the great majority of the nation are prejudiced against us. Not that they are aware of any harm or wickedness having been done by this people, but because of falsehoods that have been circulated against the Latter-day Saints. Therefore, I say that were Mr. Cleveland to administer, or cause to be administered all the laws in Utah impartially, he would be manifesting a degree of hardihood, a degree of moral courage that certainly has not been exhibited by any recent President of the United States.**

This country has produced few men like Charles Sumner, who stood up in the Senate of the United States and fought slavery. He stood there singly and alone, but he espoused a righteous cause, and by degrees he made adherents until this nation was converted and the Supreme Court of the United States that declared that a black man had no rights which a white man was bound to respect, was overturned at the point of the bayonet and the sword. Such men as Washington, Jefferson and Adams—such men as Cromwell, Knox, Luther, Wycliffe, Huss and Jerome, stand along the shores of time as beacons that have lighted the way to the higher liberty we ought to enjoy in this glorious land today. When I say we, I refer to the nation as a whole, and not to the Latter-day Saints as a community. **If we could enjoy our constitutional rights, we would be of all people upon the earth the most happy; because, with all our faults and failings, God smiles upon no people upon the earth as pure as are the Latter-day Saints, and happiness consists in purity—the living of a holy life before the Lord.**

I was very forcibly struck, a few days ago, with the remarks made by the Judge of the Third Judicial District. I don't think him to be a Christian; if he is, he does not understand the Scriptures as I understand them. In referring to remarks which have been made by an individual who had been convicted by the jury, the judge remarked that he did not wish to hear any more hypocritical cant, and in referring to the wives of the Latter-day Saints on one occasion he mentioned them as concubines; and some of our brethren have looked upon that as being a reproach. Well, of course, you can convey contempt in the manner in which a word is uttered. But I do not look upon the word concubine as being a contemptuous term by any means. All concubines, anciently, were considered wives, but all wives were not concubines. A concubine, then, was a maid servant married to

a free man; and although her mistress still maintained some jurisdiction over her actions, the fact that she was a wife gave her an honorable position —made her a legal wife in the sight of God.

Again, the judge, in referring to what father Abraham did, said, "Abraham not only lived with his wives, but also with his wife's handmaids; in other words," said the judge, "the same as though you were to live with your hired girls. Now, while that might do for Abraham," said he, "it will not do for this enlightened age."

Now I desire to show by these remarks that the judge of the Third District Court is not a Christian, and that if he has any hopes of eternal life he does not understand the plan and the promises of the great Jehovah; **for Abraham was a friend of God; Abraham talked with God face to face, and although it may be thought that he lived in the dark ages, would to God that the Christian world would walk in such darkness today! If, then, the acts of Abraham would not do for the Chief Justice of the Territory of Utah, neither would the city in which Abraham dwells do for that judge; and when he passes into eternity and beholds the names of the twelve apostles written upon the twelve foundations of the Eternal City he may admire their beauty and grandeur, but when his attention is drawn to twelve pearly gates, he will find engraven thereon the names of the twelve sons of Jacob by his four wives, and their great grandfather Abraham will be within that city.** Without its walls shall be sorcerers, adulterers, liars and whoremongers, and those who love to make a lie.

Jesus bore testimony to the virtues of Abraham. He proclaimed himself to be a literal descendant from him, tracing back his lineage to the loins of David, another polygamist; and when he, Jesus, spoke of Lazarus, who picked up the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, and who was so poor and wretched, whose sores the dogs licked to his ease, delight and comfort—when Jesus spoke of this Lazarus, he spoke of him as being in the bosom of Father Abraham. But the rich man, who perhaps had had control of him, and who had kicked and cuffed him, and looked upon him with scorn as he picked up the crumbs—**as we pick up the crumbs of liberty grudgingly dropped from the table which our fathers made in the day of oppression and dread**—I say, when that rich man looked upon Lazarus in his degradation he was then but his serf ant slave; but when he looked upon him over that wide gulf that separated them, he saw him in the bosom of Abraham, and he pleaded that Lazarus might be sent to dip his finger in one drop of cold water, that the thirst might be slaked in his throat, and that his burning tongue might be relieved. The answer was, "Lazarus had his ill things while upon the earth and thou hadst thy good things. Now, behold Lazarus has the good things and thou hast thine 'evil things:'" "Well, said the rich man, if he comes not to me send him to tell my friends and my neighbors of the condition of affairs here." The answer was made, "They have Moses and the prophets, and if they heed not these, neither would they listen to one though he rose from the dead."

If the Judge of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah is a Christian, how will he feel when he comes into the presence of Father Abraham, whom he has sought to cast reflections upon? Will not the blush of shame be upon his check? And if there is an eternal God, and if that eternal God is the creator of the heavens and the earth, and all our spirits; and is the friend of Abraham, how can that Judge bear his presence? I would rather be the poorest Latter-day Saint on earth and bear chains and fetters upon my limbs until flesh dropped from my bones than to be in

the attitude of the man who must bear, without the spirit of God, the measure of unjust judgment which he has measured to others. For this reason, my brethren and sisters, I say I have the most profound sympathy for those whom we sometimes denominate our enemies, and I am not able to forget the fact that whatever their condition in this life may be, they fought not on the side of Satan in the eternal worlds when Satan rebelled against God because the Almighty was unwilling to adopt his coercive plan of human redemption: God was determined that every man, woman and child born into the world should be free. I say, because God would not adopt his coercive measures he rebelled against Christ and one-third part of heaven followed him, and he fought against Michael and the hosts of heaven, and was cast down to earth with the hosts that followed him. But you can find no living man or woman that ever breathed the breath of life that fought on his side; for the condemnation that came upon them was a loss of opportunity to take a body. Therefore, those people who seem to be our enemies are such only by reason of their blindness, and because their eyes are closed against the things of God, and if the judgments of God are to come upon them according to the predictions of the prophets, we can well afford to have charity and sympathy for them and we do as a people. I tell you that I can pray for my enemies; I can pray that God may lead them away from darkness, that He may touch the eyes of their understanding that they may see, and in their hearts repent.

It is awful to think for a moment of the terrible condemnation that will surely come upon men who endorse the shedding of innocent blood; but we must at last come to love our enemies and pray for them who despitefully use us. And when we are prepared to do this from the heart, we are prepared to say to this world, **"I am not afraid of anything you can do." The power of the Spirit lifts the body out of the reach of harm, the spirit of Christ has gained the victory; and we can say when under the influence of that spirit, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"** I can pray for the President of the United States, with a desire in my heart that God will direct him aright, that he may have moral courage sufficient to do that which is just; because, unless the rulers of this nation are actuated by the spirit of justice, they cannot be sustained by the Almighty. And although we may find prejudice on the right hand and on the left, we shall never have given unto us the victory until we learn how to govern upon principle. When men are tested, when they are brought before the courts, cases should be tried, not men. Whenever the Latter-day Saints shall have reached that high degree of excellence in the administration of the laws of God as to judge impartially between the Saint and sinner, when they shall be willing to give Satan his rights as quickly as a Saint or a brother, then will judgment and rule be placed within their reach, and I pray that it will never come before that time.

Whether a man is a heathen or a Christian, when the kingdom of God is established, he will have his rights and liberties extended to him. There will be no bias, no prejudice, everything will be done according to the laws of justice and equity. Have we always, as a people, I may ask, manifested a disposition to act upon the basis of principle? You can answer the question for yourselves. Have you been willing, as Latter-day Saints to extend to the Gentile as readily his rights, under your municipal, your county or your Territorial government as you would extend them to a Latter-day Saint? If you have, then have we administered upon the basis of principle; but if we have not, then have we not come to an understanding

of that which the Lord has revealed; for when His kingdom bears sway there will be thousands and millions of people who do not subscribe to our religious views, who will be gladly governed by the laws of God's kingdom; and the Chinese in the empire of China, the Hindoo in Hindoostan, or the Christian in Europe, may read the laws that govern Zion, and, with mathematical accuracy, figure out the liberties they can enjoy under the laws of the kingdom of God.

There will be no prejudice or packed juries in the Kingdom of God that will bind the innocent and set the guilty free. God will govern His kingdom as He governs throughout His universe, by the laws of justice and equity.

What I say to the Latter-day Saints is, let us be of good cheer. I never have seen a better day than this. The kingdom will come off victorious, and those who have hated us will see the day when much woe and affliction will come upon them.

We hear talk about 55,000,000 of people being opposed to the Latter-day Saints. I offer to you this afternoon my testimony that this is not true. There are not 55,000,000 in this glorious government of ours who are opposed to the Latter-day Saints; it is a great mistake; there are thousands in the United States today, who are anxiously waiting for the solution of the "Mormon" problem, who are praying for the deliverance of this people. It is a great mistake to suppose that every man, woman and child in this nation are opposed to this people; there are scores that, while they have not courage to come out and speak a word for them, have a warm throbbing in their hearts for the victory of this people and their cause, and they are not blind to their surroundings either.

As an American citizen I deplore it, but I tell the Latter-day Saints this afternoon that this great government is not strong, and the reason is, they have torn up the foundations of the structure that was built by our fathers. They have ripped up the moorings of the great ship. They have allowed mob rule to get power in this land, and like a dark cloud, secret societies are gathering around. And while it may be smiled at, yet I tell you this nation stands as it were upon a mine. When the Knights of Labor and the different brotherhoods can say in calm language that within thirty minutes they can stop the motion of every car wheel between Omaha, Nebraska, and Butte, Montana, I say to you there is power there.

More than five years ago, certain secret societies instituted what were called the Pittsburgh riots. The State militia was called out to quell them, and they were not able to do it. The army of the national government was appealed to, and a United States officer told me that when he led his soldiers to Pittsburgh he feared to give the word of command to fire upon those insurgents, "for", said he, "I did not know whether they would obey or turn round and fire upon their officers." I have heard merchants of Chicago and New York declare that they had private arms stacked away in their business houses because they could not trust the municipal, the county, the State, or the national means of protection; will you tell me that a nation is strong thus situated? It is not.

The iron heel of the monopolist has long been upon the neck of labor, and the great question which is looming up in this nation today is that of labor and capital. Would to God we had statesmen with eyes clear enough to see! Would to God that they would pull out of their eyes the "Mormon" mote and behold the beam that threatens the nation. The occurrence at Rock Springs, and the mutterings we

hear from the Atlantic to the Pacific ought to be a warning that the day is not far distant, unless the Democratic and Republican parties open their eyes to the situation, when desolation and war will be in this government.

When men who live in San Francisco, Chicago and New York, have said to me, "Mr. Thatcher, why don't you renounce this objectionable feature of your religion, the nation is opposed to it, the civilization of the age does not want to permit it—why don't you renounce it and live in peace?" I have said to them, "I thank you for your kind sentiments; I thank you for the kindly feelings that you entertain", and as an evidence that I feel it, I will say when this nation, having sown to the wind, reaps the whirlwind; when brother takes up sword against brother; when father contends against son, and son against father; when he who will not take up his sword against his neighbor must needs flee to Zion for safety—then I would say to my friends come to Utah; for the judgments of God, commencing at the house of the Lord, will have passed away, and Utah, undisturbed, will be the most delightful place in all the Union.

When war and desolation and bloodshed, and the ripping up of society come upon the nation, I have said to such, "Come to Utah and we will divide our morsel of food with you, we will divide our clothing with you, and we will offer you protection." I will tell you, my brethren and sisters, the day will come, and it is not far distant, when he who will not take up his sword against his neighbor, will have to flee to Zion for safety; and it is presupposed in this prediction that Zion will have power to give them protection.

We are not going to do it outside of the government, either; we are going to do it inside the government. There is no power in this land to turn this people against the government of the United States. They will maintain the Constitution of this country inviolate, and although it may have been torn to shreds they will tie it together again, and maintain every principle of it, holding it up to the downtrodden of every nation, kindred, tongue and people, and they will do it, too, under the Stars and the Stripes. They will stand with their feet firmly upon the backbone of the American continent and maintain the principles which cost their fathers so much, and those principles cannot be taken away by men who violate their oath of office, and betray their trust.

I tell you that there are boys growing up in these mounains who have the principles of human liberty grounded deep in their hearts, and they will maintain them, not only for themselves, but for others. God speed the day I say—if the nation pursues its downward course and tears up these fundamental principles of government which have made them strong—when the Constitution may be rescued and all men and women shall be free again. I pray that Grover Cleveland may stand up as the chief executive of the greatest nation that there is on God's footstool today and say to the waves of public opinion and public pressure that the nation must be ruled upon the principles of righteousness and justice. If he would do that, he would make himself a name that would be embalmed for ever upon the pages of history. But if he will not do it—if he is not morally strong enough to do it, and if Congress will not come forward and help him do it, we will say, "O, God, we put our dependence in Thee", and where Thou leadest we will follow, and we will seek to maintain our rights, until the Almighty grants them unto us.

May the spirit of the testimony of the Lord Jesus Christ be in your hearts, for above all things it is the most precious; and when you come be-

fore the judges take no heed of what you shall say or the answers you shall give, but trust in God, and if you go before the judges silent as did your Lord and master, if they choose to nail you upon the cross or stretch you upon the wheel or the rack, or if they thrust you into dungeons or prisons, it is nothing more than was done to your Master before you. Let us trust in God. I tell you nothing of importance has ever been attained in this world without a hard struggle against the opinions and prejudices of men.

God grant that we may soon regain and forever maintain our liberty. But may it not come as long as we have an adulterer, a fornicator, or whoremaster who professes to be a Latter-day Saint. As long as such as these partake of the Holy Sacrament with this people, let bondage continue. But let us purge out these things, let us be pure and holy before God, cherishing the principles of justice in our hearts, and the day of liberty will surely come, which may God grant, is my prayer. Amen.—Journal of Discourses, 26:327-335.

THE LAW VERSUS CELESTIAL MARRIAGE

The following article from Edward Midgard teems wth good thoughts and suggestions There are, of course, some phases of his argument with which we cannot fully agree, but we strongly commend the article to the thinking people of the nation as the sentiments of a man that thinks, analyzes, and who has the courage of expression and is loyal to his convictions.—Editor.

The fight is on, the fight is good:
Long live the right to motherhood!

THE LAW vs. THE RIGHT OF MOTHERHOOD

An Opinion About the Mormon Fundamentalists and Concerning Their Present Prosecution for Plural Marriage and Unlawful Cohabitation.

By EDWARD MIDGARD
(1812 Twelfth Ave., Seattle 22, Washington)

Says Excellence: I am divine, my way shall prevail. Counters Mediocrity: I am the law of the land, to which you must comply or suffer the consequences.

There, in a few words, you have what I find to be the real issue in these Mormon - Fundamentalist - Polygamist trials now for months engaging the Utah courts, and probably destined to reach the United States Supreme Court.

If it were true, as the prosecution asserts and as those unsympathetic to them try to make it appear, that these people are advocating and practicing a primitive sort of marriage and a family life representing an uncivilized stage in human relations, I should have been the last one to take up their defense.

Nor, on the other hand, would the case of these Fundamentalists have interested me much if this were merely or chiefly another one of these recurring disputes about Freedom of Religion. That, in my opinion, is only a weak and insufficient argument for the defense in this case. In fact, I must agree with one of the trial judges when he says that religious beliefs cannot be accepted in court as justification for acts prohibited by law. Otherwise any ancient weird and barbaric cult or religious practice could claim tolerance under this guaranty of freedom in the exercise of one's firmly and fervently held beliefs that are called religious. Whatever our persuasion in regard to religion, we are all apt to be not only atheists but outright anti-religious when it comes to the other fellow acting in the name of God in a way that does not suit us.

Thus, in this case, what we call Freedom of Religion and sometimes prate about as America's specialty stands once more revealed as one of our pet illusions and perennial hypocrisies. While some other sects secure tolerance for their mannerisms that do not matter, we fail to grant freedom of

action where it would be essential and could be beneficial.

Therefore, not how much Mormon Fundamentalist views and practices agree with either a distant past and ancient scriptures, or yet with the teaching of some more modern prophet, but wherein lies their merit or demerit for today and tomorrow must be our concern and criterion.

What then has the defense to stand on in this case if it is not to be the vaguely guaranteed right to the free exercise of one's religion?

A judge, while duty-bound to enforce the law as prescribed, must do so within reason. If good judgment in enforcing the law were not needed, judges could be dispensed with.

And so to any judge considering these Fundamentalist cases I want to say: **Can you deny to a woman the right to be a mother by a man acceptable to her as the father of her child?** For that is what you do even when you condemn only the fathers of these plural marriage children. You, man born of a mother, how can you condemn and disgrace voluntary motherhood, **our nation's motherhood,** by finding against these defendants?

It is as simple as that so far as the law in the case is concerned. The law is insane, it is a stupid and shameful anachronism for an age where both biology and women's rights have begun to count. Therefore, the law must be changed. Of course, then, the real redress for these defendants must come eventually from the legislatures

* * *

Another thing or two I want to say to these courageous Mormon Fundamentalists who once more find themselves in the toils of the law.

For one thing, why insist on "having" more than one "wife" when the law says you mustn't? You see, the idea and still more the avowed practice of "polygamy" offends many of our fellow citizens these days. This is due to fear that something like it might happen to them against their will, thereby violating their valued right to exclusive possession of a legally acquired mate. Also, this taking offense is due to indoctrination that anything else than exclusive so-called love between the sexes is ethically inferior and uncivilized.

Remember how we used to be indoctrinated by our shouting clergymen against the atheistic and communistic Russians? That, of course, was before these damnable Bolshevists began to fight our battles and heroically helped to save us from Hitler. Likewise, I am confident, people will come to realize some day that something far worse could happen to us than the introduction of an expanded, more truly cooperative family life giviug every woman the chance to become a good mother, and that without murder among jealous wives—as, for instance, we find it practiced or at least sincerely aspired to by these Mormon Fundamentalists, still as little esteemed by us as Red Russia not so long ago.

So why, dear Fundamentalists, scare your unsympathetic neighbors by calling your advanced kind of family life in your own paper by the ancient obnoxious name "polygamy"? And why provoke the orthodox husband and wife by advertising that you favor "plurality of wives"? Why not speak, instead, of our women, our mothers, our cooperative families, where possession of a desired person has ceased to be a major issue, and where "wives" are no longer counted because the old primordial relationship of husband and wife has given way to a superior cooperative order? Well, let's call it poetically God's Family, or Celestial Marriage.

Above all, let me recommend that you insist on the inalienable right of every fit woman to motherhood of her own choosing as the chief justification for your expanded family life and

as a guaranty for its future in a more civilized society. For therein you have an irrefutable argument and a far more potent appeal than by insisting on your supposedly unlimited right to live your religion, or by pointing to some well-known Biblical characters of the Old Testament who lived in polygamy when marriage by purchase was still the order of the day.

Consider this: By calling it "Lend-Lease", our far-sighted President fortunately managed against much opposition to have us give aid to our present allies at a time when most of our people were not yet ready for our taking sides in this war. Similarly, men and women of vision should try and make it easy for their conservative fellow citizens to accept the introduction of a refined relationship between man and woman and of a truly cooperative family life. Thus, in order to break down the resistance coming from prejudice and hostile indoctrination, the emphasis should be placed on the modern right of our women to motherhood rather than on the ancient right of men to have as many wives as they could acquire.

* * *

Besides, was not Christianity to be something radically different from the old Mosaic order? Christianity was to bring a new and refined order in human relations. Surely, neither ancient purchase marriage, nor present-day bargain marriage for mutually exclusive possession, enforced by threats of "or else", measure up to the ethical standard dramatized in the figure of Christ. However, a superior, somewhat celestial family life and brotherhood had actually existed in Palestine during the last two centuries B. C. among thousands of Essenes (see "Essenes" in the Encyclopedia Britannica). These Essenes seem to have been the real originators and early pioneers of Christian ethics. Later on the clerics, bishops, etc., again got a hold of the movement and shaped it to suit their authoritarian rule. When contemplating Christianity and comparing it with its origin and pretended aim, one is inclined to exclaim: Alas, Christianity, your true name is Corruption!

Now some of our newspapers derisively call these steadfast Mormons "Cultists", and on the whole our publishers seem to have little use for them except to dress up their pages with sensational headlines. Well, the truth is that most if not all of our regular good churchgoing Christians are mere cultists. For they merely carry on a cult of the mythical figure of Christ, a personification of excellence in inter-human behavior, while they persist as much as possible in deals of ethical mediocrity with their fellowmen, particularly so when dealing with the other sex—that is, unless they sink there to the level of "all is fair in love and war".

Mormon Fundamentalists on the other hand, I find, aim at and are the actual pioneers of an advanced stage in man-to-woman and woman-to-woman relationship, more so at any rate than any other religious or reformatory group our civilization can boast of. That is why Fundamentalists are being hated and attacked. It is always the same story of stagnating mediocrity finding itself forever inconvenienced and embittered by attempts at excellence.

* * *

What then can we say are the possibilities or probabilities of the future in regard to marriage and family life?

In his book, A Short History of Marriage (327 pages), Prof. Edward Westermarck says: "Our examination into the causes of monogamy and polygamy makes it possible for us to explain why progress in civilization up to a certain point has proved favorable to polygamy, whilst in its highest forms it leads to monogamy".

Such reasoning cannot appeal to me for two reasons. In the first place, what but actual polygamy in one of

its worst forms is our present ever more widespread practice of marrying one woman or man after another "monogamously" with intervening scandals, divorce and broken homes? Yet this seems to be the kind of marriage which Prof. Westermarck identifies with civilization in one of its highest forms.

Then, too, who has yet seen the highest kind of civilization? What visions there have been of higher civilization did not anticipate conditions that would make monogamy at all enforceable, nor even particularly esteemed. Instead, the disappearance of marriage as we know it seemed and seems almost certain once we have learned to provide enough of life's necessities for all.

Now in his older days Westermarck has produced quite a book on The Future of Marriage (1936). But why, instead of remaining fascinated by the institution of marriage, does the learned professor not write a book giving us an outlook on a more civilized and more efficient Family Life? It is not essential that the institution of marriage have a future, sacrilegious though such statement may seem to those now owing their livelihood to this institution. But it is a vital thing that the family life of our nation have a future, a better future.

Family life does not mean the self-indulgent, now so well respected and amply state protected mutual possession of two mates. Family life is the begetting and raising of the next generation, the very thing which to the disconcernment of the writer we find here attacked, condemned and thwarted by the state.

With true family life more and more understood as a great task and a foremost national asset, things are bound to change further in the direction of an expanded family life. For, be it noted, to a considerable extent we have already passed the stage where the begetting and raising of the next generation was left entirely to the judgment and resources of the respective mates.

The state then should welcome and encourage rather than combat and frustrate private initiative that seeks to outgrow the precarious existence of the primordial family to two mates with their offspring.

My own vision of the future is a truly and purely cooperative family life, based on a more dignified relationship between man and woman, on a deal that excludes as indecent any bargain and claim for possession. Health, eugenics and child care will then be the state's only but greatly intensified concern. **And most certainly there will be no such nonsense as a law obstructing and punishing nationally desirable motherhood.**

Nobody ever is likely to try and introduce enforced polygamy. But our present restriction to monogamy under threats of criminal punishment, which only make for the frequent breaking up of homes and the discarding of one mate for the sake of another, will surely vanish as we progress from a predominantly commercial to a predominantly cooperative attitude toward each other.

After all, why should good Christians object to the coming of real love, even between man and woman, together with the overcoming of jealousy between women? And why of all people should we Americans fear one more liberty?

To sum up, the idea that a good woman is to be denied motherhood unless and until some man chooses to make her his own to the exclusion of all other women is socially reprehensible and nationally unwise, besides being biologically unsound; therefore it should be discarded and discredited by all intelligent men and women, but above all by our law-makers.

Here, my Fundamentalist friends, you have a real argument in your defense, for on this point you stand justified with your expanded family life before the best ethics of today and tomorrow.

The real controversy, then, before our United States courts in these trials is: **The Law versus the Right to Motherhood.** As shown here, this persecution of family life reveals us as backward and bigoted; it is a national disgrace.

To fight such error, slight and sneers,
Unfold this banner, Pioneers:
WHAT MATTERS IS MOTHERHOOD!

EXPRESSIONS OF A PLURAL WIFE

I am a plural wife. I have been living the law of celestial marriage according to my religious beliefs for nearly six years. I was born into the "Mormon" Church and am a thorough believer of its saving doctrines.

I am extremely happy, for I know that the convictions of my religious faith, coupled with the love that exists among the members of our family is something that comes from heaven.

I know the integrity and strength of the women who live this principle. I know their family history and background. In nearly all cases, they come from the purest strains of the highly intelligent in the Mormon Church. They are lovely and gracious, clean and moral. Their standards are, in nearly all respects, higher than that of the average woman. They have ideals and hopes, dreams and ambitions beyond that of average realm.

We endeavor with all our hearts to overcome the mortal, instinctive weaknesses that are common to womankind.

Naturally enough, we all desire to accomplish good and develop our talents as much as possible, but when someone has a talent already greatly developed, we are not jealous of her—merely hopeful that some day we, too, might develop ours to that same degree. Jealousy is indeed a rare thing.

We cooperate together, caring for each others' children and for each other in times of illness and need. We do nearly all of our own sewing, all our own cooking and housework. We are busy and that is another factor that leads to our happiness. In our spare moments, we crochet, knit, embroider, write, play the piano, sing—any number of things which make us gay and cheerful.

We are proud of our beautiful, intelligent children and of our loving, faithful husband. (Our husbands are more faithful to several wives than most husbands are to one). We are proud of our associate sisters in this Gospel. We are ashamed of nothing but our own weaknesses and try diligently to be charitable and kind to each other in those weaknesses.

There is a great deal more to the law of celestial marriage than just plurality of wives. It embodies all the saving virtues of every religion—humbleness, gentleness, kindness, love, charity, self-sacrifice, devotion to God.

We admit our failings and do not profess to be perfect, so, kind reader, do not judge us too harshly. We are still human and, as such, subject to human frailties, but our zeal in serving God is true and real and unshakeable.

R. K.

AN ARGUMENT

—Is a poor way to settle a matter.
—Is easily started with a crank.
—Never makes good table talk.
—Usually costs more time than it is worth.
—About religion seldom makes any man pious.
—Seldom changes anyone's opinions.
—Never changes the mind of God.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious.
PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy.

6

Vol. 10. AUGUST, 1944. No. 3.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

MANY of this people have broken their covenants by speaking evil of one another, by speaking against the servants of God, and by finding fault with the plurality of wives and **TRYING TO SINK IT OUT OF EXISTENCE.** But you cannot do that, for God will cut you off and raise up another people that will carry out His purposes in righteousness, unless you walk up to the line in your duty. On the one hand there is glory and exaltation; and on the other no tongue can express the suffering and affliction this people will pass through, if they do not repent.—Heber C. Kimball, J. of D., 4:108.

A LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM

In the present state and Federal prosecutions of certain members of the Mormon Church on the charge of living polygamously there are questions meriting the most serious consideration of the state legislature.

In Federal indictments against twenty-one defendants the charges come under the "Mann Act", the "Lindbergh Act" and "Conspiracy", the latter charge resting upon the theory that the TRUTH magazine, being distributed through the U. S. mails, is "obscene, lewd or lascivious".

It will be remembered that there is no Federal law against plural marriage or unlawful cohabitation that is effective in the states; so that in attacking this problem of marriage the prosecution has ingeniously adopted the Mann Act and Kidnapping charges, hoping to catch the victims in either one or the other net. The conspiracy charge presupposes that the defendants have entered into a collusion to break the laws of the nation and to encourage others to do likewise. But since there is no Federal law on the point in question there could be no conspiracy to break that which does not exist—merely a phantom law. Hence the charges must fail as they have no legal foundation. This point was so held by the Hon. U. S. Judge J. Foster Symes, who quickly quashed the indictments on the conspiracy charges.

The Mann Act and Kidnapping charges were sustained against nine of the defendants by Judge Kennedy, who doubtless had not anticipated a ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, May 15th, 1944, in the

case of Mortensen et al v. United States wherein the high court ruled to the contrary. The ruling of Judge Kennedy is being appealed for review by the Circuit Court of Appeals sitting at Denver. In view of the late decision on the points involved we can see no other course than a reversal of Judge Kennedy's ruling, which should end the government's efforts to punish alleged polygamists under unrelated statutes, throwing all the cases into the lap of the State, where they naturally belong. The states have never surrendered to the Federal government regulatory rights in family relations.

The State cases, some thirty-four in number—are brought under the charge of conspiracy and unlawful cohabitation. The two charges were employed, as we see it, with the hope that at least one of them would succeed. It is reported that one of the investigating FBI agents stated to one business man whom he was questioning that it was **not polygamy** they were after, but the TRUTH magazine. In the light of this fact one wonders what the present purpose of the prosecution is. Is it to penalize motherhood? Is it to obliterate the TRUTH magazine? Is it to assist the Church in its effort to punish its "fundamentalist" members? Is it to cleanse the atmosphere of religious freedom? Or what is it? These are questions we feel should engage the very careful consideration of our legislature; first, however, engaging the attention of the voters at the coming elections. All of these defendants (with perhaps one exception) are native born citizens of the United States. They are men and women of standing in the community —taxpayers and substantial citizens in all respects; and they are entitled to respectful treatment.

Some facts are pertinent here: The Patriarchal order of marriage as reinstituted under the Abrahamic dispensation is a principle, according to the Prophet Joseph Smith, that was instituted by God before the foundations of earth. It has to do with exaltation in the life to come. It is a law of the holy Priesthood .So exacting were the leaders of the Mormon church in the early days regarding this principle that men having the Melchisedek Priesthood conferred upon them were placed under covenant to accept this law of marriage. The Lord made it clear in a revelation to John Taylor in 1882, at the calling of Heber J. Grant into the Quorum of Twelve, that one cannot preside over the Priesthood who is not abiding in that law of marriage. Brigham Young proclaimed that the order of plural marriage was the only marriage order in heaven. He said:

> **Why do we believe in and practice polygamy? Because the Lord introduced it to His servants in a revelation to Joseph Smith, and the Lord's servants have always practiced it. And is that religion popular in heaven? It is the only popular religion there, for this is the religion of Abraham, and, unless we do the works of Abraham, we are not Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise.—J. of D., 9:322.**

We realize there is a strong prejudice against this order of marriage. But aside from the fact it is part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and that Satan is against all phases of the Gospel, we cannot understand why there should be such an opposition to the principle. It interferes with the rights and liberties of no person other than those immediately involved, and they accept it without the least degree of coercion. The principle is opposed to celibacy because God said, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth", and this can only properly be done in the marriage covenant. It is opposed to enforced monogamy because monogamy does not and cannot fully express the fulness of the marriage relation. It breeds unfaithfulness particularly on the part of husbands. It forces a certain per cent of women into celibacy, a wholly unnat-

ural situation. It only partially succeeds in its mission to "multiply and replenish the earth." Plural or Celestial marriage is the marriage order of the Gods. The principle can only be maintained in the exercise of freedom, all parties concerned using their agency with the utmost freedom. Hence no one to the compact is injured.

Suppose two or more women, otherwise unprovided for, shall choose to select one man as their husband and the father of their children, the man being willing to accept the arrangement, who can be injured in such a compact? If the parties involved be willing why should there be mutterings of legal or social inhibitions? Plural marriage can only be lived where there are surplus women who are willing to enter into the order. Certainly no person should refuse a woman an opportunity for honorable marriage and motherhood. "What matters is motherhood!" Then why seek to deprive a woman of the sweetest wish of her life?

"But", objects one, "it is breaking a law, and the Church has covenated with the government to stop the practice—within the Church." The difficulty of breaking a law in living a legitimate principle can be remedied by the legislature; and the Church, if it still feels its covenant with the nation should be kept, can continue to keep it. The law is a law of the Priesthood and NOT a law of or to the Church, except as the Church accepts the principle and abides in it. Cohabiting with more than one woman is not MALUM IN SE, but is MALUM PROHIBITUM —it cannot be a crime in itself, a natural crime. Not being a natural crime, laws against it may be oppressive and unreasonable, and all unreasonable and oppressive laws should be repealed.

The last hundred years has been the age of Mormon persecution. The most diabolical outrages have been committed against them by ignorant bigots. Formerly the victims were the Quakers, then the Catholics and Jews. In 1647 a law enacted by the General Court of Massachusetts provided, that **"No Jesuit or spiritual or ecclesiastical person (as they are termed) ordained by the pope or see of Rome, shall henceforth come into Massachusetts. Any person not freeing himself of suspicion shall be jailed, then banished. If taken a second time he shall be put to death."**

And even in Rhode Island, the supposed land of true freedom, founded by the great champion of religious and political freedom, Rodger Williams, we are informed of an Act in 1664 reading: **"That all men professing Christianity, and of competent estates and of civil conversation, who acknowledge and are obedient to the civil magistrate, though of different judgments in religious affairs (ROMAN CATHOLICS ONLY EXCEPTED) shall be admitted freemen and shall have liberty to choose and be chosen officers in the Colony, both military and civil."**—History of Bigotry in U. S., by Myers, p. 81.

This was the general attitude of the Colonies in that day. True, the restrictions were somewhat relaxed after the American Revolution, but for many years after Independence restrictive laws against Catholics and Jews were passed by the State legislatures. Merely for being of Catholic birth men were suspected of grave crimes. A Colonel Johnson gave John Lidius, a trader, "the character of a very dangerous person in any province, as he was certain of his being a Roman Catholic."

In 1787 in the Federal Constitutional Convention, a clause offered by Charles Pinckney was adopted, reading: **"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the authority of the United States."** Yet in 1790

only in three States, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland, did Catholics have the right to vote. During this time and later were the Jews undergoing similar castigations.

The scene shifted early in the nineteenth century to the Mormons. Outrages committed against them, indescribable in their horrors, now occupy the pages of history. Fighting through this maze of bigotry and prejudice the Mormons now enjoy a degree of freedom, but not a fulness thereof. Their marriage system is assailed. They are deprived by the laws of the land of living an eternal law which they conceive to be necessary to obtain the highest exaltation in the Celestial glory. The power to correct this deficiency in the law rests with our legislators and the Governor.

When the Woodruff Manifesto of 1890 was adopted by the Church, the Church only was involved. It was the intention of the brethren at the time to discontinue plural marriage in the Church only long enough to get statehood, after which, exercising its sovereign powers, the State might correct the error through its legislature. Subsequent to statehood the lawmakers tried at various times to vacate the anti-Mormon legislation, but to date this has not been accomplished. The members of the legislature have always been overwhelmingly Mormon. The Governors of the State, with few exceptions, have been been Mormons. They had the power to legislate in favor of the Patriarchal order of marriage.

This was once accomplished in part. A Bill introduced in the Utah legislature by Abel John Evans, then the President of the Senate, passed the Senate March 8, 1901, by a vote of 11 to 7, and a few days later the House by a vote of 25 to 17. This bill, while not as broad in scope as the leaders of the Church had hoped for, yet it promised a measure of relief from prosecutions then being threatened and waged against polygamists, and was heralded by its friends as a step in the right direction. The Bill reads:

Section 1. That section 4611 of the Revised Statutes of Utah, 1898, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

4611. Every person who has reason to believe that a crime or public offense has been committed may make complaint against such person before some magistrate having authority to make inquiry of the same: Provided, that no prosecution for adultery shall be commenced except on complaint of the husband or wife, or relative of the accused within the first degree of consanguinty, or of the person with whom the unlawful act is alleged to have been committed, or of the father or mother of said person, and no prosecution for unlawful cohabitation shall be commenced except on complaint of the wife or alleged plural wife of the accused; but this proviso shall not apply to prosecutions under section 4208 defining and punishing polygamous marriages.

This Bill was vetoed by Governor Heber M. Wells and failed of final passage.

Nothing further of a legislative nature was done until 1935, when H. B. 224 by Nicholes was enacted into law. It reads:

An act amending Section 103-51-2, Revised Statutes of Utah, 1933, making unlawful cohabitation a felony, and providing that all persons except the defendant must testify in proceedings therefor.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Section 1. Section 103-51-2, Revised Statutes of Utah, 1933, is hereby amended to read as follows:

103-51-2. If any ( ) person cohabits with more than one (1) person of the opposite sex, such person is guilty of a felony.

Any person, except the defendant, may be compelled to testify in a prosecution for unlawful cohabitation; provided, however, that the evidence given in such prosecution shall not be used against him in any proceeding, civil or criminal, except for perjury in such testimony. A

person so testifying shall not thereafter be liable to indictment, prosecution or punishment for the offense concerning which said testifimony was given.

In changing the crime (?) from a misdemeanor with a prison sentence in the County Jail of not to exceed six months, to a FELONY, with imprisonment in the State Penitentiary of from one to five years the Mormon legislative body literally out-heroded Herod. The Federal Government, in its severest strictures attached only a six months jail sentence, nor did it require all persons except the defendant to testify as this state law provides, and which is doubtless an unconstitutional provision. No sense of justice can condone such a law and future generations will regard it as a clear and open effort to persecute a portion of the citizenry of Utah in the enlightened age of 1935!

The objection of many of our people to reforming the laws pertaining to the Mormon marriage system is that in conforming to the Enabling Act passed by Congress, they were compelled to insert a clause in the Utah Constitution **"forever prohibiting polygamy"**. And since the citizens of Utah are honest they hesitate doing something they feel they are under obligation not to do. But this obligation does not now exist as will be shown in the next issue of TRUTH.

The Mormon people are law abiding —they mean to continue so; but they are also strong for human rights, and it is not in their blood to give their natural and inalienable rights away so long as there is the least possibility of maintaining them. Among human rights is the right of freedom to worship God or not to worship Him, as men's consciences guide them, restricting such worship or non-worship to forms that will interfere with no other man's rights.

Again, we assert that it is the right —the natural right—of every normal citizen of the United States to practice celibacy, monogamy, or plural marriage as circumstances and opportunities afford; that it is no more immoral to marry and live with two women than it is with one, providing the true purpose of marriage is maintained; and that if two women wish to associate themselves with one man as his wives and the mothers of his children, he being agreeable to the arrangement, it is the affair of none other than themselves.

CONTRIBUTIONS

The Defendants in the Federal and State cases involving plural marriage, wish to thank their many friends for their splendid response to the call made for funds in July TRUTH, and which are needed in defraying the legal expenses of the fifty odd cases involved.

Owing to the unusually large number of indictments and charges, which in their nature must be test cases—many going to the higher courts for final decision—the expenses are necessarily high.

It is also gratifying to note the fine expressions of friendship coming in from all quarters. In this fight it is consoling to feel we are not alone, and that BIGOTRY and PREJUDICE are gradually fading from the minds of many who, at first blush, felt a strong opposition to the Mormon marriage system. Good American sportsmanship is being displayed. The average American likes one who has the courage and is willing to fight for his ideals however erroneous they may appear to others, so long as others' ideals are not interfered with.

We shall be grateful for such further contributions—large or small—as our readers feel they can afford. One boy—six years of age—brought in an improvised bank containing nearly 400 pennies. These he had been saving for "good old Santa". He said, "I want you to use these in them cases

in court." That young American is a good sport. He is on his way to high honors in our great Republic.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON COURT CASES

A cross-section of comments on recent happenings in the Mormon criminal cases in the State and Federal courts of Utah, are here given:

A Leading Business Man Says:

"Who can look at the group picture in LIFE (July 3) of the fifteen families of those convicted of Unlawful Cohabitation, and find the slightest suggestion of an immoral purpose in that manner of living? Everything in the picture points to a clean life with a noble purpose behind it."

A Mormon Lawyer Remarked:

"Why, in the name of God, do the leaders of the Church oppose this 'Fundamentalist' group and their family life? Do they consider it unclean and immoral? Why practically every one of them is the product of polygamy. Do these leaders admit that they came through an unclean parentage?"

A Non-Mormon From Chicago Writes:

"Why send fifteen hard-working Christians like that man Jessop shown with his family in LIFE magazine, to the penitentiary, and put their 283 children with their fifty-five mothers on public charity? Is that the compensation of "Motherhood"? Is it the theory of a democracy to force monogamy on these men and turn the forty extra wives and mothers on the street? There is no sense to it!"

A California Philosopher Writes:

"What wouldn't Hitler give for a nation of family makers like those Mormon 'Fundamentalists' "?

A Good Sister From Nevada Writes:

"Here is $20.00 to help get out TRUTH. For goodness sakes don't stop it. TRUTH is life to me and my children. Surely the good Lord will not let them stop it!"

A Voice From Santa Clara, California:

"The picture of the group in July 3 issue of LIFE shows the finest and cleanest group of people in the world. The Spirit of the Lord shines out on all your faces."

A Caustic Comment:

An active member and worker in the Church, manifesting his displeasure towards the leaders for their confessed part in the present Federal and State prosecutions of those members charged with living in plural marriage, comments:

I now quote verbatim from a discourse by the late Brigham H. Roberts delivered in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, Sunday, June 9th, 1907: "Well, gentlemen, what of it? Whose business is it? Do you hold that you may enter the sacred precincts of the mind and uproot our opinions? Your law gives you the right to punish overt acts; but you have no law and no right to enter the domain of conscience and interfere with what is held there as the truth. Hands off here! Our belief is our own. We have a right to our opinions. If you don't believe them, that is nothing to us; we do. And if you have not succeeded in converting us, we can't help that. You have got all you deserve out of this controversy on our marriage system.

"Properly this was a question which belonged to the dominion of reason, scripture and polemics. You should have convinced us, as ministers of Christ, from the word of God and from the nature of the things involved, that the principle itself was untrue. But you were not content to leave it to the arbitrament of discussion and reason; you must needs play upon the prejudices of the masses and induce

them to belabor Congress with their petitions until your inimical legislation was put upon the statute books; and the crusade against the practice of our marriage system was declared, and those who practiced it were raided with unabated vigor for years. We yielded at last to superior force, not to your arguments, because we successfully met them.

"You remember the occasion, do you not, of the chaplain of the Senate of the United States coming to this very forum, and here discussing the question, 'Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?' That your champion was vanquished in the contest is evidenced from the fact that we publish as a campaign document both sides of the Pratt-Newman discussion. If you have not convinced us of the incorrectness of our principles, it must be because of the lameness of your reasoning, the weakness of your argument, and you must be content with the result so long as we do not carry into practice that principle which we believe. We have a right to our belief in that or any other doctrine as abstract principles, whether our belief suits you or not, and we have the right to freely express that belief, and if you don't like it, you may go hang."

Excommunication of individuals from the Church for the practice of polygamy is a ruling of the Church and I feel the leaders should adopt the attitude expressed in the above paragraph and be motivated to a point of mumness for they know the principle to be true and when they effect an excommunication they reach the limits of their official capacity; and when the leaders commend the officers of State and Government for their efforts in the prosecution of the practice of polygamy under a screen of "Mann Act" and "Lindbergh Kidnapping", they are upholding the same power and force by which they, themselves (some of them now living), were penalized a few years ago. It appears to be a subterfuge in ambush or a rank incompatibility.

GOSSIPING

(By President George Q. Cannon)

There has been considerable talk of late, among that portion of our people who take interests in public affairs, concerning the absence of discretion among neighbors in this city and other places in the Territory, and the loose and imprudent way in which they gossip about each other's affairs. It is said, and perhaps with considerable truth, that much of the trouble that the Saints have been put to by their enemies is due to the foolish, gossiping talk of those who call themseles their friends. If this be so, and I am inclined to think that to a certain extent it is, what a disgrace it is, and what a serious responsibility rests upon those who are guilty of such conduct! Though they may not intend to do their brethren and sisters harm by their talk, they really become their betrayers, and do them as serious injury as if they were their personal enemies. Rumors are circulated about one and another; they pass from mouth to mouth, from family to family, until they become the common gossip of the neighborhood and are generally believed to be true. Apostates and other enemies catch them up and carry them to some official, then a long examination is entered upon, numerous witnesses are summoned, and the parties accused are subjected to annoyance and expense, they and their family affairs are brought prominently and unpleasantly before the public, and perhaps it ends in their being indicted by the grand jury and put to all the cost, inconvenience and risk of a trial in the district and other courts. **I do not overstate the case when I say, there have been many instances of this kind, and they have had their origin in the foolish, and I may say wicked, gossip of neighbors and so-called friends. And yet such persons**

call themselves Saints, and would doubtless feel deeply offended if doubts should be expressed respecting their loyalty to the cause of God and their devotion and love to their brethren and sisters.

I have a friend whose frequent exclamation in former times was, "When will Isreal learn wisdom?" I ask myself the same question today. When, indeed, will Isreal learn wisdom? When will the Latter-day Saints learn to govern their tongues and mind their own business? The only creed that I have ever known the Church to publish as such, is the simple sentence: "MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS." Only think of the happiness and peace and good feeling that would prevail everywhere among the Saints if they would live up to this simple yet comprehensive creed!

What right have I to meddle with or gossip about my neighbor's family or affairs? What right has he to meddle with or gossip about me, my family or my affairs? If he is a Priest or a Teacher he has a right to visit me and my family, to question us concerning our lives, to see that we perform the duties of our religion. That we live at peace with one another and with our brethren and sisters and practically embody in our lives the religion we profess. When this is done his duty requires no more. Outside my house my family affairs should be sacred from observation or comment, from him, unless there is something wrong which we will not repent of, and which, therefore should be brought to the attention of the Bishop and his counsellors. That which is correct in the treatment of me, my family and my affairs in this respect, is correct in the treatment of every other person or family in the Church. But Pope, the English poet, wrote the truth when he said:

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

There are people who have a standing in the Church, who respect neither age, station nor anything else. The commands of the Lord, the covenants they have made in holy places, nor any other good influence appears to have the least power to restrain them. The Lord has attached a penalty to the command which he has given, that we shall not speak evil of the Lord's anointed. There are many who treat this with utter contempt. When they meet together in their social circles their greatest enjoyment appears to consist in talking about their neighbors and their affairs. Nothing is too private, nothing too sacred for them to discuss and gossip about. If a celestial being were to live here awhile, long enough for his mode of life and his relations with others to be known, everything about him and his affairs would be, by the class of which I speak, canvassed and overhauled. If he had taken a new wife, or had brought wives with him, not a single particular concerning him and them would escape criticism and comment. The most private details of their lives would be made the subject of gossip. Not content with this, either, he would be exceedingly fortunate if these gossips should confine themselves to the truth, if they did not misrepresent him and misrepresent his family, and say things about him and about them that were utterly false.

Is this too strong a statement? I do not believe it is. I know that the leading men in the Church, and their families and their affairs in general are subjected to this kind of treatment by the tongues of persons who call themselvees Latter-day Saints. Their characters and motives are picked to pieces; they are misrepresented, and I am ashamed to say it, they are lied about by those who ought to know better, but who yield to this dreadful habit of gossiping. This tearing to pieces of character, this meddling with private concerns, is not confined alone to those leading men and

their families; it is extended to others, until none are exempt, and matters which belong to a man and his family alone, and with which no one should meddle, and about which no one should talk, become the common gossip of the entire neighborhood.

This is not only an unfortunate habit which these people have fallen into, it is positively wicked. Where it is indulged in the Spirit of God cannot exist. Whoever practices it will go into darkness. The only safe course for a Latter-day Saint to pursue is to mind his or her own business. What a shameful occupation it must be for men and women when they get together to begin dissecting the character and conduct of their neighbors, discussing their family affairs, regaling each other with all the gossip they have been able to pick up about their friends or the people around them! It is just such an occupation as the devil takes delight at people being engaged in; but how about holy angels and the Holy Spirit? Will they not flee from such society?

Now that I am upon this subject I may be permitted to give my opinion as to the cause of this idle gossip. It is no more than reasonable to think that sensible people, aside from the commands of the Lord upon the subject, would discountenance it. Such people would naturally think that while they were engaged in dissecting other people's characters, and gossiping about their affairs, others would, in like manner, be dealing with them and their concerns. Therefore, as a matter of self-protection they would naturally frown upon and discourage such a practice in society. But sensible people have other topics of conversation than small talk and personal gossip. It is only silly people, who never use their brains to think, who never use their time to read, who fall back upon gossip as a means of amusement or passing away the time in company. In the most of instances it is for a dearth of something else to talk about that they take up the family affairs or business of their neighbors. There are thousands of more interesting subjects for people to talk about than neighborhood gossip. **If they would exercise their brains, as much as they do their teeth or their fingers, or their legs in dancing, they would not lack subjects of conversation. Gossip is the refuge of silly people. It is the amusement of people who have no other use for their brains or tongues. Yet though so destitute of sense, they are most mischievous. They are a plague, if not a curse, to any community where they live. They are to be dreaded and should be shunned. Can they be cured? Why, yes, if they, themselves, will consent to be instructed.** But not without. They can be taught to control their tongues. They can store their minds with useful information; they can learn to understand interesting things; they can school themselves in talking about them, instead of personal gossip. By doing so, they will have more enjoyment, they will be happier, their friends will derive greater profit and satisfaction from their association, society will be benefited and the tone of all social gathings at which they may be present will be improved.

Let me, therefore, advise all who may have been guilty of gossiping to stop the practice, and those who have never fallen into it to be careful and never yield to it. When inclined to indulge in it, think how you would feel, if you discovered that the person of whom you wished to speak were within earshot and could hear every word you said about him or her.—Juvenile Instructor, 20:108.

SHOULD KNOW

"Why don't you get out and hustle? Hard work never killed anybody", said the philosophic gentlemen to whom Rastus applied for a loan.

"You is mistaken dar, boss", replied Rastus. "I'se lost fouh wives dat way."

A MODERN MIRACLE

The potency of the Holy Priesthood is well illustrated in an incident which occurred on the Marshall Islands, in the Pacific, at the battle of Kwajalein, as reported by United Press, February 8, 1944.

As the United States Marine Corps approached the shore line in their small boats and were pouring out into the water, two inconspicuous Mormon boys received bad wounds from the Jap machine guns. In their struggling position in the water they were overtaken by a boat carrying Press agents. And this is the story of a war correspondent in that boat:

"Being a war correspondent, my boat was going in behind the first line of men, and we came upon these two wounded marines in the water. One, from the stain of red around him we could tell, was wounded badly; the other, wounded, too, was holding the other's head above water. We picked them up, midst a hail of shot from shore, then pulled back toward safer retreat to render first aid. The one seemed too far gone to need much help, but the other refused aid until his wounded buddy was attended. But our help seemed insufficient, as we soon realized, and we announced our decision to his comrade. Then it happened.

"This young man, the better of the two, bronzed by the tropical sun, clean as a shark's tooth in the South Seas, slowly got to his knees. His one arm was nearly gone, but with the other, he lifted the head of the unconscious pal into his lap, placed his good hand on the other's pale brow and uttered what to us seemed to be incredible words—words which to this moment are emblazoned in unforgetable letters across the doorway of my memory: "IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST, AND BY VIRTUE OF THE HOLY PRIESTHOOD WHICH I HOLD, I COMMAND YOU TO REMAIN ALIVE UNTIL THE NECESSARY HELP CAN BE OBTAINED TO SECURE THE PRESERVATION OF YOUR LIFE."

"Today the three of us are here in Honolulu and he is still alive. In fact we walked down the beach together today, as we convalesce. He is the wonder of the medical unit, for—they say—he should be dead. Why he isn't they don't know—but we do, for we were there, off the shores of Kwajalein."

A LETTER TO "LIFE"

A sample of letters going to the 'LIFE" magazine commending the display of that wonderful publication of the group of Mormons, with their wives and children, whose husbands and fathers are now being prosecuted in the State courts on the charge of Unlawful Cohabitation:

Gentlemen:

Let me commend you for your fine illustrated article on Polygamy in your issue of July 3rd. To bring before so decadent a world as we are living in at present an exhibition of such heroism, devotion to high principle, example of cleanliness of sex and family relation in contrast to the almost universal ignoring of the laws of life for personal convenience and gratification, is certainly very timely. Your contribution to eugenics may augur well the future—in a world of marriageable women, more than half of whom will never have a chance to be a true wife and mother under the present monogamic system which we inherited from decadent Rome.

In his book, "History and Philosophy of Marriage, or Polygamy and Monogamy Compared", by a Christian Gentleman, published in Boston in 1869 by James Campbell (Horace Greeley was thought by many commentators to be the real author), the history of marriage among most peoples, with a detailed comparison of polygamy and monogamy, are set out in such manner as to completely ex-

plode all the arguments of the critics of polygamy. This is the only book known that completely covers the subject of its title. (Anyone having copies of this book who would dispose of them, I would like to hear from them.)

The ecclesiastical tyranny that foisted the Pagan system of monogamy on modern peoples, shows that the champions of monogamy were more ignorant of the true spirit of Christianity, as well as of the natural rights of men and women concerning the law of marriage, than even the poor savages themselves. He proves conclusively that all the sexual evils that are destroying our race spring from the monogamic system; the thwarting of the natural instincts of womanhood to be wife and mother; the resultant perversions of sex into free love, prostitution, mistress-ship, unnatural vices, etc., with the resultant social diseases, are all traceable to the insistence on the single wife system.

The recent revolt of the University Women, who have pledged themselves not to accept for husbands the mentally and physically injured soldiers whom the nations return from wars, but they will insist on selecting the fathers of their children, may mean the beginning of the end of the insane system of imposing man-made law against the laws of nature. Let us hope society will have a chance to resuscitate itself after this holocaust of war. This will be possible only when enough well-married women sense their responsibility to the race to share their clean, honorable husbands in marriage with the old maids and widows, with the object of preserving society from its sins against the natural laws of sex and reproduction.

Sincerely,

GEO. A. STARTUP,
Provo, Utah.

LETTERS OF PROTEST

The public appears to be genuinely aroused over the efforts of State and Federal officials to convict certain members of the Mormon Church of crimes based upon their belief in and practice of Celestial marriage—the Mormon marriage system. Letters of protest are being received by officials generally from honest protestants whose feelings are outraged by that which is going on in the courts.

The following is a copy of a letter addressed to President Franklin D. Roosevelt by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Gavalya of New York City, who, while strangers to us, have had their sympathies aroused in our behalf from press dispatches reaching them. This is but one of many such letters reaching public officials.—Editor.

New York City, June 7, 1944.

Hon. President Roosevelt,

Dear Sir:

We are writing to call your attention to the polygamy trials now going on in Salt Lake City, Utah. We are not "Mormons" or "Fundamentalists", but we nevertheless feel the great injustice being imposed on a few Mormons in the name of the law.

We have watched with interest all publications concerning these trials. We have read all articles that were available; in none of them can we see where those people were not being within their constitutional rights. They did nothing lewd; they support their wives and families by whom, in return, they are loved and respected. They are not criminals. Why then should they be prosecuted? Our forefathers have left their homes to come to this great land to find greater freedom, and in many cases to get away from religious persecution. Will we stand for the same thing, that is the basis of our Government, to be torn down in the name of the law? The law was made to protect and sustain our citizens, not to destroy them.

So far, all defendants have been found guilty. Some have been sen-

tenced to five years imprisonment; others may be given "life", under the laws imposed. No prosecution was ever more unjust. It is apparent persecution. The Judge and prosecutors did not deny that hundreds of gross sexual crimes committed by Salt Lake citizens have gone unpunished, except for small fines; yet under special legislation these people, in the exercise of their religious belief, are given inhuman and grievous sentences. They are torn from their hundreds of loving children, and from loving wives, and are thrown into jail as common criminals. And it further appears that it is the intent of the people of Utah to throw the wives into jail also, and leave the children to the mercies of such a State!

We understand that the "Mormons" who not too long ago lived the law of plural marriage that these people advocate, but apostatized from it, are the chief instigators of the persecution of those people. For shame! Here is a special legislation contrary to God's justice and the supreme laws of the land.

If the avowed purpose of the church and the prosecution succeeds hundreds of innocent, helpless children will be torn from loving parents simply to satisfy demands of a local majority.

Mr. President, in the name of "Freedom and Justice", for which our country stands, please do something to stop this unconstitutional persecution.

Sincerely,

(Sig.) MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH GAVALYA

AS GOD IS SO MAN MAY BE

(Lorenzo Snow)

At a meeting of the Presidency and Twelve President Lorenzo Snow made these remarks: "There is one thing that a Latter-day Saint, and Elder of Israel, should never forget; it should be a bright, illuminating star before him all the time—in his heart, in his soul, and all through him—that is, he need not worry in the least as to whether he should be a deacon or president of the church; it is sufficient for him to know that his destiny is to be like his Father, a God in eternity. He will not only be president of a church, but he may see himself president of a kingdom, president of worlds, with never ending opportunities to enlarge his sphere of dominion. I saw this principle after being in the Church but a short time; it was made as clear to me as the noon-day sun, and I expressed it in this language: **As God once was, so now are we; as He is now, so man may be.** This thought in the breasts of men filled with the light of the Holy Spirit, tends to purify them and cleanse them from every undue ambition or improper feeling. This glorious opportunity of becoming truly great belongs to every faithful elder in Israel; it is his by right divine, and he will not have to come before this or any other quorum to have his status defined. He may be a God in eternity; he may become like his Father, doing the works which his Father did before him, and he cannot be deprived of reaching this exalted state. I never sought to be a Seventy or High Priest, because this eternal principle was revealed to me long before I was ordained to the priesthood. The position which I now occupy is nothing as compared to what I expect to occupy in the future."—From Journal of A. Milton Musser.

AN ECHO OF THE PAST

Letter From President John Taylor to Apostle John Henry Smith Editor of Millennial Star—Nov. 7, 1884

Your favor of October 21st reached me yesterday. We were pleased to learn of your welfare, and of the diligent labors of the Elders. Before its arrival we had been informed by the telegraphic dispatches of the sailing

of the last company in two parties, by reason of the injuries suffered by the steamship NEVADA through fire. We trust, like those who have preceded them, these immigrants will arrive safe.

There is a quite, yet earnest feeling pervading the hearts of the Saints. They perceive that the enemy is making a concerted attack wherever our people dwell, to bring trouble and suffering upon them. In Utah, Arizona and Idaho, indictments are being found and illegal proceedings inaugurated on purpose, largely, to manufacture political capital. The policy of our assailants will doubtless be greatly influenced by the course of events in the near future, as also by the result of the Presidential election. All these matters, however, will be controlled by the Almighty for our good, though they know it not, and as He sees we have strength to bear and with stand, to suffer and grow strong, so will He permit the agents of the arch-enemy to assail us, until they have filled the cup of their iniquity, and we have learned the lessons necessary for our perfection. The burden of the Lord that is upon me constrains me constantly to cry, Woe to those who fight against Zion, for God will fight against them; and as for us, we can abide His time in all things, for His good pleasure is our salvation.

The course taken by Chief Justice Zane in the late trials of our brethren is unprecedented, prejudiced and cruel. His aim is to convict, not to accord justice; it is a part of a crusade planned, organized, and put in motion to destroy the work of God. This infamous crusade commenced within our borders. Representatives of the various Christian Churches, including nearly all their ministers in our midst, met together in solemn conclave, and poured forth upon an unsuspecting and sympathetic world such a flood of falsehoods, such a torrent of entreaties, that the whole of "Vanity Fair" was convulsed by the recital of "Mormon" horrors and "Mormon" abominations. Petitions to Congress followed from nearly every section of our common country by the score and by the hundred, until that body, imagining that it must do something to satisfy the public demand, as though it were but the echo of public feeling and excitement, passed the villainous Edmunds bill, which—not being sufficiently outrageous to suit our reformers—governors, commissioners, judges and the rest, without even the semblance of law or authority, have gone to work and tinkered and patched it, to enable them the better to persecute and prosecute the Saints, and to carry out their inhuman, iniquitous and traitorous designs. For they are inhuman in that, if successful, they must rob many thousand innocent people of their homes, liberties, rights and possessions; they are iniquitous in that their aim is to overthrow the peace, good order and morality that prevail here, and establish in the place thereof all the vices, profligacy and crimes that are now sinking modern Babylon to an eternal damnation. And they are traitorous in that they subvert the Constitution of the nation, make war on American citizens, seek to enslave them, and fraudulently strive to rob them of their rights and liberties and even of life itself, should our lives stand in the way of the accomplishment of their most vile purposes. But for all this God rules, and He maketh the wrath of men to praise Him, and the remainder thereof He will restrain.

General good health prevails. I have much cause to be thankful to our Heavenly Father that personally I still enjoy so large a degree of this priceless blessing, as also for His assurances of continued manifestations of His good pleasure. I see no cause for any trembling at the knees, no room for doubt, no place for despondency. God, our God, has promised in every age, and has renewed the prom-

ise with succeeding generations, that in the latter days He would perform His great and wonderful work, and the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom should never be given to another people. We are the blessed people upon whom He has conferred it, and His word is certain and its fulfillment sure.

Brothers B. Young and H. J. Grant are visiting the Saints in Arizona, and will probably continue their journey as far as Guaymos in Mexico. Brother Erastus Snow is in southern Utah. The rest of the brethren of your Quorum are mostly engaged in visiting the various Stake Quarterly Conferences; these are now so numerous that three and occasionally four take place at the same time. President Cannon remains with me, Brother Joseph F. having been absent for some time.

With kind regards to yourself, to your associates in the Office, and to the Elders and Saints generally, I remain,

Your brother in the New and Everlasting Covenant,

JOHN TAYLOR.

—Millennial Star, 46:753-4.

CORRESPONDENCE

Editor of "TRUTH"

Many times I have perused the excellent articles in TRUTH with much pleasure and satisfaction. Every issue contains a brief and masterful treatise on some live topic and I have whole-heartedly corroborated with it. The great and mightiest of the mighty, Jesus the Christ, the only Redeemer with the only one effectual plan of life and salvation was truly the heavenly light in the midst of gross darkness that stubbornly rejected it.

The restoration of that same heavenly Gospel light through Joseph Smith, Jr., the great latter-day Prophet, Seer and Revelator, to the world is again fearfully assailed by all the satanic forces of earth and hell! But, in this "the Dispensation of the fulness of times" (Eph. 1:10) the visible (including the invisible) personal, tangible, corporeal, resurrected, exalted men—Gods—the Father and Son and the personal invisible Spirit, Holy Ghost—the triune Godhead—have decreed that a knowledge of them and the Gospel shall be preached in all the world; to induce humanity to repentance before the end of the world (or the wicked)—Matt. 24:14.

The process of procedure in preaching the Gospel to all the world has been systematically operating for more than a century, soon fulfilling the "days of Noah"—Matt. 24:37.

The issue of TRUTH for this month (June) is very interesting. The articles, "A Polygamous Wife Speaks" and "I Am a Plural Wife", are of celestial tone. They are the class of Gods' offspring for whom the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.—Tenth Article of Faith.

When 90% of "Mormondom" backed the beloved President Wilford Woodruff in signing the Manifesto they led "the Church" in becoming the backsliding children, (Jer. 3:14) to whom the Lord is inseparably associated — "married". Isaiah, the most honored major Prophet, calls the Manifesto a "Covenant with death and an agreement with hell" (Is. 28: 18). It was death to many children who might have been born to plural wives. Monogamy, as it exists, agrees with hellish practices. But those nefarious schemes of Satan shall not stand, but shall be disannulled.—Is. 28:14-17.

The very hour that President Woodruff and his effeminate back-sliding advisors and associates signed the Manifesto and passed that document into the hands of their satanic impelled en-

emies—in the same backsliding hour President Woodruff and every subordinate officer in every stake and ward of the Church who assented to the document in the fulness of its meaning as later interpreted by President Woodruff, were automatically obligated agents of Cain, Satan and heir subordinates, to see that the Manifesto was lived up to.

For more than fifty years the backslide Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has apparently lived up to its covenant with death and agreement with hell. But now the time is ripening for all concerned to be rebuked and the covenant with death and agreement with hell to be done away with. Who knows but that the present efforts to imprison the polygamists will be the means of destroying this covenant with death and agreement with hell? All good Latter-day Saints should do all possible to live this Celestial law for which the brethren are now being persecuted.

The wrath of God is upon the great and abominable church, the mother of abominations whose foundation is the Devil (Nephi 14:9-17, Rev. 14:6-8). The Lord is making the earth empty, and few men shall be left (Is. 24:1-6). These are the days of the greatest tribulation (Matt. 24:21, 22). The war (Is. 3:25), the leaders—Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, backsliding Latter-day Saints are causing the Lord's people to err (Is. 3:12). Children are oppressers and women are ruling and dictating in the backsliding church; also in the political rings and governmental policies of the United States.

I know that Joseph Smith is God's great latter-day Prophet and he stands at the head and holds the keys to the present dispensation. No one can be more converted to this fact than I am. As Paul stated (Heb. 9:16, 17), I do not belong to any responsible organization—religious or secular: I am not amenable to any one of them, but I stand alone responsible for my attitude.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

D. W. S.

TWO MEN

Jesus and Alexander died at thirty-three.
One lived and died for self; one died for you and me.
The Greek died on a throne; the Jew died on a cross;
One's life a triumph seemed; the other but a loss.
One led vast armies forth; the other walked alone;
One shed a whole world's blood; the other gave his own.
One won the world in life and lost it all in death;
The other lost His life to win the whole world's faith.

Jesus and Alexander died at thirty-three.
One died in Babylon; and one on Calvary.
One gained all for self; and one Himself He gave.
One conquered every throne; the other every grave.
The one made himself God; the God made Himself less;
The one lived but to blast; the other but to bless.
When died the Greek, forever fell his throne of swords;
But Jesus died to live forever Lord of Lords.

Jesus and Alexander died at thirty-three.
The Greek made all men slaves; the Jew made all men free.
One built a throne on blood; the other built on love.
The one was born of earth; the other from above.
The one won all this earth, to love all earth and heaven;
The other gave up all, that all to Him be given.
The Greek forever died; the Jew forever lives.
He loses all who gets; he wins all things who gives.

—Charles Ross Weede.
(Taken from the "Beam")

LIFE

Life is a voyage, Time is the stream;
Gospel is vision, and Peace is our dream—
Mortality the craft, Traits are the crew,
Fear is the current we all must pass through.
So then let the tides, be blessings of gain,
And Eternity the shore for souls to attain.

—Fred Jessop.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. SEPTEMBER, 1944. NO. 4.

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

Complying with numerous requests, we are publishing Appellants' Brief in the fifteen cases of Unlawful Cohabitation disposed of before the Third Judicial District Court, the Hon. Ray Van Cott, Jr., presiding. The cases were all tried upon stipulations concerning what the State witnesses would testify to, if sworn, the defendants offering no testimony. The stipulations in each case are identical. They are shown on page 94 hereof.

The defendants are: Albert E. Barlow, Morris Q. Kunz, David B. Darger, Ianthus W. Barlow, Dr. Rulon C. Allred, Oswald Brainich, Edmund F. Barlow, Arnold Boss, Heber K. Cleveland, Louis A. Kelsch, John Y. Barlow, Joseph W. Musser, Joseph L. Jessup, Alma A. Timpson and Charles F. Zitting.

These defendants were adjudged guilty by the court sitting as a jury, and each was sentenced to serve from one to five years in the State penitentiary. They are all at liberty on bail.

From our point of view, even a casual study of the Brief by an unprejudiced mind must convince the reader that no crime has been proved and that if the presumption of innocence still prevails in American jurisprudence the decision of the lower court must be reversed by the Supreme Court of Utah and the defendants set free.

It should be remembered that the original Utah statute against Unlawful Cohabitation provided for a maximum prison term of six months. The crime was then classified as a misdemeanor. It was under this law, before the Woodruff Manifesto of 1890, that such men as the Hon. George Q. Cannon, of the First Presidency of the Church, received a sentence of 75 days on one count and 100 days on a second count; and Francis M. Lyman of the Quorum of Twelve received 85 days in the penitentiary. And after the Manifesto, 1899, Heber J. Grant pleaded guilty and was fined $100.00, and in 1906 Joseph F. Smith, President of the Church, was fined $300, neither receiving a prison sentence, for which the law provided.

In 1935 the present law was enacted changing the nature of the crime to that of a felony, carrying a prison term of from one to five years. This law, it is claimed, was prepared and pushed through the Legislature by high ecclesiasts of the Mormon Church.

The act, if committed, is not a crime the nature of which is termed MALUM IN SE, but is MALUM PROHIBITUM—it is a crime only because it is prohibited by the Statutes. Why such an act should be a mere misdemeanor up to the year 1935 and the same act—not a crime in itself—a felony after said date, and why the Church leadership who had fought the lesser law as unreasonable, unconstitutional and vicious, gave aid to the enactment of the greater penalty, is a mooted question, par-

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

tially treated in this Brief and which some day must receive its full answer in the shame and contempt of all fair-minded people.

We are pleased to present this BRIEF, as a service to the reading public.—Editors.

STATEMENT

These are all unlawful cohabitation cases, which were tried by the lower court sitting as a jury, upon stipulations concerning what the State's witnesses would establish if sworn. With the exception of names of women, and dates, the stipulations are identical; and the same is true of the informations. Motions to quash, and other pleadings, are uniform. The defendants submitted no evidence and rested on their pleas of not guilty. The Court found them all guilty, and imposed the same sentence in each case.

These are all, therefore, appeals from such findings and sentences by the lower court, the District Court of Salt Lake County, Utah, with the Hon. Ray Van Cott, Jr., presiding.

The one brief covers all cases.

ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

I.

The Court erred in denying and overruling defendants' Motion to Quash the information.

II.

The Court erred in finding the defendants guilty.

III.

The Court erred in passing sentence upon the defendants.

IV.

The Court erred in denying these defendants' constitutional rights, under the Constitution of the State of Utah, under Article 1, sections 1, 4, 7, 11, 12 and 24; Article 3, and Article 6, Sec. 23, and Sec. 26, sub. 5 and 18; and likewise erred in denying these defendants' consitutional rights under the 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th and 14th amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

V.

The Court erred in its failure and refusal to protect the defendants under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo —a treaty of peace between the United States and Mexico, duly proclaimed July 4, 1848, and especially articles 8 and 9 thereof, and that paricular provision of Article 9 which provides that the inhabitants of the Territory of Mexico, ceded to the United States by virtue of said treaty, shall be protected "in the free enjoyment of their religion and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction." (It being understood that the defendants and their immediate family ancestors were residents of the Republic of Mexico on the date of said Treaty, of which the Court takes judicial notice.)

VI.

The Court erred in finding the defendants had a criminal intent in the commission of the acts charged in the information, and shown by the stipulated testimony in said cause.

VII.

The Court erred in failing to consider any presumption of innocence; and in failing to place the burden of proof upon the State in its decisions in said cause.

VIII.

The Court erred in convicting the defendants solely upon inference upon inference, to-wit:

First: The Court inferred that the belief in the Doctrine and Covenants is unlawful; and

Second: That such unlawful belief constitutes immorality; and

Third: That the association, shown by the stipulated testimony, based upon inferences first and second, was immoral and unlawful; and

Fourth: That, based upon said inferences, the Court inferred that each defendant was guilty of unlawful cohabitation.

And these defendants say that such basis and pyramiding of inference upon inference by the Court, deprived these defendants and each of them of due process of law, contrary to the constitutional guarantees as to due process, of both the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Utah.

And such inferences, and the pyramiding thereof, with relation to religious belief, and a consequent inference and thereon a determination of immorality by reason of such belief, is contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and the provisions of the Constitution of the State of Utah relating to freedom of religion, and belief therein, and each such provision; and, further, is contrary to, and in violation of, the rights and privileges accorded under the 9th Article of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

The Court will take judicial notice that, at the time the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo became effective, the Mormon people, with their Doctrine and Covenants as a guide, were inhabitants of and residents in the territory embraced by said Treaty, which territory, prior to said treaty, was an integral part of the Republic of Mexico.

IX.

The Court erred in determining the guilt of the defendants, there being no proof of a **corpus delicti.**

ARGUMENT

ASSIGNMENT NO. 1.

The Court Erred in overruling the Defendants' Motion to Quash

We shall consider this in the following order:

(a) The statute does not state an offense.

(b) The statute is unconstitutional.

(c) The title of the statute is inadequate.

(d) The statute combines a criminal with a civil statute.

(e) The statute is inconsistent.

(f) The statute violates Art. 1, Sec. 12 of the Constitution (wife testifying against husband.)

(g) The statute compels an accused to testify against himself.

(h) The information does not charge the defendant with committing an offense.

(i) The information fails to inform the defendant of the nature of the accusation, or the cause of the same.

1 (a)—**The Statute is meaningless and does not state an offense.** It reads:

> **(103-51-2) "If any person cohabits with more than one person of the opposite sex, such person is guilty of a felony."**

In State v. Jessup, 98 Utah 482, a unanimous court said:

> **"The definition of cohabitation given by our statute is so general that to limit the information to it, word for word, states no more than a class of crimes. IN FACT IT IS GRAVELY QUESTIONABLE WHETHER THE STATUTE STATES THE OFFENSE IT WAS INTENDED TO COVER. (Caps ours). It would appear that some attention should have been given to the element of time. If a man marries and lives with a second wife after the death of, or divorce from, his first, he falls within the definition of the statute; yet all must concede that it was not the intention of the legislature to make such relationships the basis of criminal offenses."**

To cohabit with more than one person of the opposite sex (L. cohabitare —to dwell) could mean to dwell with one's brothers, sisters, or even one's children; for there is no crime of cohabitation at common law, and even the statutes apply descriptive terms to it to make it so. "It is purely statutory, and it is a new offense in our statutes." (U. S. v. Cannon, 4 Utah 130). As the statute reads, a woman may be guilty by dwelling with her brothers, sons or other relatives; a man, by dwelling with his sisters, daughters, or other relatives; a little boy, by dwelling with his sisters; a little girl, by dwelling with her brothers. It even suggests polyandry, a practice known to the Tibetans and the Nairs, but exotic here. As the statute stands, therefor, it is nonsense, as the word "cohabit" alone is of innocent connotation. As has been well said:

> **"in order to give it proper effect in any case regard must be had to the subject matter to which it relates, to the situation and conditions in respect to which it is used, and to the explanatory and qualifying language accompanying it." King v. U. S., 17 F. 2d 61. 14 C. J. S. 1311.**
>
> **DeBerry v. DeBerry, 177 S. E. 440, 115 W. Va. 604.**
>
> **State v. Lawrence, 27 N. W. 126, 19 Neb. 307.**

The crime of unlawful cohabitation, as set forth in the Utah statute, namely: "If any person cohabits with more than one person of the opposite sex, such person is guilty of a felony", is unknown to the common law, and, indeed, is not recognized, so far as we are able to ascertain, in any state of the United States.

The common law crime was lewdness (36 C. J. 1035) (4 Blackstone Comm. P. 64); and as was stated in Green v. Com., 196 Ky. 17, 244 SW 64, and in Com. v. Isaacs, 5 Rand (26 Va.) 634, the living together of a man and a woman unmarried, with no public acts of indecency, is not an indictable offense at common law. In not a single state, so far as we know, does the word "cohabit" appear in the statute without qualifying words, as it does in the Utah law. "These statutes", says 36 C. J. 1035:

> **"are usually against lascivious cohabitation. . . . The statutory offenses are generally of two classes, namely lewd and lascivious cohabitation or living together in adultery or fornication and lewd and lascivious behavior or carriage."**

Just how the offense is described in the different states appears from the following cases:

"Living together in adultery or fornication"

Hall v. State, 53 Ala. 463
Peo. v. Green, 276 Ill. 346, 114 N. E. 518
State v. Naylor, 68 Or. 139, 136 P. 889
Leonard v. State, 106 Ark. 449, 153 S W 590
Peo. v. Scarpa, 32 Cal. A. 453, 163 P. 882
Grice v. State, 75 Fla. 751, 78 S. 984
Winkles v. State, 4 Ga. A. 559, 61 SE 1128
State v. Cole, 31 Ida. 603, 174 P. 131
Tribby v. State, 189 Ind. 205, 126 NE 481
State v. Marvin, 12 Ida. 499
State v. Cassida, 67 Kan. 171, 72 P. 522
Com. v. Calef, 10 Mass. 153
Spikes v. State, 98 Miss., 483, 54 S1
State v. Chandler, 132 Mo. 155, 33 SW 797
Burns v. State, 17 Okla. Cr. 26, 182 P. 738
State v. Moore, 1 Swan 136 (Tenn.)
Pruner v. Com., 82 Va. 115
State v. Poyner, 57 Wash. 489, 107 P. 181
State v. Bridgman, 88 W. Va. 231, 106 SE 708

"Living in a state of cohabitation and adultery"

Peo. v. Breeding, 19 Cal. A. 359, 126 P. 179

"Living in open and notorious adultery"

Peo. v. Salmon, 148 Cal. 303, 83 P. 42 113 AM. S. R. 268, 2 LRA NS 1186

"Cohabiting together as husband and wife without being married"

Sullivan v. State, 32 Ark. 187

"Living in adultery"

State v. Keith, 48 Wash. 77, 92 P. 893

"Where this is an essential element of the offense an indictment for lewd and lascivious cohabitation or living in adultery or fornication must allege that the parties cohabitated or lived together with each other as husband and wife."

36 C. J. 1040
State v. Dunn, 26 Ark. 34
State v. Cole, 31 Ida. 603, 174 P. 131
State v. Gartrell, 14 Ind. 280
State v. Hook, 4 Kan. A. 451, 46 P. 44
Com. v. Dill, 159 Mass. 61, 34 NE 84
Delany v. Peo., 10 Mich. 241
State v. Byron, 20 Mo. 210
State v. Naylor, 68 Or. 139, 136 P. 889
State v. Chillis (Brayt), Ut. 131
State v. Foster, 21 W. Va. 767
Jones v. State, 98 S. 342 (Miss.)
U. S. v. Musser, 4 Utah 153
U. S. v. Peay, 5 Utah 263
Cannon v. U. S., 116 U. S. 75

An allegation that the said "James Foster . . . did lewdly and lasciviously associate and cohabit with one Sarah Foster" is not equivalent to saying that they lewdly and lasciviously associated and cohabited together as the statute has it or with each other which would be equivalent words, because in the absence of such words, for aught that appears in the indictment she may be entirely innocent of the lewd and lascivious commerce which is the distinctive feature of the statutory offense, as she might be insane, or she might in good faith believe that she was only discharging toward the man she believed to be her husband, the duties of a wife."

State v. Foster, 21 W. Va. 767.

1 (b)—The statute is unconstitutional.

Section 103-51-2, Revised Statutes of Utah, 1933, as amended by Chap. 112, Laws of Utah, 1935, under which the information was drawn, is unconstitutional for the reason that it violates the Utah Constitution (Art. 6, Sec. 23) providing that "no bill shall be passed containing more than one subject." The statute in reality contains four subjects: 1. Cohabitation; 2. Compelling any person to testify; 3. Using evidence in civil or criminal proceedings; and, 4. Liability to prosecution for giving testimony. Statute reads as follows:

"103-51-2—Unlawful Cohabitation. All persons Except Defendant Must Testify. If any person cohabits with more than one person of the opposite sex, such person is guilty of a felony.

Any person, except the defendant, may be compelled to testify in a prosecution for unlawful cohabitation; provided, however, that the evidence given in such prosecution shall not be used against him in any proceeding, civil or criminal, except for perjury in giving such testimony. A person so testifying shall not thereafter be liable to indictment, prosecution, or punishment for the offense concerning which such testimony was given."

The rule against two subjects in enactments is mandatory in "nearly all jurisdictions" (59 Corpus Juris 797), and such statutes are "void" (59 C. J. 799). In fact, as stated in Utah State Fair v. Green, 68 Utah 251, concerning such a statute: "every provision thereof is unconstitutional and void", and it should be determined by the court without "reference to economic or moral effect."

The Statute amends Sec. 103-51-2, Compiled Laws of Utah, 1933, or Unlawful Cohabitation, which appears under Chapter 51 of the Penal Code entitled "Sexual Offenses". There was nothing in Sec. 103-51-2 about compelling witnesses to testify—that was added by the 1935 amendments, and was really an amendment of Sec. 105-45-6 of Chapter 45, Compiled Laws of Utah, 1933, on "Witnesses and Evidence", particularly concerning the testimony of a witness not to be used against him. The sections should have been amended separately, and thus a crime would not have been intermingled with testimony, and immunities, civil and criminal, and prosecution aids. Again, it was a case of the legislature's covering too much territory.

1 (c)—The title of the statute is legally inadequate.

The title of the Act under which the information was drawn does not

express all of the subjects, as required by Art. 6, Sec. 23 of the Constitution of Utah. The title (Chap. 112, Laws of Utah, 1935) reads:

> **"An Act Amending Section 103-51-2, Revised Statutes of Utah, 1933, Making Unlawful Cohabitation a Felony, and Providing that all persons except the Defendant Must Testify in Proceedings therefor."**

In the title there are two subjects: (a) unlawful cohabitation, and (b) all persons must testify; whereas in the act there are four subjects: (a) unful cohabitation; (b) all persons must testify; (c) evidence may not be used against witnesses; (d) non-liability to prosecution for offense on which testimony given.

It is said:

> **"All parts of an act which are not within its title are unconstitutional and void."**
>
> **59 C. J. 812, Utah Fair v. Green, 68 Utah 251.**

The word "civil" in the second paragraph of the act enlarges the scope of the act greatly, taking it from the criminal to the civil field, yet no mention of any civil procedure effect is mentioned in the title, or, for that matter, even indicated.

1 (d)—The statute combines a criminal with a civil statute.

The proceeding paragraph points out another defect in the act; it combines a criminal with a civil statute. As stated in State v. Tieman, 32 Wash. 294, 73 P. 375, 98 Am. St. Rep. 854, a statute entitled one relative to crimes and punishments and criminal proceedings cannot lawfully contain any provisions of a civil nature.

1 (e)—The statute is inconsistent.

The act is inconsistent with Sec. 105-21-39 and 105-21-40, Revised Laws of Utah, 1933, as amended by Chapter 118, Laws of Utah, 1935, both of which were passed on the same date and became effective on the same date as the statute in question. Thus the cohabitation act was passed on March 14, 1935, and was made effective on May 14, 1935; the inconsistent acts were passed on March 14, 1935, and made effective on May 14, 1935. The cohabitation act exempts "any person" from prosecution for testifying against the defendant even though he be **particeps criminis**, whereas the other two sections (105-21-39 and 105-21-40 as amended by Chapter 118, Laws of Utah, 1935) provide:

> **"Every person concerned in the commission of an offense, whether he directly commits the offense, or procures, counsels, aids or abets in its commission even though not preent, shall be informed against or indicted and tried and punished as a principal."**
>
> **"An accessory may be prosecuted, tried and punished though the principal may be neither prosecuted nor tried, and though the principal may have been acquitted."**
>
> **See State v. Hook, 4 Kan. Aff., 451, 46 P. 44.**

1 (f) The statute compels a wife to testify against her husband.

The act also violates Article 1, Sec. 12, of the Utah Constitution which provides that "a wife shall not be compelled to testify against her husband." It will be noted that the act reads:

> **"Any person, except the defendant, may be compelled to testify in a prosecution for unlawful cohabitation,"**

and, of course, "any person" includes the defendant's wife. It is so apparent that the Act is unconstitutional in this respect that it is unnecessary to argue it, even for emphasis.

1 (g)—The statute compels an accused to testify against himself.

In similar fashion, the act disregards the Utah Constitutional provision (Art. 1, Sec. 12) and the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States providing that "the ac-

cused shall not be compelled to give evidence against himself."

Unlawful cohabitation involves dwelling with more than one woman, hence in a properly drawn information using names it is inevitable that there be an "accused" other than the defendant. The very nature of the crime includes a **particeps criminis,** an accomplice. The statute compels that other one to testify against herself, thus violating the constitutional provision. **Nemo tenetur seipsum accusare** is a highly respected maxium of the common law, not lightly to be disregarded; and, while immunity from prosecution might be granted in State courts, it in no way affects Federal prosecution nor mitigates the public disgrace of self-incrimination.

ASSIGNMENT NO. 4

Even in cases such as have frequently occurred in Utah where polygamy has been asserted, which of course the evidence does not show here, there should have been the protection and security of the Constitution of the United States, and of Utah and of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo hereinafter considered.

Certain it is that these defendants cannot be punished in these proceedings unless it be held a crime to **associate as is taught by the Doctrine and Covenants** of the Mormon Church.

If such should be attempted, surely it lies under the following Constitution (State of Utah) prohibition, viz:

(a) "All men have the inherent and inalienable right . . . to worship according to the dictates of their consciences; . . . " (Utah Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 1).

(b) ". . . the State shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . ., nor shall any Church dominate the State or interfere with its functions. . . ."

(Utah Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 4).

(c) "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without the due process of law."

(Utah Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 7).

(d) " . . . , due course of law, which shall be administered without denial. . ."

(Utah Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 11).

(e) "In criminal prosecutions the accused shall have the right . . . , to demand the nature and cause of the accusation against him, to have a copy thereof . . . , to have a speedy public trial by an impartial jury, . . . The accused shall not be compelled to give evidence against himself; a wife shall not be compelled to testify against her husband, nor a husband against his wife. . . ." (Utah Constitution. Art. 1, Sec. 12)

Here the **nature** of the accusation is not set out in the information so as to advise the accused of the **cause** of the charge. Demand for bill of particulars was here made, requesting that the nature of the charge be set out; but it was denied by the trial court. No "copy thereof" has ever been supplied or made available to the accused.

As we have shown, the Judge, having lost sight of the necessities of pleading and proof, could not, and did not, accord the accused an impartial trial, yet he was sitting as a jury and was bound by this Constitutional provision as if a jury.

The legal wife, under this statute, is forced to testify against her husband.

The opposite would be equally true of such a husband if the legal wife were charged under the statute, as well as she may be. (In the case of State v. Hook (Kan. 1896) 46 Pac. 44, the charge, brought under a like statute, was dismissed on the ground that only the man—not the man **and** legal wife, equally and jointly chargeable—was prosecuted.)

"All laws of a general nature shall have uniform operation."

(Utah Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 24.)

Under this provision, if this law be a general law as stated by the District

Attorney, the legal wife, contributing to and consenting in any unlawful cohabitation, is in **particeps criminis** with the offending husband, and must be jointly charged with him.

Art. 3 of Utah's Constitution, prohibiting polygamy, was forced by the Federal Government to be included as a prerequisite to any acceptance of any constitution and the granting of statehood. (See Sec. 3, subsection designated "First", The Enabling Act—U. C. anno. 1943, p. 54.)

Such being a condition precedent, any free action upon that subject by the Constitutional Convention was rendered impossible. Any act forced upon a free people, by reason of that forcing, becomes void and inoperative. All legislation since statehood, upon that subject, has been made under such void constitutional provision, and so is, and has ever been, void.

A void act cannot be subject to any amendment.

> "The Legislature is prohibited from enacting any . . . special laws in the following cases, . . .
>
> 5. Punishing crimes and misdemeanors— . . ."
>
> (Art. 6, Sec. 26, Sub. Sec. 5).

The Edmunds Law, Sec. 3, is the initiatory act in this jurisdiction prohibiting cohabitation with "more than one woman". This Sec. 3 was a special law enacted in aid of prosecutions for prohibited polygamy by reason of the difficulty theretofore experienced in obtaining proof of a subsequent marriage after the first, among the Mormons in the Territory of Utah.

> "It was such offense that Sec. 3 of the Act was intended to reach, the exhibition of all the indicia of marriage; a household and a family, twice repeated."
>
> Cannon v. U. S., 116 U. S. 75.
>
> (See: U. S. v. Peay, 5 Ut. 263; 14 Pac. 345).
>
> "It is proper, also, to take into consideration the conditions as the national legislature anticipated and understood them in which the law was to be applied and enforced. They knew the time had elapsed within which a very large portion of those living in polygamy could be punished for that offense, ..., etc."
> U. S. v. Musser, 7 Pac., 4 Utah 153.
>
> "The Edmunds law says that there must be an end, and it puts an end, to the relationship previously existing between polygamists, whatever it was. It says that relationship must ceae."
>
> (Judge Powers in dissenting opinion in Musser case, supra.)

That law was clearly a special act, with a special purpose—the stamping out of the practice of polygamy among the Mormons.

Utah cannot enact special legislation whereas the Federal Government may.

That Act made the prohibited act but a misdemeanor. Until 1935 the law, as to classification of the crime, was unchanged. In 1935 the law was amended and the misdemeanor designated a felony, with punishment under the general statute as to felonies—5 years' imprisonment.

The Act now, like all its predecessors, has a special purpose, or special objective. It has now changed the offense from misdemeanor to felony. It now punishes a misdemeanor as a felony, else the prohibition of subsection 5 of section 26, Art. 6, of the State Constitution becomes meaningless: If that constitutional prohibitive be effective, the present Act is void.

Again, concerning subsection 18, Sec. 26, Art. 6, supra: Could not the general law against bigamy be applied here? If so, this special law is void.

A cohabitation, without any showing of a prohibited actual or apparent marriage, or sexual offense committed, done under a religious belief, has the full protection of the 1st Amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

Here, the requirements of the laws of the land—due process of law—as to particularity of the accusation and the quantum of proof, have not been complied with, and so the substaining of the convictions below would be, and such convictions are, contrary to the 5th amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

Since neither the nature nor the cause of the accusations appear, the proceedings below are violative of both the 5th and 6th amendments of the U. S. Constitution.

Nowhere, other than in Utah since 1935, insofar as we are able to ascertain, is unlawful cohabitation made a felony or punished by the prescribed penalty here, hence the punishment for offenses against this special law is cruel, and unusual, in contravention of the 8th Amendment of the U. S. Constitution, clearly a result of orthodox church interference.

The privileges of due process of law, and immunity from prosecution under an uncharacterized charge, guaranteed to citizens by the 14th Amendment of the U. S. Constitution, have been violated here. The equal protection of both substantive and adjective laws of both State and Nation, have been violated as guaranteed by said 14th Amendment.

ASSIGNMENT NO. 5

It is interesting to note that the defendants are protected in their religious practices not only by the Constitutions of the United States and of the State of Utah, but also by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Polygamy is, of course, not here shown, but if it were it would be fully protected by such rights.

The 8th Article of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo guarantees the inviolability of property rights of the then residents of this area, after assimilation by the United States. Cases are numerous which have sustained those rights. See:

U. S. v. Chaves, 159 U. S. 452
Ely v. U. S., 171 U. S. 220
Cessna v. U. S., 169 U. S. 165
Tripp v. Spring, 5 Sawy (U. S.) 209
San Francisco v. LeRoy, 138 U. S. 671
Townsend v. Greeley, 5 Wall (U. S.) 326
Astiazaran v. Santa Rite Land, etc., Co., 148 U. S. 60

and in Knight v. U. S. Land Ass'n., 142 U. S. 162, it is said:

> **"For it is equally well settled that when the United States acquired California from Mexico by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, they were bound under eighth article of that treaty to protect all rights of property in that territory emanating from the Mexican government previous to the treaty."**

The 9th Article of the Treaty reads:

> **"Art. IX: The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic, . . . shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States, and shall be admitted, at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured IN THE FREE EXERCISE OF THEIR RELIGION WITHOUT RESTRICTION."**

Both Art. 8 and Art. 9 of the Treaty are still in full effect.

It is singular that no Act of Congress (so far as we can learn) has yet been passed ending "the meantime" mentioned in the Treaty, during which "meantime" the "free exercise of their religion, without restriction", under that solemn promise of the United States, was to be "protected" and "secured" and remains so until fortified by legislation.

Under this hypothesis, the restriction of the Edmunds Act, par. 3, was violative of the Treaty; the prerequisite of the Enabling Act also was a distinct violative act, and void; and all

laws of Utah enacted under that void requirement are void for this additional violation of the security and protection guaranteed by this Treaty.

This Treaty came into effect July, 1848, within a few days less than a year after the Mormon people, the Mormon Church, and its doctrine of polygamy, had moved into Mexican territory and been fully there established. These religious doctrines, coming down, are now under full protection of this Treaty, and the Utah law forbidding the "exercise" of the tenet of plural marriage is void.

By the same token, the Utah law "prohibiting unlawful cohabitation", being a special act designed to root out polygamy, is likewise of non-effect, the Treaty "securing" and "protecting" both practices when religious.

This question as to religious rights under this Treaty has never before been raised, but has on numerous occasions been affirmed as to property rights. (See cases above cited). ,

ASSIGNMENTS NOS. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9

These assignments all point out the insufficiency of the evidence to justify a finding of guilt, of criminal intent, of the existence of a **corpus delicti** and of the error of the court in imposing sentence under such insufficiency. In the aggregate they indicate that the evidence was insufficient to show the commission of a crime; and thus they are here considered together.

The entire evidence is contained in the short paragraph of the stipulation:

> "That ——— on and between ——— in the County of Salt Lake, State of Utah, did cohabit with more than one person of the opposite sex, to-wit: ———; and that said association was based on the belief of the said defendant and the said women in the divinity of the Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (exclusive of the Manifesto). No testimony was offered concerning sexual intercourse of the defendant with said women."

The statement of fact is as meaningless as the statute, and shows nothing whatever of an unlawful nature; indeed, nothing irreconcilable with rectitude and good morals.

Suppose that instead of a stipulation there had been the usual trial; that a single witness for the State had given in testimony the exact wording of the stipulation, and both sides had then rested. A jury would have been almost indignant to be expected to render a verdict without some facts to show in what the cohabitation consisted, and would have been required to find the facts compatible with innocence.

A comparable situation arose in the case of the United States v. Musser, 4 Utah 153; and we have little doubt that if the Court had been confronted with a mere nugget of facts showing only innocent relationship, as here, it would have held the evidence to be insufficient to sustain the indictment. To show what the Court regarded in a general way as essential to the evidence in these cases we quote its summary on page 161:

> "From the foregoing evidence it appears that the women named in the indictment have for years borne his name, and before that they had borne other names; that for more than one year next preceding December last, defendant had lived in the house with Mary Musser and Belinda Musser; that these two women and defendant occupied bedrooms on the same floor; that a door opened out of defendant's room on the east, directly into Belinda's room on the west into a room which opened into Mary's; that he ate a large portion of the time at her table; that the third woman lived in a house on adjoining lot; that defendant was frequently there; that Mary has six children, the youngest two or three years old, and Belinda three, the youngest two or three years old; that Annie has three children, ages between five and eight years; that these children all bear the name of Musser and have addressed him as father, and that all three of the women are known and reputed in the family to be defendant's wives. It is undeniable

in view of the evidence that defendant lived a large portion of the time charged in the indictment, in the same house with two of the women, and all the time in a house adjoining the other woman at whose house he was frequently. What relationship did he bear to these women with whom he was living? Was it the relationship of father and daughter, brother and sister, employer and employee, master and servant? Neither of these questions can be answered in the affirmative in the light of the evidence. The evidence points to but one relationship, and that is matrimonial, husband and wife; the evidence can be reconciled on no other hypothesis. To consider a portion of the evidence apart from the rest is not the right way to determine its sufficiency; a portion may not establish the disputed fact, but all together may prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. A portion of a physical structure does not prove its existence, but when all the parts are taken together, there can be no room to doubt its existence. When all the evidence in this case is so considered, we are of the opinion that it sufficiently appears that defendant, during the time mentioned in the indictment, was living with at least two of the women named, in the apparent relation of marriage; that by his language and conduct and appearances and expressions for which he was responsible, he held them out to the world in that relationship; that he was living with them in the habit and repute of marriage. We are of the opinion that the evidence was sufficient to authorize the verdict found."

An analysis shows that in that case (a) the women bore the defendant's name, (b) occupied bed rooms next to his own, with which there were intercommunicating doors; (c) that the twelve children of the three women bore the defendant's name and called him "father". The Court there asked:

> "Was it the relationship of father and daughter, brother and sister, employer and employee, master and servant? Neither of these questions can be answered in the affirmative in the light of the evidence."

In other words, it took evidence in that case to remove the presumption of innocent cohabitation; so it does here. Yet there is no evidence here that the association was not innocent. The facts in the present cases do not show that the defendant **unlawfully** cohabitated; and it is just as consistent to say that the women were the defendant's sisters as his wives. The facts show cohabitation, but not "**unlawful** cohabitation"; and therein lies the weakness of the State's case, a weakness that on the record is fatal. The information is that the defendant "did unlawfully cohabit"; but the facts show nothing unlawful.

If as was stated in State v. Jessup, 98 Utah 482:

> "The definition of cohabitation given by our statute is so general that to limit the information to it, word for word, states no more than a class of crimes",

then with equal reason, if the evidence but reiterates the wording of the statute without any explanation of the facts behind the "cohabitation", the evidence is equally meaningless and ineffective to sustain conviction. The evidence is even weaker than the information, for it does not use the word "unlawful" in describing the cohabitation that took place or show any facts from which such inference could be drawn.

Indeed so important is the Jessup case as indicating that the unexplained, unamplified evidence in the present cases would be regarded as a nullity, that we quote further:

> "UNLAWFUL COHABITATION IS PROVED BY FACTS SHOWING A COURSE OF CONDUCT THAT TO ALL OUTWARD APPEARANCES CONVINCES ONE THAT THE PARTIES ARE LIVING TOGETHER AS MAN AND WIVES."

We could submit these cases on that statement alone, the latest word of this Court, for here there is not the slightest evidence that the parties were "living together as man and wives". Where is there any evidence of a **corpus delicti?**

> "THE QUESTION IS ALWAYS UPON THE EVIDENCE, whether the relationship was such as to induce the belief

> that they were dwelling together as husband and wife."
>
> State v. Cassida, Kan. 1903, 72 P. 522.

Let us see what the State might have shown by its witnesses in the present cases with no breaking down of any such testimony by any cross-examination:—

The Stipulation, as to facts to be shown, sets out:

> (1) The defendant, between dates stated, with women named, cohabited, at Salt Lake County, Utah.
>
> (2) That each, the defendant and said women, sincerely believe the "Doctrine and Covenants" of the Mormon Church, exclusive of the "Manifetso", and their association was under that religious belief.
>
> (3) That nothing could be shown as to any immoral acts as between the defendant and these women.

There it is, . . . the whole of it.

All know that there may be both a criminal and an innocent co-habiting of men and women, everywhere; otherwise all boarders and boarding house keepers would find themselves violating the Utah Statute, or maintaining a common nuisance, or both.

Item one is utterly meaningless and aids the prosecution not at all, unless something can be found in items two or three, or in both, which can fairly be said to show a crime.

Item 3 is likewise a negative matter, and has no probative value, except as it shows the utter lack of evidence.

And so we come to Item 2:

This Court, under the case of Hilton v. Roylance, 25 Utah 129, 69 Pac. 660, must take judicial notice of the teachings of the "Mormon" Church.

Now, it must also be judicially noticed, that when the "Woodruff Manifesto" of 1890 was promulgated, there were numerous members of that Church, then and ever since in entire good standing in it, who violently resented and disbelieved that pronunciamento to have any Divine authenticity. That Church has not yet seen fit to say without equivocation, or possibility of doubt, that the "Manifesto" was "the word of the Lord". No such declaration, so far as we are advised, has as yet appeared.

Unless it may be said that all persons innocently cohabiting, who refuse to give a full belief to and in that "Manifesto", are unlawfully cohabiting, these defendants, and each of them, must be held to be not guilty, and their several convictions below, and their several sentences there passed, must be held to be utterly without authority of law and void. This is true without any consideration of the pleas entered; but, when those pleas of "Not Guilty" be also considered, it becomes plainly manifest that no one of the several convictions can stand.

The law gives to each of these defendants the protection of a mantle of presumed innocence, which abides and controls until it shall have been overcome by competent evidence. This presumption has been wholly lost sight of by the Trial Court, who, to all intents and purposes sat as the jury in these cases, and who was bound by the same rules of presumptions and proof as a jury, had one been impaneled. What Court, sitting with a jury, and no more having been shown than here, could deny granting a motion for a directed verdict of "not guilty"? We say: There is not so much as a shadowy implication of any wrongdoing or infraction of the law here present.

We could close our brief at this point, did we not deem it advisable to cite a few authorities, and we so do, to avoid the possibility of mistake or oversight.

> "Where a woman is recognized in a family by the name of a man, it is indicative that she is something more than a stranger; and, if connected with the other facts of his having married the

> woman, and continues to treat her as a wife, etc., it is proper for the jury to take it into consideration."
>
> U. S. v. Peay, 5 Utah, 263, 14 Pac. 342.

Here are enumerated four items which a jury might properly consider in a case of alleged unlawful cohabitation, viz:—

> (1) Recognition in a family;
> (2) By the name of the man;
> (3) There having been a prior marriage between the man and the woman;
> (4) His treatment of her as a wife, continued.

Nowhere does any one of those elements here appear.

In the Peay case, supra, the Court approved the following instruction given by the trial court to the jury, as a correct one, viz: —

> "But when you come to the proof of cohabitation with the illegal wife, it requires actual proof of the fact. The presumption would be against it to commence with. The presumptions of the law are in favor of innocence, and until some evidence has been given tending to show these acts of cohabitation on his part, the presumption would be that he did not do that; but where it was shown that these acts of cohabitation have taken place with the plural wife, if shown beyond a reasonable doubt, then it is cohabitation within the meaning of the law."

This is a clear statement of required proof:

(a) the cohabitation;

(b) with a plural wife;

(c) acts of cohabitation, in fact, with such a wife.

In the instant cases we have stipulated (a) to be the testimony—but (a) alone. Each of the other two necessary items of proof do not appear. It is stipulated that no immoral act is shown by the evidence.

In the case of U. S. v. Eldredge, (one of the Edmunds Act cases), the Court said:

> " . . . on general demurrer, the allegation that the accused 'unlawfully lived and co-habited with more than one woman AS HIS WIFE', will be held sufficient."
>
> U. S. v. Eldredge, 5 Utah 161, 13 Pac. 673.

The words "as his wife" saved that indictment.

Here the motions to quash, being the present means of demurring specially, should have been sustained, under the above authority.

> "The crime of unlawful cohabitation consists in living or association with more than one woman as their husband, apparently in the marriage relation,—under the semblance thereof."
>
> U. S. v. Groesbeck, 4 Utah 487, 11 Pac. 542.

No apparent relation—no semblance thereof—no husband and wife relation appears in the record here—either in the information or the stipulated proof.

We may not look outside of the record as here made, or in an such manner supply these missing indispensable elements of a crime.

This Court has defined the word "cohabit", long since, as the same is to be considered in this series of cases, as follow:

> "The term 'cohabit', as found in the criminal codes of many of the states, is coupled with and qualified by the adverbs 'lewdly', 'lasciviously', 'adulterously', or some other equivalent expression. No such word or expression is found in the section under consideration, or in the act of which it is a part. As defined by lexicographers, 'cohabit' means to dwell with or reside together. It may mean residing in the same country, city, or neighborhood, or in the same family, or the dwelling together in lawful wedlock. This would be lawful cohabitation. Or it may mean the dwelling of a man and woman together ostensibly and apparently in wedlock, when, in fact or in law, no marriage exists; and without proof of adultery or fornication, this would be unlawful cohabitation. Or it may mean the living together of a man and wom-

> **an, without lawful marriage, in the practice of fornication or adultery. This would be lascivious, lewd or adulterous cohabitation,—another species of unlawful cohabitation. In this last case, proof of adultery or fornication is necessary to make out the offense. The ideas which accompany the use of the word determine its import. The ideas of country, of family, of marriage, of the appearance of marriage (without it), of adultery, when associated with the term, vary and determine its meaning in each case. The subject to which it is applied contracts its meaning in each case. It is a word of flexible signification.**
>
> **Cohabitation as used in a matrimonial sense, means to dwell together as husband and wife."**
>
> **U. S. v. Musser, 4 Utah 153, 7 Pac. 389.**

Now, we ask:—

1. Where, in Salt Lake County, Utah, does the record show any cohabitation of those persons?

(The motion to quash and the motion to make more specific, in these cases, asked that this question be answered in the information, but was, as we say, erroneously overruled by the Trial Court.)

2. Where in the record here can be found an allegation, either in the information or the stipulation of proof of the character of the acts which the State would have us "associate" with the term "cohabit" so as to take away the otherwise necessary and controlling presumption of an innocent association of the parties? Here, again, the motion to quash ought to have been allowed and the bill of particulars furnished.

3. Where, in the record, can be pointed out any fact, or facts, so much as containing any inference of any "ostensible" or "apparent" dwelling together as man and wife? Here, again, our motion to quash ought to have been allowed.

The information here, conforming exactly to the complaint first laid, alleges as a bald conclusion of law, (which, even under our simplified form of pleading, cannot stand in face of challenge by motion to quash, but which motions were made here, both in the Court of the committing magistrate, and there denied, and in the Trial Court, and there denied,) that the cohabitation was "unlawful"?

The stipulated proof on the part of the State fails utterly to bear out that bald conclusion essential to establish the cohabitation to have been of the character against which the statute is directed,—failed to so much as intimate that any marriage relation in fact did or did not exist,—fails utterly to show any facts from which an "ostensible" or "apparent" husband and wife relationship might have been inferred,—fails to make out any facts from which any unlawful cohabitation, as above defined, might be found.

When the several pleas of "Not Guilty" are considered, the State has presented no case that might have been so much as submitted to a jury had one been impaneled. A directed verdict of "not guilty" refused in such case would, without doubt, have been error requiring reversal and dismissal.

A wealth of evidence was presented in the Musser case, supra, but not to a degree such as precluded Powers, J., in his dissenting opinion, from saying:

> **"While a careful reading of the record discloses that the testimony was somewhat weak, still I am not prepared to say that the case should have been taken from the jury—"**

In the instant cases we have a complete dearth of the essential proof necessary so much as to raise a question of crime committed.

Again, defining the charge in the Musser case, this Court said:

> **"The offense of the defendant consists in dwelling with the women in the habit and repute of marriage, holding that relationship out to the world by his language and conduct, or by expressions**

and conduct, for which he was responsible."

"And the question is, what relationship existed between the defendant and these women? Was the defendant there as a guest; as a boarder? Was he the proprietor of the house, and the women in his employ as servants,—chamber maids or cooks? Were they his sisters? Was any one of them his mother? Or were they there as his wives?"

Of course, the same questions here present themselves, and the determination of those questions requires: First a pleading alleging the relationship, and second, proof of such allegation.

None such, either of pleading or proof, here appears in the record.

The Court, in the second paragraph of its opinion, next preceding that containing the last above quotation, in the Musser case, supra, repeats those very queries, and comments on the necessity of evidence necessary to satisfy them, in the following words:—

"It is undeniable, in view of the evidence, that the defendant lived a large portion of the time, charged in the indictment, in the same house with the two women, and all the time in a house adjoining the other woman at whose house he was frequently. What relationship did he bear to these women with whom he was living? Was it the relation of father and daughter, brother and sister, employer and employee, master and servant? Neither of these questions can be answered in the affirmative, in the light of the evidence. The evidence points to but one relationship, and that is matrimonial,—husband and wife. To consider a portion of the evidence apart from the rest is not the right way to determine its sufficiency; a portion may not establish the disputed fact, but all together may prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. A portion of a physical structure does not prove its existence, but when all the parts are taken together there can be no room to doubt its existence. When the evidence in this case is so considered, we are of the opinion that it sufficiently appears that the defendant during the time mentioned in the indictment, was living with at least two of the women amed, in the apparent relation of marriage; that by his language, and conduct, and appearances, and expressions, for which he was responsible, he held out to the world that relationship—that he was living with them in the habit and repute of marriage. We are of the opinion that the evidence was sufficient to authorize the verdict found."

Now, where in all the record here can it be said that any one of those above enumerated facts, evidencing their relationship, or any relationship at all, other than living in the same county, appears?

This record simply is blank in these matters.

Here there is no evidence at all on what the relationship of the defendants with the women named was in fact; no marital holding out is either alleged or contained in the stipulated proof; no living in the same house is shown; no blood or other tie of personal relationship is either affirmatively or negatively so much as hinted at; not a word of statement ever made by the defendants; no conduct, of any sort, shown; no appearance, or other facts from which such might be deduced; no showing of any act or expression, or other affirmative things soever shown, for which the defendant might be held responsible; no habit of marriage; no repute as to any relationship whatever. In short, no evidence.

To uphold these convictions, these indictments, these adverse rulings of the Trial Court, will be to deny to these defendants, and each of them, due process of law—the protection of the laws of the land—their right to claim all the protection afforded by the law, and to send them to the penitentiary upon a conviction of an unspecified and unproven crime.

But it may be said: What about that proof, that said association was based on the belief of the said defendant and the said women in the divinity of the Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (exclusive of the Manifesto)?

Answering that:

There is a negativing of all sexual relations, as between these people. (See stipulation.)

Surely there is no indication of any unlawful association such as would lead anyone to believe that these people so associated, or lived together in the marital relation. The whole force of that statement is against such implication.

Too, under the doctrine of Hilton v. Roylance, 25 Utah 129, 69 Pac. 660, above cited, this Court must take judicial knowledge of the "Mormon" doctrine of "The United Order", or "The Order of Enoch"—the Mormon form of communal life; and that that is one of the teachings, and positive commands, of that "Mormon" doctrinal guide; and that that form of living is moral and free from any of the inhibitions ever, or now, intended to be covered by the Acts here relied upon by the State. That doctrine, when followed as commanded, (and believed to be Divine by these people under the stipulation), involves a cohabitation quite laudable in its concepts, and completely free from censure or inhibition of the laws of Utah.

The Court must infer the lawful, as against the unlawful, all things being equal.

How could any church or religious activities be conducted without some sort of close association (cohabitation)?

In those states where cohabitation statutes define the crime as "lewd and lascivious cohabitation" the proof must show that the relationship **was ostensibly that of husband and wife.** We give but a few cases here, indicating by apt quotation what the Court in each regarded as essential in the evidence:

Burns v. State (Okla., 1919) 182 P. 738:

"—as if the conjugal relation existed between them" "together in the same house in the familiar manner of husband and wife."

State v. Cassida (Kan. 1903), 72 P. 522:

"—relationship that of husband and wife"; "The question is always upon the evidence (whether the relationship was such as to induce the belief that they were dwelling together as husband and wife)."

State v. Cole (Ida. 1918) 174 P. 131:

"—lived and cohabited together as man and wife."

The Idaho statute is like the first part of the Utah statute.

State v. Naylor (Or. 1913) 136 P. 889:

"—living together in the same manner as husband and wife."

People v. Breeding (Cal. 1912) 126 P. 179:

"—the words 'living in a state of cohabitation and adultery' means the living or dwelling together as husband and wife . . . in other words a counterfeit of the marriage relation."

State v. Poyner (Wash. 1910) 107 P. 181:

"—living together as if the conjugal relation existed."

Adverting again to the Mormon teachings of the United Order, or the Order of Enoch—the Mormon communal plan of life:

Under that doctrine, taught by the "Doctrine and Covenants" all things are to be had in common, both material and spiritual—lands, houses, farms, manufacturies, in short all that people might be possessed of in this world, and no part of it is to be claimed as his own by any man. (See: Sermon of Orson Pratt, delivered Sept. 10, 1854. Journal of Discourses, Vol. 2, p. 96; and Sermon of Brigham Young, delivered June 3, 1855, Journ. of Disc., Vol. 2, p. 298.)

This doctrine is contained in the Doctrine and Covenants, in which these defendants firmly believe, and is there found as follows:

"For it must needs be that they be organized according to my laws, if otherwise they will be cut off."

Sec. 51, verse 2.

"Behold this shall be an example unto my servant Edward Partridge, in other places, IN ALL CHURCHES."

Sec. 51, v. 18.

"It is wisdom in me that my servant Martin Harris should be an example unto the church, in laying his monies before the bishop of the church. And also, this is a law unto every man that cometh into this land, to receive an inheritance; and he shall do with his monies according as the law directs."

Sec. 58, v. 35, 36.

Section 72 of that guide, after treatment of the subject, at verse 23, reads:

"AND NOW, BEHOLD, THIS SHALL BE AN EXAMPLE FOR ALL THE EXTENSIVE BRANCHES OF MY CHURCH, IN WHATSOEVER LAND THEY SHALL BE ESTABLISHED . . ."

Section 119 is also referred to as stating the law and its obligations.

Section 78 is also referred to, and verses 5 and 6 of the same read:—

"That you may be equal in the bands of heavenly things; yea, and earthly things, also for the obtaining of heavenly things; for if ye are not equal in earthly things, ye cannot be equal in obtaining heavenly things;"

(Here footnote under Sec. 51 is referred to in the book).

Orson Pratt, in his sermon above referred to, took for his text the following:

"But it is not given that one man should possess that which is above another, whereore the world lieth in sin;"

Sec. 49, verse 20.

Section 104 is further referred to as a general treatment of this subject, and we call attention to verses 60-62, where appears the following:—

" . . . and no man shall call it his own, or any part of it, for it shall belong to you all with one accord; . . . "

And this matter is further particularly set out again at verses 68-71, et seq. of this Section 104.

Clearly these defendants, for anything contained in the record here to the contrary, were living under this teaching and their belief in the same.

"It has been suggested that if appelland objected to the lack of names in the information he should have demanded a bill of particulars. The function of a bill of particulars is not that of compelling the defense to aid the prosecution in stating a cause of action. The burden of stating such a cause rests upon the shoulders of the prosecution, and until it is stated to the extent required by our simple form of criminal pleading, the question of whether or not a bill of particulars is prerequisite to further action on behalf of the accused has not arisen."

State v. Jessup, supra.

Here a bill of particulars was demanded and refused by the Trial Court.

Here the complaint before the committing magistrate was attacked by motion to quash. That was adversely ruled on.

All of these questions of insufficiency have here been fully raised. A mere cursory study of the case should have advised the prosecution of the necessities of both pleading and proof. Both have been ignored.

It is not the province of the Court or Legislature to decide the morality of any religious practice, for to do so were to establish a state religion. People differ, for instance, on whether "confession" and the habit of seeking a "faith-healer" instead of a doctor for diphtheria, are salutary. Some creeds denounce the marriage of divorcees; others regard it as praiseworthy.

Furthermore, as has just been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in Follett v. Town, (64

S. Ct. 717), orthodox religious creeds have no higher standing in the law than minority unorthodox creeds.

These cases must not be decided, therefore, on the ground that the defendants conform, or do not conform, with any particular tenet, nor that they are heretics to a dominant church. Whatever their "association" was, it was sacred according to their creed, and, since the facts show nothing contrary to public morals, the law must leave them free.

One thing is certain: this Court has no right to presume facts. A village in France was recently exterminated because the Germans presumed that because its name sounded the same, it was the guilty city.

It thus appears that these defendants have been convicted under a statute that is meaningless, and evidence that is more harmonious with innocence than guilt.

That the Legislature attempted to make a felony out of what was always a misdemeanor, and in its eagerness failed to set forth a crime at all, is not our concern; we must take the statute as we find it--meaningless. A new statute could be written that would be based on the ostensible husband and wives relationship; but, again, that is not our province.

To show how ridiculous the stipulated testimony is, put the words "his sisters" after the names of the women, and it will readily appear that the evidence as a whole is harmonious with those words; in fact, more so than if the words "his wives" were added, for there was "no testimony offered concerning sexual intercourse." The law presumes innocence, and there is nothing to overcome that presumption.

It is not our duty to make laws, or to aid prosecutions; and now that the public interest in these defendants has reached the stage of a calm consideration of the law, it is time that the evidence be adjudged a nullity, and the defendants discharged. Already the stigma of this prosecution has so branded them that their very means of livelihood has been impaired, and they have been made the victims of a crusade more vengeful and ardent than just and legal.

Respectfully submitted,

CLAUDE T. BARNES
J. H. McKNIGHT
KNOX PATTERSON
Attorneys for Appellants.

EDWIN D. HATCH
of Counsel

A HANDFUL OF DUST

"Then shalt the dust return to the earth as it was."—Ecclesiastes XII, 7.

A handful of dust—it is blown, on the wind
That is sporting with whatever stuff it may find;
It is swirling and whirling and scattering on
Till it puffs into nothing, and then it is gone—
A handful of dust.

It may be a king who of old held his rule
In a country forgotten; it may be his fool
Who had smiles on his lips and had sighs in his heart—
But the king or the fool, who may know them apart
In a handful of dust?

It may be a rose that once burst into flame
And was kissed by a maiden who whispered a name
To its ruby-red heart—and her lips were as red—
But no echo remains of the word that she said
In a handful of dust.

A handful of dust—it is death, it is birth,
It is naught, it is all since the first day of earth;
It is fame, it is fortune, and laughter and tears,
And it holds all the mystery lost in the years—
A handful of dust.

—Wilbur D. Nesbit.

Let us endeavor so to live that when we come to die even the undertaker will be sorry.—Mark Twain.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious
PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. SEPTEMBER, 1944. No. 4.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

WHEN the day comes in which the Kingdom of God will bear rule, the flag of the United States will proudly flutter unsullied on the flagstaff of liberty and equal rights, without a spot to sully its fair surface; the glorious flag our fathers have bequeathed to us will then be unfurled to the breeze by those who have power to hoist it aloft and defend its sanctity.—Brigham Young.

A LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM

(Continued)

In the August TRUTH we indicated good reasons why certain oppressive and unreasonable laws should receive the early attention of the coming Legislature.

We will now notice some of the objections to such a course as expressed by past members of this law-making body.

1. The Utah Constitution, complying with the provisions of the "Enabling Act" provides:

Article 3. Ordinance:

The following ordinance shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of this State:

> **"Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; BUT POLYGAMOUS OR PLURAL MARRIAGES ARE FOREVER PROHIBITED."**

In order to obtain statehood, Utah was forced to place that clause in its Constitution. While it may have been the right of Congress to exact such a clause, after statehood was granted and Utah became a sovercign State she was free to shape her own affairs and change her Constitution to suit the needs; provided, of course, it be not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States.

Theoretically every state in the Union enjoys equal sovereignty, and since there is nothing in the Federal Constitution restricting marriage to the monogamic form State Constitutions may be patterned after the same, either at adoption or by later amendment. When the Colonies formed a union of States under the Constitution the Federal Government received certain powers from the States. Domestic rela-

tions or the marriage and divorce problem was one question the states retained to themselves. Congress cannot, without an amendment to the Constitution, encroach into this field—except in Territories which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress. So that when Utah was granted statehood she was entirely free to shape her own legislation on the subject of marriage.

Two leading examples of such action by other states are before us:

(a) The Oklahoma case. Oklahoma was granted statehood under the stipulation that its capital would not be moved from Guthrie for a number of years and that no unusual expenses would be incurred during that time. Shortly after statehood was granted oil was discovered at Oklahoma City and that soon became a large and thriving center. By vote it was decided to move the Capital from Guthrie to Oklahoma City notwithstanding the Constitution following the "Enabling Act", provided otherwise. Considering a protest from citizens of the State, the U. S. Supreme Court upheld Oklahoma's right to move its capital notwithstanding the restrictions placed in the "Enabling Act". We quote from the decision of the Supreme Court, (221 US 559-55 L. ed. 853):

> **This union was and is a union of states, equal in power, dignity and authority, each competent to exert that residuum of sovereignty not delegated to the United States by the Constitution itself. To maintain otherwise would be to say that the Union, through the power of Congress, to admit new states, might come to be a union of states unequal in power, as including states whose powers were restricted only by the Constitution, with others whose powers had been further restricted by an Act of Congress accepted as a condition of admission. * * ***

(b) The Arizona Case: Arizona placed in its Constitution provision for a Referendum and Recall measure. This provision was objectionable to Judge William Howard Taft, then President of the United States. He had this recall measure expunged from the Constitution before signing the statehood bill. After obtaining statehood Arizona proceeded to amend its Constitution making provisions for the recall measure. A test case was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Taft, having in the meantime become Chief Justice, wrote the decision upholding the right of Arizona to change its Constitution, it being a sovereign State, and such a provision not being incompatible with the Federal Constitution.

Utah, being a sovereign State, may, at will, make changes in its Constitution and may pass legislation that will correct this marriage problem. **Indeed, unless it can do so it is not a sovereign state,** and unless it enjoys full sovereignty it is not fully clothed with state rights.

A remedy was attempted, as shown in our previous article, in the passage of the Evans Bill, which, while receiving hearty support by the Legislature, was killed by the Governor's veto.

2nd. In taking a stand against the anti-polygamy laws enacted by Congress against the Mormon people, they adhere strictly to the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;"

In the Reynolds case initiated with the help of the Church to test the constitutionality of the anti-polygamy law of 1862, the Supreme Court ruled that while it could not disturb the faith or belief of the people it could control their actions, and that plural marriage was a proper subject for legislation.

Mormons believing in the fundamentals of the Gospel as established by the Prophet Joseph Smith and perpetuated by his successors in the

Priesthood, have not and cannot accept this decision of the Supreme Court as final. It is inconceivable that the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom has such flagrant limitations. Its real meaning, as interpreted by the best minds of the nation, is that no truly religious belief or act, the act not being in conflict with human rights, can be interfered with. That Celestial or Plural marriage is a part of the religion of the true Mormon Church is beyond the cavil of man; it cannot be denied. In its report to the Secretary of the Interior, Nov. 18, 1884, the "Utah Commission", a non-Mormon group of officers appointed from Washington to control the political actions of the Territory, this statement was made:

> * * * Three-fourths or more of the Mormon adults, male and female, have never entered into the polygamic relation, yet every orthodox Mormon, every member "in good standing" in the Church, believes in polygamy as a divine revelation. This article of faith is as much an essential and substantial part of their creed as their belief in baptism, repentance for the remission of sins, and the like. * * *

This, coming as it did from men unfriendly to the Church, and stating so clearly the position the Church for years had assumed, should be conclusive on the question involved, viz: That Celestial or Plural marriage was and, for that matter, yet is a vital part of the religion of the Mormon people, and that to take this principle away means to take the heart out of Mormonism.

If a confirmation of this fact, by the Church, is required we need but quote from the Petition for Amnesty presented to the President of the United States, December 19, 1891, signed by the First Presidency of the Church and the members of the Quorum of Twelve (the present President of the Church being among them), in which this statement is made:

> We, the First Presidency and Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, beg respectfully to present to your Excellency the following facts:
>
> We formerly taught to our people that polygamy, or celestial marriage, as commanded by God through Joseph Smith, was right; that IT WAS A NECESSITY TO MAN'S HIGHEST EXALTATION IN THE LIFE TO COME.
>
> That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our President, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago, and was steadily taught and impressed upon the Latter-day Saints up to a short time before September, 1890. * * *
>
> When the Government sought to stamp out the practice, our people, almost without exception, remained firm, for they, while having no desire to oppose the Government in anything, still felt that their lives and their honor as men were pledged to a vindication of their faith; * * * to fulfill which they had no right to count anything, not even their own lives, as standing in the way. Following this conviction hundreds endured arrest, trial, fine and imprisonment, and the immeasurable suffering borne by the faithful people, no language can describe. * * *
>
> To be at peace with the Government and in harmony with their fellow citizens who are not of their faith, and to share in the confidence of the government and people, our people have voluntarily put aside something which all their lives they have believed to be a sacred principle. * * *.—Contributor, 13: 196-7.

True, many members of the Church have given their assent to the Woodruff Manifesto on the theory, though, that the principle is only temporarily suspended; holding that it is eternal and will be restored to the Church in the due time of the Lord. To such it is still a vital part of the Gospel. While others, now being called "Fundamentalists" have never accepted the Manifesto as inspired by Heaven, and continue in the active teaching of the principle.

There is another reason why the Congressional enactments against the Mormon marriage system have been regarded as unconstitutional by many of the Mormon people. It lies in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, of Feb

ruary 2, 1848, effective July 4, 1848.

It will be recalled that the Mormons were driven out of the confines of the United States, arriving in the Salt Lake valley, Mexican territory, July 24, 1847, thus becoming wards of the Republic of Mexico. A year later this territory was ceded to the United States by the Guadalupe treaty. Articles Eight and Nine of said Treaty define and declare the rights of the citizens of Mexico after the territory should pass under the jurisdiction of the United States, as follows:

> **Article 8: Mexicans now established in territories previously belonging to Mexico, and which remain for the future within the limits of the United States, as defined by the present treaty, shall be free to continue where they now reside, or to remove at any time to the Mexican republic, retaining the property which they possess in the said territories, or disposing thereof, and removing the proceeds wherever they please, without their being subjected on this account, to any contribution, tax, or charge whatever. * * ***
>
> **Article 9: Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican republic, conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion WITHOUT RESTRICTION.**

This provision insuring the Mormons who, by the treaty, were passing from Mexican jurisdiction to that of the United States, "The free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secure in the free exercise of their religion WITHOUT RESTRICTION", gave them a guarantee that the Government later sought to take from them. Any law subsequently enacted by Congress or the States which the Congress created, inhibiting the free exercise of religion by those Mormons, with their natural following, must be held as unconstitutional. A treaty obligation cannot be abrogated without the consent of all parties to the treaty.

Under this situation it may be readily seen that it is not the Mormons who have been law-breakers, but rather the Federal and State governments that have been engaged in vitiating the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty and also the treaty rights guaranteed to the Mormon population then resident in Mexico.

In October TRUTH we will take up another phase of this question of the unconstitutionality of the law against Celestial or Plural marriage, giving reasons why the State Legislature should purge the statute books of the withering effects of all unnatural, oppressive, vicious and unconstitutional laws.

THE CHURCH RESTORED

In this day when the Gospel of Jesus Christ is being apologized for, adulterated, cluttered with substitutions and shorn of its vitality, it is refreshing to the soul to hear a real gospel sermon delivered in clearness.

Such, in part, was the pronouncement of Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, of the Quorum of Twelve, in his radio address over KSL, July 23, 1944. The subject was "The Church Restored". The speaker showed no hesitancy in declaring the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints the only religious body on earth enjoying the official approval of the Lord. He showed conclusively that there can be but one approved church. There may be times, he ventured, when there is no approved church on earth, but at no time can there be more than one church or system of religion that is approved of heaven.

But while the explanation given of the true church by Elder Smith can be of no comfort to the sectarian world, indicating as it does their false

position, it must be of little comfort to the present Mormon membership itself. Elder Smith said:

> For one nundred and twenty odd years this story has been before the world. It is safe to say that no truth has ever been placed in the crucible and been more sorely tried; no truth has been forced to pass through more severe investigation and malicious criticism than has the work of Joseph Smith. Through it all what he taught and gave to the world has come through the trials triumphant, while criticism upon criticism, attack upon attack, have fallen helpless to the ground.

This is verily true. Joseph Smith gave to the world the pure unadulterated Gospel, which heeded, would have saved the world from itself. The answer of the world to Joseph Smith was calumny, persecution and finally martyrdom, for which it must yet pay in full.

Speaking, as if it were to the Saints with their present leadership, Elder Smith said:

> The Almighty cannot permit man to "mar" His Church and change His ordinances any more than He can permit him to change the law of gravity, or annul any other natural law, and for man to attempt to do so is just as absurd and inconsistent. The Lord said to Joseph Smith: "Behold, mine house is a house of order, saith the Lord, and not a house of confusion. Will I accept of an offering, saith the Lord, that is not made in my name? Or will I receive at your hands that which I have not appointed? And will I appoint unto you, saith the Lord, except it be by law, even as I and my Father ordained unto you, before the world was?

This marring of the Church is prohibited against both Saint and sinner. The ordinances must not be changed. To change the ordinances means to change the pattern and a change in the pattern means to sectarianize the Church. To change a round wheel to a square wheel at once spoils the design and renders the vehicle less efficient. The speaker further said, in confirmation of this thought:

> From these sayings we see that it was never intended that the organization of the Church established by our Lord should ever be changed. There is no scriptural warrant that the apostles and prophets should cease to exist, and the gifts of the Spirit come to an end.

It is clear that the Gospel never changes. It is the same today as it was before the foundations of earth were laid. The Church, as the propaganda division of the Priesthood, can function in fulness only as it remains completely organized and free from changes in the laws and ordinances of the Gospel. Therefore the claim of some of the leaders of their right to change the ordinances **"in accordance with our own knowledge and experience"** (See TRUTH 9:278) is against all reason and is false. The ordinances of the Gospel are fixed and never change. As early as 1834 Oliver Cowdery, as Joseph's mouthpiece, or the Second Elder, wrote to W. W. Phelps as follows:

> There is, of necessity, a uniformity so exact; a manner so precise, and ordinances so minute, in all ages and generations whenever God has established His Church among men. * * * Common undertakings and plans of men may be overthrown or destroyed by opposition. The systems of this world may be exploded or annihilated by oppression or falsehood; but it is the reverse with pure religion. There is a power attendant on truth that all the arts and designs of men cannot fathom.—TRUTH 4:184.

These facts were emphasized in the Sunday School outlines of November, 1930, wherein we read:

> God's laws are all essential. * * *
>
> God's laws are UNCHANGEABLE and will exist throughout eternity.
>
> Religious doctrines which come directly from God are beneficial as long as they are not changed by man.
>
> Movements, which tend to change the doctrines as they were revealed, WILL NOT PROVE BENEFICIAL.

It must, then, be apparent that doctrines **"coming directly from God" can be beneficial only so long "as they remain unchanged by man."** What is the present status of the Church in this respect? It is well known that

certain vital laws and ordinances of the Gospel have been changed, and such changes are upheld by the present leadership of the Church. Among some of these changes are:

(a) The garments of the Holy Priesthood.

(b) The conference of the Priesthood—giving an office and seeking to confer a subdivision of the Priesthood, as denounced by President Joseph F. Smith (Gospel Doctrines, p. 169).

(c) Preaching the Gospel without purse or scrip.

(d) The gathering of the Saints out of Babylon.

(e) The true order of Celestial marriage; classifying the ordinance as non-essential; and even assisting the enemies of God in persecuting those of the Saints adhering to this principle of marriage today.

These and other changes are made without warrant of authority and each change has tended to weaken the church structure, to destroy the faith of the Saints and to impede their proggress.

Elder Smith gave a comprehensive interpretation of the vision of the Apostle John, while imprisoned on the Isle of Patmos. **"A woman was shown clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." She was about to be delivered of a man child, which Lucifer or the great dragon attempted to destroy. "The son born to her is the Priesthood", the Elder explained, which is to rule the earth by the truth of the Gospel (the unchanged Gospel), "which is the rod of iron".**

The Priesthood was taken back to heaven and was restored to earth through the Prophet Joseph Smith in the present dispensation. In the restoration of the Gospel **"the power of the dragon was overcome and the Lord has proclaimed that the Gospel now restored shall never be taken from the earth, for this is the dispensation in which the Lord is gathering in one all things both which are in heaven and on earth."**

Here Elder Smith reveals anew the sacred truth that the Priesthood and not the Church is to "rule the earth by the power of the Gospel". The Priesthood, as President Clark has stated, may and does operate independent of the Church, but the Church cannot operate independent of the Priesthood. The Priesthood is an organization separate and distinct from the Chuch, the latter being an auxiliary to the Priesthood. It was the Priesthood that continued on after the Woodruff Manifesto of 1890, and not the Church, in continuing Celestial or plural marriage among the worthy Saints. In setting apart Anthony W. Ivins to operate in the sealing ordinances of this principle, Presidents Woodruff and Cannon were exercising the powers of the Priesthood and not the functions of the Church.

When the Saints get this fact clearly in mind many heretofore seeming inconsistencies will be clear to them. The Priesthood is God's power on earth; it organized the Church and it organized the Kingdom. It presides over all. This being the last Gospel dispensation, it is designed, as Elder Smith stated, that the Gospel "shall never again be taken from the earth", nor will it be given to another people. But the house of God, which includes the Church, being lamentably out of order, is to be set in order (D. & C., Sec. 85), when the Gospel will again "carry on" in its glorious fulness.

Then the true Church of Christ will **"come forth out of the wilderness of darkness, and shine forth fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners!"**—D. & C., 109:73.

"WE SEEK LIBERTY"

By permission we re-publish the following article from "LIFE" (July 3rd) under the above caption. That the same may be complete we include the "Editor's Note", introducing the Author, Judge Learned Hand.

By a happy coincident—or was it a mere coincidence?—this contribution—"We Seek Liberty"—prefaces the marvelous two paged article on "Polygamy" which immediately follows in "LIFE", pp. 22-23.

In presenting the pictures of the fifteen so-called "Fundamentalists", with many of the mothers of their children, together with the intimate home life of one of the defendants, "LIFE" has performed a service to the nation and to the cause of human liberty of incalculable worth. No unprejudiced or fair-minded person gazing upon the faces of these "mothers of men" with their beautiful children —innocent, healthy and frolicsome— will permit the ugly thought to enter their minds that they are the fruits of lewdness or debauchery.

The children of these 15 "Fundamentalist" defendants sentenced to serve from one to five years in the state penitentiary for siring them, number 283 (having 55 mothers); many of the children now being in the armed service of the country, others prominent business men in the community and devoted workers in the Church that formerly taught them the necessity of the principle of plural marriage and—O the irony in it!—that is now responsible for the present crusade against them. "We Seek Liberty" is a fitting title to "LIFE'S" exhibition of this truly marvelous social and religious adventure.—Editors.

"WE SEEK LIBERTY"

If it dies in men's hearts, no court can save it

EDITOR'S NOTE: On this July 4 Americans everywhere turn their thoughts again to liberty, the elusive treasure for which we boldly asserted our right to search 168 years ago. For the right to continue this quest, Americans were dying and being buried in Normandy last week, and in Saipan, and in Italy, and in a hundred other corners of the world. At home other Americans were thinking anew about the mysterious nature of liberty, and trying once more to define it.

Of these latter, the man who came the closest was a New York jurist, Judge Learned Hand of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Last May 21 in New York City's Central Park, where more than a million people were gathered to celebrate "I Am an American Day", Judge Hand led 150,000 newly naturalized citizens in the pledge to the flag. Judge Hand's address, here printed entire, is a new and solid stone in the proud edifice of American oratory. It is not in the great Webster tradition, but in the greater, simpler tradition of Lincoln. Judge Learned Hand has been on the federal bench for 35 years. He is one of the country's most distinguished legal philosophers and his decisions, noted for their clear and graceful style, are often compared with those of the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

We have gathered here to affirm a faith, a faith in a common purpose, a common conviction, a common devotion. Some of us have chosen America as the land of our adoption; the rest have come from those who did the same. For this reason we have some right to consider ourselves a picked group, a group of those who had the courage to break from the past and brave the dangers and the loneliness of a strange land.

What was the object that nerved us, or those who went before us, to this choice? We sought liberty; freedom from oppression, freedom from want, freedom to be ourselves. This we then sought. This we now believe that we are by way of winning.

What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes. **Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there,**

no constitution, no law, no court can save it. No constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it.

And what is this liberty which must lie in the hearts of men and women? It is not the ruthless, the unbridled will. It is not freedom to do as one likes. That is the denial of liberty, and leads straight to its overthrow. A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom, soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few; as we have learned to our sorrow.

What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near two thousand years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

And now in that spirit, that spirit of an America which has never been, and which may never be; nay, which never will be, except as the conscience and the courage of Americans create it; yet in the spirit of that America which lies hidden in some form in the aspirations of us all; in the spirit of that America for which our young men are at this moment fighting and dying; in that spirit of liberty and of America I ask you to rise and with me to pledge our faith in the glorious destiny of our beloved country.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands—one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IN THE COURTS

The Federal charges of "Conspiracy" against twelve so-called "Fundamentalists", has been abandoned by the Government. It will be remembered the cases were based on the circulation through the mails of the TRUTH magazine, on the theory that this publication is "obscene, lewd or lascivious."

Judge J. Foster Symes of Denver, sitting on the cases in Salt Lake City, made quick dispatch of them by quashing the indictments. The government appealed from this decision to the U. S. Supreme Court. According to news dispatches **"After many conferences attended by Mr. Boyden (Assistant Federal prosecutor), the Attorney General decided to dismiss the appeal.**

This, we regard, as a distinct and well merited victory; one that has been expected by thousands of unprejudiced minds in Utah and elsewhere where TRUTH has received an audience. There being no Federal law against plural marriage the prosecution sought to twist this time honored postal regulation to cover polygamous teaching and living. This defeat of the forces against TRUTH will meet with general approval among all broad-minded citizens.

Appeals are being taken from Judge Kennedy's decision in the ten "Mann Act" and "Lindbergh Kidnapping" cases in which a verdict of guilty was rendered; also in the fifteen "Unlawful Cohabitation" cases tried before Judge Ray Van Cott, Jr., where a conviction was entered, the latter to the Supreme Court of Utah and the former to the Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting at Denver.

A "Conspiracy" case in which some 34 defendants are involved in the State courts is yet to be tried.

VITALITY OF MORMONISM

We do not believe in whoredoms here; we do not admit of any such thing as women to whore it, or of men to come here to do any such thing; we have none of this. (Voice: "That is civilization.")

Yes, such as they have in New York at the Five Points there; some of you have perhaps been there; and in Philadelphia and in every other city in the United States. There is the city of Rochester, about the smartest city there is in the United States. I have been there when there was but two little log cabins, when there was not such a thing known as a prostitute, and now at this day there are thousands of persons of ill fame, and the authorities license such things.

Christians, those poor, miserable priests Brother Brigham was speaking about, some of them are the biggest whoremasters there are on the earth, and at the same time preaching righteousness to the children of men. The poor devils, they could not get up here and preach an oral discourse to save themselves from hell. They are preaching their fathers' sermons, preaching sermons that have been written a hundred years before they were born. * * *

Plurality of wives—I have a good many wives—how much would you give to know how many? If I were to tell you, you would not believe it. I suppose many of you have not believed a word we have said today. We do not care whether you do or not. I am speaking to the unbelievers and not to the Saints. If I spoke lies you would believe quicker. Suffice it to say I have a good many wives and lots of young mustards that are growing and they are a kind of fruitful seed.

I know what my comparison was when Dr. Bernhisel was at Washington. We did not know what the Doctor would think when we let the old cat out of the bag. I told him that the old cat would have kittens, and the kittens would have cats. It is so with Mormonism, it will flourish and increase and it will multiply in young Mormons.

"To be plain about it, Mr. Kimball, what did you get these wives for?" The Lord told me to get them. "What for?" To raise up young Mormons, not to have women to commit whoredoms with to gratify the lusts of the flesh, but to raise up children.

The priests of the day in the whole world keep women, just the same as the gentlemen of the legislatures do. The great men of the earth keep from two to three and perhaps half a dozen private women; they are not acknowledged openly, but are kept merely to gratify their lusts, and if they get in the family way they call for the doctors, and also upon females who practice under the garb of midwives, to kill the children, and thus they are depopulating their own species. (Voice: "And their names shall come to an end.") Yes, because they shed innocent blood.

I knew that before I received Mormonism. I have known of lots of women calling for a doctor to destroy their children, and there are many of the women in this enlightened age and in the most popular towns and cities in the Union that take a course to get rid of their children. The whole nation is guilty of it. I am telling the truth. I won't call it infanticide; you know I am famous for calling things by their names.

I have been taught it and my wife was taught it in our young days, when she got into the family way to send for a doctor and get rid of the child so as to live with me to gratify lust. It is God's truth, and I know the person that did it. This is depopulating human species, and the curse of God will come upon that man and upon

that woman and upon those cursed doctors. There is scarcely one of them that is free from the sin; it is just as common as it is for wheat to grow.

Do we take that course here? * * * No. I have had altogether about fifty children, and one hundred years won't pass away before my posterity will outnumber the present inhabitants of the State of New York, because I do not destroy my offspring. I am doing the works of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and if I live and be a good man, and my wives are as good as they should be, I will raise up men yet that will come through my loins that will be as great men as ever came to this earth, and so will you.

I will tell you that some of the most noble spirits are waiting with the Father to this day to come forth through the right channel and the right kind of men and women. That is what has to be yet, for there are thousands and millions of spirits waiting to obtain bodies upon this earth.—Heber C. Kimball (July 26, 1857). The Deseret News, Vol. 7, p. 179.

THERE ARE GAINS FOR ALL OUR LOSSES

There are gains for all our losses,
  There are balms for all our pain:
But when youth, the dream, departs,
It takes something from our hearts,
  And it will never come again.

We are stronger, and are better,
  Under manhood's sterner reign;
Still we feel that something sweet
Followed youth, with flying feet,
  And will never come again.

Something beautiful is vanished,
  And we sigh for it is vain;
We behold it everywhere
On the earth and in the air,
  But it never comes again.

—Richard Henry Stoddard.

Half the joy of life is in the little things taken on the run. Let us run if we must—even the sands do that—but let us keep our hearts young and our eyes open that nothing worth while shall escape us. And everything is worth its while if we only grasp it and its significance.—Victor Cherbuliez.

THE QUESTIONER

I called the boy to my knee one day
  And I said, "You're just past four;
Will you laugh in the same light-hearted way
  When you've turned, say, forty more?"
Then I thought of a past I'd fain erase—
  More clouded skies than blue—
And I anxiously peered in his upturned face
  For it seemed to say:
  "Did you?"

I touched my lips to his tiny own
  And I said to the boy: "Heigh, ho!
Those lips are as sweet as the hay, new mown;
  Will you keep them always so?"
Then back from those years came a rakish song—
  With a ribald jest or two—
And I gazed at the child who knew no wrong,
  And I thought he asked:
  "Did you?"

I looked into his eyes, big brown and clear,
  And I cried: "Oho, boy of mine!
Will you keep them true in the afteryear?
  Will you leave no heart to pine?"
Then out of the past came another's eyes—
  Sad eyes of tear-dimmed blue—
Did he know they were not his mother's eyes?
  For he answered me:
  "Did you?"

LIFE'S SCARS

They say the world is round and yet
  I often think it square,
So often little hurts we get
  From corners here and there,
But one great truth in life I've found
  While journeying to the west:
The only ones who we really wound
  Are those we love the best.

The choicest garb, the sweetest grace
  Are oft to strangers shown.
The careless mien, the frowning face
  Are given to our own.
We flatter those we scarcely know,
  We please the fleeting guest,
And deal full many a thoughtless blow
  To those we love the best.

Love does not grow on every tree,
  Nor true hearts yearly bloom,
Alas for those who only see
  This cut across the tomb!
But soon or late the fact grows plain
  To all through sorrow's test—
The only ones who give us pain
  Are those we love the best.

—Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. OCTOBER, 1944. NO. 5.

RULES OF FAMILY CONDUCT

(From an extensive editorial, introducing the doctrine of Celestial or Plural Marriage to the United States and British Provinces in North America, in "The Seer", edited by Orson Pratt in Washington, D. C., beginning January, 1853. Pp. 174-6, 183-8).

Rule 1st. Let that man who intends to become a husband, seek first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and learn to govern himself, according to the law of God: for he that cannot govern himself cannot govern others; let him dedicate his property, his talents, his time, and even his life to the service of God, holding all things at His disposal, to do with the same, according as He shall direct through the counsel that He has ordained.

Rule 2nd. Let him next seek for wisdom to direct him in the choice of his wives. Let him seek for those whose qualifications will render him and themselves happy. Let him look not wholly at the beauty of the countenance, or the splendor of the apparel, or the great fortune, or the artful smiles, or the affected modesty of females; for all these, without the genuine virtues, are like the dew-drops which glitter for a moment in the sun, and dazzle the eye, but soon vanish away. But let him look for kind and amiable dispositions; for unaffected modesty; for industrious habits; for sterling virtue; for honesty, integrity, and truthfulness; for cleanliness in persons, in apparel, in cooking, and in every kind of domestic labor; for cheerfulness, patience, and stability of character; and above all, for genuine religion to control and govern their every thought and deed. When he has found those possessing these qualifications, let him seek to obtain them lawfully through the counsel of him who holds the keys of the everlasting priesthood, that they may be married to him by the authority of Heaven, and thus be secured to him for time and for all eternity.

Rule 3rd. When a man has obtained his wives, let him not suppose

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

that they are already perfect in all things; for this cannot be expected in those who are young and inexperienced in the cares and vicissitudes of a married life. They, as weaker vessels, are given to him as the stronger, to nourish, cherish, and protect; to be their head, their patriarch, and their saviour; to teach, instruct, counsel, and perfect them in all things relating to family government, and the welfare and happiness of themselves and their children. Therefore, let him realize the weighty responsibility now placed upon him, as the head of a family; and also let him study diligently the disposition of his wives, that he may know how to instruct them in wisdom for their good.

Rule 4th. Betray not the confidence of your wives. There are many ideas in an affectionate, confiding wife which she would wish to communicate to her husband, and yet she would be very unwilling to have them communicated to others. Keep each of your wives' secrets from all the others, and from any one else, unless in cases where good will result by doing otherwise.

Rule 5th. Speak not of the faults of your wives to others; for in so doing you speak against yourself. If you speak to one of your wives of the imperfections of the others who may be absent, you not only injure them in her estimation, but she will expect that you will speak against her under like circumstances; this is calculated to weaken their confidence in you, and sow division in a family. Tell each one of her faults in private in a spirit of kindness and love, and she will most probably respect you for it, and endeavor to do better for the future; and thus the others will not, because of your reproof, take occasion to speak reproachfully of her. There may be circumstances, when reproof, given in the presence of the others, will produce a salutary influence upon all. Wisdom is profitable to direct, and should be sought for earnestly by those who have the responsibility of families.

Rule 6th. Avoid anger, and a fretful, peevish disposition in your family. A hasty spirit, accompanied with harsh words, will most generally beget its own likeness, or, at least, it will eventually, sour the feelings of your wives and children, and greatly weaken their affections for you. You should remember that harsh expressions against one of your wives used in the hearing of the others, will more deeply wound her feelings than if she alone heard them. Reproofs that are timely and otherwise good, may lose their good effect by being administered in a wrong spirit, indeed, they will most probably increase the evils which they were intended to remedy. Do not find fault with every trifling error that you may see; for this will discourage your family, and they will begin to think that it is impossible to please you; and, after a while become indifferent as to whether they please you or not. How unhappy and extremely wretched is that family where nothing pleases—where scolding has become almost as natural as breathing.

Rule 7th. Use impartiality in your family as far as circumstances will allow; and let your kindness and love abound towards them all. Use your own judgment, as the head of the family, in regard to your duties in relation to them, and be not swayed from that which is right, by your own feelings, nor by the feelings of others.

Rule 8th. Suffer not your judgment to be biased against any one of your wives, by the accusations of the others, unless you have good grounds to believe that those accusations are just. Decide not hastily upon partial evidence, but weigh well all things, that your mind may not become unjustly prejudiced. When one of your wives complains of the imperfections of the others, and endeavors to set your mind against them, teach her that

all have imperfections, and of the necessity of bearing one with another in patience, and of praying one for another.

Rule 9th. Call your wives and children together frequently, and instruct them in their duties towards God, towards yourself, and towards one another. Pray with them, and for them often; and teach them to pray much, that the Holy Spirit may dwell in their midst, without which it is impossible to maintain that union, love, and oneness which are so necessary to happiness and salvation.

Rule 10th. Remember, that notwithstanding written rules will be of service in teaching you your duties, as the head of a family, yet without the Holy Ghost to teach and instruct you, it is impossible for you to govern a family in righteousness; therefore, seek after the Holy Ghost, and He shall teach you all things, and sanctify you and your family, and make you one, that you may be perfected in Him, and He in you, and eventually be exalted on high to dwell with God, where your joy will be full forever.

Rule 11th. Let no woman unite herself in marriage with any man, unless she has fully resolved to submit herself wholly to his counsel, and to let him govern as the head. It is far better for her not to be united with him in the sacred bonds of eternal union, than to rebel against the divine order of family government, instituted for a higher salvation; for if she altogether turn therefrom, she will receive a greater condemnation.

Rule 12th. Never seek to prejudice the mind of your husband against any of his other wives, for the purpose of exalting yourself in his estimation, lest the evil which you unjustly try to bring upon them, fall with double weight upon your own head. Strive to rise in favor and influence with your husband by your own merits, and not by magnifying the faults of others.

Rule 13th. Seek to be a peacemaker in the family with whom you are associated. If you see the least appearance of division arising, use your utmost efforts to restore union and soothe the feelings of all. Soft and gentle words, spoken in season, will allay contention and strife; while a hasty spirit and harsh language add fuel to the fire already kindled, which will rage with increasing violence.

Rule 14th. Speak not evil of your husband unto any of the rest of the family for the purpose of prejudicing their minds against him; for if he be informed thereof, it will injure you in his estimation. Neither speak evil of any members of the family; for this will destroy their confidence in you. Avoid all hypocrisy; for if you pretend to love your husband and to honor and respect his wives, when present, but speak disrespectfully of them when absent, you will be looked upon as a hypocrite, as a tattler, and as a mischief-making woman, and be shunned as being more dangerous than an open enemy. And what is still more detestable, is to tattle out of the family, and endeavor to create enemies against those with whom you are connected. Such persons should not only be considered hypocrites, but traitors, and their conduct should be despised by every lover of righteousness. Remember also, that there are more ways than one to tattle; it is not always the case that those persons who are boldest in their accusations, are the most dangerous slanderers; but such as hypocritically pretend that they do not wish to injure their friends, and at the same time very piously insinuate in dark indirect sayings, something that is calculated to have a very unfavorable prejudice against them. Shun such a spirit as you would the very gates of hell.

Rule 15th. If you see any of your husband's wives sick or in trouble, use every effort to relieve them, and to administer kindness and consola-

tions, remembering that you, yourself, under the same circumstances, would be thankful for their assistance. Endeavor to share each other's burdens, according to the health, ability and strength which God has given you. Do not be afraid that you will do more than your share of the domestic labor, or that you will be more kind to them than they are to you.

Rule 16th. Let each mother correct her own children, and see that they do not dispute and quarrel with each other, nor with any others; let her not correct the children of the others without liberty so to do, lest it give offense. The husband should see that each mother maintains a wise and proper discipline over her children, especially in their younger years: and it is his duty to see that all of his children are obedient to himself and to their respective mothers. And it is also his duty to see that the children of one wife are not allowed to quarrel and abuse those of the others, neither to be disrespectful or impudent to any branch of his family.

Rule 17th. It is the duty of parents to instruct their children, according to their capacities, in every principle of the gospel, as revealed in the Book of Mormon and in the revelations which God has given, that they may grow up in righteousness, and in the fear of the Lord, and have faith in Him. Suffer no wickedness to have place among them, but teach them the right way, and see that they walk therein. And let the husband, and his wives, and all of his children that have come to the years of understanding, often bow before the Lord around the family altar, and pray vocally and unitedly for whatever blessings they stand in need of, remembering that where there are union and peace, there will also be faith, and hope, and the love of God, and every good work, and a multiplicity of blessings, imparting health and comfort to the body, and joy and life to the soul.

Rule 18th. Let each mother commence with her children when young, not only to teach and instruct them, but to chasten and bring them into the most perfect subjection; for then is the time that they are the most easily conquered, and their tender minds are the most susceptible of influences and government. Many mothers, from carelessness, neglect their children, and only attempt to govern them at long intervals, when they most generally find their efforts of no lasting benefit; for the children having been accustomed to have their own way, do not easily yield; and if peradventure they do yield, it is only for the time being, until the mother relaxes again into carelessness, when they return again to their accustomed habits: and thus by habit they become more and more confirmed in disobedience, waxing worse and worse, until the mother becomes discouraged, and relinquishes all discipline, and complains that she cannot make her children mind. The fault is not so much in the children, as in the carelessness and neglect of the mother when the children were young; it is she that must answer, in a great degree, for the evil habits and disobedience of the children. She is more directly responsible than the father; for it cannot be expected that the father can always find time, apart from the laborious duties required of him, to correct and manage his little children who are at home with their mothers. It is frequently the case that the father is called to attend to duties in public life, and may be absent from home much of his time, when the whole duty of family government necessarily rests upon the respective mothers of his children; if they, through carelessness, suffer their children to grow up in disobedience, and ruin themselves, they must bear the shame and disgrace thereof. Some mothers, though not careless, and though they feel the

greatest anxiety for the welfare of their children, yet, through a mistaken notion of love for them, forbear to punish them when they need punishment, or if they undertake to conquer them, their tenderness and pity are so great, that they prevail over the judgment, and the children are left unconquered, and become more determined to resist all future efforts of their mothers, until, at length, they conclude that their children have a more stubborn disposition than others, and that it is impossible to subject them in obedience. In this case, as in that of neglect, the fault is the mother's. The stubbornness of the children, for the most part, is the effect of the mother's indulgence, arising from her mistaken idea of love. By that which she calls love, she ruins her children.

Children between one and two years of age are capable of being made to understand many things; then is the time to begin with them. How often we see children of that age manifest much anger. Frequently by crying through anger, they that are otherwise healthy, injure themselves: it is far better, in such instances, for a mother to correct her child in a gentle manner, though with decision and firmness, until she conquers it, and causes it to cease crying, than to suffer that habit to increase. When the child by gentle punishment has learned this one lesson from its mother, it is much more easily conquered and brought into subjection in other things, until finally, by a little perseverance on the part of the mother, it learns to be obedient to her voice in all things; and obedience becomes confirmed into a permanent habit. Such a child trained by a negligent or over-indulgent mother, might have become confirmed in habits of stubbornness and disobedience. It is not so much in the original constitution of children as in their training, that causes such wide differences in their dispositions.

It cannot be denied, that there is a difference in the constitution of children even from their birth; but this difference is mostly owing to the proper or improper conduct of parents, as before stated; therefore, even for this difference, parents are more or less responsible. If parents, through their own evil conduct entail hereditary dispositions upon their children which are calculated to ruin them, unless properly curtailed and overcome, they should realize, that for that evil they must render an account.

If parents have been guilty in entailing upon their offspring unhappy dispositions, let them repent, by using all diligence to save them from the evil consequences which will naturally result by giving way to those dispositions. The greater the derangement, the greater must be the remedy, and the more skilful and thorough should be its application, until that which is sown in evil is overcome and completely subdued. In this way parents may save themselves and their children; but otherwise there is condemnation. Therefore, we repeat again, let mothers begin to discipline their children when young.

Rule 19th. Do not correct children in anger; an angry parent is not as well prepared to judge of the amount of punishment which should be inflicted upon a child, as one that is more cool and exercised with reflection, reason, and judgment. Let your children see that you punish them, not to gratify an angry disposition, but to reform them for their good, and it will have a salutary influence; they will not look upon you as a tyrant, swayed to and fro by turbulent and furious passions; but they will regard you as one that seeks their welfare, and that you only chasten them because you love them, and wish them to do well. Be deliberate and calm in your counsels and reproofs, but at the same time use earnestness and decision. Let your children know that your words must be respected and obeyed.

Rule 20th. Never deceive your children by threatenings or promises. Be careful not to threaten them with a punishment which you have no intention of inflicting; for this will cause them to lose confidence in your word; besides, it will cause them to contract the habit of lying: when they perceive that their parents do not fulfill their threatenings or promises, they will consider that there is no harm in forfeiting their word. Think not that your precepts, concerning truthfulness, will have much weight upon the minds of your children, when they are contradicted by your examples. Be careful to fulfill your word in all things in righteousness, and your children will not only learn to be truthful from your example, but they will fear to disobey your word, knowing that you never fail to punish or reward according to your threatenings and promises. Let your laws, penalties, and rewards be founded upon the principles of justice and mercy, and adapted to the capacities of your children; for this is the way that our heavenly Father governs His children, giving to some a Celestial, to others a Terrestrial, and to others still a Telestial law, with penalties and promises annexed, according to the conditions, circumstances, and capacities of the individuals to be governed. Seek for wisdom, and pattern after the heavenly order of government.

Rule 21st. Do not be so stern and rigid in your family government as to render yourself an object of fear and dread. There are parents who only render themselves conspicuous in the attribute of justice, while mercy and love are scarcely known in their families. Justice should be tempered with mercy, and love should be the great moving principle, interweaving itself in all your family administrations. When justice alone sits upon the throne, your children approach you with dread, or peradventure hide themselves from your presence, and long for your absence that they may be relieved from their fear; at the sound of your approaching footsteps they flee as from an enemy, and tremble at your voice, and shrink from the gaze of your countenance, as though they expected some terrible punishment to be inflicted upon them. Be familiar with your children that they may delight themselves in your society, and look upon you as a kind and tender parent whom they delight to obey. Obedience inspired by love, and obedience inspired by fear, are entirely different in their nature; the former will be permanent and enduring, while the latter only waits to have the object of fear removed, and it vanishes like a dream. Govern children as parents, and not as tyrants; for they will be parents in their turn, and will be very likely to adopt that form of government in which they have been educated. If you have been tyrants, they may be influenced to pattern after your example. If you are fretful and continually scolding they will be very apt to be scolds, too. If you are loving, kind and merciful, these benign influences will be very certain to infuse themselves into their order of family government; and thus good and evil influences frequently extend themselves down for many generations and ages. How great, then, are the responsibilities of parents to their children! And how fearful the consequences of bad examples! Let love, therefore, predominate, and control you, and your children will be sure to discover it, and will love you in return.

Rule 22nd. Let each mother teach her children to honor and love their father, and to respect his teachings and counsels. How frequently it is the case when fathers undertake to correct their children, mothers will interfere in the presence of the children: this has a very evil tendency in many respects: first, it destroys the oneness of feeling which should exist between husband and wife; secondly, it weakens the confidence of the children in

the father and emboldens them to disobedience; thirdly, it creates strife and discord; and lastly, it is rebelling against the order of family government, established by divine wisdom. If the mother supposes the father too severe, let her not mention this in the presence of the children, but she can express her feelings to him while alone by themselves, and thus the children will not see any division between them. For husband and wives to be disagreed, and to contend and quarrel, is a great evil; and to do these things in the presence of their children, is a still greater evil. Therefore, if a husband and his wives will quarrel and destroy their own happiness, let them have pity upon their children, and not destroy them by their pernicious examples.

Rule 23rd. Suffer not children of different mothers to be haughty and abusive to each other; for they are own brothers and sisters the same as the children of the patriarch Jacob; and one has no claim above another, only as his conduct merits it. Should you discover contentions or differences arising, do not justify your own children, and condemn the others in their presence; for this will encourage them in their quarrels: even if you consider that your children are not so much in the fault as the others, it is far better to teach them of the evils of strife, than to speak against the others. To speak against them, not only alienates their affections, but has a tendency to offend their mothers, and create unpleasant feelings between you and them. Always speak well of each of your husband's wives in the presence of your children; for children generally form their judgment concerning others, by the sayings of their parents; for they are very apt to respect those whom their parents respect; and hate those whom they hate. If you consider that some of the mothers are too lenient with their children and too negligent in correcting them, do not be offended, but strive, by the wise and prudent management of your own, to set a worthy example before them, that they, by seeing your judicious and wise course, may be led to go and do likewise. Examples will sometimes reform when precepts fail.

Rule 24th. Be industrious in your habits; this is important as fulfilling the law of God: it is also important for those who are in low circumstances, that they may acquire food, and raiment, and the necessary comforts of life; it is also important for the rich as well as the poor, that they may be able more abundantly to supply the wants of the needy, and be in circumstances to help the unfortunate and administer to the sick and afflicted; for in this way, it is possible even for the rich to enter into the kingdom of heaven. A family whose time is occupied in the useful and lawful avocations of life, will find no time to go from house to house tattling and injuring one another and their neighbors; neither will they be so apt to quarrel among themselves.

Rule 25th. When your children are from three to five years of age, send them to school, and keep them there year after year until they receive a thorough education in all the rudiments of useful science, and in their manners, and morals. In this manner, they will avoid many evils arising from indolence, and form habits that will render them beneficial to society in after life. Let mothers educate their daughters in all kinds of domestic labor: teach them to wash and iron, to bake and do all kinds of cooking, to knit and sew, to spin and weave, and to do all other things that will qualify them to be good and efficient housewives. Let fathers educate their sons in whatever branch or branches of business they intend them respectfully to follow, despite that false delicacy which is exhibited by the sons and daughters of the rich, who consider it a dishonor to labor at the common avocations of life. Such notions of high-life should be frowned

out of the territory, as too contemptible to be harbored, for one moment, by a civilized community. Some of these bogus gentlemen and ladies have such grand ideas, concerning gentility, that they would let their poor old father and mother slave themselves to death, to support them in their idleness, or at some useless fanciful employment. The daughter will sit down in the parlor at her painting or music, arrayed in silks and fineries, and let her mother wash and cook until, through fatigue, she is ready to fall into her grave. This they call gentility, and the distinctions between the low and the high. But such daughters are not worthy of husbands, and should not be admitted into any respectable society. They are contemptible drones, that would be a curse to any husband who should be so unfortunate as to be connected with such nuisances.

Painting, music, and all the fine arts, should be cherished, and cultivated, as accomplishments which serve to adorn and embellish an enlightened, civilized people, and render life agreeable and happy; but when these are cultivated, to the exclusion of the more necessary duties and qualifications, it is like adorning swine with costly jewels and pearls to make them appear more respectable. These embellishments, only render such characters a hundred fold more odious and disgustful than they would otherwise appear.

Rule 26th. Use economy and avoid wastefulness. How discouraging it would be to a husband who has a large family, depending mostly upon his labor for a support, to see his wives and children carelessly, thoughtlessly, and unnecessarily, waste his hard earnings. Let not one wife, for fear that she shall not obtain her share of the income, destroy, give away, and otherwise foolishly dispose of what is given to her, thinking that her husband will furnish her with more. Those who economize and wisely use that which is given to them, should be counted worthy to receive more abundantly than those who pursue a contrary course. Each wife should feel interested in saving and preserving that with which the Lord has entrusted her, and should rejoice, not only in her prosperity, but in the prosperity of all the others; her eyes should not be full of greediness to grasp everything herself, but she should feel equally interested in the welfare of the whole family. By pursuing this course, she will be beloved; by taking a contrary course, she will be considered selfish and little-minded.

Rule 27th. Let husbands, wives, sons, and daughters, continually realize that their relationships do not end with this short life, but will continue in eternity without end. Every qualification and disposition therefore, which will render them happy here, should be nourished, cherished, enlarged, and perfected, that their union may be indissoluble, and their happiness secured both for this world and for that which is to come.

Let these rules be observed, and all others that are good and righteous, and peace will be the result; husbands will be patriarchs and saviors; wives will be like fruitful vines, bringing forth precious fruits in their seasons; their sons will be like plants of renown, and their daughters like the polished stones of a palace. Then the Saints shall flourish upon the hills and rejoice upon the mountains, and become a great people and strong, whose goings forth shall be with strength that is everlasting. Arise, O Zion! clothe thyself with light! shine forth with clearness and brilliancy! Illuminate the nations and the dark corners of the earth, for their light is gone out—their sun is set—gross darkness covers them! Let thy light be seen upon the high places of the earth; let it shine in glorious splendor; for then shall the wicked see, and be confounded, and lay their hands upon their mouths in shame; then shall kings arise, and come forth to the light, and rejoice in the greatness of thy glory! Fear not, O Zion, nor let thine hands be slack, for great is the Holy One in the midst of thee! A cloud shall be over thee by day for a defense, and at night thy dwellings shall be encircled with glory! God is thine

everlasting light, and shall be a tower of strength against thine enemies; at the sound of His voice shall they melt away, and terrors shall seize upon them. In that day thou shalt be beautiful and glorious, and the reproach of the Gentiles shall no more come into thine ears; in that day, shall the sons of them that afflicted thee come bending unto thee and bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and the daughters of them that reproached thee, shall come, saying, We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be joined in the patriarchal order of marriage with the husbands and patriarchs in Zion to take away our reproach; then shall they highly esteem, far above riches, that which their wicked fathers ridiculed under the name of Polygamy.

MODERN CIVILIZATION DECRIED

Excerpts from remarks of President John Taylor in 13th Ward Assembly rooms, January 12, 1873:

Ministers and editors preach and write and tell us that when the waves of "civilization" shall roll over Utah, things will be changed, and say they, "The people will become elevated and refined in their feelings and they will be like us." Some of their waves are not very pleasant, they have brought a lot of scum with them, and it bubbles and stews and froths and foams, and exhibits anything but that which is pleasant and enticing, or that is calculated to promote the happiness and well-being of man.

We do not have any sympathy with gambling, drunkennness and prostitution, for instance, and these are among the waves they have brought. They find fault with us for having more wives and children than they, and for preserving purity and chastity in our midst, and they would introduce their infamies amongst us. Gentlemen, we hope you will keep your waves back where they belong, put them in your own cesspool, keep them where they originated. No such things have been originated by us, we came here to get rid of them, and that we might fear God, and worship him in spirit and in truth, according to the principles that he has revealed.

The Scriptures say, in speaking of the last days, that "perilous times shall come—men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, truce breakers, having a form of Godliness but denying the power thereof." This is a very singular statement, but I do not think you would have to travel very far among our reformers—those who have come to reform and regenerate us—to find this pattern fully exemplified. Are they lovers of their ownselves?

There are a great many here who would not object to take our possessions, and give us nothing for them. **Covetous, the Scriptures say. Why, at the time Buchanan commenced his raid upon us, they had it all planned, and had our possessions apportioned, and had agreed who should have this establishment, that and the other.** But it did not exactly work, and they did not get them, but that did not alter the feeling or principle that existed. Covetous, boasters and proud! I am quoting from your own Bible—King James' translation—and one of your own prophets predicted these very things of you. Boasting! How much swaggering do we see around everywhere? No matter where you go you see little boys growing up full of pride, impudence and impertinence. They are called "Young America." Beautiful specimens, and fine men they will make when they are full grown. Plenty of them come along here. We know all about them. What is the feeling abroad in the world in relation to disobedience to parents? Who the devil cares about father or mother? Say the young folks, "I am of age and I will do as I d—d please", and off they go, and so as they please. The prophets have testified that these things would be, and what we see and hear is only fulfilling their words.

What kind of people should these people be? They should have a form

of godliness, many of them be very pious, have long faces, and for a pretense make long prayers. Jesus in his day accused some of being men of this kind, and said he, "These shall receive the greater condemnation." They shall be truce and covenant breakers. Have we any such nowadays? Why, if a man borrows five dollars he must give a mortgage on something, because the lender fears he will be cheated out of it. Men have no confidence in each other's word. I would not give a straw for a man if I could not trust his word. There is nothing of him, no foundation, nothing to tie to. Yet these are the very people that the Prophet said should exist in the last days. They enter into covenant and never think of fulfilling it. Their word amounts to nothing, their integrity has no foundation.

I speak of these things for your information, for this is the condition of the world. And are we free from it? Not by a long way—I wish we were. I wish there were more honesty, virtue, integrity and truthfulness, and more of every principle among us that is calculated to exalt and enoble humanity. I speak of these things as a shame to the human family; and if they exist among the Saints it is a crying, burning shame, and we all ought to be disgusted; for if anybody in the world ought to be men of integrity, truth and honesty, we should be, everywhere and under all circumstances. And if we say a thing it ought to be as worthy of belief as if we had sworn to it, and as if we were bound by ten thousand ties to accomplish it. But if a man has not the principle of integrity in his own self you cannot put it there. The Latter-day Saints should be ashamed to mix up with these things, and to prostitute the principles which God has revealed unto them. I speak of these things to warn you against them.

The Lord has brought us here, that we may be taught and instructed in correct principles and led in the paths of life. Did we gather here to get religion and to prepare to die? Nothing of the kind. I do not care one particle about death. I have had him grin at me numbers of times, but I care nothing about him, and I ask no odds of him. I know something beyond death. We are here to prepare to live, and to teach our children how to live after us; and to teach the world the same lesson if they will only receive it. We know that our spirits existed with the Father before we came here. We know that we are immortal as well as mortal beings, and that we have had to do with another world as well as this. We know that the world abounds with corruption; but it is our business to keep ourselves from it, and to progress in virtue, truth, integrity and holiness. —J. of D., Vol. 15, pp. 288-90.

A modern "REWARD" version—if the Savior appeared among men today teaching his former doctrines:

"REWARD

For information leading to the apprehension of JESUS CHRIST.

Wanted—For Sedition, Criminal Anarchy—Vagrancy, and Conspiring to Overthrow the Established Government.

Dresses poorly. SAID to be a carpenter by trade, ill-nourished, has visionary ideas, associates with common working people, the Unemployed and Bums; ALIEN—believed to be a Jew. ALIAS: "Prince of Peace", "Son of Man", "Light of the World", etc., etc. Upholds Abraham's family life. PROFESSIONAL AGITATOR. Red Beard; marks on hands and feet the result of injuries by an anry mob led by respectable citizens and legal authorities."—Young.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. OCTOBER, 1944. No. 5.

A LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM

(Continued)

The Mormons are a law-abiding people. As early as February, 1831, positive instructions were received from the Lord, that if any man commit murder, rob, steal, or lie, he should be "delivered up unto the law of the land". In August, 1831, the Lord further said, "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. (D. & C., 58:21). Still later (August, 1833), the Lord explained His meaning of the "laws of the land." He said, (Ib. 98:4-8):

> And now, verily I say unto you concerning the laws of the land, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them.
>
> And that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind; and is justifiable before me.
>
> Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land; and as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever is more or less than this cometh of evil.
>
> I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore ye are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

AND I say again, woe unto that nation, or house or people who seek to hinder my people from obeying the patriarchal law of Abraham, which leadeth to a Celestial Glory, which has been revealed unto my Saints through the mouth of my servant Joseph; for whoever doeth these things shall be damned, saith the Lord of Hosts, and shall be BROKEN UP AND WASTED AWAY FROM UNDER HEAVEN BY THE JUDGMENTS WHICH I HAVE SENT FORTH, AND WHICH SHALL NOT RETURN UNTO ME VOID. And thus, with the sword, and by bloodshed, and with famine, and plagues, and earthquakes, and the thunder of heaven, and the vivid lightnings shall this nation and the nations of the earth be made to feel the chastening hand of an Almighty God, until they are broken up and destroyed and wasted away from under heaven, and no power can stay my hand. —From Revelation to Wilford Woodruff.

Here, then, the law of the land that God enjoins upon the Saints to observe is that law which does not conflict with the Constitution of the land. In another revelation (Ib. 101:77-80), the Lord explained that He suffered the Constitution to be established for the "protection of all flesh according to just and holy principles"; and further:

> **Therefore, it is not right that any man should be in bondage one to another. And for this purpose have I established the Constitution of the land, by the hands of wise men whom I raised up unto this very purpose, and redeemed the land by the shedding of blood.**

The Lord, having established the Constitution, certainly knew the meaning and intent of it, and He is not dependent upon any court of the land for an interpretation of its meaning. The Morrill anti-polygamy law was enacted by Congress in 1862. In 1879 this law (in the George Reynolds case) was declared constitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Did God recognize as sound the ruling of this high court? Had He so done that would have stopped further plural marriages. However, in 1882, the Lord revealed to His Prophet John Taylor to call George Teasdale and Heber J. Grant into the Quorum of Twelve, and Seymour B. Young into the Presidency of the Seventy, **provided**,—and this is His answer to the Supreme Court's decision, an answer that should forever settle the question of the constitutionality of the law —PROVIDED "HE WILL CONFORM TO MY LAW; for", said the Lord further, "it is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood; * * *." The law the Lord referred to and which Seymour B. Young later entered and abided in as a qualification for such office, was plural marriage. The U. S. Supreme Court said it was unlawful to live that law of our religion, while God said, if you do not live it you cannot go on to your exaltation! While, as stated, this should settle the constitutionality phase of the question, other just as positive evidences are before us.

In 1882 the Edmunds Bill was enacted into law by Congress. This measure extended the range of the Morrill law and included the prohibition of cohabiting with plural wives. This law was decided constitutional by the Supreme Court March 23, 1885, yet on September 26-27, 1886, the Lord again revealed to His Prophet John Taylor the irrevocability of His law of Plural Marriage. He said:

> *** * * All those who would enter into my glory MUST and SHALL obey my law. And have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory, they MUST do the works of Abraham (enter into the law of Abraham and live the Gospel as Abraham lived it)? I have not revoked this law, NOR WILL I, for it is everlasting, and those who will enter into my glory MUST obey the conditions thereof.**

(It was doubtless under the authority of this revelation that plural marriages continued, under Priesthood leadership, after the Manifesto of Wilford Woodruff absolving the Church from further practicing it.)

The Edmunds-Tucker law further encroaching upon the rights of the Mormon people, was enacted by Congress and became operative March 3, 1887, and in 1889 the Lord told Wilford Woodruff, then President of the Church (November 24, 1889):

> *** * * Let not my servants who are called to the presidency of my Church deny my word or my law (meaning plural marriage) which concerns the salvation of the children of men. * * * Place not yourselves in jeopardy to your enemies by promise. * * * Let my servants who officiate as your counselors before the courts make their pleadings as they are moved upon by the Holy Spirit, without ANY FURTHER PLEDGES FROM THE PRIESTHOOD. I, the Lord, will hold the courts, with the officers of gov-**

ernment and the nation responsible for their acts toward the inhabitants of Zion. * * *

We have thus shown conclusively the Lord's attitude toward the prohibitary laws of Congress which are designed to interfere with the free exercise of the religion of the Mormon people. The contest is between God and man. It has been going on since the beginning of time. In the days of ancient Israel, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon—earth's greatest ruler at that time—set up an image of gold and directed his subjects to worship that image. God had set up His law through His Prophet Moses: "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." Here the law of man clashed with the law of God. Three Israelitish slaves chose to obey God's law and disobey the king's command, and their miraculous escape from death in the fiery furnace is common knowledge. Later, King Darius signed a decree that no subject of his should ask a petition of any other person than himself for thirty days. The penalty for disobedience was the lions' den. Daniel was confronted with the same situation—"Thou shalt have no other God before me." We know the history. Man's law challenged God's law. The latter prevailed, as it inevitably must, and those opposing it paid the penalty of their disobedience. The Apostles Peter and John gave the keynote to all the world: **"But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to harken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."**

Since those early days conditions have changed, customs of the people have changed, laws have changed, but the necessity of observing God's laws remains inexorably fixed. Any attempted change has a fixed penalty attached which MUST be paid.

Some Mormons find justification in ignoring God's laws in the 12th Article of Faith, reading: **"We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law."**

In the first place the Articles of Faith were not given by Revelation; they were written by Joseph Smith for the Press, and obviously could not in their condensed form express the fulness of the Gospel. And in the second place the Articles are co-related—they must stand together. The 12th Article must be read with the 11th, which says: **"We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may."**

In this light the only logical meaning of the 12th Article is that we subject ourselves to earthly "kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates" in honoring and sustaining the law insofar as such laws do not contravene the laws of God. The logic of this is unavoidable. No Latter-day Saint can get by under an agreement to obey the laws of God ONLY as they do not conflict with the laws of man.

Indeed this has been the attitude of the Church from the beginning. Our missionaries have repeatedly broken the local laws and regulations of certain European countries. Thousands of conversions and baptisms have been accomplished under the shades of darkness, near midnight, in order to avoid the consequences of breaking the laws prohibiting such actions. In His instructions to the Apostles to "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost", Christ did not base His instructions upon the permission of the rulers. They are told to do it by the King of kings and the Lord of lords and that was justification enough. They were to do this though it cost them their lives—which it eventually did. But what a fearful price those

rejecting the message of the Apostles have had to pay. And the same applies to our day. The Gospel requirements do not change.

We contend that there is every justification for our legislators to enact measures that shall adequately guarantee religious freedom to every citizen of the State, be he Mormon, "Fundamentalist", Gentile, Jew, Athiest, or what not, so long as in the exercise of their beliefs they do not infringe upon the rights and liberties of other people.

Our appeal to the legislative branch of the Government is in consonance with the advice given by Federal Judge T. Blake Kennedy, in his recent decision in the cases of eight so-called "Fundamentalists" charged with violation of the Mann Act and the "Lindbergh Act", as follows:

> The Mormon Church proper, spoken of in these cases as the "dominant" Mormon Church, still maintains the attitude as expressed by its head in 1890. There was evidently a split in the Church (which is not unusual in all classes of churches) and the adherents of the polygamic doctrine, calling themselves "Fundamentalists" to which the defendants purport to belong, have appeared as not only earnest advocates of polygamy but have practiced it literally. This in a way forces the Court to the unenviable situation of sitting in judgment between factions in a Church fight. * * * While the Courts of the country are always open to appeal of its citizens to the protection of their rights in every respect, yet it must be apparent that the jurisdiction and authority of the courts are limited to a narrow scope. It would seem more logical that the appeal for relief for those who now hold views concerning religious beliefs and practices thereunder should be made to the legislative branches of government for the adoption of laws consistent with their respective doctrines.

Our subject will be continued in the November TRUTH.

"BE ORTHODOX"

It is always pleasing to true Latter-day Saints when evidences of sincerity are manifested by the leaders of the Church. The Church, as the propaganda division of the Priesthood, has a sacred and mighty mission before it, and the nearer the approach to fulfilling its calling the stronger it becomes in the sight of the Lord; at the same time, of course, proportionately loosing world friendships.

Our immediate thoughts are activated by an Editorial in the Church Edition of the Deseret News, August 19, 1944, on the subject, "Be Orthodox". Ortho, from Greek, means straight, right, direct. Orthodox to us signifies correct or sound in doctrine. Holding to the commonly accepted faith, etc. To some, however, the term "orthodox" means to subscribe to the doctrines of the Church as today set forth rather than as they were originally instituted. Still the article, by its wording, evidently intended to express the fundamental principles of the Gospel as established by the founder of the Church, Joseph Smith. We read:

> It is the purpose of the Church to have every child and every adult obtain a full and correct understanding of the doctrines of the restored gospel. To accomplish this purpose, teachers are requested to present the orthodox doctrines of the Church IN THEIR PURITY AND THEIR PLAINNESS, and to make every effort to wipe out doubts and avoid misunderstandings. Instructors should make it a rule * * * to be sure that their lessons are an embodiment of the orthodox teachings of the Church.

And that these "teachings of the Church" must in themselves be fundamental and orthodox with the Gospel as revealed, the article explains, **"The orthodox is that which is given us by revelation."** This definitely fixes the meaning of the term, as we take it, to harmonize with the original revelations given to the Prophet Joseph Smith.

We accept this meaning fully and completely. We have maintained that not one particle of change—not one "jot nor tittle"—may be made in the laws and ordinances of the Gospel as they came to the Church by direct revelation from heaven. And insofar as this is the position of the Church we are in full accord.

In the article mentioned the late President Joseph F. Smith is quoted as saying:

> The first qualification of the teacher is that he be heart and soul a Latter-day Saint. He must believe in and unreservedly accept the doctrines of the Church, * * *.

Doubtless the President in saying "the doctrines of the Church", assumed those doctrines would be unchanged from the original revelations, for he was always a "fundamentalist" in the sense we are using the term. Of late the expression has become more or less common, **"The doctrines of the Church", "The gospel of the Church", "The Priesthood of the Church"**, etc. More properly we should say **"The doctrines of the gospel of Jesus Christ", "The Priesthood of Melchisedek or of God".**

As we have frequently pointed out, the Church changes in its prescribed ordinances "in accordance", as expressed by one of its present leaders, **"with our knowledge and experience".** Doubtless with the primitive church the ordinance of baptism was performed by immersion. The church gradually left the orthodox doctrine and, in an exigency, allowed the baptismal rite to be performed by sprinkling. (See Roberts' Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, p. 147). In time sprinkling became, and is today the orthodox form of baptism; but fundamentally the form is still immersion as the Lord revealed it to Joseph Smith.

True, the Mormon church has not changed the ordinance of baptism as did the Catholics, but other set ordinances have been changed as mentioned in September TRUTH. We have been reprimanded on many occasions by Bishops, Stake Presidents and higher-ups" in the Church for insisting on cleaving to the revelations of the Lord as published in the law book of the Church, the Doctrine and Covenants. These officers, in their chalk and water composition, say, "Forget the Doctrine and Covenants and the Book of Mormon, and follow the living oracles". Because we refused to forget these revelations and insisted on being guided by them, following the so-called "living oracles" only insofar as they followed the revelations of God, we have been excluded from the Church, ostracized and cast out.

A similar situation arises in considering the Editorial in the News of Aug. 26, subject—"An Obligation". Here parents are urged to have their soldier boys get in and keep in touch with their spiritual affiliates located in the different fields of battle. The writer deplores the state of indifference being manifested by both parents and sons in this matter. We quote:

> The home-folks have an obligation in this matter. They should do all they can to encourage their sons and daughters to attend church services as regularly as their duties permit. Their persuasion will carry a great deal more weight if it is known to the young people that the older ones themselves are doing their duty at home, but every person in the service should understand that he cannot shed his religious obligations as he does his civilian clothing.

This, in theory, is good advice. In the work in which those boys are engaged the companionship of the Spirit of the Lord is needed more, if possible, than ever before. But isn't it rather a lame appeal the Church is making, when many of those boys know that their parents have been ostracized by the church at home, branded as impure and denied the privilege of meeting with the membership of the Church—and for what? For insisting on trying to live the Gospel as revealed through

the Prophet Joseph Smith? The Church has not only driven these parents out, but is actually employing its influence and powers to have them placed in the State and Federal prisons, while their children are being pelted with epithets of bastardy for being born in the order of Celestial marriage. True, many of the children of these parents write that they do take advantage of the meeting places of the Latter-day Saints notwithstanding the treatment their parents are receiving at home, and good is derived therefrom. Those who keep themselves aloof from Church activities are doubtless the ones whose faith in the sincerity of the Church is lost. They are not blind to the treatment accorded the class of people we mention, they themselves having witnessed the double dealings of the Church toward this class of its members.

The Church is still the Church of Jesus Christ, but its "forked" actions have lost to it much of the vitality enjoyed in former years, when its leaders were in full harmony and fellowship with the Lord.

We welcome this call to return to "orthodoxy" on the part of the Church and hope the call is genuine. Only by returning to and adhering strictly to the doctrines of the gospel as revealed by the Lord to Joseph Smith in the present dispensation can the Church hope to enjoy the guidance of the Spirit of the Lord.

The Gift of the Holy Ghost is given the Saints to guide them into all truth. If they will not be thus guided but insist on further paganizing their religion, making unauthorized changes in the revealed ordinances of the Gospel, they must continue to wander in the wilderness of doubt and darkness until they are prepared to return to the truth and be truly orthodox.

NATIONAL WASTE

The aftermath of war brings to the nations super problems that the wisdom of man cannot solve. The destruction of human life is horrible beyond the power of expression. But after the supreme sacrifice which leaves its sorrowing marks in millions of homes, peace has her problems. At the present time the Government figures a surplus of war supply left-overs amounting to some one hundred and three billions of dollars. Of this it is figured 15% can be marketed through the regular channels of trade. This leaves an enormous amount of material outside of the range of human consumption, which it may be assumed will be finally disposed of at tremendous losses.

However, whatever may be realized from the sale of these surpluses may be considered "velvet", as it is manufactured to destroy, and better that it should become a total loss than to continue its use in destroying life and property.

A more deplorable situation exists, however, in the wanton destruction, by the government, of property that could well be used by millions of citizens who are in need of it. This destruction of property, during the coming years, if not checked, will amount to an economic crime for which the guilty nations may well be held accountable. The following account of the wholesale waste of valuable household and other goods along the Alcan Highway, as published in the Los Angeles Examiner of July 23rd is in point:

"Large quantities of equipment, intended for use during construction of the Alcan Highway are being deliberately destroyed. B. A. McKelvie, writing from Dawson Creek, B. C., charged that destruction of property is being done with deliberate purpose."

McKelvie, who estimated the value of the equipment being destroyed as

"very large", added:

> **Fires burn night and day, consuming articles that are not only slightly used and still serviceable, but new articles as well. Stoves, ranges, furnaces, many of which never had a fire in them, are cracked with sledges and dumped into the discard, he charged. Crockery, mattresses, sleeping bags, blankets and camp equipment are also destroyed wholesale.**
>
> **Wherever you go in the Peace River block you are told stories of the work of destruction. I visited several of these dumps. At one, some miles out of Ft. St. John, in the dusk of evening, some 200 feet down from the 1000-foot rim of the high bench, it looked like an ant heap.**
>
> **McKelvie said that settlers from miles around had trekked in to salvage what they could from the discard. One farmer with a team and a long line was pulling up brand-new stoves and water heaters for small fees.**

Under an agreement with Canada, it seems, this property, if not used for war projects along the highway, cannot be sold. It must either be returned to the United States or destroyed. "McKelvie said he was told by a business man that at least 600 pounds of sugar was burned in one dump; another said he had salvaged packages of heavy new blankets in their original wrappings that had been destined for one of the dump fires."

It seems to be the fear of some that to place large amounts of such surplus property on the market at prices within the reach of the poor would destroy the economic equilibrium of the nation or community. This is a man-invented fallacy. Standards of living are elastic and their growth or expansion through receiving such surplus property would create markets for other goods. The nation that destroys foodstuffs destroys its own citizenry. To deliberately keep the standard of living at low ebb tends to weaken rather than strengthen the national structure.

Our "New Deal" policy has destroyed much food and other material that, distributed among the needy of this and other nations, would have proved a great blessing. Joseph in Egypt built granaries and other storage facilities to absorb and care for the great surpluses of the groaning earth during the "seven fat years", that the people of his day would not starve during the "lean" years to follow. Oh, for a Joseph today to display some degree of wisdom in the economics of food and industrial production! "Waste not, want not." Deliberate waste will as surely bring want and distress as "sun brings morning".

COURAGE

One of the greatest character attributes is courage; and the greatest of all is MORAL COURAGE. It is a comparatively easy thing to face a gun—many have done it and have been unafraid—but, oh, it is a difficult thing to stand up and fight for one's ideas and ideals in a world that is all too eager to attack both.

Ask the men who have blazed the way for civilization, and they'll tell you that the most dreadful ordeal of all, was the jeering of the crowd.

Sympathy is a nerve tonic. But the man who advances a new idea, gets very little of it.

Convictions aren't hard to acquire. To stand by them isn't quite so easy.

Physical courage is largely a matter of nerves, rather than of nerve. Moral courage goes deep—it is founded on character, faith, the spirit of the conqueror.

My heart goes out to the man who has a better way, who knows he is right and who braves the forces of convention until they give ground and finally bend the knee to his doing.

—Contributed.

Each of us have some special train of thought we dwell upon in solitude. It is these thoughts that mould our character.

A FIRST WIFE SPEAKS

Since the beginning of the present crusade against those charged with living in the Mormon marriage system we have received numerous testimonials from men and women, both in and out of the principle, affirming the position of the so-called "Fundamentalists". A general feeling has existed among opposing monogamists that plural marriage, while quite agreeable to the men folks, works a special hardship upon the female side of the household.

TRUTH has published many testimonials from women of high standing in the community denying this inference, and affirming the fact that the plural marriage arrangement is their choice; affording them, as it does, the opportunity of entering into the glorious "Law of Sarah", and bearing the souls of men both in time and eternity.

We take pleasure in presenting one of these testimonials recently received from a Utah lady whose name, for obvious reasons, is withheld from publ.cation:

Dear Editor:

Today's issue of the Deseret News carried an article entitled "Polygamy Ban Under Attack", in which attorneys for the Defense were quoted as saying: "How can there be a crime when the motive is purity, not impurity; morality, not immorality; marriage, not prostitution; procreation, not debauchery? We defy anyone upon examination of the doctrine of plural marriages as it is practiced, to say such practice is conducive to immorality or injuries to others in their natural or civil rights.."

I, having been a wife under both the system of monogamy and the system of polygamy, say that the attorneys are perfectly correct. I was the only wife of my husband for more than ten years; then he took another, the marriage being solemnized by a man who was called and appointed to that work by one holding high authority in the Church. I feel that because of my personal experience with both these systems of marriage I am in a fair position to judge between them. I say that the conditions and by-laws under which the law of plural marriage is practiced make it not only as pure a system as monogamy, but a purer one, and one that protects rather than harms the rights of woman.

If that statement of honest opinion is not strong enough, permit me to add that because of the inherent inequality of sex nature as between men and women, monogamy (almost without exception to the rule) sinks to the level of **licensed debauchery.** Now, I am not so far removed from touch with popular opinion but what I realize that to a society which crowns monogamy as its ideal of snowy purity, the above statement must sound like the talk of a moron. But I claim that I have brought from my background of personal experience with both systems sufficient evidence to justify my assertion.

"There is a way of life which seemeth good unto man, but the ends thereof are the ends of death." Now, it is quite possible that the prophet who uttered those words did not in his own mind apply them to this subject. Nevertheless, the application of them to monogamous marriage is perfect. Ask any physician to give you a statement of how many cases of miscarriage have come under his care which are treaceable to sexual intercourse perpetrated upon pregnant wives. His answer, if honestly given, would be revealing! Yet this practice of pregnant wife debauchery is the rule rather than the exception under the monogamous marriage system.

On the other hand, consider the fact that polygamy as taught to the priesthood eliminates this evil. For the sake of information I have gone to some trouble to question some of Short Creek's plural wives. I had often heard monogamous wives rail against polygamy in no uncertain terms of intolerance, contempt and hatred, but all these railings seemed like chaff in the wind when compared to the calm statements of these socially ostracized plural wives. To my question they replied

in effect: "Yes, we live the Celestial Law with reference to sexual intercourse. My husband never approaches me sexually when I am pregnant." Then each and all of them added in various ways expressions of disgust at the ordinary monogamous habit of sex indulgence with pregnant wives. Perhaps had their railing sisters of one-wife marriage heard these remarks they would thereafter have failed to feel quite so exemplary and superior!

Even in its barest outline, this embryo and fetus destroying practice is hideous. It is little short of involuntary baby-slaughter. An ugly, unholy picture it makes. Even in the many cases where the act does not result in the death of the unborn child, the evil aftermaths can be numbered by the score. And furthermore, the women who have suffered this experience know the inexpressible sensation of revolt, shrinking and nausea that floods their bodies and souls at such times. Yet the loving, faithful wife submits, usually without protest, because she wants to please her man and keep him loving her alone. Then as the months drag on she is sometimes able to adjust more or less to what she comes to look upon as a duty and necessity. But still, the fact that her finer nature is gradually prostituted to her husband's lust makes the thing no less a debauchery. Even the creatures of the brute kingdom sink to no such level! No wonder the Prophet Isaiah said:

"And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man saying, we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach. In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel. And it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion and he that remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem: when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion."—Isaiah 4:1-4.

I especially wish to avoid becoming too expansive in description of our success in living plural marriage in peace, happiness and love. I would conduct myself very humbly in this matter, acknowledging the hand of the Lord in all things. I do not want to be boastful, and yet I would like to find a way to express the truth about this experience concisely and effectively. I suppose that when the proper method of handling any of life's problems is found and sifted down to fundamentals, our final answer comes out in terms of positive and negative emotions. We must conquer the negative: fear, jealousy, selfishness, envy, malice, hate, covetousness, etc. At the same time we must cultivate that great positive emotion called "LOVE". "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy might, mind and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself. Upon these two hang all the laws and the prophets." Suffice it to say that after the first few months of trial and adjustment, when I really did begin to make headway in eliminating all negative emotions, there came to me an inexpressible feeling of happiness, an actual sensation of spiritual nature, as though a clean strong wind were continually blowing through my soul. I know this is a queer way to describe it, but it is as near as I know how to get to a comparison. From the very beginning unto this day not even a shadow of an unpleasant word has passed between the other lady and myself. Yet we have lived under the same roof all the while, seeing each other many times daily, and the days have lengthened into years. Surely plural marriage is the greatest college of character education that the world affords. I would not sell my experience in it for all the wealth of the earth. I am not ashamed of my connection with polygamy. Instead of feeling ashamed

of it, I would say to those down below me: "Come on up—the air is fine!"

So far as the present leadership of the Church is concerned, perhaps they could not take any other course than the one they have chosen, considering the condition of faith—or rather the condition of lack of faith that they have to deal with. Babies must be fed the milk of the Gospel; to feed them the meat might prove disastrous. And so the right men have been brought forward and installed as their leaders to serve them according to their development. It may be that I am inadvertantly stalling against a more severe judgment here. At any rate, I, a mere woman, do not feel to criticize the authorities of the Church. Let the Lord attend to that Himself by the mouth of His Prophet Isaiah: "As for my people, children are their oppressors and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err and destroy the way of thy path. What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of hosts."—Isaiah 3:12-15.

If President Grant ever does receive a "thus saith the Lord" revelation, I will gladly accept it. But until that time comes, am I to be blamed if I turn the eyes of my faith toward that man who did have direct communication with heaven? Here is the Prophet Joseph's word upon this subject:

"They accuse me of polygamy, and of being a false Prophet, and many other things which I do not now remember; but I am no false Prophet; I am no imposter; I have had no dark revelations; I have had no revelations from the devil; I made no revelations: I have got nothing up of myself. The same God that has thus far dictated me and directed me and strengthened me in this work, gave me this revelation and commandment on celestial and plural marriage, and the same God commanded me to obey it. He said to me that unless I accepted it and introduced it, and practiced it, I, together with my people, would be damned and cut off from this time henceforth. And they say if I do so, they will kill me! Oh, what shall I do? If I do not practice it, I shall be damned with my people. If I do teach it and practice, and urge it, they say they will kill me, and I know they will. But we have got to observe it. It is an ETERNAL principle and was given by way of COMMANDMENT AND NOT BY WAY OF INSTRUCTION."

I thank the God of Israel that I have had the courage to defy all the pressure through fear that both Church and State have had the power to bring upon me to keep me from living the fulness of the law of celestial marriage. I thank Him that I have had the courage to denounce the filth and degradation of monogamous sex life. I desire to testify that never in my life have I experienced a more exalted happiness than I felt that day when I stood up, a third party to my husband's plural marriage ceremony, and taking upon myself the role of Sarah, the great mother of Israel, I spoke to my husband my part in the ceremony: "I, Sarah, take this woman by the right hand and place it in thy right hand, and give her unto thee to be thy legal, lawful wedded wife."

I am a Mormon. I believe in the Gospel of Jesus Christ just as He revealed it to the Prophet Joseph Smith —not a whit taken therefrom. I belong to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and shall continue to belong to it until the authorities of the Church discover that I am living the Gospel in its fulness. Even then, I do not think that they can have my name blotted off the records of heaven; for my conscience is clear.

If they ever succeed in wiping the Fulness of the Law of Celestial Marriage out of my life, they will do it with my life's blood.

ODIUM OF PERSECUTORS

By George Q. Cannon

The manly stand taken by several of the brethren who have been accused of unlawful cohabitation, in explaining their positions in the courts, has called forth the admiration of every unprejudiced man, both "Mormon" and non-"Mormon". The remarks, as they are reported, which they made will live in history and will be read with delight as illustrations of manly courage and a zeal for religious liberty, and for the truth that will be worthy of emulation.

I read with the greatest pleasure the remarks made by Elder John Nicholson, Elder Andrew Smith and Elder Aurelius Miner. With the last Judge Zane entered into controversy, much to his disadvantage, for I think that Brother Aurelius Miner was exceedingly happy in his remarks and that he had altogether the best of the argument. But, of course, argument with a man on the bench who has the power which the judge of the Third District Court has, places a man in an awkward position, for the judge has the last word, and, in addition to that, he can give vent to his malice in a way that is thoroughly conclusive and cuts off all debate in a very summary manner—that is, by sentencing the accused to imprisonment and to fine.

The Latter-day Saints are making history, or, at least, those of them especially who are called to answer to these charges before the courts, and their example will yet be quoted by posterity with admiration.

In the reply of Judge Zane to Brother John Nicholson, he indulged in the usual platitudes about the Hindoo mother, the car of Juggernaut, etc. Did ever any sane man use weaker arguments than these—as though there was the least comparison between the act of the Hindoo mother in casting her child into the Ganges, or in prostrating one's self before the car of Juggernaut and permitting it to roll over one's body! The comparisons are far-fetched and without the least analogy. With just as great propriety a man might compare the ordinance of baptism or the sacrament, or any other ordinance of salvation, as to compare plural marriage with such hideous practices as these. But Zane seems to look upon whatever is said before the U. S. Supreme Court as of far higher importance than anything that the Bible teaches, or any utterance of a holy prophet or apostle, or of the Son of God Himself.

Attorney General Devens used these comparisons in his argument in the Reynolds' case when it was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. They have been a thousand times refuted, and their inappropriateness has been exposed. But, we suppose, men of Zane's calibre will continue to use them so long as there is any need for their use, apparently not having discernment enough to perceive how inapplicable they are to the case under consideration. He shows striking ignorance, also, in quoting what the sages who lived in the days when the Constitution was framed thought about religious liberty. Among others, he quotes the "immortal Jefferson". Now, nothing can be more clearly shown than that Jefferson entertained very different ideas to those which Zane and others—among them, Chief Justice Waite, of the U. S. Supreme Court—attribute to him. To say that Jefferson, or Madison, or any of the strong men of the revolutionary period who contended for religious liberty, only confined that liberty to belief and worship, is to misapprehend entirely and to destroy, also, their views; for they have, in their own writing, made it so plain that there is scarcely room for argument upon the subject—that where religious faiths find expression in acts not inconsistent with the rights of others, they should be permitted, and those who perform them should be protected in

the exercise of their religious liberty.

It is egregious folly for any man to say that belief and worship, as Zane understands these, are the extreme limit of religious liberty. With as great propriety he might say that circumcism is a barbarous practice and that it should not be permitted. There would be much more propriety in assuming that position in regard to the rite of circumcision among that of the Jews than there is in his assumptions concerning plural marriage.

One of the chief charges brought against Jefferson by Dr. Hawks, author of the **Ecclesiastical History of the United States,** is that he aimed a blow at Christianity, because of Jefferson's explanations concerning his motives in framing an act for establishing religious freedom in Virginia. Hawks, in speaking of this act, says it "was viewed by many as utterly subversive, in its declarations, to the Christian religion, and called forth at the time (1785) the severe animadversions of some who still reverenced the faith of the apostles."

Dr. Hawks denounced Jefferson because he did not favor Christianity. He accused him of endeavoring to degrade it "to a level with the creed of Mecca." His reason for this was that Jefferson, in his autobiography, says, in regard to this act of religious liberty that he framed and was successful in having passed through the Virginia Legislature, that he intended the law **"to comprehend within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and Gentile, the Christian and Mohammedan, the Hindoo and infidel of every denomination."**

The Doctor, in his history, argues that it was obviously the dictate of justice, of humanity, and of enlightened policy, to protect these various classes in personal property; but it was not necessary in securing them protection to degrade "Christianity itself to a level with the voluptuousness of Mohammed, or the worship of Juggernaut."

These were Jefferson's views. He intended that if a Mohammedan should come to Virginia, or a Hindoo, or a Jew, or a Gentile, or an infidel of any kind, he should be protected in his belief and the practice flowing from that, in the State. This was the kind of liberty that he advocated—the same kind of liberty that Madison defined in a letter to Edward Livingstone, of New York, giving religion immunity "from civil jurisdiction in every case where it does not trespass upon private right or the public peace." This was Madison's view of the bounds of religious liberty, agreeing with Jefferson, who says, in his notes on Virginia, that "the legislative powers of government extend to such actions only as are injurious to others."

These men had comprehensive views of religious liberty and did not confine it to mere belief and worship alone. Judge Zane talks about "overt acts against society". Jefferson uses the words, **"overt acts against peace and good order."** Now what is there in plural marriage that is antagonistic to peace and good order? Who has been injured by this practice? Has society? Let a comparison be instituted between our society and the society of other communities, and need we shrink from the issue? Has there not been, at least, an equal amount of peace and good order in our communities to that which exists elsewhere? If we take the testimony of unprejudiced men not of our faith, the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the greater degree of peace and good order which we enjoy over communities similarly situated. However much Zane and men of his class may prate about the injury that is done to society by our belief and practice of this principle, God knows, and so does every unprejudiced man know, that such accusa-

tions are false. It is men like himself who have disturbed the peace of society, and who have endeavored to introduce disorder and confusion, and to break up families and destroy peaceful communities.

I suppose, however, it is no use reasoning with such people. We shall have to trust to the logic of events to convince them of their errors. They belong to a class that, if they had lived in the days of Jesus, would have been on the side of the high priests in crying out for the crucifixion of the Savior. If they had lived in the days of pagan Rome they would have applauded most heartily the decrees against the Christians, and would have clamored most loudly for them to be cast into the arena to contend with wild beasts. If they had lived in the days of the Inquisition, when it was popular, they would have been its warmest supporters and advocated the application of torture to its victims. At every time and in every age, and under all circumstances, such men are found on the side of the majority, no matter what the views may be, or how cruel or unholy the policy that might be adopted. Whether, if truth were triumphant, they would have purity enough to advocate, defend or live by it, is very questionable, except so far as it might be profitable to them to join with the majority. The same arguments that Zane uses have been used in every age by the advocates of tyranny, through the mouthings of men who would defend the most atrocious acts of wickedness if only performed under a show of legality or by the authority of the courts of law. But history will pronounce sentence upon him and others like him, and he has acquired an infamous notoriety. Unless he changes, his name will go down to posterity as one of the most odious oppressors of a free people.

In the meantime the true heroes and heroines of the day are consigned to prison. Posterity will view their course with admiration, and contemporaneous history will yet do them justice, because no fair man or woman can fail to perceive that those who submit to such wrongs as our brethren and sisters have done are truly noble.

It would be an easy matter, all must admit, for men and women, if not actuated by the highest motives, to compromise on questions of this kind, especially when the courts are so willing to relieve them from imprisonment if they will comply with its requirements. A man has only to express his willingness to cease living with his wives as such, and he is free. He may make mistresses of them; he may have every kind of association with them except that pure and holy one sanctified by marriage. It is against that relation that the whole force of this persecution is directed.—Juvenile Instructor, 20:326.

A man is a great thing upon the earth and through eternity; but every jot of the greatness of man is unfolded out of woman.—Walt Whitman.

A PERTINENT QUESTION

A TRUTH subscriber asks the question on which our readers may well ponder:

"If a President of the Latter-day Saint Church should become incapacitated, through sickness or otherwise, and not able to function in the affairs of his calling, have his counselors, who are subordinate to the President, a right to take the reins of government of the Church; or should they not step aside and let the Quorum of Twelve take charge? Is it not the duty of this Quorum to take charge of the affairs of the Church when the President ceases to function?"

TESTIMONY IN TONGUES

The reader will have noticed in the sketches of the sisters, both American and foreign, frequent mention of the "gift of tongues." This seems to have been markedly the woman's gift. One of the first who manifested it approvedly was Mother Whitney. She was commanded by the prophet Joseph to rise and sing in the gift of tongues in the early days of Kirtland. She did so, and Joseph pronounced it the "Adamic tongue," or the language spoken by Adam. Parley P. Pratt afterwards gave a written interpretation of it. It was a story, in verse, of Adam blessing his family in "Adam-Ondi-Ahman"—the Garden of Eden in America.

As an instance in which the gift of tongues proved of decidedly practical value, we transcribe the following incident, which occurred near Council Bluffs, in the history of a girl of seventeen by the name of Jane Grover (afterwards Mrs. Stewart), from her journal:

"One morning we thought we would go and gather gooseberries. Father Tanner (as we familiarly called the good patriarchal Elder Nathan Tanner), harnessed a span of horses to a light wagon, and, with two sisters by the name of Lyman, his little granddaughter, and me, started out When we reached the woods we told the old gentleman to go to a house in sight and rest himself while we picked the berries.

"It was not long before the little girl and I strayed some distance from the rest, when suddenly we heard shouts. The little girl thought it was her grandfather, and was about to answer, but I restrained her, thinking it might be Indians. We walked forward until within sight of Father Tanner, when we saw he was running his team around. We thought nothing strange at first, but as we approached we saw Indians gathering around the wagon, whooping and yelling as others came and joined them. We got into the wagon to start when four of the Indians took hold of the wagon wheels to stop the wagon, and two others held the horses by the bits, and another came to take me out of the wagon. I then began to be afraid as well as vexed, and asked Father Tanner to let me get out of the wagon and run for assitance. He said, 'No, poor child; it is too late! I told him they should not take me alive. His face was as white as a sheet. The Indians had commenced to strip him — had taken his watch and handkerchief— and while stripping him, were trying to pull me out of the wagon. I began silently to appeal to my Heavenly Father. While praying and struggling, the spirit of the Almighty fell upon me and I arose with great power; and no tongue can tell my feelings. I was happy as I could be. A few moments before I saw worse than death staring me in the face, and now my hand was raised by the power of God, and I talked to those Indians in their own language. They let go the horses and wagon, and all stood in front of me while I talked to them by the power of God. They bowed their heads and answereed 'Yes,' in a way that made me know what they meant. The little girl and Father Tanner looked on in speechless amazement. I realzied our situation; their calculation was to kill Father Tanner, burn the wagon, and take us women prisoners. This was plainly shown me. When I stopped talking they shook hands with all three of us, and returned all they had taken from Father Tanner, who gave them back the handkerchief, and I gave them berries and crackers. By this time the other two women came up, and we hastened home.

"The Lord gave me a portion of the interpretation of what I had said, which was as follows:

"'I suppose you Indian warriors think you are going to kill us? Don't you know the Great Spirit is watch-

ing you and knows everything in your heart? We have come out here to gather some of our Father's fruit. We have not come to injure you; and if you harm us, or injure one hair of our heads, the Great Spirit shall smite you to the earth, and you shall not have power to breathe another breath. We have been driven from our homes, and so have you; we have come out here to do you good, and not to injure you. We are the Lord's people and so are you; but you must cease your murders and wickedness; the Lord is displeased with it and will not prosper you if you continue in it. You think you own all this land, this timber, this water, all the horses: Why, you do not own one thing on earth, not even the air you breath—it all belongs to the Great Spirit.'"

JUDGMENTS OF GOD

The Lord said to Wilford Woodruff, January 25, 1880:

"Let my Saints search the word of the Lord, and treasure up wisdom and be prepared for that which is to come. As I have decreed, so shall my judgments begin at the House of God. There are those in my Church who have a name among you, who are adulterers and adulteresses, and those who blaspheme my name and those who love and make a lie, and those who revel and drink with the drunken. If they do not speedily repent of this wickedness and abomination they should be severed from the ordinances of my house, saith the Lord. There are many who have need to repent, whose hearts are set upon the things of this world, who aspire to the honors of men, and do not honor the Priesthood, nor seek to build up the Kingdom of God as they should. Neither do they learn and comprehend that the rights of the Priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven, and that the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only upon the principle of righteousness. Such should repent and turn unto the Lord, and seek for the Holy Spirit to guide them. Judgments will begin upon my house, and from thence will they go forth unto the world, and the wicked cannot escape. Blessed are the pure in heart, for my blessings await them in this life and eternal life in the world to come."

SPRING CLEANING

Recently in a large city, an officer of the law found it necessary to enter a large, ancient house where two old brothers had been living in seclusion for more than a generation. He reported that the place was a shambles. Apparently the brothers had never thrown anything away. Old crates, cardboard cartons, string, paper, clothing, even a couple of cars and the remains of a full-sized boat had been kept.

How horrible, you say! All that mess gathering dirt, attracting germs, shutting out light and air, degrading what was once a lovely home.

Do not a great many of us, however, store in our minds all the rubbish of our thoughts?

We know a woman whose home is immaculate. Every corner would pass inspection by the most rigid army officer. But her mind is as cluttered as the old hermits' home, and the accumulation is just as dangerous.

Mentally she is always tripping over dusty, germ-laden, old resentments and insults. Disappointments and criticisms are piled so high they shut the light and air from her soul. Hoarded misunderstandings block the doors, so she cannot escape from her prison.

Our minds need constant spring cleaning if they would be free and immaculate, preferably a daily cleansing rather than an annual upheaval.

Every night before going to bed, let us quietly clear from our minds and thoughts all that is useless, and, if

cherished, dangerous. Release the resentments and jealousies. Add the outmoded misunderstandings to the scrap pile. Leave your mental windows open to the air and sun, the exits free.

Too many nations in the world hoard their jealousies and envies, their hatreds and differences until they become centers of infection—and we have wars.

Americans do less of this than other peoples. Therefore we must guard against any tendency to accumulate useless mental trash, that we may not only preserve liberty and freedom to ourselves but share it with others when peace comes.—Selected.

GOD IS UNCHANGEABLE

Mankind were placed on this earth for a certain purpose, and however erratic, foolish and visionary the course of man may have been, the Almighty has never altered his purpose, never changed his designs nor abrogated his laws; but with one steady, undeviating course from the time the morning stars first sang together for joy, until the earth shall be redeemed from under the curse and every creature in heaven and on earth shall be heard to say: "Blessing and glory, honor and power, might, majesty and dominion be ascribed unto Him who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb forever"; and throughout all the successive ages that have been and that will be, his course is one eternal round.—John Taylor (April 7, 1872) J. of D., 15:23.

MORMON PROVERBS, FROM THE NEW YORK PROPHET

(Times and Seasons, 6:900)

The globe lamp, suspended in the heavens is the best and cheapest light of the world.

A wise man will prefer it to any other, but a fool will sleep while the morning sun shines, and light a lamp when it goes down.

This is like cutting cloth from one end of a piece, and sewing it on the other to make it longer.

He that sleeps when the sun shines, and lights his lamp when it does not, despises the lamp of the Lord, and taxes his eyes and purse for nought.

Industry goes hand in hand with godliness. It is an honor to be an agriculturist, for such was our Father in heaven. He performed the first planting on this earth.

It is good also to be a tailor, for our Father in heaven was the first tailor on this planet.—He made coats for Adam and Eve, when they were young and inexperienced, and thus clothed them.

It is good also, to write, for our Father in heaven was a writer. He wrote with his own finger on the tables of stone.

To build ships, temples and houses, 'tis also godliness, for God was a master workman in all these branches of industry. He gave the pattern of the first ship to Noah; and he was the architect of the tabernacle of Moses, and of the temple of Solomon.

A wise man will pattern after his order; but fools will erect synagogues after the imagination of their own heart.

Great is the mystery of iniquity, and error; but all truth is simple, and easy to be understood.

"Truth is a knowledge of things as they are and were, and are to come."

All truth is independent in its own sphere—its laws are omnipotent, eternal, and unchangeable.

"Intelligence, or the light of truth never was created, neither indeed can be."

Truth is light—light is spirit—spirit is life. Truth, light, spirit, is the law of life and motion, by which all things

are governed, and by which they move and have a being.

Truth will justify.
Truth will purify.
Truth will sanctify.

Truth will exalt man to the throne of heaven and crown him with eternal life and dominion in the presence of Jehovah.

The truth comes to man by means of higher intelligences; by the voice of God—by the ministering angels, and by the Holy Spirit of prophecy and revelation.

In all your gettings, get truth, for this will give you everlasting life, and crown you with riches and honor, which shall never fade away.

IN THE COURTS

In the eleven "Mann Act" and "Lindbergh Act" cases wherein nine alleged members of the so-called "Fundamentalists" were adjudged guilty in the Federal Courts and sentenced to prison terms, Appellants' Brief has been filed with the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit. After the Government files a reply brief the cases will doubtless be argued and decided in their regular course.

The charges, it is clearly shown, grew out of simple "Unlawful Cohabitation" acts relative to polygamous living, and concerning which there is no Federal law applying to the States. Summing up the cases the Brief concludes as follows:

> **The most that may be said of all of the Mann Act cases herein is that they establish the fact that the defendants were guilty of unlawful cohabitation. Since that is an offense against United States law only in the territories (18 U.S.C.A., Sec. 514), where it is punishable by a fine of $300.00 or imprisonment of not more than six months, it here comes exclusively within the jurisdiction of Utah or the other states involved. To raise unlawful cohabitation, which is a misdemeaner, to the enormity of the Mann Act with a sentence of three years, shocks one's sense of justice. The plain truth is: there should never have been an attempt to thrust unlawful cohabitation cases upon the jurisdiction of the Federal Court by trying to pervert a sincere religious practice into "prostitution" and "debauchery". The Federal Court must not be made the instrumentality of vengeance of religious sect upon religious sect; and therefore these cases should be dismissed and the defendants discharged. Their fate in the State Courts is of no concern here.**

In the State Conspiracy cases involving some thirty-four defendants, much time has been spent securing a Jury of eight persons to try the case. These issues are before the Hon. Judge M. J. Bronson of the Third District Court. The taking of testimony began September 26th.

In this case the State prosecutors will endeavor to show a wholesale conspiracy among so-called "Fundamentalists" to not only teach the principle of plural marriage—the Mormon marriage system—but also to commit the overt acts of living in "unlawful cohabitation" against the laws of the State.

FEEDING POTATOES TO COWS

If potatoes are fed in a properly balanced ration they do not dry up cows, as is sometimes believed. They do not contain any significant amounts of vitamins A or D., so this lack should be supplied by feeding well-cured legume or good mixed hay. One hundred pounds of potatoes are worth about 22 to 25 per cent as much as 100 pounds of grain. This crop should be sliced or chopped before feeding to cattle or sheep to make it more palatable and to prevent choking. Potatoes may cause scours, so stock should be accustomed to them gradually. Fed at the rate of 20 to 40 pounds a day, spuds do not effect the flavor of the milk or the odor of milk or butter, but if these dairy products are exposed to an atmosphere heavy with the odor of this crop, the milk and butter readily absorb it. Potatoes should be fed immediately after milking and not before.

HELLO!

(A message from one wife to her sister wife and husband)

I knew you both when first we met
Tho why, I can't explain—
I knew I loved you once before
On a more ethereal plane.
Perhaps we sat on breeze-kissed clouds
And watched the stars at play,
Or walked together—just we three—
Along the "milky way".

Perhaps we took a tourists' trip
Across the heavenly void—
To see the factories of the universe
And the workmen they employed.
Perhaps we saw them build the earth,
Where some day we would dwell—
Just another battle-ground
For the powers of heaven and hell.

Perhaps we planned our life on earth
And chose the friends we'd know,
And on a stage of star-dust
Rehearsed our earthly show.
We knew the world was full of trials,
But these we'd gladly share;
We'd meet the test with eager hearts,
And we'd be happy there.

We'd fight the powers of darkness
And conquer them—we three,
And with our heads uplifted
Walk through eternity:
So now on earth, we meet again—
Hello, dear ones I love!
Let's live our lives as we have planned,
And meet again—above!

IT TAKES SO LITTLE

It takes so little to make us sad;
  Just a slighting word or a doubting sneer,
Just a scornful smile on some lips held dear;
  And our footsteps lag, though the goal seems near,
And we lose the courage and hope we had—
  So little it takes to make us sad.

It takes so little to make us glad;
  Just a cheering clasp of a friendly hand,
Just a word from one who can understand;
  And we finish the task we long had planned,
And we lose the doubt and the fear we had,
  So little it takes to make us glad.

The eyes of other people are the eyes that ruin us. If all but myself were blind, I should want neither fine clothes, fine houses nor fine furniture.—Benjamin Franklin.

PRAYER

All the day thy hand has led me
  And I thank thee for thy care,
Thou hast warmed and clothed and fed me
  Listen to my evening prayer.
Keep me now from every danger,
  Let thine angels guard my bed,
Thou hast nothing but a manger
  Where to lay thine infant head.
Now I close my eyes so weary,
  Fold my arms upon my breast
Praying thee, my God, to bless me
  As I gently sink to rest.

"How shall I a habit break?"
As did that habit make.
As you gathered, you must lose;
As you yielded, now refuse.
Thread by thread the strands we twist
Till they bind us neck and wrist;
Thread by thread the patient hand
Must untwine ere free we stand.
—O'Reiley.

Over the sunlit hills of Time
To distant heights beyond the clouds,
Luring the souls who dare to climb
Above the listless, plodding crowds.

Hearts that are fearless lead the race
To that grand eternal destiny:
Mind that is free outreaches space
Encompassing Infinity.
—Bessie B. Decker.

YOUR REWARD

We must not hope to be mowers
  And to gather ripe, golden ears
Unless we have first been sowers
  And watered the furrows with tears.

Is it not just as we take it,
  This mystical world of ours?
Life's field will yield as we make it—
  A harvest of thorns or of flowers.
—Alice Carey.

TRIAL TREATMENT

Sufferer—I wish I had some drops to cure this toothache.

Friend—It's all a matter of the mind, not medicine. Yesterday I was feeling terrible. But when I went home my wife put her arms around me and kissed me, and consoled me, so that I soon felt better.

Sufferer—You don't say. Is your wife at home now?

REASONING

Teacher—Rastus, why does Missouri stand at the head of the mule raising business in this country?

Little Rastus—I dunno, 'xactly. Must be 'cause de other end am too dangerous.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. NOVEMBER, 1944. No. 6.

Who Are the *Real* Conspirators?

. . *An Editorial* . .

On the morning of March 7th, 1944, near 6 o'clock, Federal F. B. I. agents, U. S. Deputy Marshals, Deputy Sheriffs and City Policemen swooped down upon a group of Utah men and women, arresting some forty-six of them on Federal and State charges of "Conspiracy" and the "Mann and Lindbergh Kidnapping Acts". The F. B. I. agents, without search warrants, proceeded to search the homes and premises of the defendants and confiscate such documents, books, letters and other private papers as they could find and which it was thought might be damaging testimony against the group, none of which, however, as we are informed, was actually used in the trials.

The defendants were incarcerated behind the bars of the County jail. Taken handcuffed through the streets into the Federal court they were placed under heavy bonds; a day was set for their pleas, to hear motions and for the beginning of the trials, the latter date being March 20th. Obviously the thirteen days allowed were far too inadequate to prepare for a proper defense.

While the defendants were in prison they were re-arrested on charges brought under the State statutes, fifteen of them being charged with "Unlawful Cohabitation" and thirty-four with "Conspiracy" to promote the practice of unlawful cohabitation, the former crime being a felony carrying a prison sentence of from one to five years, and the latter being an indictable misdemeanor with a possible sentence of one year in the County jail or a fine of $1000.00.

The Federal charge of conspiracy was based upon an alleged violation of No. 334, Tit. 18 U. S. C. A. (No. 211 Crim. Code) as amended, "which denounces as a crime the mailing of obscene matter", which, in part, reads as follows:

> Every obscene, lewd, or lascivious, and every filthy book, pamphlet, picture, paper,

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

> letter, writing, print, or other publications of an indecent character, * * * is hereby declared to be nonmailable matter * * *. Whoever shall knowingly deposit, or cause to be deposited, for mailing or delivery, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable * * * shall be fined * * *, etc.

It was alleged that the mailing of the TRUTH magazine came under this statute—that the Magazine is **"obscene", "lewd"** and **"lascivious"**. The "Mann Act" cases were based upon a husband traveling from one state to another, in the regular course of business, with his alleged plural wife. The kidnapping cases against three of the defendants resulted from a man taking his intended wife to another state for marriage to give her coming baby legitimacy. The party driving the automobile, and having his wife with him, the two were included in the indictment.

The conspiracy indictment was promptly quashed, while in the "Mann Act" and kidnapping cases the defendants were adjudged guilty and sentenced to prison terms. These cases are on appeal to the Tenth Circuit Court of appeals.

When the arrests were made the leaders of the Mormon Church gave their endorsement of the action, over the signature of the First Presidency, from which we quote the following:

> Since the Manifesto by President Wilford Woodruff was adopted by the Church (on October 6, 1890) the first presidency and other general authorities have repeatedly issued warnings against an apostate group that persisted in the practice of polygamous marriage, illegal both as to the church and the state. Members of the church who have let this warning go unheeded and have violated the rule and doctrines of the church by entering into these illicit relationships have been formally dealt with and excommunicated as rapidly as they could be found out. This is the **extreme punishment** which the church can inflict.
>
> Notwithstanding excommunication, some of these persons have persisted in propagating their false ideas regarding the doctrine of plural marriage. **Their attitude is one of** rebellion against the church. Their activities are unauthorized, illegal and void.
>
> We commend and uphold the federal government in its efforts through the office of the United States district attorney and **assisting agencies** to bring before the bar of justice those who have violated the law.
>
> (Signed)
>
> HEBER J. GRANT
> J. REUBEN CLARK
> DAVID O. McKAY

President Heber J. Grant of the Mormon Church had previously stated over his signature:

"I shall rejoice when the government officials put a few of these polygamists in the county jail or the State penitentiary."

President Anthony W. Ivins who, after the Manifesto of 1890 had been appointed to continue performing plural marriages in Mexico for people whom the Presidency of the Church would send to him (and who performed many such marriages), under date of February 10, 1934, and over his signature, said:

> I know of no people who have been made happy, who have been made prosperous, and whose lives have been made enjoyable because of entering into or advocacy of this principle (of plural marriage) **I expect the time to come when the civil law will enter into this question, making the lives of these people more miserable than they already are,** for that appears to be the only manner in which the system can be stayed. (Brackets ours)

(This of course was a threat and the foreshadowing of Prest. Ivins' anticipated effort to invoke the law upon so-called "Fundamentalists" which he was preparing to do when taken by sudden and unexpected death.)

At the April conference of the Church, 1931, Prest. Heber J. Grant denounced those practicing or upholding plural marriage and placed the membership of the Church under covenant to assist in prosecuting them, using the following language:

> We have been, however, and we are entirely willing **and anxious,** too, that such offenders against the law of the State (those

> sustaining plural marriages) should be dealt with and punished as the law provides. We have been and we are willing to give such legal assistance as we legitimately can in the **criminal prosecution** of such cases. We are willing to go to such limits not only because we regard it as our duty as citizens of the country to assist in the enforcement of the law and the suppression of pretended "plural marriages", but also because we wish to do everything humanly possible to make our attitude toward this matter so clear, definite and unequivocal as to leave no possible doubt of it in the mind of any person. * * * I would like all those in this congregation who feel to sustain this statement that I have read to you to manifest it **as the Apostles and all the General Authorities have done,** by raising their right hands.

The audience was apparently unanimous in sustaining the proposition.

Referring to four arrests of Mormons in 1935, on charges of polygamy, made in Arizona, President Grant said, as quoted in the press: "WE ARE GOING TO SEE THIS THING THROUGH."

Claud Hirchi, President of the Zion Park Stake where these defendants resided, expressed to the County prosecutor, **"Willingness of the High Council and the Stake Presidency to assist in any way possible to bring the accused parties to trial."**

David A. Smith of the Presiding Bishopric stated:

> We feel that it would be a good thing for the government agents to take strong action against the offenders (those arrested in Arizona on the charge of unlawful cohabitation) and make an example of them. * * * Persons using the Church as a cloak for such practices are bringing ill repute to us, **and we are cooperating, wherever possible in obtaining enforcement of the law.**

Elmo Bollinger, Mohave County (Arizona) Attorney, in a press interview, is credited with saying: **"Officials of the regular (Mormon) church, were assisting to bring about the arrest and conviction of polygamists."**

Speaking of John Y. Barlow, one of those arrested, Melvin J. Ballard, a member of the Quorum of Twelve, stated to the Kansas City Times of Novewber 11, 1935:

> He was following his occupation as a farmer last spring, **when the Church authorities urged Arizona officials to act against him and his followers.**

At the trial of these defendants John Y. Barlow was released, the remaining three, Price W. Johnson, I. C. Spencer and Sylvia Spencer, his wife, and the mother of five children, were adjudged guilty and sentenced to from 18 to 24 months in the Arizona penitentiary.

Some four years previously Charles F. Zitting was arrested on the charge of "Unlawful Cohabitation", at the instigation of Dr. James E. Talmage, a member of the Quorum of Twelve, who was known at the time as the official investigator of the Church in these matters. The complaint was signed by City Detective Clayton, an Elder in the Church, at Dr. Talmage's request. The case was dismissed on account of a faulty complaint to the obvious disappointment and chagrin of Dr. Talmage, two Stake Presidents and other members of the Church who were to act as witnesses against defendant Zitting.

In September, 1939, Elders Rich and Fred Jessop, ranching at New Harmony, Utah, were arrested and tried in Washington County on the charge of "Unlawful Cohabitation". In the trial before a Mormon judge, who, soon after the trial was made the President of a Stake, and Mormon jurors, one of the defendants was adjudged guilty and sentenced to prison. The case was subsequently dismissed by the Supreme Court of Utah because of errors committed by the Judge.

In presenting the recent cases in the Federal Court, the assistant prosecutor, John S. Boyden, a Mormon Elder, stated to the Court in justification of his attempt to prosecute the defendants under Federal statutes, that the leaders of the Church had urged him,

since the County and State had failed in attempts to bring convictions, to initiate this series of proceedings.

It will be recalled that under the old statutes unlawful cohabitation was a simple misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed $300 or imprisonment not to exceed six months. It was under this law that Heber J. Grant, then a member of the quorum of Twelve and now President of the Church, confessed guilt of polygamous living and was fined $100. This was in September, 1899, nine years after the Manifesto was issued. In 1906 Joseph F. Smith, President of the Church, was fined $300 for a like offense. No prison sentence was imposed in either case. In 1935 on the alleged advice of the Mormon leaders a law was drafted by Elder Hugh B. Brown, President of the Granite Stake, changing the law from a simple misdemeanor to that of a felony, the latter carrying a sentence of from one to five years in the State penitentiary. This vicious and wholly uncalled for measure was introduced in the Legislature by a Mr. Nicholes, an official of the Mormon Church, and was guided through both houses by a steering committee, comprising, as we are informed, a member of the First Presidency of the Church, a member of the Presiding Bishopric, and the Manager of the Deseret News, the official organ of the Church.

On the witness stand, testifying for the State in the conspiracy cases above mentioned, one Casper Fetzer, testified under oath that he had been appointed by David O. McKay of the First Presidency, to work in conjunction with Bishop Fred E. H. Curtis and others against those defendants and others disclosed that he was to ferrit out these plural marriage cases, reporting the evidence to the Church as the basis for excommunication, and to the Civil authorities to assist in the prosecution of such cases.

It is also disclosed that certain members of the Church were excommunicated for acting as bondsmen for some of the defendants, and that others were reprimanded and threatened with excommunication for so doing. One good sister was severely chided by her Bishop for going on such bonds and was promised, as she explained to the writer, that if she would covenant not to repeat the act, he would renew her recommend to the temple, otherwise she would be "handled".

In an article written by Hugh B. Brown, President of the European Mission and author of the Felony law above referred to, published in Vol. 106, page 795 (July, 1944) of the Millennial Star, an official church publication in England, in an attempt to convince the European Saints that repudiation of the principle of plural marriage by the Mormon church leadership is genuine, this statement occurs:

> Much publicity has been given to the prosecution recently of certain members of a group of apostates who are alleged to be practicing polygamy, but most of the papers have been fair enough to point out that this group is in no way connected with the Church. **The Church has in fact assisted in obtaining the information leading to the indictments, and a "Mormon Elder" is the prosecuting attorney.**

We have given very conclusive steps in this sordid matter hatched by the leaders of the Mormon Church, aided by the City, County, State and Federal authorities. Every member of the leadership of the Church is involved. They obviously have apostatized from the Celestial Marriage covenant. The President of the Church, once convicted of polygamous living and credited with marrying a third plural wife some twenty-five years after the Manifesto, has now reversed his former stand, and is the chief instigator of the persecutions now under way. **Shamelessly** he pursued his brethren whom he knows to be true to their covenants, with the savagery and vindic-

tiveness, all circumstances considered, that savors of all out apostasy.

The law pertaining to Celestial or plural marriage was restored to the Priesthood by the Lord through Joseph Smith in the present dispensation. In that Revelation in introducing the Mormon marriage system, the Lord said:

> 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; for all who will have a blessing at my hands shall abide the law which was appointed for that blessing, and the conditions thereof, as were instituted from before the foundation of the world; and as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory; and he that receiveth a fulness thereof must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord.—D. & C., 132:4-6.

This is a Revelation from God on a subject which Brigham Young characterized as being the "fulness of the Gospel". Joseph Smith said:

> O ye Twelve! and **all Saints!** profit by this important key—that in all your trials, troubles, temptations, afflictions, bonds, imprisonments and death, **see to it,** that you do not betray heaven; that you do not betray Jesus Christ; that you do not betray the brethren; that you do not betray the **Revelations of God;** whether in the Bible, Book of Mormon or Doctrine and Covenants, or any other that ever was or will be given and revealed unto man in this world or that which is to come. Yea, in all your kickings and flounderings, see to it that you do not this thing, **lest innocent blood be found on your skirts, and you go down to hell.**—His. of Church, 3:885.

The Prophet Heber C. Kimball said:

> You might as well deny Mormonism, and turn away from it, as to oppose the plurality of wives. Let **the Presidency of this Church,** and the **Twelve Apostles,** and **all the authorities** unite and say with one voice that they will oppose that doctrine, and the **whole of them would be damned.**—J. of D., 5:203.

Obviously the "whole" of them have and are now opposing that doctrine with the "Revelations of God", and Heber C. Kimball was a true Prophet of God.

Brigham Young said:

> Why do we believe in and practice polygamy? Because the Lord introduced it to His servants in a revelation to Joseph Smith, and the Lord's servants have always practiced it. And is that **religion popular in** heaven? It is the **only popular religion there,** for this is the religion of Abraham, and unless we do the works of Abraham, we are not Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise.—J. of D., 9:322.

The Prophet John Taylor said:

> We are not ashamed to proclaim to this great nation, to rulers and people, to the President, Senators, legislators, judges; to high and low, rich and poor, priests and people, that we are firm, conscientious believers in polygamy, and that it is part and parcel of our religious creed.—Life of John Taylor, p. 255.

As we have shown the whole leadership of the Church is opposing this principle of exaltation. They neither have the manhood to live it themselves, nor will they tolerate its being lived by others, if they have their way. On this point the Lord told His Saints through His Prophet, Wilford Woodruff:

> As I, the Lord, have spoken, so will I fulfill. * * * As I, the Lord, have suffered, so will I put all enemies under my feet. For I the Lord utter my word and it shall be obeyed. And the day of wrath and indignation shall come upon the wicked. And I say again, **woe unto that nation, or house or people who seek to hinder my people from obeying the Patriarchal Law of Abraham, which leadeth to a Celestial Glory,** which has been given unto my Saints through the mouth of my servant Joseph, for whosoever doeth these things **shall be damned,** saith the Lord of Hosts, **and shall be broken up and wasted away from under Heaven by the judgments which I have sent forth, and which shall not return unto me void.** — Supplement to New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, p. 46.

God's leader and Prophet, Lorenzo Snow, as he was about to be sentenced to serve time in the penitentiary for unlawful cohabitation, said:

> Respecting the doctrine of plural or celestial marriage * * * it was revealed to me, and afterwards in 1843, fully explained to me by Joseph Smith, the Prophet. **I married my wives because God commanded it.** The ceremony which united us for time and eternity was performed by a servant of God having authority. God being my helper I would prefer to die a thousand deaths than renounce my wives and violate these sacred obligations. Though I go to prison God will not change His law of Celestial marriage. **But the man, the people, the nation, that oppose and fight against this doctrine and the Church of God will be overthrown.**—Mill. Star, 48:110-111.

Respecting the far-reaching effect of this law of marriage, the Lord's Prophet and leader, Joseph F. Smith, proclaimed that the Savior, himself, lived the law. He said:

> Jesus Christ never omitted the fulfillment of a single law that God has made known for the salvation of the children of men. It would not have done for him to have come and obeyed one law and neglected or rejected another. **He could not consistently do that and say to mankind, follow me.**—Mill. Star, 62:97.

Jesus Christ made known the patriarchal law of marriage to His people, and hence He must have lived that law. (D. & C., 131-132).

Some of the Saints in their shallow faith figure the law has accomplished its purpose and is no longer binding upon them. But the Lord told John Taylor in September, 1886, that **He had not revoked the law, NOR WOULD HE, because it was eternal, and he could not revoke an eternal law.**

At the Special Conference of the Church, August, 1852, when the law was received by the Church, President Brigham Young said:

> The principle spoken upon by Brother Pratt this morning (principle of plural marriage), 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. * * * The world have known, long ago, even in Brother Joseph's days, that he had more wives than one. One of the Senators in Congress, knew it very well. Did he oppose it? No! But he has been our friend all the day long, especially upon that subject. * * * He said, "Joseph has introduced the best plan for restoring and establishing strength and long life among men, of any man on the earth; and the Mormons are a very good and virtuous people."

———

Should there yet be doubt in the minds of our readers that the present leaders of the Church are at the bottom of the vicious and unholy crusade against members of the Church who insist on being guided in their spiritual concepts by the revelations of the Lord, we need but cite the fact that notwithstanding the defense was prevented from getting the true situation before the jury in the recent conspiracy trial, at the close of the case Mark E. Petersen, a member of the Quorum of Twelve and former Manager of the Deseret News, gave a written statement to the "United Press" agency for "outside" consumption only. The information was not to appear in the Salt Lake papers. It was doubtless felt by the leaders of the Church that if presented to the public through the local press the vicious falsehoods and unwarranted implications the statement carries would be challenged in the columns of TRUTH and properly denounced by the public as indecent and underhanded.

The time has come when the people should know the depths to which the leaders of the Church will sink in order to put their determination over and make their present crusade against an innocent group of people successful. Their hypocrisy should be bared to the world. The statement presented to the United Press by the Church through its representative, Mark E. Petersen, elicited the following news items published in the Ogden Standard-Examiner of October 7th:

MORMONS TO HUNT OUT CULTISTS

> Meanwhile, the Mormon church, which has been ex-communicating polygamists ever

since the 1890 manifesto, revealed that it had appointed investigators to "search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution."

The most recently appointed Mormon apostle, Mark E. Petersen, said that the term, "Fundamentalists" was incorrect, "since the fundamental doctrines of the church are now opposed to polygamy." He added that "some sect members were recruited from various Protestant faiths" and that "we are now beginning to get the blame for this mess."

Quoting further from Mr. Petersen's written statement to the United Press:

Among witnesses for the prosecution are men who have been appointed by the Church to search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution for their use; **these men have also been appointed by the Church to do all they can to fight the spread of polygamy.**

Mr. Petersen stated that the title, "Fundamentalists", is misapplied to the defendants, claiming "the fundamental doctrines of the Church are now opposed to polygamy".

The word "NOW" infers that the Church has not always been opposed to polygamy, or more properly, to plural marriage under the Celestial order. Mr. Petersen, however, should hark back to the statement of his chief, J. Reuben Clark, to the effect that **"the fundamental principles of the Gospel are immutable—they never change"**. He should weigh with care the statement of Joseph Fielding Smith, Church Historian and member of the Quorum of Twelve, that **"Plural marriage is one of those irrevocable and unchangeable laws of the Gospel, but the Church is not teaching it now."**

If the doctrine is immutable, if it is "irrevocable and unchangeable" it is as fundamentally true today as it was when first revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith. One is at a loss to understand the higgledy-piggledy state of Mr. Petersen's mind. Has the new position he occupies in the Church gone to his head—or is it the heat of the ninety-three dry spell days we have just passed through that has undermined his reason? Quite recently, while speaking to the Saints in the Yale Ward, he is reported to have exclaimed with great pomposity: **"I want you people to know that every word the Apostles say is the word of the Lord! I repeat: EVERY WORD that the Apostles say is the word of the Lord!"**

Of course under this new doctrine of Mr. Petersen's, perhaps the fundamental doctrines of the Church have changed, and perhaps it is also true that **black is white** and that the **waters of Great Salt Lake are not salty.** But we cannot comprehend it.

The real conspiracy, as we conceive it to be, and in which some of the Federal and State authorities are involved, was to make a wholesale arrest, confiscate the records of the defendants to be used as evidence against them, place them under heavy bonds which it was thought they could not raise, force them into an early trial without proper legal help, convict them (they would be too poor to appeal their cases) and scatter them into the Federal and State prisons within thirty days' time. Federal Judge Tillman D. Johnson was adamant in his determination that no delay be tolerated in the trial of the defendants.

On March 8th, the day following the arrests, the Deseret News published a photograph showing the Judge with the Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, John S. Boyden, in the absence of defendants' counsel, conferring on matters pertaining to the case. The picture carried this caption:

"He prepared for one of most difficult and extensive criminal trials of his long career. Eighty-seven year old Federal Judge Tillman D. Johnson confers with Assistant U. S. District Attorney John S. Boyden on matters in the polygamy case before him."

Confronted with an affidavit and motion for disqualification the aged jurist disqualified himself as trial judge. This accomplished the first delay in the cases and gave defendants more time to prepare their defense.

Judge J. Foster Symes of Denver was appointed to handle the Conspiracy cases, involving the mailing of the TRUTH magazine. He promptly quashed the indictments, turning the defendants free from that charge. Judge T. Blake Kennedy of Cheyenne was appointed to dispose of the "Mann Act" and kidnapping cases.

In the State conspiracy cases set for hearing before Judge Ray Van Cott, Jr., the jurist, at the request of the defendants and after a hearing before the Supreme Court of Utah, withdrew from the case. A photograph showing him in consultation over matters pertaining to the case, with Federal Asst. Prosecutor Boyden and State Prosecutor Brigham E. Roberts, published in the Deseret News of August 16th, much like the Johnson photo episode, may have been a factor in causing the Judge's withdrawal. This move delayed the conspiracy trial until the October term of court, when it was assigned to Judge M. J. Bronson's division.

The defendants' contention that since the Mormon Church had taken such a prominent part in bringing about their arrest and prosecution, no Mormon in good standing in the Church should sit as a juror in the trial, was overruled by the court; and after hearing the evidence the jury comprising five Mormons and three non-Mormons found the defendants guilty. A motion for a new trial is pending.

The leading brethren have gotten themselves into this "MESS" as Mr. Petersen terms it in his message to the United Press, and each move they make sinks them deeper into the villainy of the situation. Deceitfulness and hate characterize their actions in this persecution. Pity that the leaders had not long ago given heed to the solemn message contained in the Book of Mormon:

> **Now there was a strict law among the people of the Church, that there should not any man, belonging to the church, arise and persecute those that did not belong to the church, and that there should be no persecution among themselves.—Alma 1:21.**

UNITY AND THE FUNDAMENTALS

"Appeals for unity and a return to fundamentals of the Gospel in its simplicity" was the keynote of the conference instructions. President J. Reuben Clark is quoted particularly as stressing this doctrine. He is credited with saying:

> Brethren, if this church is to grow as the Lord wants it to, if the people are to become as righteous in their living as the Lord wants them to become, there must be unity in the Church. It will not do for presidencies of stakes, bishoprics of wards or heads of auxiliary organizations and priesthood quorums to go off on their own. If we are to move forward we must move together.

To this very sound thought President Clark added:

> We are beginning to fall along the lines of the early Christian church. So long as it was persecuted from without it was strengthened, but when its foes attacked from within it disintegrated. There is creeping into our midst—I warn you about it and ask you to meet it—a great host of sectarian doctrine that has no place in it.

This is verily true. For a long time the leaders of the Church, in their frenzied efforts to make friends of Babylon, have been straying from the simple fundamentals of the Gospel. Many of the principles as established by the Prophet Joseph Smith have been ruthlessly changed or entirely repudiated. Temple ordinances are tampered with, the garments of the Holy Priesthood are being abandoned and the Celestial order of marriage is repudiated. Cer-

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. NOVEMBER, 1944. No. 6.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

JESUS said, "If it be possible, let this cup pass". But it was not possible; for to have done so would have been a violation of the law, and he had to take it. The atonement must be made, a God must be sacrificed. NO POWER CAN RESIST A LAW OF GOD. It is omnipresent, omnipotent, exists everywhere, in all things, through all things and around about all things.—John Taylor.

tainly there can be no unity while these things are going on. President David O. McKay is quoted as saying, **"The Church has gone on a short detour, but it will eventually come back."**

The present call to return to fundamentals is suggestive, but we remind the Saints, as desirable as that course may be, it will not be an easy task to accomplish. The present generation has been sectarianized into the new order of things. The changes in the gospel plan have come from the leaders—often times, to be sure, in appeasement of the restless desire and demand of many of the Saints for a loosening up of gospel requirements to meet changing social conditions. The masses of the Saints have fallen into the trap of Satan with a sense of ease and comfort that will be difficult to overcome. After years of training along these lines it will not be easy for the Saints to forego their worldly habits and take upon themselves the whole yoke of Christ, accepting the truth as expressed by the Apostle Paul, **"Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus SHALL suffer persecution."**

The President stated, as reported, "The principles of the Gospel are simple. We have them from the lips of our prophets and leaders of our Church, from Joseph Smith down to and including the present leaders. We make a mistake if we try to harmonize our simple beliefs with the sectarian doctrines and philosophies."

This is all very well to talk about, but have not the "present leaders" permitted the changes mentioned? Was it not one of our "present leaders" who proclaimed from the tabernacle pulpit, without being corrected:

"I hold it entirely compatible with the genius of the Church to change its form of procedure, customs and OR-

DINANCES in accordance with our own knowledge and experience?''

If the ordinances may be changed by the leaders of the Church how can we expect the rank and file to remain true to the revealed word when the social, political and business conditions seem to warrant changes?

The President said further that **''we must not 'liberalize' our teachings. We must accept them as God gave them to us and there must be among the Church a unity in the faith.''**

We have been contending for this return to unity in the columns of TRUTH for the past ten years. It goes without saying that in the absence of unity there can be no victory in Christ. But to achieve unity there must be a consistent adherence to the full Gospel, and side-stepping it must cease. It is for the leaders to take the initiative in the matter. They should acknowledge their past wanderings and give the Saints a true leadership back to the simple principles of the Gospel as revealed by the Lord.

''God! how I hate prejudice!'' said Elder J. Golden Kimball on one occasion. ''A man who is prejudiced cannot be just.'' This is a worthy key for the Saints and leaders alike to follow. Let Zion's Generals pluck from their feelings all semblance of prejudice, clothe themselves with the mantle of justice tempered with mercy, become one in serving the Lord, even at the cost of financial ruin and world friendships, when necessary, and the Lord can and will come out of His hiding place and scatter the enemy to the four winds.

It will be in vain for the leaders to cry ''unity'' and urge the return to the ''simple fundamentals'', unless they are willing to take the lead in this very difficult task which will be opposed by all the powers of Satan. But the results to be achieved will fully justify the effort.

THE PROPHET JOHN TAYLOR

November 1st marks the 136th anniversary of the birth in mortality of the Prophet John Taylor, who died in exile July 25th, 1887. President Taylor was the kind that never stumbled; he never wavered in his support of every principle of the Gospel. He faced death on many occasions for supporting the principles of life and salvation, but he never backed down nor did his knees tremble.

Brigham Young who was succeeded in the Presidency of the Church by John Taylor, said of this great man:

> With regard to Brother John Taylor, I will say that he has one of the strongest intellects that can be found. He is a powerful man, and we may say that he is a powerful editor. But I will use a term to suit myself and say that he is one of the strongest editors that ever wrote.

His writings on all phases of the Gospel are clear, forceful and, to our minds, faultless. He was a capable champion of the right and never faltered in his defense of it. At the Martyrdom of the Prophets Joseph and Hyrum Smith in Carthage jail, June 27, 1844, John Taylor was a voluntary prisoner with the martyrs, receiving four balls in his body, a fifth one meant by nature to be fatal struck his watch in his vest pocket and was deflected. Two sentences spoken by President Taylor testify to his immovable nature: **''There are two things I have always said I would do, and I mean to carry them out, living or dying. One is to vote for whom I please and the other to worship God as I please.''**

The current issue of TRUTH carries several articles written or spoken by President Taylor, which somewhat reflect the broad range of thought which he covered in his earthly ministry. The life of this mighty exponent of truth must be an inspiration to all that part of Zion that are bent on accepting and living the Gospel in its fulness.

We knew John Taylor in the early eighties and are proud of those too brief contacts with him. However, the majesty of his person and spirit, with his golden counsels linger in our memories as a beacon light guiding, though perhaps falteringly, our footsteps in the path which he blazed for the Saints to tread.

STAMP OUT THE SOURCE OF IT

In his peroration before the Jury in the recent so-called "Fundamentalists" cases, State Prosecutor Brigham E. Roberts enunciated the philosophy that when the law of God and the law of the land conflict, we must adhere to the law of the land. Otherwise, he proclaimed, **"We will have chaos and anarchy. This is a government of laws", he said, "and they must be enforced."** Speaking of the principle of plural marriage the prosecutor said, **"The source MUST be stamped out and a verdict of guilty returned."**

The law of the land in England in the seventeenth century was invoked in the case of Dr. Leighton, who was charged with sowing sedition against the state church. This sentence was given him:

> That he be committed to the prison of the Fleet for life, and pay a fine of ten thousand pounds; that the High Commission should degrade him from his ministry; and that he should be brought to the pillory at Westminster while the court was sitting and be publicly whipped; after whipping be set upon a pillory a convenient time and have one of his ears cut off, one side of his nose split, and be branded in the face with a double S. S. for a sower of sedition; and then he should be carried back to prison, and after a few days be pilloried a second time in Cheapside, and have the other side fo his nose split and his other ear cut off, then be shut up in close prison for the rest of his life.—Roger Williams.—Longacre, p. 48.

Had Mr. Roberts been the prosecuting attorney in that day would he have invoked such a sentence? It was the law of the land, mind you! Dr. Leighton was contending for religious liberty—for nothing else.

Does Mr. Roberts forget that God, the builder of the earth and the organizer of man is supreme? Why should not the law of God take precedence over human law?

"But", says one, "how do we know that it is the law of God?" That is where conscience asserts itself. Men are expected to worship God in accordance with their consciences, provided that such worship does not infringe the rights of others. In such restrictions no harm can be done. If a person wants to worship a golden calf, give adoration to the sacred cow of India, marry two women or adhere to the strict law of monogamy or celibacy, whose right is it to say him nay? He interferes with no other human's rights. Why should law or society interfere with him?

And so we contend this is a question for the Legislature. The rights of man should be carefully safeguarded. Archaic laws should be ruled out. It should not be forgotten that Utah was built up by a polygamous people; its forbidding wastes were conquered by this species of human lawbreakers. The leading men and women of Utah today are the offspring of Mormon polygamy. As a rule they are proud of their birthright. Even the grandfather of the prosecuting Attorney that bore down so heavily on the defense was a leading polygamist. He was elected by the citizenry to represent Utah in Congress. For years he was Assistant Historian of the Church and perhaps was the foremost champion, in his day, of this Mormon order of marriage. He was an honorable man and greatly beloved by his native Utahns.

The question is not what certain society thinks of polygamy or plural marriage, but should the law be permitted to invade the right of woman to honorable motherhood by the man of her choice. What man has the right

to declare that woman shall not taste the sweetness of motherhood? Is it right for man to enjoy the social elixer of life with childless mistresses without let or hindrance while woman is deprived of the glories of motherhood? So says the law of the land or, at least, the administration of the law. Is it not up to the Legislators to correct the law equalizing it to the good of both male and female?

Mr. Roberts used the hackneyed argument that a man may commit murder in the name of religion, but such could not be tolerated among a law-abiding people. He compares murder with motherhood. Astute as he is he must know there is a grave difference in the two situations; one giving life while the other destroys it. No third person is injured in the case of motherhood. Surely the prosecuting attorney can discern the difference between murder and motherhood!

INFANTICIDE

By John Taylor

Journalists are ready to condemn the primitive law of "plurality of wives" because at present it is popular to do so, and at the same time record the workings and results of monogamy as natural consequences or results for which there is no responsibility. Let such things as we are about to relate transpire in a community of polygamists, and how readily would their system have to father it, especially if they were Mormons, and we should not blame the accusers; for we believe that such things are a stench in the nostrils of the Almighty, and sooner or later will meet their just reward.

One contemporary says:

> But few are aware of the extent of child murder in this city. The number of still-born is truly frightful even if we take the city inspector's report as to what that number is. But not more than one-half of the cases of this character find their way into that report. What is the cause of so much child murder in this city? We have practiced abortionists by the score, males and females, who obtain a living by murder. Also, the mother in hundreds of instances, terminates the life of her offspring.

From the Times we extract the following:

> Take the case of a fallen woman; no matter how she fell; by her strong affection, by her evil education, by the choice between that state and starvation, by trusting to promises of marriage, or, frequent, perhaps, as any, by the grossness of a corrupt husband; let her fall by any of these, and her fate is almost always the same. Man and woman treat her with the same cruelty. She is to both an outlaw, to the woman an object of loathing and abhorence which eloquence cannot conquer, nor prayer soften, nor reason convince. The moment that her sin is discovered, she becomes the wehr wolf of female society, for whom mercy were an error, forgiveness and restoration impossible things. Some sisters banish her for her sins, some for her breach of that eleventh commandment, so powerful in society, "thou shalt not be found out".

Men are divided. A few are practically, more are, theoretically disposed to be gentle with the poor soul, not to destroy her utterly, but, if it were possible, to restore her. Others have only for her fierce anger and pitiless, stern rebuke, and loud outspoken condemnation, which may result from extreme holiness, and which may not. But, unfortunately, there is another class of men, who see in these poor fallen ones only the servants of their unhallowed passions, who gloat over the record of every new sin committed, who rejoice over every fresh exile of society that come to recruit the ranks of unfortunate women. And these are precisely the men into whose association the fate of the world has consigned these women. Nor is this class a small one; they are found in the drawing room and the ball room, at the watering places and in the hotels. We have seen them, keen-scented, merciless, fearless, unspairingly cruel, hunting some lone woman as jackals hunt an antelope over the sands.

See, then, what the woman's case is, and wonder what it is that has taught

the world that when two people commit the same sin, one shall be received into favor again and the other remorselessly driven to destruction. Why the favored one should be the strong, the irresponsible, the cooler, calmer of the two; and the one to be rejected and accused, the more loving, more frail, more trustful, the utterly defenseless one, the only brave one; for the man may escape discovery through a life time, but the maternity betrays woman. And in those words "unwedded maternity", lie the fearful sources of abortion and other child murder.

The unmarried mother sees before her such an endless perspective of horrors that she can forget the offspring even of her own body. She knows, that once discovered, she can see the face of innocent or undiscovered woman no more, that she must go forth with the father of her child until he tires of her, must be passed off then to another, must result in the brothel, and so sink lower and lower, day by day, until the curtains of the hospital bed shall be drawn, and her tainted, unlovely body be carried to its nameless grave in the Potter's field. She knows, too, that while she takes this fast descent, he is waltzing with the pure, pressing the hands of the respectable, taking wine with her former equal at the table of wealth. And so she flies, sometimes to suicide, sometimes to this monstrous infanticide.

A woman sins no more than the partner of her guilt—in most cases infinitely less. Let the virtuous world keep a bolt or two for him, out of the abundant lightnings wherewith it blasts her. Expel him from the society of good women; drive him to the companionship suited to his infamy; or if you persist in saying only of him, "he has been a little wild", say only of her, "she has been a little wild", and there let the matter end. If he is yet a fit partner for your daughter, then she, by immutable fairness, is a fit wife for your son. Get at this root which grows from long cherished routine of thought, and as the two have sinned alike, punish them both or forgive them both; have for both equal mercy, equal good nature, equal condemnation; above all, equal justice.—"The Mormon", October 20, 1855.

THE CONSTITUTION AN INSPIRED DOCUMENT

DISCOURSE BY
PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR
Delivered at the General Conference, Held in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, October 6th, 1879.

The Work of God Cannot Be Hindered—the United States to Be Afflicted by Judgment—Perescution Cannot Settle a Question Permanently.

I have been interested in listening to the remarks of the brethren this afternoon, and I am thankful to find **that good old-fashioned Mormonism**, or Latter-day-Saintism is not altogether dead yet—that there is a little of it living in the bosoms of the Saints, in our speakers, and in those who hear.

The Methodists, you know, used to have a prayer to the effect that "His Spirit might pass from heart to heart as oil passes from vessel to vessel", and I have thought that that kind of a spirit has been exhibited more or less here today, whether we have any Methodists among us or not.

We have come here, as has been stated, to worship Almighty God in accordance with his commands. Most of this congregation were good citizens before they came here. Some are from the various parts of Europe and from other parts of the earth, and a great many from different parts of the United States. They are good citizens and observed the laws of the land to which they belonged. **They have observed every law of the United States, except one that was made on purpose**

to make them disobey God, and therefore, so far as political affairs are concerned, and the duties pertaining to citizens of the United States, they have been maintained in their integrity up to the present time.

I remember being asked in a court here some three or four years ago—I do not remember the time precisely, but the court seemed to be very fond of interfering with religious matters, it was not always so; but I suppose civilization has extended—**I was asked, "Do you believe in obeying the laws of the United States?" "Yes I do, in all except one"—in fact I had not not broken that." "What law is that?" "The law in relation to polygamy." "Well, why do you except that one?" "Because", I replied, "it is at variance with the genius and spirit of our institution; because it is at variance with the Constitution of the United States; and because it is in violation of the law of God to me."** The United States Supreme Court, however, since that time has made it a law of the land, that is, it has sanctioned it; it was not sanctioned at that time, that question was not then decided.

We are here today, gathered together according to the word and law of God and the commandments of God to us. "Gather my Saints together unto me", says one of the old prophets, "those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." "I will take you", says another, "one of a city and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion, and I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding."

Now, the servants of God in these last days have been sent out as they were in former days to gather the people, and the Lord has given us this law—the law of polygamy—among other things, and I know it before God and can bear testimony of it, if nobody else knows it. I know that it came from God, and that God is its author. But there are hundreds and thousands of others who have a knowledge of the same thing; but I speak of it in this wise to testify before God, angels and men, before this nation and all other nations that it came from God. That is the reason that I speak of it, that I may bear my testimony to you and to the nations of the earth.

Now, then, about the results of it; that is with God and with the people. It is for us to do the will of God; it is for the Lord to bring about the results in his own way. But one thing I can assure all men, in the name of Israel's God, that neither this nation, nor any other nation, can do anything against the truth, but for the truth. Do their very best, help themselves as they may, they cannot help themselves in regard to these matters, for the Lord will say unto them, as he did unto the waves of the mighty ocean, **"Hitherto shalt thou come but no further: and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."** Now, that is how the thing is. The prophet in another place says, **"Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain."** He will manage the other. He will put a hook in the jaws of men and of nations, and lead them just as he pleases. They are in his hands.

Need we be surprised that people should feel inimical to the Gospel of Jesus Christ? No. Need we be surprised that men, as the scriptures say, "should wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived?" No. We have preached it—I have preached it upwards of forty years in this nation and in other nations. Need we be surprised that they should trample under foot the Constitution of the United States? No; Joseph Smith told us that they would do it. Many around me here knew it long ago that they would do this thing and further knew that the last people that should be found to rally around that sacred instrument

and save it from the grasp of unrighteous men would be the Elders of Israel! When, therefore, we see these things progressing need we be astonished? I do not think we need be.

Some of our people you know, who are a little shaky and get how? Why a little astride of the fence and say, "good Lord and good devil", not knowing into whose hands they will fall; when they see some of these things transpiring they are filled with amazement; but men who understand themselves, and who are in possession of the gift of the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of the living God, are looking for such things and they are not at all surprised.

Were we surprised when the last terrible war took place here in the United States? No; good Latter-day Saints were not; for they had been told about it. Joseph Smith had told them where it would start, that it should be a terrible time of bloodshed and that it should start in South Carolina. But I tell you today the end is not yet. **You will see worse things than that, for God will lay his hand upon this nation, and they will feel it more terribly than ever they have done before; there will be more bloodshed, more ruin, more devastation than ever they have seen before. Write it down! You will see it come to pass; it is only just starting in.** And would you feel to rejoice? No; I would feel sorry.

I knew very well myself when this last war was commencing, and could have wept and did weep, over this nation; but there is yet to come a sound of war, trouble and distress, in which brother will be arrayed against brother, father against son, son against father, a scene of desolation and destruction that will permeate our land until it will be a vexation to hear the report thereof. Would you help to bring it about? No, I would not; I would stop it if I could. I would pour in the oil and the wine and balm and try to lead people in the right path that will be governed by it, but they won't. Our Elders would do the same, and we are sending them forth doing all that we can, selecting the very best men we can put our hands upon—men of faith, men of honor, men of integrity—to go forth to preach the Gospel to this nation and to other nations. And how do they receive them? Not long ago they killed one and mobbed others. Well, we cannot help that. They are in the dark; they do not realize the position they occupy; they know not what spirit they are of. But it is our duty to have our bowels full of compassion extended to them, to send forth the message of life.

But when our Elders go among these people they have to take their lives in their hands and trust in the living God. Nevertheless, we need not be afraid, we need not be troubled about any of these matters. **"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."** Yea, I say unto you, fear Him; and we feel today, while we would submit to every ordinance of man that is just, equitable and right, observe every law and interfere with no man's rights, we are not ignorant of the fact that it is unjust for legislatures and courts to make and enforce laws to entrap and destroy us; that a magnanimous and just government would protect all its citizens; but we feel, at the same time, that the Lord is our God, the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King, and He shall rule over us; and all that feel like saying that, say Amen. (The vast congregation responded, "Amen".)

It is an historic fact, written in letters as of living fire, that neither nations, peoples, emperors, kings, or presidents, nor the combined powers of the earth, are able to regulate the conscience or change the faith of man.

Noah maintained his faith alone, as against that of a world. Abraham could not be swerved by the most unnatural and forbidding circumstances. Moses, at the behest of God, alone withstood the power of Egypt's king and nation. Daniel unflinchingly bowed his knee to Israel's God, in the face of a prohibitory regal decree, passed by the intrigues of the combined powers of the kingdom of Babylon, who were his enemies. Job, when tried, maintained his inegrity, even as against God, and said, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him"; and he further said, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he will stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."

The three Hebrew children could not be made to bow to the image set up by the King of Babylon; but rather than deny their faith chose the penalty of the fiery furnace, in which they walked accompanied by the Son of God.

Jesus came to do the will of His Father, and though in doing it he sweat great drops of blood, and begged of his Father to let the cup pass if possible, yet "not my will", he said, "but thine be done"; and when groaning in mortal agony he cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And though he could have commanded twelve legions of angels, who would have obeyed him, yet in obedience to the mandate of his Father, he quietly said, "It is finished", and gave up the ghost.

And this nation may yet learn that under no fictitious pleas, as used by the Babylonish nation against Daniel and others, can they pervert or overthrow the faith and religion of the Latter-day Saints; and that no legislative enactment, nor judicial rulings, can pluck from the mind of men his undying faith, or legislate away the scrupulous exactions of an inexorable conscience.

The rack, the gibbet, the faggot, and death in all its horrid forms has never accomplished this, nor never will. And in free America, the land of boasted toleration, it will be as impotent under the guise of liberty as it has been in other ages under the name of despotism. And Congress to cover their shameless infraction of the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees religious liberty to all—in order to avoid the odium of religious persecution, which naturally attaches itself to them, may pervert an institution of God by misnaming polygamy and calling it bigamy and not religion, and though the Supreme Court of the United States may confirm their acts, yet there are more than one hundred thousand persons who know better than they do, who will declare that polygamy is a part of their religion and a command and revelation from God.

These are our feelings and we will try to acknowledge the Lord in all things. And then, on the other hand, we do not wish to treat anybody disrespectfully. Have we any quarrel with this nation? No; they are seeking to quarrel with us; don't let us give them the opportunity.

They are like the boy strutting along the street with a chip on his shoulder, asking us to knock it off. But we won't knock it off, let them strut. It is true they try all they can to annoy and provoke us—that is, a few mean men do, although that is not generally the feeling of the nation, but is confined in great measure to religious fanatics and corrupt politicians, some of them holding positions under government, are trying to stir up strife. What for? Well, they want to get a certain "ticket" elected.

A great amount of this "fuss and feathers" that we have today is simply a political ruse in the interest of party politics. What for? Why, the brethren have told you. Mormonism is very unpopular, and if they can only do something that will be in opposi-

tion to Mormonism it will satisfy the howling priests throughout the land, and a great many of their flocks.

As was remarked by one of the brethren, when Jesus was crucified, Pilate and Herod could be made friends. When Mormonism is to be opposed, all men, or at least a great many men, can unite in opposing it. And they want to go before the people and tell them that they have rooted out slavery, and now they are after Mormonism, and won't you religious fanatics join in? No, excuse me, I mean, you pure and holy religious people, who are so humble and possess so much of the spirit that dwelt in the lowly Jesus, won't you help us to do this thing—won't you vote for us because we are doing this thing? Why, bless your souls, they would not hesitate to sweep us off the face of the earth to get elected. That is their feeling. They care nothing about human rights, liberty, or life, if they can bring about the results desired. They would despoil, destroy and overthrow this people to accomplish their own end.

Well, the other party, it is true, would not be very well suited about it, but they would not care to see it politically. However, it is for us to do the best we can. We have got to put our trust in the living God. We might ask—will they derive any benefit from any course taken against the Latter-day Saints? No! a thousand times no!! **I tell you that the hand of God will be upon them for it, and every people, be it this nation, or any other nation, that shall lift up their hands against Zion shall be wasted away; and those that want to try it let them try it, and it is them and their God for it.**

But it is for us to fear God, to keep his commandments; we can afford to do right whether other people can or not. Respect all men in their rights, in their position, and in their privileges, politically and socially, and protect them in the same; but be not partakers of their evil deeds, of their crimes, nor their iniquities, that you have heard spoken about here today. We do not want them to force upon us their drinking saloons, their drunkenness, their gambling, their debauchery and lasciviousness. We do not want these adjuncts of civilization. We do not want them to force upon us that institution of monogamy called the social evil. We will be after them; we will form ourselves into police and hunt them out and drag them from their dens of infamy and expose them to the world.

We won't have their meanness, with their foeticides and infanticides, forced upon us. And you, sisters, don't allow yourselves to become contaminated by rustling against their polluted skirts. Keep from them! Let them wallow in their infamy, and let us protect the right, and be for God and His Christ, for honor, for truth, for virtue, purity and chastity, and for the building up of the Kingdom of God. Amen.—J. of D., Vol. 20, pp. 316-21.

BONDAGE OF DEBT

By John Taylor—1857

The majority of the people think you are a most corrupt people, following a doctrine something like those Free Love societies in the East. Greeley, the editor of the New York Tribune, was associated with one of those societies, and was its principal supporter.

That is what is called a virtuous kind of an abomination, used under a cloak of philosophy, a species of philosophy imported from France. Hence they call Greeley a philosopher; and, in writing about him, I have called him the same. **I believe him to be as dishonest a man as is in existence.**

These are my sentiments and feelings. I have examined his articles, watched his course, read his paper

daily, and have formerly conversed with him a little; but latterly I would not be seen in his company. I was thrown into his society in traveling from Boston, and occasionally met him afterwards; but I would not talk to him: I felt myself superior to such a mean, **contemptible cur.** I knew he was not after truth, but falsehood.

This Greeley is one of their popular characters in the East, and one that supports the stealing of niggars and the underground railroad. I do not know that the editor of the Herald is any more honest; but, as a journalist, he tells more truth. He publishes many things as they are, because it is creditable to do so. But Greeley will not; he will tell what suits his clandestine plans. and leave the rest untold. I speak of him, because he is one of the prominent newspaper editors in the Eastern country, and **he is a poor, miserable curse.**

I do not consider that many of them are much better. They are in a state of vassalage; they cannot tell the truth if they felt so disposed. **People talk very loudly about liberty; but there are very few who comprehend its true principles.** There is a species of bondage that is associated with every grade of society. It is with the mercantile community, the editorial fraternity, the political world, and with every body of men you can associate with, up to members of Congress and the President of the United States. There are yokes made for men of every grade to put their necks into; and everyone bows down to them willingly, and they are driven in their turn according to circumstances.

In the mercantile world there is what is called the **credit system, which I consider one of the greatest curses that was ever introduced among men.** Some will set up a small groggery or grocery; they go into debt to those who have a bigger groggery, or to a man who can, perhaps, buy a barrel of whiskey at a time, or a few pieces of calico. These little merchants are in debt to some larger ones in St. Louis; those to merchants in Cincinnati, New York, and New Orleans; and they are in debt to larger houses in England, France, Germany, and other places.

They all bow the neck: they are all trammelled and bowed down with the same chain. People talk about our credit not being good lately. **I hope to God nobody will credit a "Mormon".** We don't want anything on credit. I want us to live as we can live; and if we cannot live without going into debt to our enemies, let us die—never put our heads under the yoke.—J. of D., 5:118-9.

POLITICS

When a President is elected, a crowd of men press around him, like so many hungry dogs, for a division of the spoils, saying, "Mr. President, what are you going to do for our town? Remember, here is Mr. So-and-so, who took a prominent position. We want such a one in such an office. And, finally, after worryings and teasings, and whining and begging, some of those little men, mean, contemptible pups, doggery men, broken-down lawyers, or common, dirty, political hacks, bring up the rear, swelled up like swill barrels; they come to the table for the fragments, and, with a hungry maw and not very delicate stomach, whine out, "Won't you give me a place, if it is only in Utah?" In order to stop the howling, the President says: "Throw a bone to that dog, and let him get out"; and he comes out a great, big "United States officer", dressed in a lion's garb, it is true, but with the bray of an ass. He comes here, carrying out his groggery and whoring operations, and seeking to introduce among us, eastern civilization.

The people here, however, feel a little astonished, some of them, although they are not very much astonished at anything that transpires; and when

they look at him, they say in their simplicity, "Why, that man is acting like a beast". His majesty, however, swells up, struts and puffs, and blows, and says, "You must not insult me: I am a United States officer; you are disloyal. I am a United States officer; don't speak to me". Of course, you are, and a glorious representative you are.

I did start once to write a history of the judges sent to Utah; but I did not get through with it. You know we have the history of the judges in former days. If I had only had time, I would have liked to have written a history of the judges of Israel that came out from the Ammonites and Moabites down yonder.—John Taylor, 1857, J. of D., 5:120.

THE RIGHT TO MOTHERHOOD

(Editor's Note: The following is copy of a letter addressed to Col. Robert R. McCormick, of Chicago, from our friend Edward Midgard of Seattle, Washington. Mr. Midgard, as our readers of past numbers of TRUTH are doubtless aware, is a champion of the right to HONORABLE MOTHERHOOD, notwithstanding the archaic laws now being enforced in Utah):

October 7, 1944.

Col. Robert R. McCormick
1 Tribune Square, Chicago.

Dear Colonel McCormick:

Your broadcast speeches had told me of your great interest in human rights and how you rejoice in seeing them recognized more and more. This caused me to send you my article in the August issue of TRUTH (Salt Lake City). THE LAW VERSUS THE RIGHT TO MOTHERHOOD.

Your reaction is this one sentence: "I do not think you will be able to get many converts to polygamy". That reply, while not of the kind I had hoped for, is welcome nevertheless since it states so plainly what seems to be a frequent misunderstanding of my efforts.

Where am I trying to make converts to polygamy? I advocate neither polygamy nor monogamy as these forms of marriage have existed so far, namely as institutions primarily designed to insure the possession of a person or persons desired. Quite early I came to realize that such social arrangement is inferior, that is, inferior to the best man is capable of in human relationships.

To let us rise to a higher plane socially, I recommend that we recognize first of all the right of the fit woman to motherhood. And I mean unconditional recognition except for control as regards fitness. With this vital right firmly established, we could then proceed to work out plans for sensible and decent cooperation to make its achievement socially and nationally beneficial. My coming CALL TO EXCELLENCE aims to be a step in that direction.

I also would have us refrain from intolerance toward those who of their own free will and from serious conviction (whether called religious or not) wish to be pioneers in trying out cooperative forms of family life differing from our common bargain for mutually exclusive possession of a desired mate. Man has made remarkable progress elsewhere by way of the "trial-and-error" method. Why should a liberty-loving people be afraid to apply this valuable method in the important field of family life? Why submit here to the dictatorship of our "divinely inspired" dominators of opinion? Or to a rigid majority rule? All too often majority means mediocrity. And what barbarity or backwardness has not at one time or another been backed up by theology!

Tell me then, you who want to put my message aside with "I do not think you will be able to get many converts to polygamy": Don't you think with me that our boasted Bill of Rights remains woefully incomplete while we fail to recognize the Right to Motherhood? And don't you share my faith that American ingenuity will yet

evolve a superior kind of family life to take the place of this more and more disintegrating or wholly disappearing family life of our time?

On the other hand, consider this: A nation fighting grimly a war for survival and at the same time so lacking in vision that it discourages and suppresses motherhood at home, however victorious in battle at present, can that nation expect to survive in this world in the end? **War, like disease, is first of all invited.**

EDWARD MIDGARD.

HISTORICAL ITEMS

Pertaining to the Organization of the Seventies, and Their Council in Particular

In February, 1835, the First Quorum of Seventies was organized by the Prophet Joseph Smith, in Kirtland, Geaugo County, Ohio. The names of the presidents were as follows:

Hazen Aldrich, Joseph Young, Levi W. Hancock, Leonard Rich, Zebedee Coltrin, Lyman Sherman, and Sylvester Smith.

Six of these were ordained Presidents at the time of the organization of the quorum. Levi Hancock, being absent, his place was held vacant until his return.

It is here proper to remark, that it is natural in human beings, when assuming new fields of labor for the development of their talents and abilities, that they seek to ascertain the bounds of their prerogatives. This was forcibly illustrated by the different organizations of the priesthood at that time. Some of the High Priests and a number of the Seventies introduced a question, as **to which is the greatest among them**, the Seventies or the High Priests. Their discussions continued to increase, with so much warmth that it amounted to jealousy.

At length it attracted the notice of the prophet. Both parties asserted their claims of pre-eminence to his father, who took so much interest in the question that he referred it to his son Joseph to decide, and the Prophet called a council for that purpose.

The Council was called together in the month of November, 1835. After it was assembled he asked the newly organized quorum if any of their number had been ordained to the High Priests' office, previous to their ordination as Seventies. It was not ascertained how many from the Seventies' quorums had previously been ordained High Priests; five out of the seven Presidents, however, acknowledged that they were High Priests before they were ordained Seventies. These were Hazen Aldrich, Leonard Rich, Zebedee Coltrin, Lyman Sherman and Sylvester Smith. Accordingly, the Prophet invited them to take their places in the High Priests' quorum again, which was complied with, thus leaving Joseph Young and Levi W. Hancock in the Council. He thought that this was the best way to settle the difficulty and remove all feelings, without deciding the question as to which was the greatest.

A few weeks after this a new second selection was to be made; the Prophet met Elder Joseph Young, and said: "Brother Joseph, we have taken five of your Council away, but will supply their places with others". And he appointed the following brethren, viz., Elders James Foster, Josiah Butterfield, John Gould, John Gaylord, Daniel S. Miles and Salmon Gee.

Shortly after this the Prophet met Joseph Young again, and told him six brethren, instead of five, had been chosen to fill the vacancy in the Council of the Seventies, at the same time requesting him to see Brother John Gould. and signify to him the desire of the Prophet to have him placed in the High Priests quorum. Brother Gould complied with the wishes of the Prophet, and he was ordained a High

Priest. When Brother Levi Hancock returned, he was ordained a First President of the Seventies, and took the position assigned him in the Council in the fall of 1835.

This Council stood intact until the month of May, 1838. The Prophet had departed from Kirtland and had journeyed as far as the State of Missouri, the place of his destination, the previous year. The brethren in Kirtland received a message from him, giving all the Councils of the priesthood, remaining in that place, instructions to have them filled up. At this time the Council of the Seventies convened for this purpose. Elders Salmon Gee and John Gaylord were absent from the Council, but sent word that they wished to be excused from any further services in the Council. Consequently, pursuant to their request, they were excused and were dropped by the Council, and Zera Pulsipher and Henry Herriman were chosen in their places, and were ordained First Presidents and members thereof.

This organization took the lead in the "Kirtland Camp", in their journey to Missouri, where they remained until the winter of 1838 and 1839, at which time they were driven with the Saints from the State, by mob violence, and the destruction of life and the loss of much of their property. The Church located in Hancock County, Illinois, in 1839, where they built the city of Nauvoo. At this place a Conference of the Church was held, in the spring of 1840.

During this period the Prophet called together the Council of the Seventies, and gave them instructions, for the purpose of organizing new quorums. Some of its members were not present at the Councils. Among those absent was James Foster. It appears that he had settled in Jacksonville, Morgan County, in the State of Illinois, and had no direct communication with his brethren. It was reported, however, that he had lost his faith; that he took sick and died. He was born April 1, 1775, and died December 21, 1840, in the 66th year of his age, and was buried in Morgan County, Illinois, near Illinois river.

Elder Albert P. Rockwood succeeded Brother Foster in the Presidency of the Seventies, and was ordained to that office during the April Conference, in 1845.

Elder Daniel S. Miles was in the Council of the Seventies, as one of the First Presidents, five or six years. He was a man of good faith; constant in his attendance at the meetings of the Council, until the time of his death, which occurred at quite an advanced stage of his life. He died in Hancock County, Illinois.

The vacancy occasioned by his death was filled by Elder Benjamin L. Clapp.

Elder Josiah Butterfield retained his standing as one of the First Presidents of the Council until a misunderstanding arose between himself and the Prophet. There being no definite terms of reconciliation between them, he lost his confidence, in consequence of which he absented himself from the meetings of the Council, and was dropped, under the presumption that he would not retain his standing therein. He left Nauvoo, removed to California, and died in Monterey County, in that State, in the month of April, 1871.

The vacancy occasioned thereby was filled by Elder Jedediah M. Grant, who was subsequently ordained a First President of the Seventies, in Salt Lake City.

In the year 1846 the Church was again driven from Illinois. Being disinherited of their homes, the Saints fled to the valleys of the Rocky Mountains, which flight was accomplished in the year 1847; and in a few years those who lingered succeeded in reaching the body of the Church.

Upon the demise of President Willard Richards, a vacancy occurred in the First Presidency of the Church. Elder Jedediah M. Grant was selected by President Brigham Young, and ordained to fill the office, as his second counselor, leaving also a vacancy in the Council of the Seventies.

Elder Horace S. Eldredge succeeded Jedediah M. Grant and was ordained a First President in the Council of the Seventies in the year 1855.

Elder Benjamin L. Clapp, after living some years in Salt Lake City, removed his family to Ephraim, Sanpete County. He had some difficulty with Bishop Warren S. Snow of that place, who preferred a charge against him before his brethren of the Council of Seventies. An investigation of his case was had before that body, and by instructions of President Brigham Young he was dropped from his position in the Council. He removed to California, and settled in that State until his death. He died with a settled conviction of the truth of the latter-day work.

Elder Jacob Gates filled the vacancy occasioned by the removal of Elder Clapp, and was ordained a First President in the Council of the Seventies during the fall conference of 1862.

Elder Zera Pulsipher transcended the bounds of his priesthood in the ordinance of sealing, for which he was cited to appear before the First Presidency of the Church, and was dropped, by the instructions of President Brigham Young. He was subsequently ordained a patriarch.

Zera Pulsipher was born June 24, 1789 in Rockingham, Windham County, Vermont; he moved to Kirtland in 1835, and was ordained a First President of the Seventies in the latter part of January, 1838; he moved with the Saints to Missouri, and from thence to Nauvoo, and came with the Church to the valleys of the mountains, and died in full faith of the gospel, at Hebron, in southern Utah, January 1, 1872, aged 82 years 6 months and 8 days.

Elder John Van Cott was called to fill the vacancy occasioned by the removal of Elder Zera Pulsipher, and was ordained one of the First Presidents of the Seventies.

The foregoing is a short history of the First Presidents of the Seventies, from the first organization until the present time. The Council now stands as follows:

Joseph Young, Sen., Levi W. Hancock, Henry Herriman, Albert P. Rockwood. Horace S. Eldredge, Jacob Gates, John Van Cott.

JOSEPH YOUNG, SEN.

Salt Lake City, November 1, 1878, pages 4-8.

PEARLS AND SWINE

Why is it that a swine cannot discern the value of pearls, and tramples them under its feet? Because it does not understand—it has not the intelligence, and does not comprehend the difference between the filth that surrounds it and precious gems. You might cast a precious jewel at a hog, and it would turn and rend you; but throw that to a man of understanding and intelligence, and he would ask for more. That is the difference. God has so ordained that straight shall be the gate, and narrow the way that leads to life; and but few there are that find it.—Elder John Taylor (August 23, 1857), J. of D., 5:145.

ONE MORE CHANCE

"Well, we have exhausted reason, logic, common sense, and justice; what more can we do?"
"I guess we'll simply have to go to law."

We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
In feelings, not in figures on a dial.
We should count time by heart-throbs.
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.

WHO WAS THE MYSTERY MAN IN INDEPENDENCE HALL?

Radicals sneer at the suggestion that things spiritual were in any way concerned with the founding of this nation, or that the United States of America can possibly have any spiritual significance.

Little do they realize how foredoomed to failure their efforts ultimately are, to disrupt and desecrate this nation. True, this failure may not be demonstrated until America's Christian manhood has been put to the test of preserving, or restoring, what the forefathers bequeathed them as a social heritage. But the instigating of the United States to begin with was too vitally tied up with what the worldly minded would call mysticism, for it was to perish at the hands of Anti-Christ merely because the rank and file of the American people have not yet aroused to a grasp of the menace with which the country is confronted.

Mystery Man

In his admirable little treatise, **Our Flag**, Robert Allen Campbell gives the details of a most important episode in America's history—the designing of the Colonial flag of 1775. The account involves a mysterious man, concerning whom no information is available other than that he was on familiar terms with both General George Washington and Benjamin Franklin. The following description of this man is taken from Campbell's treatise:

"Little seems to be known concerning this old gentleman; and in the materials from which this account is taken, his name is not once mentioned. He is uniformly referred to as "the Professor". He was evidently far beyond his three-score years and ten, and he often referred to historical events of more than a century previous as if he had been a living eye-witness of their occurrence. Still, he was erect, vigorous and healthy—hale, active and clear-minded—as strong and energetic in every way as though in the prime of life. He was tall, of fine figure, perfectly easy, and very dignified in his manner, being at once courteous, gracious, and commanding. He was, for those times and considering the customs of the colonists, very peculiar in his methods of living, for he ate no flesh, fowl, or fish, he never used for food any green thing, any roots of anything unripe; he drank no liquor, wine, or ale, but confined his diet to cereals and their products, fruits that were ripened on the stem in the sun, nuts, mild tea, and the sweets of honey, sugar, or molasses.

Designed Flag

"He was well-educated, highly cultivated, of extensive as well as varied information, and very studious. He spent considerable of his time in the patient and persistent perusal of a number of very rare old books and ancient manuscripts. It is not known whether he was deciphering, translating or rewriting them. These books and manuscripts together with his own writings, were never shown to anyone. He did not even mention them in his conversation with the family except in a very casual way, and he always locked them up carefully in a large, old-fashioned, cube-shaped, iron-bound, heavy oak chest.

"By something more than a brief coincidence, the committee appointed by the Colonial Congress to design a flag, accepted an invitation to be guests while in Cambridge of the same family with whom the Professor was staying. It was here that General George Washington joined them for the purpose of deciding upon a fitting emblem. By the signs which passed between them, it was evident that both General Washington and Doctor Franklin 'recognized' the Professor and by unanimous approval he was invited to become an active member of the committee!"

Immediately Vanished

During the proceedings which followed, the Professor was treated with the utmost respect and all of his suggestions immediately acted upon. He submitted a pattern which he considered symbolically appropriate for the new flag and this was unhesitatingly accepted by the other six members of the committee, who voted that the arrangements suggested by the Professor be forthwith adopted.

After the episode of the flag, the Professor just vanished and nothing further is known concerning him!

Did General Washington and Doctor Franklin recognize the Professor as an emissary of the Mystery Schools which have for so long controlled the destinies of this planet?

Benjamin Franklin was a Philosopher and a Mystic. He and the Marquis de Lafayette—also a man of mystery—constitute two of the most important links in the chain of circumstance that culminated in the establishment of the original thirteen colonies as a free and independent nation. Doctor Franklin's philosophic and spiritual attainments are well attested in POOR RICHARD'S ALMANAC, published by him for many years under the name of Richard Saunders.

The Continental Congress at Philadelphia, so far as the records go, had nothing to do with the destinies of the original flag. The flag unfurled at Cambridge, Massachusetts in 1775 symbolized the union of the colonies; it was called the Grand Union Flag.

When General Johnson and Doctor Franklin visited Mrs. Elizabeth Ross, otherwise known as Betsy Ross, to get her inspiration in making the flag, the five-pointed star appealed to her as being more beautiful than the six-pointed star. Out of deference to her sense of beauty, the five-pointed stars were used, and thirteen of them were placed in a circle on a blue field with the standard seven red and six white stripes completing the flag.

This sample flag was made just before the Declaration of Independence, although the resolution endorsing it was not passed by the Continental Congress until July 14, 1777. The six-pointed star, now extensively employed in Jewish symbolism until it has almost become identified with Jewry, originally symbolized the possession of spiritual or intuitional knowledge and power. The five-pointed star represents the promise of spiritual power to come!

The influence of the Mysteries was also shown in a very definite manner at the time of the Proclamation of the Declaration of Independence, though the materialistic historian has been unwilling to accept the truth. We shall reveal here the long-hidden facts, though they are of recorded authoritative publications.

On June 7, 1775, Richard Henry Lee, a delegate from Virginia, offered in Congress the first resolution declaring that the United Colonies were, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

Remember the rebellion had already been in effect since the Battle of Concord, April 19, 1775. Soon after Mr. Lee introduced his resolution he was taken sick and returned to his home in Virginia, whereupon on June 11, 1776, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman and Robert Livingston were appointed as a committee to prepare a formal Declaration of Independence.

On the first day of July the committee made its report to Congress. On the second of July, Lee's resolution was adopted in its original words. During the third of July the formal Declaration was reported by the committee, and debated with great spirit. The discussion was resumed on the fourth, Jefferson having been elected as chairman of the committee.

On July 4th there was great suspense throughout the nation. Many were adverse to severing the ties with the mother country; many feared the vengeance of the king and his armies; many battles had been fought already but no decisive victory had been won. Gloom and uncertainty, together with fear, cast a great shadow over the colonies. Each man in Congress Assembled realized with Patrick Henry it was either Liberty or Death.

The debate continued all morning. The old bellman stood by his rope in the State House in Philadelphia waiting for the signal to ring out the news. The crowd of bystanders became discouraged. Some of them said: "They never will do it!" Which was repeated by the bellman: "No, they never will!"

Stranger Appears

But inside of that closed chamber were men wrestling with a mighty problem. Jefferson and the others had written into that Declaration the thoughts of the Gods. Noon came, and then one o'clock. No decision had yet come, for the executioner's sword dangled before their eyes. It was a moment of tenseness and great anxiety and not a few of those men feared that their lives would be the forfeit for their audacity.

In the midst of their debating, a fierce voice rang out!

The debaters stopped and turned to look upon a Stranger. Who was this man? Who had so suddenly appeared in their midst, to begin to transfix them with his oratory?

They had never seen him before. None knew when he had entered. But his tall, stately form and pale face filled them with awe and his voice with admiration.

His voice ringing with a holy zeal, the Stranger stirred them to their very souls. After his rousing address, his closing words rang through the building:

"GOD HAS GIVEN AMERICA TO BE FREE!"

As the Stranger sank back into a chair exhausted, a wild enthusiasm broke forth. Name after name was placed upon the parchment. The Declaration of Independence was signed.

But where was the man who had precipitated the accomplishment of this immortal task, who had lifted for the moment the veil from the eyes of the assembly and revealed to them a part, at least, of the grand purpose for which this nation was conceived?

HE HAD DISAPPEARED! NOR WAS HE EVER SEEN AGAIN, NOR HIS IDENTITY ESTABLISHED!

Freedom Rings

This episode parallels many of a similar kind recorded by ancient historians, attendant upon the founding of new nations. They are not coincidences. They only demonstrate that the wisdom of the ancient mysteries are still serving mankind as in Days of Old.

At 2 o'clock in the afternoon, when the bystanders and the bellman were thoroughly discouraged, the doors were flung open wide and the old bellman received the signal to ring the notes of freedom to the nation. The multitudes caught the signal and answered with shouts of joy.

WHAT A WOMAN CAN DO

As a wife and mother, woman can make the fortune and happiness of her husband and children; and even if she did nothing else, surely this would be sufficient destiny. By her thrift, guidance and tact, she can secure to her partner and herself a competence for old age, no matter how small their beginning, or how adverse a fate occasionally be theirs. By her cheerfulness she can restore her husband's

spirit, shaken by the anxieties of business. By her tender care she can often restore him to health, if disease has seized upon his overtasked powers. By her counsel and her love, she can win him from bad company, if temptation in an evil hour has led him astray. By her example, her prospects, and her sex's insight into character, she can mould her children, however diverse their dispositions, into good and noble men and women. And by leading in all things, a true and beautiful life, she can refine, elevate and spiritualize all who come within reach, so that with others of her sex emulating and assisting her, she can do more to regenerate the world than all the statesmen or reformers that ever legislated. She can do as much, alas! perhaps even more, to degrade man if she chooses it.

Who can estimate the evil that woman has power to do? As a wife she can ruin her husband by extravagance, folly, or want of affection. She can make a devil and an outcast of a man, who might otherwise have become a good member of society. She can bring bickerings, strife and perpetual discord into what has been a happy home. She can change, the innocent babes whom God has intrusted to her charge, into vile men and viler women. She can lower the moral tone of society itself, and thus pollute legislation at the springhead. She can, in fine, become an instrument of evil, instead of an angel of good.

Instead of making flowers of truth, purity, beauty, and spirituality, spring up in her footsteps, till the whole earth smiles with loveliness that is almost celestial, she can transform it to a black and blasted desert, covered with the scum of all evil passions, and swept by the bitter blasts of everlasting death.

This is what a woman can do for the wrong as for the right. Is her mission a little one? Has she no "worthy work", as has become the cry of late? Man may have a hardier task to perform, a rougher path to travel, but he has none loftier, or more influential, than woman's.—Woman's Advocate, from "The Mormon", June 14, 1856.

PASSING OF "AUNT MATTIE"

A noble character has gone to her reward. Mattie Jessop Barlow passed quietly to her rest on the 22nd of October at 7:30 P. M. at her home in Short Creek, Arizona, after a prolonged illness. She is the daughter of Joseph S. and Martha Yates Jessop.

Sister Mattie was the mother of fourteen children, twelve of whom, with her husband, John Y. Barlow, survive her. One son, Louis, in the armed service of the country, is at present stationed at San Diego, California. The body will be interred in the family plot at Short Creek.

The deceased was born at Millville, Utah, September 24, 1900. Among her outstanding characteristics were those of cheerfulness and helpfulness. The cookies and pies of "Aunt Mattie", as she was lovingly called, endeared her to the hearts of the children wherever she lived. She was a thorough Latter-day Saint and insisted upon living the full Gospel as revealed in the present dispensation.

Her exit from mortality leaves a void that never can be quite filled, but we feel the heavenly Hosts will be commensurately enriched. Her good works will follow her. Our deepest sympathy is extended to the bereaved husband and children, who will greatly miss the wifely and motherly kindness and care of Sister Mattie.

He is the happiest, be he king or peasant, who finds peace in his home.—Goethe.

CHARITY

The smallest effort is not lost;
Every wavelet on the ocean tossed
Each raindrop helps some flower to grow,
Aids in the ebb-tide or the flow;
Each struggle lessens human woe.

INFANT GODS

In the smoke curls of a campfire
Or a hill's snow garnished crest,
Is told a tale quite ageless,
That few have ever guessed.
You can hear it in the whirlwind
Sweeping sand across the plain.
You can hear it in the patter
Of a gentle April rain.
You can hear it, if you'll but listen,
In a sleeping baby's breath,
The tale that foolish mortals
Heed not, even unto death.

What is this priceless story
In the root of every soul,
That the deaf who will not hear it
Never reach salvation's goal?
'Tis the story of creation
From before the world was born,
To celestial heights undreamed of,
Bathed in everlasting morn.

In the rusted leaves of autumn,
Or the crisp new buds of spring,
Or the throats of mother robins,
Teaching fledglings how to sing,
Is the same eternal story
Of the handiwork of God,
From the highest to the lowest
That exists on mortal sod.

Time records within this story
Of when He was mortal, too.
Thru eons, down progression's trail,
E'er forgotten worlds were new.
And now in His same likeness,
He fashions men of earth,
And implants the seed of Godhood
In their very souls at birth.

Then are not they who listen
To the tale of sweet accord,
And follow in the footsteps
Of their everlasting Lord;
Tho weak the flesh of mortals,
As each his hard way plods,
Even tho they're but beginning,
Are not these the Infant Gods?

Oh, be no deaf to music
In the night wind's pleading cry,
Or the stars that bid you follow
In their orbits 'crossed the sky.
Search deep the hidden records
In the catacombs of time,
And unearth the buried portions
Of this glorious tale sublime.

Leave not a page unstudied,
Leave not a leaf unturned,
Lest you lie in ignorance's ashes
With the highway's rubble burned.
Hear the wail of those lost spirits
Who refused to hear the call,
Searching now for dissolution
In time's forgotten hall.

Be not as these wasted lost ones,
Lift your faces to the dawn.
Tho the world decay around you,
Claim your birthright, carry on!
The great author of the story,
Intent with watching, nods,
And smiles upon His children—
Press on, ye Infant Gods.

—Alyne Jessop.

WHEN I GROW OLD

When I grow old
God grant that every child
Will feel the youthful texture of my soul
And will not turn away from me
As from a shade or shrunken vine
When I grow old.

When I grow old
God grant that I may have some task
Which must be done or someone fare the worse—
That in some corner of the Earth
Someone will need my hand
When I grow old.

DAN CUPID

First Soldier—What's up, Bill?
Second Soldier—I sent my girl two letters every day since I was drafted and now she's married the postman.

USEFUL—AT THAT

"What's the idea—only two prunes?" roared the sergeant.
"You save the stones twice a week till you get a thousand", said the orderly, "and then you know the war has lasted five years all but ten weeks."

HOW, HOW TRUE!

"Anything man can live without is luxury", declares a government official. Well, for centuries man lived without government officials.—Atlanta (Ga.) Journal.

HOPE NEVER DIES

Mrs. Green was proudly displaying a new hat to Mrs. Gray.
"It's lovely", said Mrs. Gray; "but how do you manage to get so much money from your husband?"
"Quite simple, my dear", was the triumphant reply. "I just tell him I'm going back to mother, and he immediately hands me the fare."

Achievement is the sum of effort.

JUST OFF THE PRESS

THE NEW READY REFERENCE

on

CELESTIAL OR PLURAL MARRIAGE

THE MORMON MARRIAGE SYSTEM

In Clear, Condensed and Understandable Language

GET IT NOW!

Treats: Celibacy, Monogamy and Polygamy *including the* Divorce and Birth Control Evils

Exhaustive Comments on Legal and Ethical Aspects of Subject
Fully Indexed and Illustrated

THE MOST COMPLETE REFERENCE WORK YET PUBLISHED ON THE SUBJECT

No Library Can Be Complete Without This Book—160 pages, 7x10

Price, postpaid, $1.50 per copy. Club rates, to accommodate Priesthood and Auxiliary Classes, in lots of ten or more, $1.00 each

TRUTH PUBLISHING COMPANY
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City 3, Utah
AND AT BOOK SHOPS

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME

VOL. 10. DECEMBER, 1944. NO. 7.

An Open Letter

To Mark E. Peterson of the Quorum of Twelve:

In your recent note to the United Press agency, at the conclusion of the trial of the thirty-one defendants for alleged conspiracy, you are reported as stating in substance:

> **The use of the name "Fundamentalist" by the cultists is regarded by the Church as a misnomer. They are not fundamentalists in the sense of holding to the fundamental doctrines of the Church, for the fundamental doctrines of the Church are now opposed to polygamy.**

Being a member of the Quorum of Twelve, and speaking with apparent authority it is fair to assume that you are the mouthpiece of the Church on this point. We wish not to be captious in this matter, but would like to have your position made clearer. The expression, "for the fundamental doctrines of the Church are NOW opposed to polygamy", very definitely implies that while the Church is NOW opposed to polygamy, at one time it was not so opposed; that at one time polygamy was a fundamental doctrine of the Church, while NOW it is not.

Just when and how did a fundamental doctrine of the Church change? And by whose authority? If the Church is founded on the principle of revelation, as we claim it to be, and polygamy or plural marriage was revealed from heaven as an eternal and fundamental principle of salvation, how are we going to get the fundamental essence out of the doctrine? Our dictionary defines the word "Fundamental" as constituting a "foundation", "indispensable", "basal"; "a necessary truth"; an "essential", etc.

As we previously pointed out, (TRUTH 10:147), President J. Reuben Clark has stated "the principles of the Gosepl are immutable—they are fundamental, they never change". And Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, Church Historian and a member of your Quorum, has said, "Plural marriage is one of those **irrevocable** and **unchangeable laws of the Gospel**, but the Church is not teaching it NOW".

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

We submit that if the doctrine is irrevocable and unchangeable, whether the Church teaches it "now" or not, it remains a fundamental. The late President Joseph F. Smith, in speaking on the unchangeability of the Gospel said:

> * * * **The rites of the Priesthood of the Church, as the Lord has revealed them, and the principles that underlie the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ, are irrevocable, unchanging and unchangeable. We talk of the "everlasting gospel of Jesus Christ", which "is the power of God unto salvation", and these principles in and of themselves ARE ETERNAL PRINCIPLES, and will last while life, or thought or being last, or immortality endures.—Gospel Doctrines, 14.**

Now, this principle of plural marriage, the Lord told Joseph Smith, was "instituted from before the foundation of the world". (D. & C., 132:5). That certainly gives it strong antiquity and sound standing.

In a revelation to John Taylor, in 1886, the Lord said:

> **I the Lord do not change and my word and my covenants and my law do not, and as I have heretofore said by my servant Joseph: all those who would enter into my glory must and shall obey my law. * * * I HAVE NOT REVOKED THIS LAW, NOR WILL I, for it is everlasting, and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof.**

Joseph Smith taught that "In the celestial glory there are three heavens or degrees: And in order to obtain the highest, a man must enter into this order of the Priesthood (meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage); and if he does not he cannot obtain it."—D. & C., 131:1-3.

These statements strike us as fixing every law of the gospel as **irrevocable and unchangeable** in their nature. Perhaps you being an Apostle, have some light that has not reached us, enabling you to change the meaning of these statements. Certainly if the Church is following in minute detail the revelations of the Lord and the Lord has changed His former rulings on the subject of plural marriage, the change would be regarded as fundamental in its nature. But if such a change has been made why is it not noted in the Doctrine and Covenants, the law book of God to the Church, to offset the revelations contained therein teaching to the contrary? The Saints should have the full story to enable them to worship God intelligently.

In a recent meeting at Yale Ward you are reported as making this statement, repeating it by way of emphasis, three times:

> **I want you people to know that every word the apostles say is the word of the Lord. I repeat: EVERY WORD THE APOSTLES SAY IS THE WORD OF THE LORD!**

This being a new doctrine we invite some elucidation of it. It smacks of the thought that the "king can do no wrong". Is it contended that the apostles are NOW so perfected that they can and do make no mistakes? If so, when did this happen? The Lord made it very plain that when men are moved upon by the Holy Ghost they give forth the word of the Lord. He says:

> **And whatsoever they shall speak when moved upon by the Holy Ghost shall be scripture, shall be the will of the Lord, shall be the mind of the Lord, shall be the word of the Lord, shall be the voice of the Lord, and the power of God unto salvation. —D. & C. 68:4.**

The very language of this revelation implies that men are not always "moved upon by the Holy Ghost"; but when they are, or "whatsoever they speak" when so moved upon, is Scripture and the will and word of the Lord.

It would give us a tremendously good feeling to know that the present members of the First Presidency and of the Quorum of Twelve had reached this point of perfection. We recall that the late President B. H. Roberts of the First Seven Presidents of Sev-

enty, and Assistant Church Historian, once stated:

> **We believe in an inspired Priesthood for the Church, we believe in inspired teachers; but that does not require us to believe that every word that is spoken from the pulpit is the very word of God. Sometimes they (the leaders) speak merely from their human knowledge, influenced by passions; influenced by interests of men, and by anger, and vexation, and all those things that surge in upon the minds of every servant of God. When they so speak that is not scripture, that is not the word of God, nor the power of God unto salvation; but when they speak as moved upon by the Holy Ghost, THEIR VOICE THEN BECOMES THE VOICE OF GOD.**

The late President Charles W. Penrose, a member of the First Presidency of the Church under Joseph F. Smith and also under Heber J. Grant, made this observation:

> **President Wilford Woodruff is a man of wisdom and experience, and we respect him, but we do not believe his personal views or utterances are revelations from God; and when "thus saith the Lord" comes from him, the Saints investigate it: they do not shut their eyes and take it down like a pill.**

If you are correct in your statement it shows a wonderful advancement in the scale of progress among the leaders of the Church since the days of these brethren. Perhaps you can give us some further light upon the matter. TRUTH will be glad to pass your views on.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH W. MUSSER.

REFORMERS AND POLYGAMY

(Extracted from the "SEER", Vol. 1, pp. 178-183).

While the world was thus overwhelmed in darkness, following the false traditions and superstitions of the Papists, the great Reformers, Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Denis Melanther, and numerous other German Divines, introduced a wonderful reformation in many things; among which they re-established the right of their priests to marry; and again permitted the Divine institution of Polygamy to exist in the Church.

Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, one of the principal Lords and Princes of Germany, wrote to the great Reformer, Martin Luther, and to the principal heads of the reformation, anxiously imploring them to grant unto him the privilege of marrying a second wife, while the first wife, his Princess was yet living. Many arguments were urged by the Landgrave, showing that the practice was in accordance with the Bible, and not prohibited under the Christian dispensation. Upon the reception of this information, Luther, who had from the beginning of the reformation favored Polygamy, met in council with the principal Christian Divines to consult upon the propriety of granting the request of Lord Philip; after considering upon the subject, they addressed to him a lengthy letter, granting him his request; at the same time earnestly exhorting him to live a virtuous and upright life. The letter commences as follows:

"To the Most Serene Prince and Lord Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenlembogen, of Dietz, of Ziegenhain, and Nidda, our Gracious Lord, we wish above all things the Grace of God through Christ:

"I. 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 seemed to us very difficult so speedily to answer the doubts proposed; nevertheless we should not permit the said Bucer, who was urgent for his return to your Highness to go away without an answer in writing."

Then follows a lengthy exhortation to the Prince to live a life of virtue as a remedy to promote his health; for, say they,

"If your Highness, after marrying a second wife, were not to forsake

those licentious disorders, the remedy proposed would be to no purpose."

In the twenty-first paragraph, they counsel the Landgrave to keep his second marriage a secret from the public at large, and that only a few trusty persons should be present at the celebration. This counsel is as follows:

"XXI. 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 need 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, preferable 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 corruption of nature.**

"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's salvation."

The letter closes with these words:

"May God preserve your Highness. We are most ready to serve your Highness. Given at Wittemberg the Wednesday after the feast of Saint Nicholas, 1539.

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

Martin Luther
Philip Melancthon
Martin Bucer
Antony Corvin
Adam
John Levingue
Justus Wintferte
Denis Melanther."

This letter is in Melancthon's own hand-writing, as the following testimony clearly shows:

"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 manual, and have delivered the present copy in five leaves of good paper, whereof I bear witness.

George Nuspicher,
Notary."

Having given extracts from the letter written by this Council of Protestant Christian Divines, permitting and approbating Polygamy in their Church, we will next give the Marriage Contract unto which the Landgrave and his second spouse entered, and also the oath of Marriage administered to them by the Reverend Dennis Melanther, preacher to his Highness.

"The Marriage Contract of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, with Margaret de Saal.

"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 puissant and most victorious Emperor Charles VI., 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's Counsellors, on one side, and the good and virtuous Lady Margaret de Saal, with some of her relatives, 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 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 Melanther, 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, nor curiosity, nor for 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 of 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's 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 the Princess's 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 Melanther 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 Melancthon, Martin Bucer, Denis Melander; and likewise in the presence of the illustrious and valiant Eberhard de Than, counsellor of his electoral Highness of Saxony,

Herman de Malsberg, Herman de Hundelshausen, the Lord John Fegg of the Chancery, Rudulph Schenck; and also in the presence of the most honorable and most virtuous Lady Anne, of the family of Miltiz, 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 Fuld, 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 testimonial of the truth thereof.

Balthasar Rand."

These extracts have been taken from the first volume of a work entitled, "History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches", by James Benign Bossuet. They have also been extensively published in other works.

These celebrated Protestant Divines and great Christian Reformers of the sixteenth century, have thus most clearly decided that **"the Gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses with respect to Marriage."** And in accordance with these sentiments, they most freely declare to the Landgrave that **"Your Highness hath therefore, in this writing", "the approbation of us all concerning what you desire."** And **"The Reverend Denis Melanther, preacher to his Highness"**, administered the oath of marriage and solemnized the nuptial ceremony in the name of God, declaring that **"to have two wives"** was both **"Christian and lawful"; while, like Sarah, Leah and Rachel—Abraham's and Jacob's wives, "the most serene Princess Christina, Duchess of Saxony, his Highness's first lawful wife", freely consented and admitted "of a partner", "as the deed written with the Princess's own hand sufficiently testifies."**

These Reverend preachers did not come to a hasty conclusion that Polygamy was approbated by the Gospel; for Luther, "in a sermon which he delivered at Wittenberg, for the reformation of Marriage", in speaking of wives, says:

"If they are stubborn, it is fitting their husbands should tell them, if you will not, another will; if the mistress refuse to come, let the maid be called."

This "sermon was pronounced in 1522", some eighteen years before they gave a written permission to the Landgrave to become a Christian Polygamist; hence it will be perceived that their conclusions in regard to the Divine approbation of Polygamy, were formed after many years reflection upon the subject.

Having proved that the heads of the Protestant Reformation in Germany approbated Polygamy in their Church, we will next show that at the same period the supreme head and founder of the Church of England—Henry VIII—was a Polygamist. This King, having been married for upwards of twenty years to Catharine of Arragon, became deeply in love with Anne Boleyn; and in the year 1532, he was privately married to her, while Catharine still remained his lawful wife. This second marriage, like that of the German Prince, was celebrated in secret through fear of public scandal; for it should be remembered, that through the delusive influence of the Romish church, the most of the people had been traditioned to believe that Polygamy was unchristian; hence, it became, in their estimation, scandalous; and those who believed to the contrary, and wished to practice this divine institution, were under the painful necessity of keeping their marriage contracts with their second wives partially se-

cret, only permitting a few trusty friends to witness the same.

The king, after having been privately married to Anne Boleyn, his second wife, through fear of being scandalized as a Polygamist, sought for a divorce from his first wife, Catharine; but the head of the Romish Church would not sanction his proceedings, whereupon, the King forthwith proclaimed himself the supreme head of the Church, and invented new Articles of Religion, and enforced the same upon the people under the penalty of martyrdom. Some, refusing to acknowledge him as head of the church, were shamefully tortured and put to death. Thus was laid the foundation of the great and popular Church of England; its first celebrated head and founder, being a polygamist.

It is evident that the more intelligent and learned portion of England, considered Polygamy perfectly consistent with Christianity, or they never would have confirmed by Parliamentary acts, the title of **"Supreme Head of the Church"** upon their Polygamist King. It is in vain for the church of England to say that Polygamy is not sanctioned by the gospel, so lang as they acknowledge that the very founder and head of their church was a Polygamist.

Though Polygamy is a divine institution, yet neither the German nor the English Reformers were justified, in the absence of an inspired Priesthood, in officiating in the nuptial ceremonies. Not having the Priesthood, they had no authority to officiate in a divine ordinance. Though Polygamy was practiced in unrighteousness, under the sanction and approbation of the great Christian Divines of the sixteenth century, yet it proves most conclusively that those Divines did sincerely believe it to be just as legal and lawful for a Christian to have two wives as to have one only; and they, no doubt, acted in all good conscience in accordance with their firm conviction.

Thus Polygamy, after having been abolished for many centuries from the churches of Christendom, was again instituted therein by the most celebrated Reformers of the sixteenth century. But they dare not, through fear of scandal, publicly proclaim this divine institution. It remained for the Renowned Prophet of the Nineteenth century, Joseph Smith, to restore this divine institution in all its original purity to the earth, by the word and commandment of the Most High God. It remained for the inspired Apostles and Elders of the restored Church of God, to publicly announce to all nations the re-institution of this sacred and Christian ordinance.

They do not fear the scandal of the deluded fanatics of an apostate Church: they do not tremble to announce in the presence of an apostate priesthood, the beauty and holiness of the Divine institution of Marriage, whether including one or more wives: they are not ashamed to practice and proclaim publicly, that which the Protestant Divines, though convinced of its righteousness and purity, dare only approbate in secret. But in saying this, we would not boast, neither would we speak disrespectfully of the timidity of those good Christian Reformers; they were not sent to restore the Christian Church to the earth with all its heavenly ordinances and principles; and not being sent and clothed with the power of the everlasting Priesthood, they could not speak as men having authority, and consequently were timid, and afraid of scandal, and approbated Polygamy privately; this care or prudence was no doubt best, under the strong power of tradition and other circumstances with which they were surrounded.

But "the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" are at and, prepar-

atory to the coming of Jesus Christ, whom the heavens must receive until the restitution of all things is completed, when he will again be sent to take unto himself his great power and reign over all people. Among the "all things" which the prophets have predicted should be restored before the Messiah comes is Polygamy. The holy prophet Isaiah predicted, that in the day that the cloud and fire should be restored to the earth, as should be manifested upon all the assemblies and dwelling places of Zion, every one in that city should be called holy, and should be beautiful and glorious, and that seven women would take hold of one man, anxiously imploring him to let them be called by his name to take away their reproach, at the same time, promising that they would be no expense to him, but would agree to eat their own bread and wear their own apparel, if he would only become their husband, and let them be called by his name.

Thus we see that the Messiah never would come, unless Polygamy were restored to the Christian Church; for the heavens must receive him until all things are restored which all the holy prophets have predicted. If any should suppose that this prediction, so far as Polygamy is concerned, was fulfilled by the early protestants, we reply, that it is true that the protestant Divines restored Polygamy, but in their day we have an account of only two women taking hold of one man, by their approbation, whereas Isaiah says expressly, that it is to be SEVEN WOMEN who are to do this: therefore, though it cannot be admitted that the reformers restored Polygamy, nor can they claim the honor of having restored it in the full sense of Isaiah's prediction. This honor was reserved for a people who should be called Zion, where all should eventually be called beautiful, and glorious, and holy. The pure and virtuous daughters of Zion will consider it a great reproach to remain single and have no posterity: hence, their exceedingly great anxiety for husbands, that their reproach may be taken away. They will learn that a woman cannot, through her own carelessness or neglect, fail to fulfill the end of her creation, without bringing upon herself everlasting reproach, as well as condemnation for disobeying the Lord's great and first commandment to multiply.

Oh! how different will be their feelings from those now manifested by females traditioned under Papist and Protestant superstitions! Surely there must be some mighty changes and revolutions when all things that the ancient prophets have predicted shall be restored! Polygamy, as well as Monogamy, will then be honored by all the heavenly hosts above, and by all the nations of the righteous upon the earth; and there will not be so much as a dog to move his tongue against any of the institutions of the Bible.

—Editor.

A REMARKABLE HISTORY

A Family of Saints Emigrates by Direction of an Angel

(From the Utah Journal)

Editor Journal:

In reading your column, "Items of Local Interest", of Sept. 19th, I saw a notice that brought to my mind some of my experience in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The notice referred to runs as follows:

> **Information wanted: A man by the name of Samuel Hadfield, and his wife (formerly Miss Godby), are said to have joined the Church, and emigrated with the Saints to America, from Manchester, England, about forty or forty-five years since. They had three children named respectively, Joseph, Sarah and Ann; if they or any of their descendants are living they can hear of something to their advantage by writing to or visiting Abraham Hadfield, Redgate Farm House, New Smithy, near Chapel En Le Frith, Derbyshire, England.—Mill. Star.**

Of the whereabouts of the parties at the present time, I cannot give any information, but some other person may, after reading my narrative concerning them, and for the truth of which I can most certainly vouch.

In the year 1841, at the June conference, I was called to the office of Teacher in the Manchester Branch, and was afterwards assigned to take charge of the Beswick District. Among the Latter-day Saints whose names were enrolled was the family in question. They were then very poor, and though five in number, occupied a small front room in a place called "Every Street, off Ancoats' Lane", which was rented from a brother, Hartley by name, and at whose house the weekly night meetings were held. I will here state that Mr. Samuel Hadfield was by trade a baker, and had died a short time before my acquaintance with them, so that at this time (1841), the family consisted of the widow, Mrs. Hadfield, her aged father, her son Joseph, about 13 years old, and the two girls, Sarah and Ann, both older than Joseph; but neither of them had passed their seventeenth year. All three children worked in the cotton factory, but their wages were a mere pittance, upon which the family had to subsist. I am pleased to say they were very good people and consistent Latter-day Saints.

Those were the days when we were in dead earnest, and did everything with a zest peculiar to the latter-day work. I can truly say the spirit of God like a fire burned in the hearts of the people. The meetings were well attended, and many spoke in unknown tongues. Others gave the interpretation. Some would prophesy, and often the sick were healed by the power of God.

During the fall of 1841, the boy Joseph had a great measure of the Spirit of the Lord resting upon him. He was an amiable and remarkable little fellow, and during the winter he startled everybody by telling his mother that during one night an angel of the Lord came to him and told him that he and all the family should shortly be delivered, and go to Nauvoo and be gathered with the Saints.

Sister Hadfield spoke of the matter in the meeting; and during that winter he repeatedly saw the same person, who always repeated the same promise. These assurances continued until the emigration commenced in 1842, when the heavenly messenger again came to him, and told him to tell his mother "to sell her household goods, and go to Liverpool ,and they should go to America." This required a little more faith than she had at her command on the instant. She hesitated, and soon another visit from the same personage to the boy took place, telling him again to tell his mother not to fear but sell all she had and go.

The mother was much excited and sent for your correspondent, who was her teacher, and asked him what she had better do, as she thought it possible the boy might be deceived. Your correspondent said to her, "God has spoken to the lad; do not confer with flesh and blood, but do as you have been instructed to." She delayed no longer, but sold her all, which by the way was not much, and went to Liverpool. After paying expenses, all the money they had left was two shillings and sixpence (in American money sixty cents). Apostle Parley P. Pratt was then the emigration agent.

The sequel I must tell you as I heard it from P. P. Pratt's own mouth, and which he related to a large assembly in Carpenter's Hall, Manchester. The story was told to show that God gave revelation for the guidance of his people. He said: "I sat in my office in Liverpool, when an old gray-headed man, the father of a poor widow lady who, with the old gentleman and three children, came in. I asked them to be seated, but they seemed too much ex-

cited to sit, but stood in the center of the room while the widow explained their business, and tremblingly related to me that an angel of God had instructed her son to tell his mother to sell all her household goods and go to the Liverpool office and they should go to America. I saw and felt in a moment that God had sent them, and it placed me in an awkward position, for the vessel I had chartered was to sail directly, and the berths were all filled to their utmost capacity. I told them how things stood, and again requested them to be seated and await my return. I then went and engaged passage for them an another vessel, and paid their fare out of my own money, and felt I was complying with the requirements of God."

Your correspondent was afterwards informed that the whole family arrived safely at Nauvoo, and on their arrival Joseph Smith, the Prophet, sent for the boy Joseph, and had him relate the angel's visits to him, and said the message was from God. I was told that Joseph Smith gave the family a house to live in. That is the last I have heard of any of the family.

Wellsville, Sept. 21, 1883.

T. B.

—Millennial Star, 45:674-6.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON LIBERTY

(Our good friend, George A. Foote of Ferron, Utah, contributes the following lines from a speech of Abraham Lincoln, delivered at Baltimore, April 18, 1864.)

The world has never had a good definition of the word "Liberty", and the American people, just now, are much in want of one. We all declare for Liberty; but in using the same word, we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word Liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men, and the product of other men's labor. Here are two not only different but incompatible things called by the same name, Liberty, and it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names—Liberty and Tyranny. The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as its liberator; while the wolf denounces him for the same act, as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly, the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon a definition of the word Liberty; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all professing to love liberty. Hence we behold the process by which thousands are daily passing from under the yoke of bondage hailed by some as the advance of Liberty, and bewailed by others as the destruction of all Liberty.

DECEMBER

While Boreas around us is roaring and raging,
Within we have matter for good winter cheer;
Books, friends, and good fires are very engaging,
With means of supply for the ensuing year.
—Poor Richard Revived, 1915.

I like to see a man proud of the place in which he lives. I like to see a man who lives in it so that his place will be proud of him. Be honest, but hate no one; over-turn a man's wrong-doing, but do not over-turn him unless it must be done in over-turning the wrong. Stand with anybody that stands right. Stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong.—Abraham Lincoln.

HOW TO TELL A WOMAN'S AGE

Many a woman, otherwise truthful, will give a false answer when her age is questioned. Here is a way by which she may be snared into a disclosure of the real facts. Ask her to write down the number of the month in which she was born, multiply by 2, add 5, multiply by 50, add her age, subtract 365, add 115 and then tell you the resulting amount. The two right-hand figures will denote her age, and the figure or figures to the left will tell the month in which she was born. If the answer is 1252, she is 52 years of age and the month of her birth is December, the 12th month.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

By Truth Publishing Company

1153 Third Avenue

Salt Lake City, Utah

Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. DECEMBER, 1944. No. 7.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

BROTHER JOSEPH SMITH many times said to Brother Brigham (Young) and myself, and to others, that he was a representative of God to us, to teach and direct us and reprove the wrongdoers. He has passed behind the veil, but there never will a person in this dispensation enter into the celestial glory without his approbation.

Brother Brigham is Brother Joseph's rightful successor, and he has his Counselors, and together they are an earthly pattern of the divine order of government. Those men are God's agents, His servants, and are witnesses of your covenants, which you will have to fulfil.—Heber C. Kimball.

JOSEPH SMITH THE PROPHET

In December our thoughts associate the great latter-day work with the humble beginning of its founder. Joseph Smith, the Prophet of the last dispensation, was born at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, December 23, 1805. We now celebrate the 139th anniversary of his birth.

When Joseph Smith first saw the light of day earth was clothed in spiritual darkness. For nearly eighteen hundred years God's children, having rejected the light and crucified their Savior, walked in the darkness of superstition, ignorance and infidelity. The heavens had been closed to them not again to be opened until men's hearts were prepared to sense the light and abide in it.

Joseph Smith, being one of the faithful spirits whom God chose and reserved to advance His work on earth, was set apart to be born in mortality in the present dispensation, to hold the keys of power and authority over earth as Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Elijah, Peter, James and John, and others held them in their respective dispensations. Brigham Young said of him:

> **It was decreed in the councils of eternity, long before the foundations of the earth were laid, that he, JOSEPH SMITH, should be the man, in the last dispensation of this world, to bring forth the word of God to the people and receive the fulness of the keys and power of the Priesthood of the Son of God. The Lord had His eyes upon him, and upon his father, and upon his father's father, and upon their progenitors clear back to Abraham, and from Abraham to the flood, from the flood to Enoch and from Enoch to Adam. He has watched that family and that blood as it has circulated from its foundation to the birth of**

that man. He was fore-ordained from eternity to preside over this last dispensation.—Instructor, April, 1930.

Joseph Smith came into a fallen world to establish light in the midst of darkness, at a time that the masses held no rational belief in God. He came clothed upon by the Priesthood of the Son of God, which was re-confirmed upon him during mortal life. He broke the seal of darkness and let the light of the Gospel in upon the accumulation of the dust and cobwebs of superstition and ignorance beclouding the human mind. It was his work to establish an order eventually to clear the atmosphere of all retarding elements, making way for perfect liberty of conscience that men might think, pray, and act in consonance with their convictions; that by the exercise of these God-inspired attributes they may work themselves back into His presence and become heirs with Him and with His Son Jesus Christ throughout the eternities. This was a tremendous assignment the Prophet accepted.

CHRIST'S SERMON ON THE MOUNTAIN

And seeing the multitudes, Jesus went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came unto him:

And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,

Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.

Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

—From St. Matthew V.

Joseph Smith established the order of the Priesthood in completeness as it pertains to mortality. He set into being the Church and the Kingdom of God, each organization now functioning among men. From the birth of the great leader the Prince of Darkness sought to destroy him and cut short his work. This, of course, he could not do.

One part of Joseph's calling was to re-establish the patriarchal order of marriage, as through this order, along with all other principles of the Gospel, men may inherit eternal lives and themselves become Gods. Introducing this new order Joseph foresaw his death which the enemy of light would bring about. But he faltered not; he fought the good fight. He was arrested some fifty times and, according to the words of Brigham Young, stood trial in the courts forty-six times with never a conviction.

Joseph had the courage of his convictions. The power of the Holy Priesthood enveloped him. Illustrating his courage in leadership, President John Taylor told of a circumstance occurring at Far West, Missouri, when a mob of some 3500 men came against 200 Mormons. One fellow in the Prophet's Company, with shaking knees, yelled the command, "Retreat!" Joseph exclaimed, "Retreat! Where, in name of God shall we retreat to?" **"He then led us out"**, said Brother Taylor, **"to the prairie, facing the mob, and placed us in position."** A messenger came out from the mob to treat with Joseph. He sent word back, **"Tell your general to withdraw his**

troops or I will send them to hell!'' The number of Saints was doubtless magniefid in the eyes of the mob, for they withdrew and the incident closed.

The message that Joseph Smith brought to a benighted world comprehends in its fulness the ''Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.'' He revealed the true character of God, that ''As man is God once was, and as God is man may become.'' That God is an exalted man; as expressed, from the Prophet's teachings by Parley P. Pratt: **''An immortal man, possessing a perfect organization of spirit, flesh and bones, perfected in his attributes, in all the fulness of Celestial glory, is called a God.''** Joseph brought forth the glorious Gospel of the Resurrection, of the Gathering, the Order of Enoch, the location of the garden of Eden, the Patriarchal order of heaven, the building and the purpose of Temples. He taught the Priesthood of Elijah, thus:

> **Behold I will reveal unto you, says the Prophet Malachi, the Priesthood, by the hand of Elijah, the Prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. And he shall plant in the hearts of the children the promises made to the fathers, and the hearts of the children shall turn to their fathers. If it were not so the whole earth would be utterly wasted at His coming.**

Joseph brought forth the future glories of man, the Celestial the highest, the Terrestrial and the Telestial, and he taught how man may attain to the highest.

These are but highlights in the ministry of the Prophet. He revealed to his followers a perfect plan which, if followed, will insure complete salvation and exaltation to the human race. But he saw the plan would not be followed. Men would be overcome of the world. The servants of the Lord would detour from the ''straight and narrow path.'' They would surrender many truths and principles of the Gospel in order to better fraternize with the ''mammon of unrighteousness.'' He saw a ''falling away''. In these tragic words he expressed that which was to follow:

> **Yea, thus saith the still small voice, which whispereth through and pierceth all things, and often times it maketh my bones to quake while it maketh manifest saying:**
>
> **And it shall come to pass that I, the Lord God, will send one mighty and strong, holding the scepter of power in his hand, clothed with light for a covering, whose mouth shall utter words, eternal words; while his bowels shall be a fountain of truth, to set in order the house of God, and to arrange by lot the inheritances of the Saints whose names are found and the names of their fathers, and of their children, enrolled in the book of the law of God. While that man who was CALLED OF GOD AND APPOINTED that putteth forth his hand to steady the ark of God, shall fall by the shaft of death, like as a tree that is smitten by the vivid shaft of lightning. * * * These things I say not of myself; therefore as the Lord speaketh He will also fulfill.—D. & C., 85.**

A tragedy is being enacted in and by the Church today. Satan has exerted such an overwhelming power over the Saints as to cause them to apostatize from many of the truths of the Gospel and cause them to become persecutors of their brethren.

How must the Prophet feel, after sealing with his blood his mission as a Witness and Testator of all he taught the Saints, to see them now join hands with the wicked in the attempted destruction of a few faithful ones who have the desire and courage to cling to the fundamentals of the Gospel as established by him? It is a sorry commentary on the short-sightedness and faithlessness of man. During this month of December all kinds of eulogies will be heaped upon the memory of the martyred Prophet by his assumed successors, while they are using their utmost powers to crush and destroy those engaged in keeping alive the teachings of that self-same Prophet!

However, this situation was foreseen by Joseph Smith. He saw a coming

disintegration among the Saints at Kirtland, at Zion in Missouri and at Nauvoo; and while there would be a "falling away" among the Saints he also saw a faithful group in the Church that would forge ahead, keeping alive the flickering fires of faith among the more faithful of the Saints until such a time as the Lord's power shall again bring them to a recollection of their covenants and to repentance. This view was expressed by President Daniel H. Wells on the point at issue:

> **Many will doubtless make shipwreck of their faith and will be led away by the allurements of sin into by and forbidden paths; yet the kingdom will not be taken from this people and given to another. BUT A PEOPLE WILL COME FORTH FROM AMONG US, who will be zealous of good works, willing to do the bidding of the Lord, who will be taught in His ways, and who will walk in His paths.—Deseret News, Nov. 6, 1875.**

And on another occasion (Des. News, Dec. 9, 1882), speaking upon the same subject, President Wells spoke these words:

> **And if we as a people do not hold ourselves on the altar ready to be used, * * * He will pass on and get somebody else; because He will get a people that will do it. I do not mean to say that He will pass on and leave this people; no, THERE WILL COME UP FROM THE MIDST OF THIS PEOPLE that people which has been talked so much about.**

A like truth was expressed by the late Apostle Orson F. Whitney in these words:

> **Many of this people are perhaps preparing themselves, by following after the world in its mad race for wealth and pleasure, to go down with Babylon when she crumbles and falls; but I know that there is a people, in the heart's core of this people, that will arise in their majesty in a DAY THAT IS NEAR AT HAND, and push spiritual things to the front; a people who will stand up for God, FEARING NOT MAN NOR WHAT MAN CAN DO, but believing, as the Prophet Joseph says, that all things we suffer are for our best good, and that God will stand by us forever and ever.—Des. News Weekly, Aug. 11, 1889.**

(For a more exhaustive treatise on this point, see TRUTH, Vol. 9, No. 9, pp. 230-234.)

Joseph Smith has gone on. His mortal mission is ended. Yet his spirit and the genius of his leadership remains with those whose hearts are in the work. He holds the keys of the present dispensation and, as the song goes, "Mingling with Gods, he can plan for his brethren; death cannot conquer the hero again"; he is directing the work with the Priesthood on the other side, and a crown of glory is being prepared for those who remain faithful.

DUPLICITY

The mean and sinful duplicity of the present leaders of the Mormon church was outlined in our November Editorial. We showed conclusively that the present crusade against a few men and women who believe in the revelations of the Lord given through the Prophet Joseph Smith and to his successors in the Priesthood, was initiated by the present leaders of the Church. The reason for this unholy crusade must spring from prejudice and jealousy. The object of it must be to retain the world popularity now thought to be enjoyed by the Church, along with dictatorial powers over the members of the Church.

It is beyond human understanding how a professed great leader of a religious faith, who, years ago, resisted and even defied the laws of the land, claiming them to contravene the laws of God, could make such a complete and ignoble surrender and become the persecutor of his brethren and sisters who are alleged to be doing now just what he was doing then.

It was the present leader, who, as a member of the Quorum of Twelve, spoke this doctrine:

> **No matter what restrictions we may be placed under by men, our only consistent course is to keep the commandments of God. We should, in this regard, place ourselves in the same position as that of the**

three Hebrews who were cast into the fiery furnace. If we are living in the light of the Gospel we have a testimony of the truth, and we have but one choice, that is to abide in the law of God, no matter as to the consequences. It is sometimes held that the Saints are in error because so many are opposed to them. But when people know they are right it is wrong for them to forego their honest convictions by yielding their judgment to that of a majority, no matter how large. * * * There will be opposition to the Latter-day Saints until the whole social fabric of the world is revolutionized.—Deseret News, April 6, 1885.

It was this present leader who in 1889, nine years after the issuing of the Manifesto, pleaded guilty in the Third District Court to a charge of unlawful cohabitation, and paid a fine, and it is the same leader who, years after the Manifesto, made his boast that he was going to keep marrying until he got a wife that would bring him a son. And it is now this same church leader who, through his agent, **openly and brazenly, AND BRAGGINGLY** admits to the press that he helped to instigate the present crusade against certain Latter-day Saints because of their beliefs.

There was a time when a conspiracy was hatched to destroy Jesus of Nazareth. "The chief priests and the elders" of the church entered into a plot to ensnare the Lord and, through the agency of false witnesses, have him adjudged guilty of sedition against the government at Rome and crucified. He was a hated "cultist". He was a "Fundamentalist" in that he believed in the Gospel as it came down through his Father from the beginning of time.

Caiaphas, the high priest, presided at his trial. Witnesses were summoned to give false evidence. These witnesses could not agree on their evidence. There was perjury, as in the present instance. And yet the Son of God was condemned to die on the cross. How like that circumstance is the present crusade! A band of Saints, believing in the fundamentals of the Gospel as established by the Prophet Joseph Smith who sealed his solemn testimony with his blood, are assailed and the machinery is set up for their destruction. Lacking a better charge under the law, the plotters make it a conspiracy—"sedition" with the Savior.

Taken before the courts, leading elders are there to prosecute. False witnesses are summoned to testify against them. The evidence does not agree. An attempt is made to absolve the Church from all complicity. Known enemies of the defendants are selected as Jurors to sit as their judges. There are thirty-one defendants. Even if conspiracy could be implied against some, no evidence to prove conspiracy was produced against a number of them; yet all were adjudged guilty. Several of the defendants are wives and mothers—some preparing to bring forth life. Their crime (?) was to play a piano solo, sing a hymn, bear a faithful testimony that Jesus is the Christ and Joseph Smith a Prophet of God. Yet the prosecuting elders, following the desire of the "high priest", had them found guilty of conspiracy against the peace and dignity of State.

At the end of the last trial and notwithstanding the perjury of certain witnesses in their efforts to shield the Church from any possible complicity in initiating the cases, and notwithstanding the leaders of the church disavowed any connection with the prosecutions, an agent for the Church, Mark E. Petersen, a member of the Quorum of Twelve, had information sent to outside papers through the Managing Bureau of the United Press, along following lines:

1. The Mormon church, "which has been excommunicating polygamists ever since the 1890 Manifesto, had appointed investigators to search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution."

2. That the term, "Fundamentalists", as applied to the defendants, was

a "misnomer, since the fundamental doctrines of the Church are NOW opposed to polygamy", and that "some sect members were recruits from various Protestant faiths", etc.

The account, as published in the Ogden Standard-Examiner of October 7, 1944, and as furnished by the United Press from information volunteered the Bureau by Mark E. Petersen, reads as follows:

> **Meanwhile the Mormon church which has been excommunicating polygamists ever since the 1890 Manifesto, REVEALED that it had appointed investigators to "search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution". The most recently appointed Mormon apostle, Mark E. Petersen said that the term "Fundamentalists" was incorrect, "since the fundamental doctrines of the Church are now opposed to polygamy". He added that "some sect members were recruited from various Protestant faiths", and that "we are now beginning to get the blame for this mess."**

In giving the United Press the information, Mark E. Petersen, **claiming** to be an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, either knew that he was bearing false witness against an innocent people or confessed to a palpable ignorance; at any rate he was revealing the perfidy of his file leaders.

The defendants knew the "dice had been loaded", but could not get the facts before the Jury. After the trial, this stool-pigeon, Mark E. Petersen, gave the game of the church away and confessed its part in "loading the dice". Of course, previously the Presiding Bishopric, through its mouthpiece, David A. Smith, had said, "**We are cooperating, wherever possible in obtaining enforcement of the law.**" Melvin J. Ballard of the Quorum of Twelve said, speaking of the Arizona defendants in 1935, "**The Church Authorities urged Arizona officials to act against him (John Y. Barlow) and his followers.**" Prosecuting Attorney Bollinger of Mohave County, Arizona, said, "**Officials of the regular Mormon Church, were assisting to bring about the arrest and conviction of the polygamists.**" In the recent cases, Assistant Federal Prosecuting Attorney John S. Boyden stated to the court the **Church had urged him, since the County and State had failed to bring convictions, "to initiate this series of proceedings."**

The President of the European Mission, advertises in the Millennial Star that "**The Church has in fact assisted in obtaining the information leading to the indictments, and a 'Mormon Elder' is the prosecuting attorney.**" Then, to top it all off, and as an addition to the statement of President Heber J. Grant, that "**I shall rejoice when the Government officials put a few of these polygamists in the County jail or the State penitentiary**", the First Presidency of the Church added its official endorsement of the Federal prosecutions as follows: "**We commend and uphold the Federal Government in its efforts through the office of the United States District Attorney and assisting agencies to bring before the bar of justice those who have violated the law.**" (Or in other words those who have broken the law as I, Heber J. Grant, and numerous other leaders of the Church, have done and are now doing).

And yet in the conspiracy trial the prosecutor attempted to give the Church a thorough white-washing and assume the entire responsibility of the **prosecution. Mark E. Petersen "spilled the beans".** He revealed to the world through the United Press the utter duplicity of the leaders of the Church in the matter. The other stool-pigeon, the snooping and spying Casper Fetzer, with whom no confidences are sacred, **purjured himself on the stand. He** endeavored to turn his perfidy, his mean, spying, nosey escapades into the act of a humble missionary sent out by President McKay, not to gather evidence for the prosecution to use, but to "save the souls of the young". He said: "**With tears in his eyes, Brother**

McKay sent me forth to save the youth''. With his compeers, Sappie and Bishop Curtis, Fetzer revealed an **unholy triumvirate organized and sent cut by the church leaders to set traps for those not in harmony with the present policy of the Church, that they might be immolated or driven from the community.**

In stating that the cultists were not all former members of the Church, some having been recruited from various Protestant faiths, Mark E. Petersen was passing misinformation. These cultists, as he and his nosey cohorts call them, are all ''old line'' Mormons. They have not left the faith as established by the Prophet Joseph Smith, but are clinging to it tenaciously. They refuse to accept the innovations of false doctrines now being introduced into the Church; and for this reason, and this reason only, they are castigated, lied about and persecuted. The church authorities have, on numerous occasions, been invited to discuss these matters and show the so-called ''cultists'' their mistakes, but the invitation has not been accepted. Let Mr. Petersen name one person among this group who was not formerly a Mormon in good standing.

The further statement of Mr. Petersen that ''all cultists who have held membership in the L. D. S. church have been excommunicated by the Church'': What does our acrobatic authority mean by this mis-statement? What is a cultist? Let us turn to the dictionary: CULT: ''Sect'', ''denomination'', ''religion'', ''communion'', ''faith'', ''creed'', ''persuasion'', ''church''. A cultist then must be one adhering to religion, to a church. Is not Mr. Petersen a cultist—is not President Grant one? If by the statement made by Mr. Petersen he means that all who have disregarded the Manifesto of 1890 have been excommunicated from the Church his statement is totally false. In making the statement the astute deceiver has greatly overshot the mark. Has he forgotten that both Joseph F. Smith, while President of the Church, and Francis M. Lyman, while President of the Quorum of Twelve, testified in the Reed Smoot case before a congressional committee, in 1904, that they were both living in violation of the laws of the land and of the rules of the Church? And Heber J. Grant hurried off to Europe, in the same year, to avoid a second arrest for violation of the laws of the land; and he was, at that time breaking the Woodruff Manifesto and violating the rules of the Church. Neither of these brethren was excommunicated from the Church, nor disciplined in any respect.

True, as we have stated on previous occasions, the Church does not officially sanction plural marriage. It cannot do so without having the Saints vote upon the question, for **''All things shall be done by common consent in the Church''**, (D. & C., Sec. 26). The Church repudiated the principle in adopting the Woodruff Manifesto—together with the interpretations placed upon it by the authorities, and to re-institute the practice the Church would have to reverse its former action by vote. But if Mr. Petersen knows anything concerning church history he must know that while the Church gave the principle up the Priesthood, to whom the principle belongs,—it being a law of the Priesthood—carried on, and thousands of brothers and sisters have broken the Church rule since the Manifesto, a very small fraction of whom have been excommunicated or even demoted. Many of our present officials in that category, are being held in their positions. Does Mr. Petersen want us to produce in the columns of TRUTH examples of these facts?

It is certainly a **''mess''**, as Mr. Petersen terms it in his message to the United Press, the Church through action of its leaders, has gotten itself into, by trying to reform the Gospel

as established by God through Joseph Smith the Prophet, then trying to convince the world it is not doing so.

The Church, once a sorely persecuted body, has now joined hands with the persecutors. Are the "fires of Smithfield" again to be lighted? Where will the persecution end? When a great and strong church begins a second St. Bartholomew's crusade with the confessed purpose of destroying that part of its membership that insists upon clinging to the fundamentals of Mormonism as revealed from heaven, we expect the Lord to come out of His hiding place and do some correcting on His own account, as He has promised to do.

HOLIDAY SEASON

We feel to give a word of caution against unreasonable gift buying and gift trading during the approaching Christmas holidays. While there is always something pleasant in the making and receiving of gifts, especially where sincerity is the foundation of the act, still there is a tendency to go to an extreme in this time-aged custom, which we feel should be curbed.

In the first place we regard the term "Christmas" as it applies to the birth of Jesus the Son of Mary, a misnomer. Practically all the authorities are agreed that December 25th is not the day, nor does it closely approximate the time of the birth of the Savior. Latter-day revelation places the exact date, April 6th. (D. & C., 20:1).

The story of old Santa has served to gladden the hearts of the children for many generations and we feel a reluctance in attempting to erase this very enticing legendary fable from the juvenile mind. The Christmas tree, which figures strong in Yuletide celebrations is at best a pagan custom, as hinted by the Prophet Jeremiah (10:3-5). In that day a form of idol worship was doubtless tendered the tree. We have adopted this spasm of ancient heathenish custom as a part of a Christian celebration.

One particular end we feel the Saints should strive towards is to keep out of debt. All kinds of inducements are offered the purchasing public to buy on credit, thereby voluntarily placing themselves in jeopardy to the merchant kings. In the present situation when employment is fairly sure and wages high, it affords an excellent opportunity to economize and free ourselves from debt, in order to breathe the air of freedom when the dark days of want again overtake us, as they inevitably must do.

If the Christmas custom is to be perpetuated we advise that the purchases made be fitted to the purse without going into debt for the same; and let the gifts be of a nature to serve actual needs of the recipients. Many toys for the youngsters may be made at home and decorated to meet the childish fancy, while the grown members of the family may have an understanding of the needs of each other and make their selections accordingly.

It will please the Lord if the Saints will learn retrenchment, using good judgment in their buying, taking a course to get free from debt and then remain so. Foodstuffs that can be stored for future use, would be an excellent gift for many people.

Let a word to the wise be sufficient.

JOSEPH WRITES FROM LIBERTY JAIL

Joseph Smith's anxiety for the Saints and the work of the Lord is shown in a letter written by him from Liberty Jail in Missouri, to his dear friend, Precinda L. Huntington, who had tried to visit the Prophet on two previous occasions:

Liberty Jail, March 15, 1839.

Dear Sister:

My heart rejoiced at the friendship you manifested in requesting to have conversation with us; but the jailor is a very jealous man, for fear some

one will have tools for us to get out with. He is under the eye of the mob continually, and his life is at stake if he grants us any privilege. He will not let us converse with anyone alone.

O what a joy it would be for us to see our friends. It would have gladdened my heart to have had the privilege of conversing with you; but the hand of tyranny is upon us; but thanks be to God, it cannot last always; and he that sitteth in the heavens will laugh at their calamity and mock when their fear cometh.

We feel, dear sister, that our bondage is not of long duration. I trust that I shall have the chance to give such instructions as have been communicated to us, before long; and as you wanted some instruction from us, and also to give us some information, and administer consolation to us, and to find out what is best for you to do, I think that many of the brethren, if they will be pretty still, can stay in this country until the indignation is over and passed. But I think it will be better for Brother Buell to leave and go with the rest of the brethren, if he keeps the faith, and at any rate. for thus speaketh the Spirit concerning him. I want him and you to know that I am your true friend.

I was glad to see you. **No tongue can tell what inexpressible joy it gives a man to see the face of one who has been a friend, after having been inclosed in the walls of a prison for five months.** It seems to me my heart will always be more tender after this than it ever was before.

My heart bleeds continually when I contemplate the distress of the Church. O that I could be with them; I would not shrink at toil and hardship to render them comfort and consolation. I want the blessing once more to lift my voice in the midst of the Saints. I would pour out my soul to God for their instruction. It has been the plan of the devil to hamper and distress me from the beginning, to keep me from explaining myself to them, and I never have had opportunity to give them the plan that God has revealed to me. Many have run without being sent, crying, "Tidings, my Lord", and have caused injury to the Church, giving the adversary more power over them that walk by sight and not by faith. Our trouble will only give us that knowledge to understand the mind of the ancients. For my part I think I never could have felt as I now do if I had not suffered the wrongs which I have suffered. All things shall work together for good to them that love God.

Beloved sister, we see that perilous times have truly come, and the things which we have so long expected have at last begun to usher in; but when you see the fig tree begin to put forth its leaves, you may know that the summer is nigh at hand. There will be a short work on the earth; it has now commenced. I suppose there will soon be perplexity all over the earth. Do not let our hearts faint when these things come upon us, for they must come or the word cannot be fulfilled. I know that something will soon take place to stir up this generation to see what they have been doing, and that their fathers have inherited lies, and they have been led captive by the devil to no profit. But they know not what they do. **Do not have any feeling of enmity towards any son or daughter of Adam.** I believe I shall be let out of their hands some way or other, and shall see good days. **We cannot do anything, only stand still and see the salvation of God. He must do His own work or it must fall to the ground. We must not take it in our hands to avenge our wrongs. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord; I will repay."** I have no fears; I shall stand unto death, God being my helper.

I wanted to communicate something, and I wrote this. Write to us if you can. Etc.

J. SMITH, JR.

—Women of Mormondom, pp. 210-212.

ITEMS PERTAINING TO ORGANIZATION OF SEVENTIES

Related by
PRESIDENT JOSEPH YOUNG, SEN.
November 1, 1878

Enoch and His City—From What Part of Earth Taken—Tongues Enjoyed —Language of Adam to Be Restored—Translation Explained by the Prophet.

Enoch, the seventh from Adam, stands among the greatest spirits of antiquity, and foremost among those whom the Lord declared should be his rulers. One of the mightiest for the work he was destined to perform. Predisposed from his infancy to accept of everything that was revealed from God; and it being instinctively incorporated in his very nature to be eligible to every divine manifestation, he finally grew to be a God in humanity, and he received this testimony from his Heavenly Father that he pleased Him.

We read, from modern revelations given through Joseph Smith the Prophet, that Enoch was born in the 622nd year of the world; was 25 years old when ordained under the hands of Adam, and was blessed (by God) at the age of 65. He walked with him 365 years, making him 430 years old when he and his city were translated. He obtained such favor with the Lord, that at his voice the mountains shook from their foundations, the rivers were turned out of their courses, and the lands came up out of the depths of the sea, upon which his enemies took refuge through fear.

The city of Enoch implies a problem, which is difficult of solution. It stands alone, without precedent or succession to the present period. The author is not advised that there is any published history, or any manuscript brought forth, which has survived the antedeluvian dispensation, leaving any details of such extraordinary events as the gathering together of a righteous people called Zion, and of the building of so large and beautiful a city. Indeed, such an one as the Lord called "His abode forever". The knowledge of such events must therefore have been the productions of inspired men.

From these revelations it may be inferred that the disciples of Enoch were gathered together. At his suggestion they built a city, on the site which he had selected. He had seen the Heavens opened. Had gazed upon cities that were celestial; had been familiar with the gorgeousness of the heavenly mansions, and the splendor of their architecture. Acquiring thereby a superior intelligence and that spirit of refinement and taste, which enabled him to instruct his brethren to build after the pattern of the heavenly.

The gathering of the people and the building of the city increased and continued for a great length of time, until it was consumated. The form, the order and the architecture of the buildings of the city of Enoch, presented to the eye a glory and splendor surpassing our sublimest conceptions of art. The gardens, orchards and vineyards; the lawns, shade and floral fields; partaking of the best selections of fruits, flowers and evergreens that could be collected, from far and near. Such had been the perfection attained by the favored persons who had listened to the voice and preaching of Enoch, and who comprised the inhabitants of his city.

Since the period of the first acquaintance of the author with Joseph Smith, the Prophet, he occasionally referred particularly to this subject, which transpired in the author's hearing. Once in Kirtland, and once in Nauvoo. At the former place, in a meeting held in the year 1832, on the occasion of Elder Brigham Young speaking in tongues, the Prophet being

present; it was the first time that the exercise of this gift had come under his notice. The congregation was at the time in a kneeling posture. As soon as Brother Brigham had concluded his prayer, the Prophet rose to his feet and invited them to rise and be seated. Joseph then addressed them, and said:

"Brethren, this tongue that was heard is the gift of God, for He has made it known unto me, and I shall never oppose anything that comes from him. I feel the spirit that Brother Brigham has manifested in this gift of tongues, and I wish to speak myself in the tongue that it will please the Lord to give me." He accordingly spoke in what may be called an open and fluent language; more so than was commonly heard. He occupied some minutes in the exercise of the gift. After he had concluded he said, **"Brethren, this is the language of our Father Adam while he dwelt in Eden; and the time will again come, that when the Lord brings again Zion, the Zion of Enoch, this people will then all speak the language which I have just spoken."**

Ten years subsequently, at Nauvoo, while naming historical incidents of antiquity, he alluded to the Church, or Zion of Enoch, and discoursed some time upon the nature of its organization, order and progress. He spoke with a view of correcting the teachings of some of the elders who had maintained the doctrine that the people of that Church had passed through the ordeals necessary to consumate the work of complete immortality, and that they would be prepared to enter into the presence of the Father and the Son. This idea the Prophet took up, and revealed it in a different light—in what may be styled a divine philosophy. He declared of the Church of Enoch "that they did not die; that they had not then gone through their last changes and greatest refinement; and that they had, nevertheless, triumphed over death. That the people, and the city, and the foundations of the earth on which it stood, had partaken of so much of the immortal elements, bestowed upon them by God through the teachings of Enoch, that it became philosophically impossible for them to remain any longer upon the earth; consequently, Enoch and his people, with the city which they occupied, and the foundations on which it stood, with a large piece of earth immediately connected with the foundations and the City, had assumed an aerial position within the limits of our solar system; and this in consequence of their faith."

He further said, "that inasmuch as they did not pass through all the refinement which was necessary, as the Lord lives, they would return to the earth, when they and the city would pass through the same fiery ordeals that yet await the earth; when it shall be transformed into a sea of glass, mingled with fire, and their preparations for a celestial abode of the glorified Saints shall be perfected.*

The reader will naturally ask, what are the keys of the commencement of this city of Zion? The scriptures say, in Paul's address to the Saints, "Know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost?" And modern revelation says, "This is Zion—The Pure in Heart." Who can doubt, then, that Zion is within us; a temple adorned with all the attributes of our Father in Heaven. In that view of it, the recipient thereof holds within himself the work of his Father, and hears the voice of His Spirit; obeys all of His commandments, spiritual and temporal, without the least hesitation or mental reservation. When this spirit is fully established in the hearts of all the Saints, then there will be no idol in the way of their progress. One word, or command, is just as easy for them to hearken to and obey as another; and they realize the saying, **"God is love; he that dwells in love dwells in God, and God in him."** Then they have

a Zion first within their hearts; a germ of an abiding inheritance upon the new earth.

The Saints are looking for a modern Zion which shall be after the identical order of the ancient one; and for a time when the Apostles, with their President at their head, will rise up and thunder so loud, that if they do not shake the mountains from their foundations, they will have the effect of shaking pride and coveteousness out of the hearts of the Saints, who will be filled with righteousness—their only motive, the building up of Zion; making their faith and their works, their means and substance to bow to that end, and that only; and so continuing to the Zion within them, and erecting and adorning temples and mansions, building cities, and spreading abroad, until they shall become a model of the Zion of old, built by Enoch.

Whether these designs of the Saints will be consumated in a very short period of time, or at a "set time" still more remote, it will and must be the fruits of their faith in the Lord God, or they will not be acknowledged as His people, according to the revelations which He has given concerning Zion. Taking this view of the subject, the Seventies and the Elders of Israel will be endowed with the power of their calling, in preaching the Gospel and gathering the people from the uttermost parts of the earth. Their words will be as the words of God to the people, in strengthening their hands and cheering their hearts to persevere, until Zion is built up and perfected on the earth, and the Lord shall appear in his glory and acknowledge it His abode, as He did the Zion of old.

JOSEPH YOUNG, SEN.

*Joseph Smith said, on another occasion, in the hearing of some of the Saints still surviving, that the City of Enoch would again take its place in the identical spot from which it had been detached, now forming that chasm of the earth, filled with water, called the Gulf of Mexico.

APPENDIX

The following sentiment was delivered by the Prophet Joseph Smith in an address to the Elders, assembled in Kirtland, soon after the Seventies were organized. He said:

"Brethren, some of you are angry with me, because you did not fight in Missouri; but let me tell you, God did not want you to fight. He could not organize his kingdom with twelve men to open the gospel door to the nations of the earth, and with seventy men under their direction to follow in their tracks, unless he took them from a body of men who had offered their lives, and who had made as great a sacrifice as did Abraham.

"Now, the Lord has got his Twelve and His Seventy, and there will be other quorums of seventies called, who will make the sacrifice, and those who have not made their sacrifices and their offerings now, will make them hereafter."

—Historical Items, p. 14, L. C. 2988, R. 27 V. 59. Brigham Young University Library.

THE ELIAS

BY JOHN TAYLOR

There are few subjects that have puzzled the children of men more than the solution of this one question: Who is Elias? There has not been so much difficulty in identifying him with Elijah, as there has in relation to the office that he was to sustain, as spoken of prophetically by Malachi. **"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse."** (Mal. 4:5, 6.) The great question that remains to be solved is, was John the Baptist the Elias, or was he not? There is indeed something perplexing, since there

seems to be a clashing of scripture testimony in relation to this subject. I say **seems to be,** because in reality there is not. The angel Gabriel, when he appeared unto Zachariah, the father of John the Baptist made the following statement concerning him:

> Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife shall bear thee a son; and thou shalt call his name John, and thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth, for he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the SPIRIT AND POWER OF ELIAS, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.—Luke 1:13-17.

Here then is a clear statement, making out that John the Baptist was the Elias. Now we turn to John, Chap. I, beginning at the 20th verse: "And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed I am not the Christ. And they asked him, what then? Art thou Elias, and he saith I AM NOT. Art thou that prophet? and he answered, NO." Turn we now to Matt. XI:13, 14: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John, and if ye will receive it, THIS IS THE ELIAS which was to come." Here, then, is a strange comixture of prophesying and testimony, apparently conflicting and at variance; so palpable, indeed, is the difference that one says that he is the Elias, the other says that he is not. What shall be done? Is one part of it untrue? Verily, no. Shall we try to evade it? No. If the paradox cannot be unriddled on reasonable terms, we will acknowledge the difficulty, leave it irreconcilable to our understanding, and say, "Let God be true and every man a liar." We will, however, venture an assertion which strange and anomalous as it may appear, and indeed is, we think we can sustain; which is this that John the Baptist was the Elias, and that he was not the Elias, and in taking this singular course we are only stating what is above stated and we think that we shall be sustained by reason, common sense, and the scriptures.

The Elias spoken of in the scriptures, is a restorer, hence our Saviour said, "Elias verily cometh and restores all things". And yet it is evident that John the Baptist was the Elias, for our Saviour says, "but I say unto you that Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whotsoever they listed, as it is written of him".—Mark IX:13.

Ever since the fall of man the great Jehovah has had it in his mind to restore him to his pristine excellency, to remove the curse from the brute creation and to restore the earth to its primitive glory; nay, while this earth was one dark chaotic mass, before God said, "Let there be light, and it was so", or ever this world rolled into existence, or the morning stars sung together for joy a plan was formed in the councils of heaven, it was contemplated by the great Author of our existence, Eloheim, Jehovah, to redeem the earth from under the curse. Hence when the Gods deliberated about the formation of man, it was known that he would fall and the Saviour was provided who was to redeem and to restore, who was indeed the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world".

The eternal plan of Jehovah, however, was as perfect at that time as it is now. The foundation was perfectly laid, the outlines were clearly sketched with a master hand, and the interstices have been filling up from that day to this. Satan has gained no more power, than he has been permitted to hold; the universe has been under the direction of the Lord of Hosts and it will be seen by and by that he whose right it is, will possess the earth. Satan will be bound, the earth redeemed, and **"the kingdoms of this**

world become the kingdoms of our God, and of his Christ''.

The earth has to be redeemed by the power of God, through the medium of the priesthood; the priesthood in heaven and on earth combined. And ever since the fall of man, in the different ages of the world, men clothed with the priesthood, have had a view of this subject: poets have sung about it, and prophets have prophesied of it; it has engaged the pencil of the artist, the tongue of the learned, and the pen of the scribe; and if ever the souls of the prophets were fired with the Spirit of God it was when they prophesied of the mountains dropping down sweet wine, and the wilderness blossoming as the rose, when the lion and the lamb should lay down together, and the earth be filled with the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea. When Zion should be established in glory, and all nations flock to her standard. When the temple of God should be reared, and the waters of life flow from its threshold; when the tree of life should be planted, and the leaves thereof be for the healing of the nations; when the inhabitants of Zion should dwell in safety and no more say I am sick, and Jerusalem become the throne of the Lord.''

In prospect of these things many prophets and servants of God have united their faith, and energies to bring about the thing so desired, and to act the part of Elias, or restorers. Enoch tried to do it, but was not able. He walked with God, he had great faith, he raised up a powerful church, and taught them the principles of righteousness, but could not redeem the earth. The earth was becoming more corrupt and God took Enoch and his church to himself, and hence arose the saying, ''Zion is fled''. The salt being thus removed, there was nothing to preserve the earth, and it was overthrown with a flood.

Moses tried, in his day, to accomplish something in relation to this matter; but he did not accomplish it; he drew nigh unto God by faith, and obtained promises from God. The Lord said that he would make of the children of Israel a kingdom of priests and thus they being taught of God, and being enabled to teach all nations it might necessarily be presumed that intelligence would flow through their instrumentality, and that the kingdom of God would be planted and flourish on the earth; but they sinned against God; they lost the Melchisedek Priesthood; and instead of being a kingdom of priests, they had only one High Priest, who could go into the presence of God, and that only once a year, instead of the whole kingdom being brought into the presence of God, as a ''kingdom of priests''. Moses failed in his attempt. He was taken from their midst, and they placed under a ''schoolmaster until Christ''.

The great prototype of John the Baptist, Elijah, was a great prophet, the spirit of God rested upon him in a powerful manner, yet he could not do much; but had to exclaim, **''They have killed the prophets, and digged down thine alters; and I am left alone and they seek my life.''**

John the Baptist came in his day as an Elias; a restorer. The angel Gabriel said that he come in the ''spirit and power of Elias'', and if the people would have submitted to his teaching and to the teaching of our Saviour, the things that are spoken of in the prophets would have been fulfilled; hence, says our Saviour, ''if ye will receive it'', this is the Elias which was to come; but he goes on to tell them that they would not receive it. He says, ''he that hath ears to hear let him hear, but whereunto shall I liken this generation?'' It is likened unto children sitting in the markets and calling unto their fellows, saying: **''We have piped unto you and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto**

you and ye have not lamented. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say he hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say behold a man glutenous and a wine bibber, a friend of Publicans and sinners.'' (Matt. XI: 14 and 19.) Thus they rejected John the Baptist, and although he was indeed the Elias, he could not be so to them, and hence, when they asked him ''art thou Elias?'' he said, ''I am not.'' They had forfeited the favor of Jehovah, the kingdom of heaven was taken from them, and the blessings of God withdrawn from their midst.

We do not attach the blame to any of the ancient prophets. We believe they did their best; but they lived among a corrupt people who would not listen to the word of the Lord, besides, the time appointed by Jehovah had not come and they could not be made perfect without us, and we without them. It requires the priesthood in heaven, and the priesthood on earth combined, to bring about these things. And as the Lord has been pleased to reveal unto us the fulness of the gospel, and he is about to gather his word into one, and his people into one, since we are favored with the faith of all the priesthood that have lived, as well as those that are now living. The faith and assistance of the fathers on the Asiatic continent, as well as the ancients on this continent, inasmuch as we are faithful, we may perhaps unite in singing this new song, saying:

The Lord hath brought again Zion:
The Lord hath redeemed his people, Israel,
According to the election of grace,
Which was brought to pass by the faith,
And covenant of their fathers.
The Lord hath redeemed his people,
And Satan is bound, and time is no longer:
The Lord hath gathered all things in one;
The Lord hath brought down Zion from above:
The Lord hath brought up Zion from beneath;
The earth hath travailed and brought forth her strength;
And truth is established in her bowels;
And the heavens have smiled upon her;
And she is clothed with the glory of God:
For He stands in the midst of his people:
Glory, and honor, and power, and might,
Be ascribed to our God, for He is full of Mercy;
Justice, grace and truth, and peace,
For ever and ever: Amen.

As the Prophet observes, ''Behold, this is wisdom in me: wherefore marvel not for the hour cometh that I will drink of the fruit of the vine with you on the earth, and with Moroni, whom I have sent unto you to reveal the book of Mormon, containing the fullness of my everlasting gospel; to whom I have committed the keys of the record of the stick of Ephraim; and also with Elias, to whom I have committed the keys of bringing to pass the restoration of all things, or the restorer of all things spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began, concerning the last days: and also John the son of Zacharias, which Zacharias he (Elias) visited and gave promise that he should have a son, and his name should be John, and he should be filled with the spirit of Elias; which John I have sent unto you, my servants, Joseph Smith, Jr., and Oliver Cowdery, to ordain you unto this first priesthood which you have received, that you might be called and ordained even of Aaron: and also Elijah unto whom I have committed the keys of the power of turning the hearts of the fathers to the children and the hearts of the children to the fathers that the whole earth may not be smitten with a curse; and also with Joseph, and Jacob, and Isaac, and Abraham your fathers, by whom the promises remain; and also with Michael, or Adam, the father of all, the prince of all, the ancient of days:

And also with Peter, and James and John, whom I have sent unto you, by whom I have ordained you and confirmed you to be apostles and especial witnesses of my name, and bear the keys of your ministry; and of the same things which I revealed unto

them; unto whom I have committed the keys of my kingdom, and a **dispensation of the gospel for the last times; and for the fullness of times, in which I will gather together in one all things both which are in heaven and which are on earth**"; and also with all those whom my Father hath given me out of the world; wherefore lift up your hearts and rejoice, and gird up your loins, and take upon you my whole armor, that ye may be able to withstand the evil day, having done all ye may be able to stand. Stand, therefore, having your loins gird about with truth; having on the breastplate of righteousness: and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace which I have sent mine angels to commit unto you, taking the shield of faith wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked; and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of my spirit, which I will pour out upon you, and my word which I reveal unto you, and be agreed as touching all things whatsoever ye ask of me, and be faithful until I come, and ye shall be caught up that where I am, ye shall be also. Amen.—Times and Seasons, 4:120-3 (March 1, 1843.)

THE LORD'S COURSE IN MORAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD

We will now inquire, what part the Lord has ever taken in the moral government of the world. In the last chapter I showed that man has a moral agency; acting under the Lord, and is, consequently, responsible to him for his acts, as a moral agent.

But does he leave him alone and unassisted to carry out his designs? No. Looking upon man as his son, he has from time to time offered his services and instructions, as a father. He has given revelations, instructing and warning his people. He has given promises to the obedient, and threatened the disobedient. He has instructed kings, rulers, and prophets. He has also protected the righteous, and punished, by judgments, the wicked. He has promised to Abraham and others lands and possessions. He has held out promises of eternal life to the faithful; but has never coerced or forced the human mind.

He destroyed the inhabitants of the old world because they had corrupted themselves. He did not govern their minds; they might forget God, "and every thought of their hearts be only evil, and that continually"; but the earth was the Lord's, and he was the Father of our spirits; and although man had an agency to propagate his species, it was given him by God; and if he was so blind as to corrupt himself, and entail misery upon millions of unborn beings, the God of the universe, "the Father of spirits", had a right to prevent him. And if he was prostituting the use of those facilities given him by God, to the service of Satan, and abusing the liberty which his Creator had so liberally given, although the Lord could not control the free action of his will, he could destroy his body, and thus prevent him from cursing posterity.

Hence, if a man transgresses the laws of the land, he is considered a bad member of society, and is punished accordingly; sometimes imprisoned; sometimes banished; and sometimes put to death. Legislators assign as a reason for these things, that such persons are injurious to society; that if crime was not punished, the virtuous and good would be abused; the wicked would triumph; character, life, and property would be insecure; and anarchy, confusion, and desolation would inevitably ensue.

I would here ask, if man acts upon this principle, has not God a right to do so with the affairs of his government? Or should we arrogate to ourselves privileges that we will not allow the Lord to possess? Upon this principle the Devil and his angels were cast out of heaven. The devil having his agency, as well as man,

came here, and sought to destroy the works of God; and succeeded so far as to obtain an influence over man's spirit, and bring his body into subjection to his agency; and if man was so ungrateful and corrupt as to yield to his influence, and obey his agency, God had as much right to punish him as he had the Devil; and as he cast the Devil and his angels out of heaven, he also cut man off from the earth, and thus punished the "spirits that were disobedient in the days of Noah".

Satan, in heaven, had no power over those spirits; but when they came to earth, he gained an ascendency over them, and not having a body himself, made use of their bodies to corrupt the world, and thus thwart the designs of Jehovah. They must therefore bear the consequences of their disobedience.

And if I am asked by a skeptic why God destroyed so many human beings, I answer, this was God's government, they had transgressed His laws, were traitors to him, and he had a right to punish them as I before stated, to prevent them from bringing ruin upon others, and perpetuating this misery of the human family, in time, and in eternity.

The Lord has given laws, and although he has not forced man to keep them, nor coerced his will, yet he has punished him for disobedience, as a father would a son. A father of a child can teach that child correct principles; but unless he controls or confines the body, he cannot force that child to observe them; he can punish him for disobedience, however, and thus exert a moral or physical influence over him.

Our Father does the same. He punishes the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, Babylon, Ninevah, Jerusalem, and many other cities, and will punish the world on the same principle.

Again: He has offered rewards, and given them to the faithful, such as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; he protected the Children of Israel, and blessed them with temporal and national prosperity, when they served him, and punished their enemies; and He would have extended His blessings to the world, if they would have been obedient to him.

The Lord has used these influences; but never coerced the will. Hence Jesus said to the Jews, **"How often would I have gathered you togther as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."** God would have benefited them, but they would not be benefited. Again, the Prophet, says, **"Because I have called, and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but yet have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh."** (Prov. I:24-26). These things clearly prove that man is a free, moral agent, and that God never has controlled the human mind, and that, consequently, if man is found in a state of wretchedness, degradation, and ruin, he has himself to blame for it, and not the Lord.

The Lord would have given him his counsel if he had sought it; for he did instruct men of God formerly, and gave them laws, and ordinances; and he told his people that if they called upon him "in the day of trouble, he would hear them"; and James says, **"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him."** (1:5).

When the children of Israel served God and obeyed him, they acknowledged his authority, and said, **"The Lord is our judge; the Lord is our lawgiver; the Lord is our king; he will save us."** (Isaiah 33:22). If the children of Israel had been obedient, and this principle had extended over the earth, we should have had the king-

dom of God established on the earth, and universal peace and happiness would have prevailed. But man's corruption and degeneracy have destroyed the world, and nothing but the wisdom, power, and blessings of God can restore it.—Extracted from the work, "The Government of God", by John Taylor, chapter 7, pp. 54-57.

PROGRESS IN THE COURTS

On the tenth of October the thirty-one defendants who had been adjudged guilty of conspiracy in an act to encourage the breaking of the laws of the State with reference to the Patriarchal order of marriage as revealed to the Priesthood by the Lord, were each sentenced to serve a year in the County jail in Salt Lake City. Notice of appeal was given and the case will go before the Supreme Court of the State for review. The defendants are at liberty on bail.

The appeal taken to the Circuit Court of Appeals at Wichita, Kansas, in the Mann Act and Linbergh Kidnapping cases, was argued by the respective attorneys during the month. A decision may be expected in these cases at any time.

A PRAYER

Lord of our land, our flag and our people;
God of our farm, the city, the steeple;
Knit our fingers in suppliants' kind,
Give us serenity and peace of mind,
As we search our hearts the words we find.

These are the words we send unto Thee
From the lips of a nation unbowed and free:
"In the breadth of Thy mercy guard our men
On trackless desert, on mountain and fen,
Clothe them in faith and keep them, Amen."

This then, is our prayer on the day we give thanks:
Look kindly upon them, aloft and in ranks.
Be Thou a pillar by day and a flame in the night,
Strengthen their arms, God; lead them aright.
The Lord is their Shepherd, their hope, and their light.

—David Soibelmann in "The Gilcrafter".

JUSTICE, NOT CHARITY

(By Ella Wheeler Wilcox)

All hail the dawn of a new day breaking,
When strong-armed nations shall take away
The weary burden from backs that are aching
With maximum work and minimum pay.

When no man is honored who hoards his millions,
When no man feasts on another's toil,
And God's poor, suffering, starving billions
Shall share his riches of sun and toil.

There is food for all in the world's broad bosom;
There is food for all in the world's great store;
Enough is provided if rightly divided;
Let each man take what he needs—no more.

Shame on the miser with unused riches.
Who robs the toiler to swell his hoard;
Who beats down the wage of the digger of ditches,
And steals the bread from a poor man's board.

Shame on the owner of mines, whose cruel
And selfish measures have brot him wealth,
While the ragged wreches who dig his fuel
Are robbed of comfort and hope and health.

Shame on the ruler who rides in his carriage,
Bought by the labor of half-paid men—
Men who were shut out of home and marriage,
And are herded like sheep in a hovel pen.

HOOZAT?

I crept upstairs, my shoes in hand,
Just as the night took wing,
And saw my wife, four steps above,
Doing the same darned thing.

Why build your cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world
Unless the builder also grows.
We are blind until we see
That in the universal plan
Nothing is worth the making
If it does not make the man.

We have more than once asserted that those who go out of their way to rail against the "Mormons" and denounce their plural marriage as immoral, are themselves persons whose private characters will not bear scrutiny.—Millennial Star, 45:695.

It takes a baby two years to learn to talk, and from 60 to 75 years to learn how to keep its mouth shut.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. JANUARY, 1945. NO. 8.

An Epistle

To the Presidents of Stakes, High Councils, Bishops and Other Authorities of the Church, Dated at Salt Lake City, May 1, 1882

United Order and Cooperation—Saints to Follow Council—Destined to Become a Great People

Dear Brethren:

I wish to say something in regard to our financial position, associated with the various Stakes. At a recent meeting of the Presidents of Stakes, held in my office, I made some general remarks relative to our policy, arising from some instructions given by me at the late general conference, namely, that it was much better for our own people to do our trading than to have outsiders do it. The following is the gist of my observations on this subject, at Conference:

President Taylor then said that there had been some remarks made during conference about our dealing with those not of our people; that while we wished to be liberal, when men manifested a spirit of hostility against us, it became us, as wise and prudent men, to take care of ourselves.

Cooperation had been talked about considerably, from time to time, as being a stepping-stone to something that would yet be more fully developed among the people of God, namely, the United Order. We had no example of the United Order strictly in accordance with the word of God on the subject. Our cooperation was simply an operation to unite us together in our secular affairs, tending to make us one in temporal things, as we were one in spiritual things.

A feeling had been manifested by some of our brethren to branch out into mercantile business on their own account, and his (the speaker's) idea, as to that, was, if people would be gov-

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

erned by correct principles, laying aside covetousness and eschewing chicanery and fraud, dealing honestly and conscientiously with others as they would like others to deal with them, that there would be no objection on our part for our own brethren to do these things; that it was certainly much better for them to embark in such enterprises than our enemies. Because in putting money into the hands of our enemies, we placed ourselves, to that extent at least, in their power to do us injury, which, it would seem from past experience, they were not, as a general thing, slow to do.

We believed in being generous, hospitable and kind, but when our generosity was abused, as it had been so flagrantly of late, it behooved us to be cautious in our movements. The old adage, "Self preservation is the first law of nature", was applicable to us, especially under the present circumstances. Those that were wise and had good judgment would understand.

Our cooperative institutions generally had done very well in subserving the interests of the people; and if other institutions should be introduced in the various stakes by wise, honorable, just and honest men, who had at heart the spirit of cooperation, and who practiced the principle and carried it out, there would be no objection to their calling upon the people to sustain the same principle in anything that they might introduce by way of financial enterprises among themselves.

It was far better for our people to do these things, and themselves derive the benefits arising therefrom, than to employ their enemies to do it for them. But men who embarked in financial enterprises, expecting the patronage of the people, should be honest and honorable men, who would deal fairly and uprightly with their patrons, and be men who lived their religion. An honorable Gentile was preferable to a dishonorable Mormon, because the latter hypocritically made use of his religion as a means of fleecing the people.

The present cooperative and other institutions in which the people were interested paid their tithing, to help to meet the requirements of the Church; and any other institution, the business of which was conducted in accord with the spirit and principles of our faith, we would sustain; otherwise, we would not; for, if people would not sustain cooperation themselves, we would not sustain them, it mattereth not under what name or guise it was carried on. In those affairs they should consult the Stake authorities.

At the meeting in my office above referred to (Tuesday, 11th April, 1882), I made some further remarks on this subject, the leading features of which are as follows:

With regard to our mercantile affairs, there were none of us but believed that the Zion of God would be built up, the kingdom of God established and the government of God obtain among the righteous, and that the wicked would be overthrown, and the will of God be done on earth as in heaven. It was for us to keep this in view and govern ourselves accordingly.

President Taylor deprecated the feeling of selfishness that existed, and called upon the brethren to put it from themselves and to contend against it in their several stakes; but it was necessary that they themselves should be free from it, in order to contend against it successfully. **He that possessed the elements of eternal life was rich, ten thousand times richer than the man who was grasping after the things of the world and the praise and honor of men.** Our cooperative enterprises were started to unite and cement us closer together, and much good had been accomplished in that way.

Under existing circumstances, it had been thought best to throw open the field of trading, under proper restrictions, but that we should do all we could to confine it as much as possible in the hands of our own people, who were honorable and upright, and good Latter-day Saints. All should be subject to the principle of cooperation, and not recede a particle from it; but we should put our own business people in the place of outsiders, and sustain them, inasmuch as they sustained the principle of cooperation themselves by acting honorably in their dealing, paid their tithing and donations, were willing to be counselled and advised, and had at heart the interest of the work of God. But you, yourselves, ought to be examples in such things.

There was no going back on the principles of cooperation; it was not standing still, but moving on, and it would continue to move on; and, in the name of Israel's God, Israel would continue to move on, and no power could prevent it. **The day would come when the dishonorable, and those who sought riches at the expense of the principles of our holy religion, would be rooted out and have no place among us. God would elevate us and place us on high among the nations, and the kings of the earth would yet, as prophesied of, come to gaze upon the glories of Zion.**

These are matters of considerable importance to the Latter-day Saints, as they enter into all our secular affairs, especially those of a mercantile nature, and are among the leading features connected with the building up of the kingdom of God upon the earth. While we are in a state of incipiency and just beginning to launch out in our mercantile and manufacturing interests, we wish to have these principles, as well as everything else, in strict subserviency to the laws and government of the Kingdom of God, for, while that extends great liberality and personal freedom in all our acts, it nevertheless exacts an undeviating submission to, and a course of action in strict accordance with, the laws, institutions and regulations which govern the kingdom.

It must be remembered here, that it is not the kingdom of the world, the kingdom of man, or anything of an individual character, but it is under the inspiration and direction of the Lord, and must be subject to His law, rule and government. If it is the Kingdom of God, it certainly cannot be the kingdom of man; and, being the Kingdom of God, it demands our allegiance and obedience and conformity to its law and requirements in all things. As in the Church of God, there is an order which is beautiful, harmonious and effective in all its operations, and which already is spoken of highly by statesmen and politicians as being more farseeing and comprehensive than anything else that exists on the earth, and excites the jealousy of demogogues. It must be remembered that this organization came from God, and that He, not man, is the author, director and counselor in regard to all the affairs of the Church government.

We are trying to build up a kingdom, which, as before stated, is the Kingdom of God; if it is not that, it is nothing. If it is that, then we require the same guidance and direction from our Heavenly Father, in regard to all of our secular affairs pertaining to the management and direction of everything that concerns our material interests and mercantile and manufacturing operations, and in preserving the rights and liberties of our people and of all peoples that come under our jurisdiction. In doing this, we want to ponder well the path of our feet, and be very careful in regard to every step that we take, lest we adopt principles which are at variance with the broad and comprehensive views of our Heavenly Father, pertaining to our liberty and to the liberty and rights of all men; and, while we seek

to accord certain rights and principles to individuals, that we be very careful that we do not trammel nor fetter others who have like privileges with us.

We must ever remember, as the sun shines for all, and the breath of heaven is free to all, that the earth, air and water should be as free to and within the reach of all, and that we should do nothing that will circumscribe the universal liberty of universal man. But while we accord to all this perfect liberty, which is granted freely by our Heavenly Father, we must never forget that this general liberty is subject to principles, rules and government; that it is under the guidance and direction of our Heavenly Father, and of those to whom He commits His authority and who are His legitimate representatives; and that if He introduces principles and develops theories, ideas, and laws, He has a perfect right to claim the honor of such organization, such principles and such developments.

If the Lord is to be our judge, our king and our lawgiver, He looks for and has a right to expect an acknowledgment of His prescience, wisdom and intelligence, as well as a cheerful and unwavering submission to His will and law, and an acknowledgment of His authority.

If, as the cycles of time roll on, the nations, governments and rulers are weighed in the balances and found wanting; and if, in the overthrow of nations and the dissolution of existing systems and dynasties, the Lord introduces a system of laws, governments and organizations, He will expect to dictate in all matters pertaining to the welfare of His people on the earth and the building up and establishment of a righteous kingdom, namely, the Kingdom of God.

We are yet in our infancy and comparatively in an immature state in relation to all of these matters, and it is requisite that we be very careful as to any steps that we take pertaining to them. We are emerging from the plans, systems, theories and principles of Babylon. It is different for us all at once to throw off our old usages, and in consequence of our previous education, to inaugurate a system which shall be perfect in all its parts. In fact, we are at present dependent upon them, more or less, for many of the comforts, necessaries and luxuries of life, and we are just emerging from our embryonic state, in a chrysalid condition.

Whilst striving to reach a higher plane, and adapt ourselves to the institutions of heaven and the laws of God, we are all the time in danger of dragging into our systems the pernicious views and practices of the Gentiles, of engrafting them into the tree of life, and amalgamating them with the pure principles which emanate from God.

In consequence of these things and of the covetousness and dishonesty of man, it was found impracticable, under the auspices and direction of the Prophet Joseph, to introduce and carry out the law of God in regard to secular matters. We have been progressing for half a century, have had many experiences, which, if properly comprehended and appreciated, ought to serve to exhibit to us the futility of trusting to all outside operations, as such have proved unreliable, and to teach us to know and feel, that in God alone can we trust, and on Him only can we rely for our guidance and direction in all temporal as well as spiritual things.

The organization of our Stakes is a step in the right direction to assist us in the management of our temporal as well as our spiritual affairs. And while we find them useful in all matters pertaining to the Church and in regulating and manipulating all things pertaining thereto in their jurisdiction, we shall find them as useful, when under the proper influence, in assisting in the management and control of our

secular affairs.

But in this, as in Church matters, there must be an entire absence of individuality, covetousness, and selfishness, and we must operate, under God, in the interests and for the benefit of all with whom we associate; **for we are building up a kingdom that will stand forever, that will command the respect and esteem of all peoples; the greatness of which will be acknowledged to the ends of the earth, and whose head will be Jesus Christ, to whom every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, to the glory of God the Father;** not by force or coercion of any kind, but because that kingdm will be manifestly the best, purest and most elevated, and more in the interests of humanity, and will command the respect, admiration and obedience of universal man.

There has been a good deal of talk about the United Order, and about Co-operation. These things are very imperfectly understood at the present time, and in our emergence from the world, with its customs and habits, we find it extremely difficult to adjust and regulate our secular affairs. When the perfect law of God shall be instituted, a state of things very much more perfect than that which we now have will be introduced; and, while every man will be expected to hold himself, and everything that he has subject to the law of God, and in the starting out will give a strict account to men appointed to that office of all his affairs. When he has done this, he will have awarded to him by those authorities that portion which the wisest counsels shall dictate; and then will have appointed to him a stewardship for the management of all his own affairs, placed under his jurisdiction, wherein he will have the free exercise of his own will and judgment, subject, of course, to all legitimate and necssary counsl. If he requires more means than he possesses, for the carrying out and accomplishment of any project he may have in view, he can draw such means from the public treasury. If he makes profits, large or small, he returns the means that he obtained from the treasury, and reports his profits; and so much thereof as is considered wisdom is placed in the treasury, together with the original; and thus he and all men act without restraint in the interest of and for the welfare of all.

This is a simple outline if how things will exist with regard to some of these matters, when the law of God shall be fully carried out. Our relations with the world, and our own imperfections prevent the establishment of this system at the present time, and therefor, as was stated by Joseph in an early day, it cannot yet be carried out. But cooperation and the United Order are a step in the right direction, and are leading our brethren to reflect upon the necessity of Union as one of the fundamental principles of success in temporal things, as well as in spiritual things; and, indeed, as one of the essentials pertaining to permanent prosperity. For the Lord hath said, "If ye are not one, ye are not mine."

What do we infer from this statement? We can infer only this, that, if we are not one, we are not of the Lord in spiritual things; and, further, if we are not one in temporal things, we are not the Lord's. In proportion as there is a lack of union in either temporal or spiritual things, just so far is there a lack of those principles of prosperity and progress, and of that harmonious co-working which are essential to the establishment and building up of the Kingdom of God on the earth. We must at least have unity among the Saints in temporal as well as spiritual things, before we shall be able to command the respect and esteem of all good Latter-day Saints, and of the high-minded and honorable men of the earth, the respect of our own selves, and the approval of our Heavenly Father.

But to return to our Stakes. **I stated that it was much better for our own people to do our own trading than for that class of outsiders who are our avowed enemies to do it. I further stated that we expected that our mercantile or trading men would be honorable men, who would deal justly and righteously with the people, would be subject to counsel, and would place themselves under their Presidents and those who held rule in their stakes.**

Need I say here, that while that is the case with regard to Bishops, High Counselors and other Stake authorities, and the people in the several Stakes, it is quite as necessary that the Presidents of Stakes and their counselors should place themselves under the direction of the legitimate authority that presides over them; and that all people and presidents and other officers in the various Stakes, as well as the Twelve and the First Presidency of the Church, should place themselves under the guidance and direction of the Almighty; for the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our king, the Lord is our lawgiver, and He shall rule over us.

With a policy of this kind strictly carried out, we shall lay the foundation of a kingdom that is free, liberal and generous, and that will extend itself to all peoples and all nations, until all shall acknowledge the rule, government and dominion of God. There have been indications in some stakes of a desire to control their own secular affairs, independent of any other authority. This is an erroneous policy, for there is no such system associated with the Kingdom of God. The same system, carried out, would lead to disintegration and disunion, to the severance of all the bonds of union which cement and bind the Saints together. If we had a union which would cement the Stakes together, each Stake would set up a separate and independent form of its own, each would separate itself from the head, and confusion and anarchy would be the result.

Let us follow the reasoning of such men to its legitimate results. If, according to the theories of some men, the presidency of a Stake and the authorities thereof have a right to direct affairs in their own interests alone, in regard to mercantile and secular affairs generally, independent of the presiding authorities, and irrespective of the interests of others, then, on the same ground, which they would scarcely like to admit, the Bishops in every Ward and the officers of that Ward have just the same right to ignore the Presidency and other general authorities of the Stake in their operations. Then, if the Presidency and Bishops possessed these powers, why not the Priests, Teachers and Deacons, by natural sequence? Then, to follow out the same principle, why not every individual take his own way? This would be the natural result of that course of proceeding. This would be the effect of taking a false departure in Stakes, and it would necessarily lead to disintegration, to anarchy and to a disruption of all those principles and relations that harmonize, cement and unite the Saints of God.

Take it in the other way—the people listen to their Priests, Teachers and Deacons; the Priests, Teachers and Deacons follow the counsels of their Bishops; Bishops are placed under the direction of the Presidents; the Presidents under the direction of the First Presidency; the First Presidency seek the guidance of the Almighty; and then the Twelve, the High Councils, the High Priests, Seventies, Elders and all operating in their several spheres, in the interests of Israel, under the direction and guidance of the properly constituted authority, and each at the same time under the guidance of the Almighty, and we have a system that is as perfect as the universe, directed by the Almighty, subject and obedient to the laws, as the planetary system

and all worlds are subject to the laws by which they are governed. These are principles which are after the order of nature; and are as invulnerable as the throne of God, that will continue and rule while eternal ages roll.

JOHN TAYLOR
President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

We concur in the above,

George Q. Cannon
Joseph F. Smith,
Counselors in the First Presidency.

Reference: Supplemented to the work "Atonement, etc." Items on Priesthood, by John Taylor. L. C. 298.8, R. 27, V. 59. Brigham Young University Library.

THE NEW YEAR

(Contributed)

Salute the New Year with a spirit of loyalty, cooperation and gratitude.

Standing on the threshold of 1945, notwithstanding its untrodden paths, we feel it offers opportunities with possibilities. Yea! Better plans for us to avoid the failures that lie behind us in the dead year just gone. We think by reason of some lessons learned with sad experience which we gained during 1944 new ideas will materialize for 1945. We believe to admire the New Year one must not only look forward, but must look backward and view the dead year; as success in the future must depend upon the knowledge gotten from experience in the past.

Involuntarily we will grow reminiscent with the power of recollection which can't be resisted. It is then memory will open up old eras in our past with thoughts and impressions so indelibly stamped upon our minds that they cannot be rubbed off—that which we cannot forget, but left there to haunt us in after years as they linger with our memories like ghosts on parade until time swallows us in death.

The new year comes fresh from God, and offers another clean blank record whereon we must write another year's history of our lives—and many of us are wondering what that history will tell! Will it write anguish upon the face of Time, to make trembling pages shake with desperation like quivering lips distorting features and have men suffer melancholy, terror, cruelty, pity and frenzy, or is it the messenger bringing elegance, contentment and happiness which they crave with a longing excitement that enthralls their souls?

To some it will fetch new sorrows and fresh disappointments; to others it will bring the opportunity for new plans, brighter hopes, better joys and success with happiness to make life sublime. Happiness is the substance of something hoped for—the evidence of things unseen, but which is felt, and we all crave this mysterious thing. We are told that "with earnest zeal the soul is urging its quest for knowledge, and will continue to do so, just as long as eternity withholds a secret."

The artist feeds on the expression of the face in search of human suffering or happiness, he explores the globe, climbs the mountain, ransacks the starry places, descends to the bowels of the earth and rummages among the files in the dust-bins of history for the prey—happiness! He reaches the climax of emotion to end a suspense that thrills, and with tragical leap he seizes the prey in a tight grip. Then he opens his hand, and it is gone!

Many of us remain silent rather than speak a truth that may hurt. A web spun with words count little unless they have a truthful, inspiring chant to move one with susceptible notion. Words distilled just to get the essence to charm a phrase don't count, even when seasoned by time and colored with beauty or sadness if not flavored with truth. Dignified mourning that shields a moral evil is the ruse that never substitutes forgiveness for in-

gratitude, consideration for revenge, and confidence for jealousy to close gaping wounds caused by ignorance and misfortune.

Our ideal character is one who loves justice whose existence he knows and feels, and the man who outrages it commits an unpardonable wrong. He hates, despises and abhors injustice with such an intensity that it becomes a divine expression. He loves right so strongly that it evolves into a virtue. Wrongs proceed by method in trial or investigation with error on the pendulum swinging evil from each extreme with every move bearing the fringe of injustice, if the defendant is in disfavor with the presiding judge.

There are some critics who will say, "Never judge the wave by its scum." Let the answer be: "Such men never smile except when they have committed an injustice and only find pleasure in boasting about their offenses, the worst of human ills."

As far back as history records, infidelity, disloyalty and treachery, more than any other cause, has been the rock upon which countless innocent victims have been betrayed and sacrificed. Recent experience has proved to us that that rock, though camouflaged by artifice and guile, still exists. When the veil falls between this life and eternity we don't know where this class will find haven. Surely Heaven will be closed to them, and, in Purgatory, there is no crevice so small and crooked that will house such miserable, shriveled, atomic souls.

Loyalty, cooperation and gratitude compose the hinge on which success hangs for any group or combination. They are words to ravish the senses with marvelous hopes; they thrill with feeling pleasing as a love dream, and are fatal to the gods of injustice. They are words which charm men with musical melody; gives them magical conception and vision to see images of wonders, and fashions individuals for usefulness too pleasing for description.

Whether good, bad, wise, stupid or clever, it matters not as we are all traveling on the same ship of life, tossed by the same storms and bound for the same unknown port in eternity, so why should we not cooperate to make a safe landing?

—Jarbee.

FRUITS OF APOSTASY
By John Taylor

I used to think, if I were the Lord, I would not suffer people to be tried as they are; but I have changed my mind on that subject. Now I think I would, if I were the Lord, because it purges out the meanness and corruption that stick around the Saints, like flies around molasses.

We have met on the road a great many apostates. I do not want to say much about them. If they can be happy, all right; but they do not exhibit it. When a man deserts from the gospel, from the ordinances, from the Priesthood and its authority, from the revelations of the spirit of God, from the spirit of prophecy, from that sweet, calm influence that broods over the upright man in all his acts, he loses the blessing of God, and falls back into error; and, as the scripture says, "The evil spirit that went out of him, returns again, bringing with him seven spirits more wicked than himself; and the last state of that man is worse than the first".

It has become proverbial, where apostate "Mormons" live, to say, "Oh, he is only an apostate Mormon". They look upon them as ten times meaner than a Mormon.

I happened to go into a barber shop one day, to get shaved. A man came in, and when he went out again, the inquiry was made, "Who is that man?" "Oh, he is only an apostate Mormon". Their mouths are full of cursing; and you will find them chewing tobacco and getting drunk, thinking that, by so doing, they will

recommend themselves to the people; but they have not learned the art very well; they can't swear and degrade themselves so naturally as others, and the people find them out and repudiate them.

You that don't know him, have heard of Thomas B. Marsh, who was formerly the President of the Twelve Apostles, but who apostatized some years ago, in Missouri. He is on his way here, a poor, decrepit, broken down, old man. He has had a paralytic stroke—one of his arms hangs down. He is coming out here as an object of charity, destitute, without wife, child, or anything else. He has been an apostate some eighteen years. Most of you know his history. He has been all the time since then afraid of his life—afraid the "Mormons" would kill him; and he durst not let them know where he was.

In meeting with some of the apostates, he said to them, "You don't know what you are about; if you want to see the fruits of apostasy, look on me." I thought they could not look on a better example.

In relation to some of those other folks that left here—the Gladdenites and others—where are they? Some of them that contended most strenuously for Gladden have cast him off, and now have nothing to tie to. Where is there hope of salvation?—(August 9, 1857). J. of D., 5:115.

A STRANGE PERSONAGE

Occasionally, our missionaries while traveling preaching the Gospel, encounter men and objects, that to the casual observer are a matter of course; but to a careful student they offer a field for study, as the following will illustrate:

In May, 1878, a man calling himself Robert Edge, came into Lexington, Henderson County, Tennessee, preaching what he called the Gospel after the apostolic order. His advent was as remarkable as his manner and teachings. The night he made his appearance there was a great noise, as of a terrible explosion, which was heard a distance of thirty-five miles.

He was a man of ordinary appearance, small of stature, with red hair and pleasing address. He was well versed in scripture; in fact, the Bible was to him as a child's primer—he knew it all. He applied for the privilege to preach, and having obtained it, he preached the most remarkable sermon of modern times.

He spoke of the apostasy from the primitive church, and upon the apostolic order, and dwelt at some length upon the first principles of the Gospel, more particularly upon the power of the Holy Ghost.

He said he could not baptize, but the power to do so was upon the earth, and it would be revealed to them in due time.

He proved conclusively by the Bible, that the Roman Catholic church is the "mother of harlots", that the churches of modern Christianity are daughters and grand-daughters of her, and that their priesthood is false, and their members deluded.

He said that all the secrets of masonry, and all the secret combinations of man as now practiced are a base counterfeit, and an abomination in the sight of the Lord.

He called upon all men to come out of Babylon, to forsake man-made doctrines and follow Christ; to assist in rolling forth the purposes of God, and prepare for the great millennium soon to be ushered in, when Christ will reign personally upon the earth.

Many other things he also told, that were so remarkable that people stood aghast, and inquired of him further.

He preached a series of sermons, denouncing masonry, etc., and expounding the intricate parts of the scrip-

tures. There was not a prophecy but what he could explain as easily as if he had written it, and the first chapter of Ezekiel was to him as the alphabet.

He organized a body of the church, as he said, by blessing and the laying on of hands, and admonished his converts to be faithful and pray to God always, who would reveal many great and important things to them, that they should understand.

He required them to fast three days in succession, after which he administered the Lord's supper, and informed them that they were not the only ones that were of this faith, but that he could not give them any further information upon this point.

He instructed them, that if any should persecute them for their doctrine, they should remove to the west.

The people watched him very closely. He lived as he taught them to, was abstemious in his habits, refraining from animal food of all kinds, and ate only corn bread and buttermilk.

Many remarkable cases of healing occurred under his administration.

He was asked if he was a "Mormon", to which he replied, "If I am a a Mormon, God bless the Mormons."

He intimated in talking to the people that when they had gone to the mountains of the west he would again visit them. He said he had not authority to perform any of the ordinances, pertaining to the church, but that the priesthood was upon the earth, and its power would be made known to them.

He said he had been preaching for eighteen hundred years.

He remained with the people some time, and explained a great many things to them that are not here mentioned.

The people offered him money and clothes, but he positively refused to accept either.

He was always forewarned of any danger that was about to happen to himself, and his disappearance was quite as mysterious as his advent. He has never been heard of since in that region.

A great many more very curious traits of character and remarkable sayings and teachings of this wonderful man might be here jotted down, but let this suffice. I leave my readers to solve the question: Who is he?

The little band he organized have since been baptized, and have emigrated to Colorado, and are faithful and true to this great Latter-day work.—R. S. S., Millennial Star, 43:174-5.

JUDGMENTS TO COME

Do our enemies object to some being frightened away from here by the glass of truth being held before them to enable them to see themselves as God sees them, and have become frightened at their own moral deformities and left? Will the time not come when none of the uncircumcised in heart or the unclean can enter the abodes of the Saints? If the old Prophets have told us the truth, such times must come; and if they now begin to be foreshadowed, think it not strange! "Zion will be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness. And the destruction of the transgressors and the sinners shall be together; and they that forake the Lord shall be consumed."—Orson Hyde, J. of D., 5:144.

CARPET-BAGGERS
By John Taylor

I said, we have been outrageously imposed upon by United States officials. They send out every rag-tag and bob-tail, and every mean nincompoop they can scrape up from the filth and scum of society, and dub him a United States officer; and we are expected to receive all manner of insults from such men without one word of complaint. They will assuredly find themselves mistaken.—(August 9, 1857). J. of D., 5:118.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. JANUARY, 1945. No. 8.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

Motherhood

LET nobody thwart or discourage our women in their disposition to motherhood, under whatever form of family life it may be feasible, lest the blame for his nation's eventual downfall be upon him.

—Edward Midgard.

THE MARK E. PETERSEN LETTER

Since this remarkable letter is now a part of the Court files and is public property we are permitted to publish it in full. It has caused much comment and considerable criticism from both members and non-members of the Church. While it has been suspected that the leaders of the Church were behind the present crusade against a group of members adhering to its original doctrines and teachings, in the minds of some of the fact was not entirely clear until this letter appeared.

Mark E. Petersen is a member of the Quorum of Twelve. He is a newspaper man. He speaks for the Church leaders. They were being heckled by the members and criticised by other people for their unwarranted and un-Christian opposition to a small group of earnest worshipers claiming, as the Church itself claims and has published to the world, "The right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience." This part of the 11th Article of Faith they accept, but they disavow the balance of the Article which says, "and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may."

Mark E. Petersen was deputized to turn the tide of criticism through the power of the Press. His crude attempt follows:

"Murray Moler,

Bureau Manager United Press.

"Dear Murray: The trials are now nearing their conclusion and I wonder if you would mind carrying another statement or two setting forth the church's position again. It will be greatly appreciated if you would do so.

("In some Eastern sections especially, many people are beginning to think that the cultists are Mormons, and we are now beginning to get the blame for this mess so far as many newspaper and magazine readers are concerned.)

"In case you are willing to carry another statement, I would appreciate having the following points covered:

1—That all the cultists are not former members of the Church. Some have been recruited from various protestant faiths.

2—All cultists who have held membership in the L. D. S. Church have been excommunicated by the Church; some of them, such as Joseph Musser, the ring leader, having been excommunicated many years ago.

3—The Church has actively assisted federal and state authorities in obtaining evidence against the cultists and helping to prosecute them, under the law.

4—Among witnesses for the prosecution are men who have been appointed by the Church to search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution for their use; these men have also been appointed by the Church to do all they can to fight the spread of polygamy.

5—The Church has opposed the practice and teaching of plural marriage since the adoption of a Manifesto in an official conference of the Church held in Salt Lake City October 6, 1890, and has excommunicated members since that time who have either taught or practiced it.

6—The cultists use the name Fundamentalists, which is regarded by the Church as a misnomer. They are not fundamentalists in the sense of holding to the fundamental doctrines of the Church, for the fundamental doctrines of the Church are now opposed to polygamy. Use of this name has caused confusion in the public mind and has tended to give the impression (which is what the cultists sought) that they are old line Mormons, which they are not."

(Signed) "MARK E. PETERSEN."

It will be noted that Mark E. Petersen states that **"The Church has actively assisted federal and state authorities in obtaining evidence against the cultists and helping to prosecute them, under the law."** That **"among witnesses for the prosecution are men who have been appointed by the Church to search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution for their use; these men have also been appointed by the Church to do all they can to fight the spread of polygamy."**

From the information sent out by the United Press, based upon the information furnished by Mark E. Petersen, the Ogden Standard-Examiner, of October 7, published the following:

Meanwhile, the Mormon church, which has been excommunicating polygamists ever since the 1890 manifesto, revealed that it had appointed investigators to "search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution."

The most recently appointed Mormon apostle, Mark E. Petersen, said that the term "fundamentalists" was incorrect, "since the fundamental doctrines of the church are NOW opposed to polygamy". He added that "some sect members were recruited from various protestant faiths" and that "we are now beginning to get the blame for this mess."

We read in the "HANDBOOK OF INSTRUCTIONS" (Number 16, 1940) of the Church, the following:

Members who have been disfellowshipped or ex-communicated should not be avoided or persecuted by the members of the Church. They should be dealt with kindly and prayerfully, in the hope that they may turn from their mistakes and receive again the full privileges of church membership.—P. 149.

And this is the way the leaders of the church who published that instruction, are showing kindness to their excommunicants. They appoint sleuths (the late Joseph F. Smith's term was "infamous spotters", while President John Taylor characterized them as "miserable sneaks" and others called them "Skunks" and "Jackals") to spy on the actions of these people; they back up the lawyers in their prosecutions; they cut people off the church, or assume to, for going bail on behalf of those caught in the net of the crusaders. In fine, they use their great ecclesiastical powers to crush those whom they do not like.

The Prophet Joseph Smith taught:

We believe that religion was instituted of God; and that men are amenable to Him, and to Him only, for the exercise of it, unless their religious opinions prompt them to infringe upon the rights and liberties of

others; but we do not believe that human law has a right to interfere in prescribing rules of worship to bind the consciences of men, nor dictate forms for public or private devotion; that the civil magistrate should restrain crime but never control conscience; should punish guilt, but never suppress the freedom of the soul.—D. & C., 134:4.

THE "ONE" MAN

Much is being said of and much is claimed for the interpolation contained in verse 7, Sect. 132 of the Doctrine and Covenants, viz: "And I have appointed unto my servant Joseph to hold this power in the last days, and there is never but one on the earth at a time on whom this power and the keys of this Priesthood are conferred." The statement is a self-evident truth, though the interpretation given it by many is far afield of the facts.

Certainly the Celestial order of marriage which, to be complete comprehends plural marriage, is a law of the Priesthood, (See D. & C., 132:28, 58, 61). And he who rightfully holds the keys to Priesthood is the "one" man through whom this blessing from the Lord is expressed to the Saints. It could not be otherwise. There can be only one Commander-in-Chief of the army of the nation. Were there two or more Commanders-in-Chief one can easily understand how clashes in authority would occur resulting in complete chaos.

When Joseph Smith dictated the revelation to William Clayton he was inspired to include that interpolation doubtless in order to correct an impression, then growing, to the effect that all men holding the Melchisedek Priesthood possessed equal authority. In fact this thought was given some justification in the language recorded by the Prophet in setting apart his counselors, Sidney Rigdon and Frederick G. Williams, in the First Presidency. We quote from History of the Church, 1:334:

March 18, 1833: "Doctor Hurlburt was ordained an Elder; after which Elder Rigdon expressed a desire that himself and Brother Frederick G. Williams should be ordained to the offices to which they had been called, viz: those of Presidents of the High Priesthood, and to be equal in holding the keys of the Kingdom with Brother Joseph Smith, Jun., according to the revelation given on the 8th of March, 1833. Accordingly I laid my hands on Brothers Sidney and Frederick, and ordained them to take part with me in holding the keys of this last kingdom, and to assist in the Presidency of the High Priesthood, as my counselors.

From this language it may be inferred that Joseph's counselors considered themselves possessed of the same authority held by Joseph and could act separately from and independently of him. No such a thought could have been in Joseph's mind, however. These brethren were his counselors and were set apart to "take part with him (not independent of him) in holding the keys of this last kingdom, and to assist (not direct) in the Presidency of the High Priesthood, **as his counselors.**"

Sidney Rigdon, according to all accounts, assumed too much and it was because of this assumption, based upon lack of understanding and upon ambition, that caused the Prophet to be impressed to add the interpolation mentioned.

True, in the revelation of 1880 to Wilford Woodruff, the Lord said:

And while my servant John Taylor is your President, I wish to ask the rest of my servants of the Apostles the question, Although you have one to preside over your Quorum, which is the order of God in all generations, do you not, all of you, hold the Apostleship, which is the highest authority ever given to men on the earth? You do. Therefore you hold in common the keys of the kingdom of God in all the world. You each of you have the power to unlock the veil of eternity and hold converse with God the Father and his son Jesus Christ, and to have the ministration of angels.—Supplement to New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, p. 49.

In regarding this statement from the Lord it must be remembered that these brethren had received the higher order of Priesthood—they were High Priest Apostles, the same as Joseph

was. Yet while they all held equal authority John Taylor was their head and spokesman as Joseph had been before him.

Some of the Elders who had been given the Melchisedek Priesthood, but were not endowed with the higher order thereof, were receiving revelations, as they supposed, for the guidance of the Priesthood. The work was young and human mistakes were frequently manifest concerning the order of the Priesthood, so the Lord made it very clear that there could be but one head—one mouthpiece to His respective organizations; and since the Priesthood organization was a theocracy all instructions to that quorum came direct from heaven and through the appointed mouthpiece. Joseph Smith was that mouthpiece and the only one with authority to pass the word of the Lord along, either personally or through his agents.

A false tradition has arisen among the Saints: that the Church is the all and all of organization, and that its president is not only the head of the Church, but is also the President of Priesthood. This is a serious error and its adoption is leading the Saints into great difficulties. The Church is a semi-Democracy. The Lord said: **"And all things shall be done by common consent in the Church, by much prayer and faith."** (D. & C., Sec. 26). The Church, being under the control of its members, has its limitations. The First Presidency may nominate and the members may reject. It has been done. The Church was organized by the Priesthood and the revelations from God to the Church always comes through the Priesthood. Sometimes the President of Priesthood is also the President of the Church. Joseph Smith was, as also were Brigham Young, John Taylor and Wilford Woodruff. But to hold that Brother Grant, because he is President of the Church, is necessarily the President of Priesthood, and by reason of which he is the "one" man holding the keys to power, is a serious mistake. True, as President of the Church he is the mouthpiece of the Priesthood to the Church, the members of which either accept or reject his message. He is accountable to God who talks through the Priesthood Presidency which constitutes the mouthpiece of God upon the earth. The President of the Church is always subject to the Presidency of the Priesthood as the Priesthood is subject to God. This fact must, to thinking men, be conclusive.

We have many times pointed out in TRUTH (See Vol. 9; 166 et seq.) that the Church and Kingdom are separate organizations; each of them being separate and apart from the Priesthood, and yet each functions by authority of the Priesthood. The house of God being out of order (D. & C., Sec. 85) the Church and kingdom, each being a part of that house, may take opposite courses. This is now true. As President of the Church, and in the absence of a vote from the Church reinstituting plural marriage, Brother Grant may properly hold that the Church does not sanction that order of marriage, but as pertaining to the Priesthood the present church leader is entirely without authority. There isn't a scintilla of evidence to prove he is the President of Priesthood, or even that he is endowed with the higher order of the Priesthood, he merely holding the position of President of the Church.

In the revelation to John Taylor, 1882, the Lord said: "Let my servants George Teasdale and Heber J. Grant be **appointed** to fill the vacancies in the Twelve." Here these two brethren were called and "appointed" to a certain position. In Doctrine and Covenants, Sec. 85, the word of the Lord to Joseph Smith is, "And while that man who was **called** of God and **appointed**, that putteth forth his hand to steady the ark of God, shall fall by the shaft of death, like as a tree that is smitten

by the vivid shaft of lightning." No one among the Saints will contend that President Grant was not **"called** of God and **appointed"**. And all informed Saints must know that it is President Grant that has taken the major part in destroying a principle of salvation —the Celestial or plural order of marriage. The circumstances suggest that he has been struck "by the shaft of death". The language is expressive. Lightning does not necessarily kill a tree suddenly. When struck, the tree begins to wither, but sometimes remains in a semi-live condition for years, yet it was struck by the "shaft of death". We are not necessarily claiming that President Grant fulfills this revelation but the circumstances are suggestive.

Elder Harold B. Lee of the Quorum of Twelve, has fallen into the error of supposing the President is the "one" man spoken of in the revelation. At the recent conference of the Church he quoted approvingly remarks of Elder Joseph Fielding Smith given in October, 1920, in part as follows:

> *** * * If the President of the Church should say to us, "You shall not baptize in this state or in that state, or in this nation", any man that would go forth to baptize contrary to that command would be violating a command of God and going contrary to authority and power; and that which he did would not be sealed.—Improvement Era, Vol. 47, p. 708.**

The assumption that the President of the Church could invalidate the law of baptism if he chose to do so is too puerile to consider for a moment. No such power exists in man and when the Lord acts he does it through the Priesthood and not necessarily through the Presidency of the Church.

EULOGIES AND—EULOGIES

In the eulogy of Heber J. Grant (Deseret News, Church Edition, Nov. 18, 1944) by his counselor J. Reuben Clark, Jr., in anticipation of his 88th birth anniversary occurring on the 22nd, the writer was most effusive in his encomiums.

We appreciate that at such times one may assume license to voice his enthusiasm and spread rather generously his words of praise, and especially so when his presiding officer is on the receiving end. Nor do we criticise such a course when held within reasonable bounds. Age rarely ever refuses the embrace of copious words, especially when seasoned with a "dash" of this and a "dash" of that and a handful of flattery. Such is anticipated. We would not expect it otherwise. At times, however, it is important that we take stock of ourselves and determine how far afield our friends have wandered and whether eulogy or criticism would serve them better.

Our attention is forcibly directed to one statement made by Elder Clark of an outstanding virtue he attributes to his file leader in the First Presidency. We quote:

> **He has great courage. Is a thing right, if so it must be sustained, and if necessary fought for; if wrong, it must be condemned, and if necessary fought against. He never hesitates to espouse the right or condemn the wrong.**

If the President really qualifies in this outburst of praise, his many human weaknesses which now draw criticism from his numerous associates and acquaintances may well be overlooked. Mortal weaknesses enter into the lives of all men. In judging, however, the Lord looks deeper than the surface. He examines the heart and weighs the motives. The Prophet Joseph Smith admonished:

> **O ye Twelve and all Saints! profit by this important key—that in all your trials, troubles, temptations, afflictions, bonds, imprisonments and death, see to it that you do not betray heaven; that you do not betray Jesus Christ; that you do not betray the brethren; that you do not betray the revelations of God; whether in the Bible, Book of Mormon or the Doctrine and Covenants, or any other that ever was or will be given and re-**

vealed unto man in this world or that which is to come. Yea, in all your kickings and flounderings, see to it that you do not this thing, lest innocent blood be found on your skirts and you go down to hell!—His. of Church, 3:385.

"If the thing is right it must be sustained and if necessary fought for. * * * He never hesitates to espouse the right or condemn the wrong." Let us measure this claim by one single example: We take the law of Celestial or plural marriage, which the President must know is the "marriage law of the Gods." This law was revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith in 1831. He was told that unless he accepted the law and established it with the Priesthood he would be damned. He knew if he did adhere to it his enemies would kill him. He established the law and died a martyr's death. His followers in the Priesthood, including Heber J. Grant while the latter was a member of the Quorum of Twelve, maintained that the law was unchangeable and irrevocable. They all taught that to regain the presence of the Father and become a joint heir with Jesus Christ His Son, one must enter and abide in this order of marriage.

Brother Grant, according to his testimony, entered the order first by taking two additional wives in 1884. He then must have thought the principle was right. When the Woodruff Manifesto was issued discontinuing the practice in the Church, Brother Grant still believed the principle to be right and continued to abide in the law. Nine years after the Manifesto he was arrested and pleaded guilty in the Third Judicial District Court, of an infraction of the law and paid a fine. In 1904, another warrant being sworn out for his arrest for an alleged infraction of the anti-polygamy law, he fled to Europe and became the President of the European Mission. He then thought the principle should be lived. In a subsequent visit to Europe after becoming President of the Church, he made the remark: "In my labors in this land as President of the British and European Mission (1904-6), where I was devoting all my energy to the work of the Master, I got nearer to the Lord and had more joy in my labors than I have ever had before or since." (See Des. News, Aug. 21, 1937). While in Europe in 1904-6, and while standing four-square for the Patriarchal order of marriage—that being the principle that took him to Europe, away from the legal jurisdiction of Utah, he enjoyed his labor and got nearer to the Lord than he has ever been since. At that time he was devoting ALL his energies to the work of the Master. Now, is he working only part time for the Master, spending much of his time in an effort to imprison those living the principle that drove him to Europe? (Or is he a mere figure-head, and his Counselors the authors of this persecution?) From the time the President entered into plural marriage in 1884 to at least 1906 he knew that the principle was right and in his "great courage", sustained it. When he became President of the Church and declared a new policy in preaching the Gospel—one to make friends of the world, and not enemies as the pure Gospel inevitably does—he took a sudden and strong stand against this holy principle of marriage.

At one time he said, "No matter what restrictions we may be placed under by men, our only consistent course is to keep the commandments of God. We should, in this regard, place ourselves in the same position as that of the three Hebrews who were cast into the fiery furnace. If we are living in the light of the Gospel we have a testimony of the truth and we have but one choice, that is to abide in the law of God no matter as to the consequences." (Des. News, April 6, 1885).

That was the President's attitude in 1885, while in the recent crusade against those upholding this law of God, he expressed unqualified endorsement of the movement which was cal-

culated to place nearly fifty people, part of whom are mothers in Israel, in the federal and state prisons for long terms.

At which time was President Grant right. Surely he could not be right in both instances. He claims the distinction of being a son of the Prophet Joseph Smith by the operations of the Priesthood of Elijah. Joseph Smith was killed for abiding in this law, and yet his son (?) condemns the law and designates those entering it as adulterers. Was President Grant living in adultery from 1884 to the time he broke with this principle? He cannot hide behind the Twelfth Article of Faith in justification of his actions, for when he took his two first plural wives both the Federal laws known as the Morrill and the Edmunds Acts were enacted and the former law had been declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In taking his present stand against plural marriage and in aiding in the persecution of his brethren and sisters who are abiding in that law, is not the President betraying heaven? Is he not betraying Jesus Christ, who revealed this holy law to the Prophet Joseph Smith? Is he not betraying his brethren who are upholding the law? Is he not betraying the revelations of God particularly those pertaining to the law, D. & C., Sections 131-2? And is he not in danger of having innocent blood discovered on his skirts? Should not the President's satelites be a little more modest in their adulations?

Another thought: The present period in the administration of Church affairs will likely go down in history as the "Photographic" period or the "Mutual Admiration" period. At no time in our history as a Church have the leaders had their visages displayed in the press as well as in the Church organs as at the present. It has become an epidemic. We should expect it of the vain-glorious world, but in this respect we are out-worlding the world. Real culture and saintly modesty oppose this innovation. The practice is doubtless an outgrowth of our over-indulgence in heaping flattery upon each other and particularly upon the leader. Would it not be a good policy to declare a recess from this noxious practice until say the President's 95th or 100th birthday, and then spread it on with a vengeance?

EXCOMMUNICANTS

The constant increase in excommunicants from the Mormon Church must be very disconcerting to its leaders. The Improvement Era for December, 1944, names some thirty-three of such cases covering a few months' period. It can hardly be assumed that these members are taken from the roles of the Church on account of entering into plural marriage, as many of them, to our knowledge, are not in this class. Doubtless the bulk of these excommunicants have registered their disgust at the hop-skip-and-jump policy of the Church relative to its present activity in surrendering vital principles of the gospel and in persecuting certain of its members for adhering to the fundamentals of Mormonism as established by the Prophet Joseph Smith. To be excommunicated for this reason must be regarded by thinking Saints as a boost up rather than a demotion.

If the Church were to take a secret ballot from its members on their stand of accepting the present leadership as **"prophets, seers and revelators"**, we apprehend the result would be startling and very disappointing to the leaders. President John Taylor, at a meeting with some of the brethren at Centerville in 1886 said the time would come when many of the Saints would apostatize because of the principle of celestial marriage for which he was then in hiding, "yea, and possibly one-half of the other half." He said further: **"I would be surprised if ten per cent of those who claim to hold the**

Melchisedek Priesthood will remain true and faithful to the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the time of the seventh President of the Church, and that there would be thousands that think they hold the Priesthood at that time, that would not have it properly conferred upon them.''

This is a gloomy outlook for the future of the Church as at present constituted. Are not the bulk of the present excommunicants among those who are faithful to their covenants and who were referred to by the early brethren (See Apostle Orson F. Whitney, TRUTH 9:233) as those who are **''in the heart's core of this people, that will arise in their majesty in a day that is near at hand and push spiritual things to the front; a people who will stand up for God, fearing not man nor what men can do, but believing, as the Prophet Joseph says, that all things we suffer are for our best good, and that God will stand by us forever and ever?''**

THE TRIBUNE LIST

For historical purposes we pass this clipping from the Salt Lake Tribune on to our readers. It is a revised reprint of a list of members of the Mormon Church entering plural marriage since the Manifesto of 1890. The original list appeared in the Tribune October 10, 1910. Papers containing this list are not available at the Tribune office. and since the Church and the Tribune appear to be operating under a mutual understanding, it is not likely that this list will be reprinted in that paper.

We suggest Elder Mark E. Petersen scan these names over and check off those who have been excommunicated, in accordance with his statement to the United Press, as presented in the current issue of TRUTH.

Members of the Quorum of Twelve appearing on the list are in capital letters, there being six in all. Of course the Tribune could have had only a partial list of these alleged law-breakers, as such things were carried on in secret.—Editor.

THE LIST, REVISED

It was on the morning of Saturday, October 8, 1910, that The Tribune printed a revised list of Mormon new polygamists down to that date. Since that time we have received a great number of applications for copies of that issue which we have been unable to satisfy because the edition was sold out on the day of publication. Incidentally, we have also, since that time received a number of other names of offenders who are entitled to enrollment. On both these accounts, therefore, we deem it advisable to reprint the list, with additions, this morning. Here it is:

Aldridge, Isaac
Allred, Calvard
Beck, Francis
Badger, Rodney C.
Barlow, Israel, Jr.
Becraft, John
Beesley, Fred
Bench, Ephraim
Bennion, Heber
Bennion, Israel
Bentley, Joseph C.
Black, David
Black, Morley
Bloomfield, John
Bowman, Henry C.
Brandley, Theodore
Brimhall, Geo. H.
Brown, Arthur
Brown, Ezriah
Brown, Orson P.
Brown, Richard D.
Buckholt, William
Butler, Elder
Call, Anson B.
Call, Willard
CANNON, A. H.
Cannon, Angus J.
Cannon, George M.
Cannon, Hugh J.
Cannon, John M.
Cannon, Lewis M.
Carroll, James
Carroll, Thomas
Carroll, Willard
Chamberlain, Thos.
Cheney, Frank
Clark, Arthur
Clayson, Nathan
Cluff, Benjamin
Cluff, Hyrum
Cordon, Joseph
Cordon, Louis P.
COWLEY, MATHIAS F.
Cox, Amos
Cutler, A. B.
Dean, Joseph H.
Dennis, Israel F.
Done, Abraham
Done, Elder
Driggs, Appollos
Droubay, Peter
Durfey, M.
Evans, John
Eager, John
Eager, Joseph
Eccles, Elder
Eccles, David
Ellison, E. P.
Emmett, James
Eyring, Ed
Farr, Lorenzo
Farr, Alonzo
Farr Winslow
Goslin, Peter
Grace, Isaac H.
Grant, Joseph H.
Hendey, James
Hurst, James A.
Hague, Elder
Hurst, Walter
Hardy, John
Hardy, Abel
Harmer, Lorin
Hart, Arthur W.
Haws, George M.
Haymore, F. D.
Hickman, Francis
Hickman, Josiah E.
Higgs, Alpha J.
Hilton, Thomas
Hyde, Ezra T.
Humphrey, John A.
Jasperson, Jasper
Johnson, Zebedee
Jensen, James
James, Joseph
Jameson, Alex.

Jarman, Charles
Jarvis, Samuel
Johansen, Jens
Johnson, Benjamin
Johnson, David
Johnson, Heber
Johnson, J. Francis
Johnson, Obiah
Johnson, Wm. D.
Jolly, Haskell S.
Jones, Daniel B.
Jorgensen, J. S.
Kelsch, Louis B.
Lee, John
LeBaron, Don
Lake, Alonzo
Lemmon, Peter
Lewis, Walter (Mex.)
Lillywhite, Chas. W.
Longhurst, Warren
Lyman, Walter C.
Merrill, O. D
Merrill, Albert
Merrill, Chas G.
Miller, Reuben G.
Mortensen, Francis
Mortensen, Andrew
McCall, Robert
McClellan, Chas. E.
McClellan, George
McGregor, D. A.
Memmott, J. W.
Morrell, Joseph
Morris, Robert
Michelson, Maurice
Muir, Daniel
Musser, Joseph W.
Nagle, Bishop
Nagely, George
Nagely, James
Nagely, John
Newton, Samuel
Nielsen, Carl
Ockey, William
Parkinson, Wm. C.
Parkinson, Geo. C.
Payne, Edward
Peterson, Franz
Pierce, Brigham
Pratt, Helaman
Pratt, Rey L.
Raymer, W. H.
Rich, Ben E.
Richardson, Edmund
Richens, Parley
Robinson, John (1)
Robinson, John (2)
Robison, Joseph E.
Romney, George S.
Romney, Miles A.
Romney, Miles P.
Romney, Thomas
Richens, Orson
Sherwood, Robert
Sanders, Peter
Sears, Wm. G.
Smith, James
Sessions, Byron
Silver, John
Silver, Joseph
Skousen, Daniel
Skousen, James
Steed, Walter
Skousen, Peter
Smaley, John
Smith, Isaac
Smith, Jesse M.
Smith, Jesse M., Jr.
Snarr, Daniel
Spencer, Elder
Spilsbury, Alma P.
Spilsbury, David
Steele, M. M., Jr.
Stevens, Alma
Stevens, John
Stevens, Joshua
Stehl, John
Stowell, Brigham
Stringham, Bryant
Summerhays, J. W.
Tanner, Joseph M.
Tanner, Henry S.
Taylor, Alonzo
Taylor, E. L.
Taylor, Frank Y.
Taylor, Guy
TAYLOR, JOHN W.
TEASDALE, GEORGE
Tenny, Levi
Thurber, Albert
Thomas, Elder (1)
Thomas, Elder (2)
Thurber, Allen D.
Todd, Donald M.
Thurber, Joseph
Turley, Ed
Turley, Ernest
Turley, Joseph
Whitaker, John M.
Wright, Joseph
Wall, Frank W.
Wilson, David
Walser, J. J.
Walser, J. J., Jr.
Whetten, John T.
Whipple, Charles
Wilson, David
Wilson, Guy C.
Wilson, Lycurgus F.
Woods, Jonathan
Woolfenden, Chas.
Wood, Edward J.
Willey, D. O.
WOODRUFF, A. O.
Wrathall, James
Watson, Hugh
YOUNG, BRIGHAM, JR.
Young, Newell K.
Young, Don Carlos
Young, Royal B.
Young, William
Zundell, Abraham

Not having mentioned the gentleman's name heretofore, we call attention to the case of Elder Arthur Brown, who resides at Chichupa, Mexico, and who in the year 1896 married a Miss Porforst of that place as a plural wife.

The list now consists of two hundred and twenty names, and it is steadily growing. We respectfully desire to bring it to the atttention of Apostle Francis M. Lyman, who at Logan recently declared ecclesiastical war against this class of men, whom he designated as "Skull-duggers". In this list alone is furnished enough to keep the president of the twelve busy disciplining and excommunicating while we look up some more cases for him. He should at least write us a private note of thanks (not for publication, of course, but as an evidence of good faith) for our assistance in this matter.

But we are altogether too much of the thought that Apostle Lyman's recent little splurge of indignation was no more and no less than a bluff—which fooled nobody in particular, and least of all The Tribune.

A FAITH PROMOTING STUDY

By Athlene Mills Allred

I was asked to give a faith promoting story this morning, and during the week I have read many remarkable experiences from the lives of Church members during the early years of Church history. But as the circumstances surrounding these incidents were very similar to the situation we have been placed in recently, I decided to use this opportunity to tell of a personal experience which happened a short while ago.

Sworn officers of the law have entered our homes and without due process of law, have confiscated personal properties, and in many instances acted most ungentlemanly; however, we have not as yet been placed in the position to endure such extreme privations as the early Saints, and for this we should be very thankful.

Since the F. B. I. and state officers had appeared at the door on that eventful day of March 7th (1944), my mind had been in a constant whirl of

thoughts concerning the welfare of this group of Saints.

After the State officers had taken the twins (the two Finlayson sisters) and the F. B. I. had unlawfully entered and searched our home — carrying away many personal possessions, lovely and sweet to us, and taken Rulon (our husband) away, my heart was heavy and the feelings of bewilderment and anxiety began to enter my heart as I knew not their fate and whether or not we would ever see them again was a question.

About three days after the arrests were made on the 7th and 8th of March (Myrtle, Leona and I were arrested on the 8th) I retired after earnestly praying to God that if it was His will, we as a people might be spared much of the persecution that was being waged against us.

Early in the morning, I became conscious of dreaming a most glorious dream:

This group of people seemed to be mingling together (here in this valley) and associating very closely in their pursual of daily life, when all of a sudden we noticed a storm sweeping toward the valley from the mouth of one of the canyons in the northeast.

The storm became worse as it approached and appeared much like a tornado, destroying everything in its wake. Lives, homes, gardens, all manner of vegetation were demolished as it swept through the valley.

We were directly in its path and seemed to know that nothing short of a miracle could save us from its intense ferocity. We ran from our homes (we seemed to be living much closer together than we are now) and gathered together outside and began praying most fervently to God to spare us from the ravages of the approaching storm that we might not be destroyed and swept away.

The storm's fury increased as it came closer, but as it reached us, it lifted above our heads just enough to miss us. We could, however, feel the force of it blow against us and we drew closer together for protection. We sensed the terror of its might as it passed over our heads and then returned to the earth to continue on its way directly behind us. We turned and watched it pursue its destructive course on down the valley.

Such rejoicing! Our lives had been spared! We shouted, laughed and shook hands, wept, praised God and gave exultant thanks to Him who had so graciously saved us from destruction.

Suddenly we noticed that the valley was no longer bare of vegetation, but the flowers were blooming in gorgeous profusion. The trees were of a more beautiful green and much heavier with leaves. The mountains were covered with beautiful shrubbery and growth. We looked at our homes and noted that they had a new appearance—more stately and lovely—not different as to pattern, but more hallowed and peaceful, radiating a heavenly spirit. The experience we had just passed through served to strengthen the bonds of love and appreciation between us as brethren and sisters and the spirit that glowed from one to another was one of unspeakable joy, happiness, understanding and charity.

At breakfast the next morning when I related my experience to the family, our husband said it must surely mean that much of the horrible prosecution which now awaits us will be averted if we unitedly seek our blessings from God.

Throughout the dream, I was impressed that the key to our rescue was that we were united heart and soul in our supplications to God to prserve and protect us. This is my constant hope and prayer—to be united and gain our exaltation together in God's Kingdom.

EDWARD MIDGARD 1812 Twelfth Ave., Seattle 22, Wash.
WRITER · PRINTER
PUBLISHER

November 23, 1944

American Civil Liberties Union
170 Fifth Ave., New York City 10

Sirs:

Below please find for publication or use as you may see fit my reaction to the recent sentencing in the courts of Utah of a number of American women for the "crime" of choosing motherhood and family life by and with mates of their own preference.

I maintain that our boasted Bill of Rights remains woefully incomplete while we fail to recognize The Right to Motherhood.

This Christmas, had we not better turn our attention from the cult of Mary and the Christ child to this case of outraged motherhood in our country?

EDWARD MIDGARD

MARTYRS OF MOTHERHOOD

Utah's Martyr Mothers, I greet you!
Now, in 1944, they have dragged you from your homes,
Have hailed you into court and condemned you to prison terms.
For what? For bearing and rearing the children of our Nation!
In your case they call that "Unlawful Cohabitation".
What insanity, where a nation is fighting for its survival!
What infamy, where we pride ourselves in being the champions of human rights!
And what mockery have they made of their Christ cult
By this persecution of family life, by such defamation of motherhood!

Utah's Martyr Mothers, I greet you!
You may go to jail now to serve out your terms in conformity with
An unwise law that must be repealed and replaced by better law;
But I predict that a monument honoring and exonerating you
Will yet be erected by a more enlightened and more civilized generation,
While your persecutors and your jailers will be remembered
As latter-day barbarians in the lamentable history of human relations.
Shame on you, City founded a century ago by a great pioneer
Whose vision and courage turned the desert into a populated place!
Utah's Martyr Mothers, I greet you!

EDWARD MIDGARD

The American Way I believe in, it is that of finding a better way for the one we so far considered the best

THE NEGRO RACE

We are asked concerning the Negro; why his black skin and why is he deprived of the Priesthood? We quote from a statement of John M. Whitaker, given in a "Seminary Lecture", June 14, 1821, and filed in the Brigham Young University Library, L. C. 298. 4, B76s.

"I desire at this point to quote a statement my father secured from the late Anson Call of Bountiful, who obtained it direct from the Prophet Joseph Smith. Among other things he said:

> **Now after we had proved ourselves worthy before God that we were willing to go through temporally, sufferings, privations and trials that we did spiritually, we were chosen or selected and we merited our prize or reward according to the works we did in the spirit world; but we were not chosen or selected until we had shown by our works to our Heavenly Father that we were willing to go through what He might permit us to, and we were not deprived of our agency.**
>
> **In the Grand Council of Heaven, there were some spirits that did not take part in the great rebellion at all. They were called neutral spirits, they were on the fence and when Cain killed his brother Abel God placed a skin of blackness upon him as the first of Adam's race and through the posterity of Ham this seed was propagated through the flood. And the neutral spirits in heaven possess these black bodies. Through Ham's marriage with a Canaanite, this curse continued after the flood and another curse was added. Noah said, "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shalt he be unto his brethren." And those neutral spirits in heaven preferred to take the body of a negro rather than have no body at all.**

"I filed this with many other sayings of President Anson Call with the First Presidency of the Church, and at the same time received further proof of at least the idea of the leading brethren, that the neutral spirits in heaven become the negro in this life. President Brigham Young and President Lorenzo Snow left similar statements in sermons they delivered, Oct. 9, 1859, and March 8, 1863. (J. of D., 10:110).

"The Pearl of Great Price seems to be very plain in speaking upon this subject. (See pages 36, 38, 53 and 54). While this is not established doctrine, it is the accepted view of the leading brethren.

"It therefore seems very clear that free agency is the privilege of assuming responsibility and upon the exercise of this wonderful privilege comes the weal or woe of mankind."

Brigham Young said upon this subject:

> **We have thus illustrated in the account of Cain and Abel. Cain conversed with his God every day and knew all about the plan of creating this earth for his Father told him. But for the want of humility and through jealousy and an anxiety to possess the kingdom and to have the whole of it under his own control and not allow anybody else the right to say one word, what did he do? He killed his brother. The Lord put a mark on him and there are some of his children in this room. When all the other children of Adam have had the privilege of receiving the Priesthood and of coming into the kingdom of God and of being redeemed from the four quarters of the earth, and have received their resurrection from the dead then it will be time enough to remove the curse from Cain and his posterity. He deprived his brother of the privilege of pursuing his journey through life, and of extending his kingdom by multiplying on the earth and because he did this he is the last to share the joys of the kingdom of God.—J. of D., 2:142-3; The Vision, Sundwall, pp. 65-6.**

And again—Brigham Young:

> **I have endeavored to give you a few items relating to the Celestial Kingdom of God and to the other kingdoms which the Lord has prepared for His children. The Lamanites or Indians are just as much the children of our Father and God as we are. So also are the Africans. But we are also the children of adoption through obedience of the Gospel of his Son. Why are so many of the inhabitants of the earth cursed with a skin of blackness? It comes in consequence of their fathers rejecting the power of the Holy Priesthood and the law of God. They will go down to death. And when all the rest of the children have received their blessings in the Holy Priesthood, then that curse will be removed from the seed of Cain, and they will then come up and possess the Priesthood, and receive all the blessings which we now are entitled to.—J. of D., 11:272, and The Vision, pp. 64-5.**

PERPETUAL CALENDAR—This calendar will enable anyone to find the day of the week any certain date fell on, between the years 1801 and 1952. Suppose you want to know what day of the week the 12th of November, 1905, fell on; look under the table of years for 1905, and on the parallel line for the month of November. The figure 3 which you will find there refers to the columns of days below. Look in col. 3 for the figure 12, and you will find that the 12th of November fell on Sunday.

1801 to 1952	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
1801 1807 1818 1829 1835 1846 1857 1863 1874 1885 1891 1903 1914 1925 1931 1942	4	7	7	3	5	1	3	6	2	4	7	2
1802 1813 1819 1830 1841 1847 1858 1869 1875 1886 1897 1909 1915 1926 1937 1943	5	1	1	4	6	2	4	7	3	5	1	3
1803 1814 1825 1831 1842 1853 1859 1870 1881 1887 1898 1910 1921 1927 1938 1949	6	2	2	5	7	3	5	1	4	6	2	4
1805 1811 1822 1833 1839 1850 1861 1867 1878 1889 1895 1901 1907 1918 1929 1935 1946	2	5	5	1	3	6	1	4	7	2	5	7
1806 1817 1823 1834 1845 1851 1862 1873 1879 1890 1902 1913 1919 1930 1941 1947	3	6	6	2	4	7	2	5	1	3	6	1
1809 1815 1826 1837 1843 1854 1865 1871 1882 1893 1899 1905 1911 1922 1933 1939 1950	7	3	3	6	1	4	6	2	5	7	3	5
1810 1821 1827 1838 1849 1855 1866 1877 1883 1894 1900 1906 1917 1923 1934 1945 1951	1	4	4	7	2	5	7	3	6	1	4	6
Leap-Years		29										
1804 1832 1860 1888 1928	7	3	4	7	2	5	7	3	6	1	4	6
1808 1836 1864 1892 1904 1932	5	1	2	5	7	3	5	1	4	6	2	4
1812 1840 1868 1896 1908 1936	3	6	7	3	5	1	3	6	2	4	7	2
1816 1844 1872 1912 1940	1	4	5	1	3	6	1	4	7	2	5	7
1820 1848 1876 1916 1944	6	2	3	6	1	4	6	2	5	7	3	5
1824 1852 1880 1920 1948	4	7	1	4	6	2	4	7	3	5	1	3
1828 1856 1884 1924 1952	2	5	6	2	4	7	2	5	1	3	6	1

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Monday 1	Tuesday 1	Wed. 1	Thursday 1	Friday 1	Saturday 1	Sunday 1
Tuesday 2	Wed. 2	Thursday 2	Friday 2	Saturday 2	Sunday 2	Monday 2
Wed. 3	Thursday 3	Friday 3	Saturday 3	Sunday 3	Monday 3	Tuesday 3
Thursday 4	Friday 4	Saturday 4	Sunday 4	Monday 4	Tuesday 4	Wed. 4
Friday 5	Saturday 5	Sunday 5	Monday 5	Tuesday 5	Wed. 5	Thursday 5
Saturday 6	Sunday 6	Monday 6	Tuesday 6	Wed 6	Thursday 6	Friday 6
Sunday 7	Monday 7	Tuesday 7	Wed. 7	Thursday 7	Friday 7	Saturday 7
Monday 8	Tuesday 8	Wed. 8	Thursday 8	Friday 8	Saturday 8	Sunday 8
Tuesday 9	Wed. 9	Thursday 9	Friday 9	Saturday 9	Sunday 9	Monday 9
Wed. 10	Thursday 10	Friday 10	Saturday 10	Sunday 10	Monday 10	Tuesday 10
Thursday 11	Friday 11	Saturday 11	Sunday 11	Monday 11	Tuesday 11	Wed. 11
Friday 12	Saturday 12	Sunday 12	Monday 12	Tuesday 12	Wed. 12	Thursday 12
Saturday 13	Sunday 13	Monday 13	Tuesday 13	Wed. 13	Thursday 13	Friday 13
Sunday 14	Monday 14	Tuesday 14	Wed. 14	Thursday 14	Friday 14	Saturday 14
Monday 15	Tuesday 15	Wed. 15	Thursday 15	Friday 15	Saturday 15	Sunday 15
Tuesday 16	Wed. 16	Thursday 16	Friday 16	Saturday 16	Sunday 16	Monday 16
Wed. 17	Thursday 17	Friday 17	Saturday 17	Sunday 17	Monday 17	Tuesday 17
Thursday 18	Friday 18	Saturday 18	Sunday 18	Monday 18	Tuesday 18	Wed. 18
Friday 19	Saturday 19	Sunday 19	Monday 19	Tuesday 19	Wed. 19	Thursday 19
Saturday 20	Sunday 20	Monday 20	Tuesday 20	Wed. 20	Thursday 20	Friday 20
Sunday 21	Monday 21	Tuesday 21	Wed 21	Thursday 21	Friday 21	Saturday 21
Monday 22	Tuesday 22	Wed. 22	Thursday 22	Friday 22	Saturday 22	Sunday 22
Tuesday 23	Wed. 23	Thursday 23	Friday 23	Saturday 23	Sunday 23	Monday 23
Wed. 24	Thursday 24	Friday 24	Saturday 24	Sunday 24	Monday 24	Tuesday 24
Thursday 25	Friday 25	Saturday 25	Sunday 25	Monday 25	Tuesday 25	Wed. 25
Friday 26	Saturday 26	Sunday 26	Monday 26	Tuesday 26	Wed. 26	Thursday 26
Saturday 27	Sunday 27	Monday 27	Tuesday 27	Wed. 27	Thursday 27	Friday 27
Sunday 28	Monday 28	Tuesday 28	Wed. 28	Thursday 28	Friday 28	Saturday 28
Monday 29	Tuesday 29	Wed. 29	Thursday 29	Friday 29	Saturday 29	Sunday 29
Tuesday 30	Wed. 30	Thursday 30	Friday 30	Saturday 30	Sunday 30	Monday 30
Wed. 31	Thursday 31	Friday 31	Saturday 31	Sunday 31	Monday 31	Tuesday 31

SAINTS CANNOT SURRENDER

By George Q. Cannon

The question is frequently asked me, do I see any light breaking through—any relief in prospect from the present difficulties which surround us. My reply has been that I do see, or think I see, a rift in the clouds, and that the day of our deliverance from the present attacks and difficulties is not far distant. In my associations with the leading men of the Church I find they all feel alike. They feel cheerful, contented and happy. So far as my own feelings are concerned I never felt more serene, and undisturbed, and confident concerning the future than I have done since the beginning of this year. From this condition of feeling which the servants of God possess I draw this conclusion: that our difficulties are not likely to be of so serious a nature as our enemies are hoping they will be.

I remember being on the ocean at one time when icebergs were very thick and we had a violent storm. The ship was considered to be in great danger. I watched the captain very closely; I formed my opinions as to our true position by his demeanor. I never have been at sea—and especially when threatened with peril—without forming my conclusions as to the imminence of the danger by the manner of the captain or pilot.

So in this Church. My experience has taught me that no serious danger has ever threatened our people without the man of God who stood at the head, and those associated with him, knowing concerning it. The premonitions of the Spirit to them have always been of a character to enable them to prepare the people for those events which awaited them.

Our enemies hope, in making this raid upon us, that they will get us in a corner and compel us, by the violence of their proceedings, to surrender the principle of plural marriage. Mr. Dickson is credited with saying that he is tired of this prosecution. Perhaps so. I am not, however, inclined to believe all his statements. But he says that President Taylor, by a very few words published in the Deseret News, could end it. That is, I suppose, President Taylor could surrender the principle of plural marriage and tell the people to do so. That is what Mr. Dickson means. That was the hope entertained by him and probably Judge Zane when this raid commenced.

But six months, or thereabouts, have elapsed and they are not one step nearer the end than they were—that is, if they hope by their action, to bring about a surrender of this principle. It is true that seven of our brethren who have refused to bend the knee to Judge Zane's demands are in the penitentiary; a number of others who are indicted and are under bonds; a number of others who are indicted, have not been arrested; but are the people any more inclined now to give up this vital principle of their religion than they were six months ago? I have not had the opportunity of mingling with them to any very great extent; but I am satisfied, from my own observation, and from all that I can hear, that they are not.

This crusade will result as many other attacks upon us have done in the past. It will have the effect to give us a name, and a reputation, and a power that we have not heretofore had. This is inevitable.

One of the difficulties the Elders have had to contend with of late years has been the widespread feeling that our system was a system of sensualism; that our people are licentious. It has been difficult for the world to conceive how it was possible that we should have plural marriage as a part of our religion unless this was the case. How can we convince them of the fallacy of this view? We have published as extensively as possible our true views and practice. Our Elders have taken

great pains to inform the public as to the cause of our believing in and practicing patriarchal marriage; but with what little effect! Something more than this is needed. The world must have a better idea of our motives than they ever have had.

This persecution will have the effect to enlighten a great many thinking people upon this point. They will learn, as they are now doing, that men, and women, too, are willing to go to prison for this principle.

Do people go to prison when they can honorably avoid it? **The Latter-day Saints can avoid going to prison if they will reject their wives. They can commit adultery and whoredom and not go to prison. If they were a licentious people they would do this. How much cheaper it would be to gratify their lusts without marrying wives and rearing children!** Thinking people must see this.

Women especially, however much they may dislike patriarchal marriage, must admire men who are so true to their wives and children that, rather than discard them, they will go to prison. All honorable people will be impressed by such devotion and courage. It will have more weight than any amount of preaching or writing upon the subject. They will see that there is something more than licentiousness connected with the principle; that that cannot be the motive which prompts men and women to enter upon its practice; because every man of experience knows that if that were the motive there would be no need to go to prison for its gratification; we could be popular as other people are and gratify the lusts of the flesh without being under the least necessity of going to the penitentiary. The world will see that there is a higher motive than sensuality for the Latter-day Saints clinging to patriarchal marriage, and the effect will be to uplift the doctrine on to a higher plane and to place it in a new light before their minds.—Juvenile Instructor, 20:197 (1885).

AN INSTRUCTIVE DREAM

By Brigham Young

February 17, 1847, at Winter Quarters

While at Winter Quarters, on the 17th of February, 1847, President Young had a very interesting dream which he related to the brethren. He dreamed that he went to see Joseph, the Prophet, and when he met him he looked perfectly natural. He appeared to be sitting in a chair at the time. President Young took hold of his right hand and kissed him many times, and said to him:

"Why is it we cannot be together as we used to be? You have been from us a long time; we want your society and do not like to be separated from you."

Joseph rose from his chair, and looked at him with his usual earnest, expressive and pleasing countenance, and said: "It is all right."

President Young repeated that he did not like to be away from him. Joseph said:

"It is all right. We cannot be together yet; we shall be bye and bye, but you will have to do without me for a while; then we shall be together again."

President Young discovered there was a hand-rail between Joseph and himself. Joseph stood by a window, and at the southwest of him it was very light, but President Young was in the twilight, and to the north of him it was very dark. President Young said:

"The brethren you know well, better than I do; you raised them up and brought the priesthood to us. They have a great anxiety to understand the law of adoption or the sealing principle, and if you have a word of coun-

sel for me I shall be glad to receive it.''

Joseph stepped towards him, looked very earnestly yet pleasantly, and said:

''Tell the brethren to be humble and faithful and be sure to keep the Spirit of the Lord, and it will lead them aright. Be careful and not turn away the small, still voice; it will teach them what to do and where to go; it will yield the fruits of the kingdom. Tell the brethren to keep their heart open to conviction, so that when the Holy Ghost comes to them their hearts will be ready to receive it. They can tell the Spirit of the Lord from all other spirits—it will whisper peace and joy to their souls; it will take malice, hatred, strife and all evil from their hearts, and their whole desire will be to do good, bring forth righteousness and build up the Kingdom of God. Tell the brethren if they will follow the Spirit of the Lord, they will go right. Be sure to tell the brethren to keep the Spirit of the Lord; and if they will, they will find themselves just as they were organized by our Father in heaven before they come into the world. Our Father in heaven organized the human family, but they are all disorganized and in great confusion.''

Joseph then showed President Young the pattern how the human family were in the beginning. He saw where the priesthood had been taken from the earth, and how it had to be joined together so that there would be a perfect chain from Father Adam to his latest posterity.

Joseph again said to him: ''Tell the people to be sure to keep the Spirit of the Lord and follow it and it will lead them just right.''

Such a dream was very consoling to President Young and instructive to the people. From it we can learn how important it is to keep the Spirit of the Lord. No man or people can prosper who do not have it as their guide.

The news reached Winter Quarters about this time of the hanging by the mob near Farmington, in Iowa, of Brother William H. Folsom. They did not kill him outright; but his friends had much difficulty in restoring him to life. They also hung Brother Rodsey Swazey by the heels for about five minutes. Six other brethren were also hung by them; and in this manner the Saints were treated by mobocrats in that vicinity, after having been expelled from their homes and robbed of nearly all they possessed by the mob at Nauvoo.—Juvenile Instructor, 8:114.

JOSEPH SMITH'S MISSION

By John Taylor

Joseph Smith was considered a fool—a gold digger. Although all the world nearly have turned gold-diggers since that, it has become a respectable profession; but it is highly unpopular to be a prophet and receive revelations from God. And these priests and professors have always been the most bitter opposers of God and his revelations.

Some twenty years ago when I was out preaching the Gospel, I always expected some priest to pop up and create a disturbance by opposing the truth; and I never had any peace until I met them and made manifest their folly before their own congregations. Then I could go peaceably about my business.

The priests were always the first to oppose the truth, the Bible, the revelations of God, containing the principles God had revealed for the salvation of the human family.

The Lord sent Joseph Smith, gave him the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and the Spirit of wisdom and intelligence rested down upon him, and he unfolded and made plain the Scriptures to the Elders that first came to him. They were not educated, but they spake as I never heard man speak before. They knew the Bible a thousand times better than I did. Where did they get

their information? From the Bible? Where else? From that record which the Lord revealed through a holy angel to Joseph Smith, and gave him power to translate the same. That record contains wisdom and intelligence we knew nothing about.

Again, God gave sundry revelations, and in them he unfolded things pertaining to our position and the position of men of God who have lived in the different ages of the world, and pertaining to the condition of all classes of men and angels in the eternal worlds, the future destiny of the human family, the salvation that has been wrought out for them, and how they are to obtain it.—J. of D. 7:322 (Oct. 7, 1859).

LIFE'S TAPESTRY

(Contributed by Pvt. Allen V. Bennion)

'Tis strange how the Lord oft leads us
In paths we have not sought,
But o'er us is his loving care—
His constant allwise thought.
God has fond dreams for you and me,
He sees us at our best;
He knows our possibilities
And gives life for our test.

God has a pattern for each life,
A pattern wondrous fair,
The warp and the woof He gives us,
And we should weave with care.
The colors which we are weaving
May be somber or gay,
But if we follow the pattern
We'll see their need some day.

When life's tapestry is finished,
If God's fond dream comes true,
We'll see the need of the colors
Given to me and to you;
We will understand His purpose,
His leading we will see,
And thank Him for His loving care
Which guided you and me.

—Ella May Cook Chandler.

CALAMITY PLUS

Asked at a Sunday School examination to describe the sufferings of Job, a little girl wrote:

"Job had one trouble after another. First he lost his cattle, then he lost his children, and then he had to go live in the desert with his wife."

THANK YOU!

We are not able to acknowledge personally the many holiday greetings we are receiving, nor the intimate expressions of good will coming from our numerous friends throughout the country. However, we take this means and occasion to express our thanks and deep gratitude for such contributions of love and felicitations. We wish to all of our readers the compliments of the season with a liberal share of the goods of life to add to their comfort and happiness. May the years to come prove better years for everyone who is seeking to serve the Lord; and may our feet be firmly planted upon the foundation of truth and righteousness.

TRUTH greets you with love and confidence.

NO TIME

I have no time to find fault with others,
I have too many faults of my own.
While I, myself, may not know them,
I am sure that to others they're known.

I have no time for idle gossip,
It may be all a lie,
And soon the story will die out
If everybody passes it by.

I have no time to believe everything that I hear
And to others the story repeat,
I would rather obey the Golden Rule
And be kind to all that I meet.

I have no time to listen to those who tell
Something to stir up strife,
Far better to tell of good deeds done
And to brighten the journey of life.

I have no time to be moody and lonely,
No time to be gloomy or sad.
It takes all my spare time planning
How I can help to make others glad.

"How did you win that medal?"
"I saved the lives of my entire regiment."
"Wonderful! And how did you do that?"
"I shot the cook."

TO THE VIRGINS

Gather rose-buds while ye may
Old Time is still a-flying:
And this same flower that smiles today
Tomorrow will be dying.

The glorious Lamp of Heaven, the Sun,
The higher he's a-getting
The sooner will his race be run,
And nearer he's to setting.

The age is best which is the first,
When youth and blood are warmer;
But being spent, the worse, and worst
Times still succeed the former.

Then be not coy, but use your time;
And while ye may, go marry:
For having lost but once your prime,
You may for ever tarry.

—Robert Herrick.

NOT A PROPER QUESTION!

In 1828 the Lancaster (Ohio) school board refused the use of the school house for a proposed debate as to whether railroads were practical or not. The minutes of the school board read:

"You are welcome to use the school room to debate all proper questions, but such things as railroads are impossibilities and rank infidelity. If God had designed that His intelligent creatures should travel at the frightful speed of 15 miles per hour by steam, He would have foretold it through his holy prophets. It is a device of Satan to lead immortal souls to hell."

NOT SO DULL

The village idiot sat over a rain puddle with his fishing rod and line. A passing tourist, dropping a quarter in his jar asked:

"How many have you caught, young man?"

"You are the third", was the reply.

NOW AVAILABLE

THE NEW TREATISE ON

CELESTIAL OR PLURAL MARRIAGE

THE MORMON MARRIAGE SYSTEM

Treats: Celibacy, Monogamy and Polygamy, Including the DIVORCE AND BIRTH CONTROL EVILS

Exhausive Comments on Legal and Ethical Aspects of Subject
Fully Indexed and Illustrated

THE MOST COMPLETE WORK YET PUBLISHED ON THE SUBJECT

Read from authorized sources on questions now rocking Utah and agitating the Nation

Price, postpaid, $1.50 per copy. Club rates, to accommodate Priesthood and Auxiliary classes and individuals, in lots of ten or more, $1.00 per copy.

TRUTH PUBLISHING COMPANY
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City 3, Utah
AND AT BOOK SHOPS

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. FEBRUARY, 1945. NO. 9.

The Supreme Court Decision of 1879

Interview With President John Taylor by O. J. Hollister for the New York Tribune

An interview with President John Taylor, having been requested by O. J. Hollister, Esq., United States Collector of Internal Revenue for Utah Territory, and correspondent of the New York Tribune, on Monday, January 13, 1879, those gentlemen met by appointment in the President's office, Salt Lake City, when the following conversation ensued, as reported by Mr. George F. Gibbs, phonographer, Mr. Hollister having his questions prepared in writing. President Taylor is not in the habit of granting such requests for interview, and met Mr. Hollister simply because he was in some sense a representative of the Federal Government. The report is now published in full because it embodies many important statements, and because it is hardly to be expected that the whole conversation, unabridged, will appear in the paper for which it was obtained. In connection with current events vitally affecting the religious liberties of the Latter-day Saints, we have no doubt that it will be read with interest by many persons of various creeds, as well as by the people who are chiefly concerned in the issues alluded to therein, and the bearings of the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.—Ed. News.

Mr. Hollister—I would like, as a representative of the New York Tribune, to ask you, Mr. Taylor, whether you dissent from Judge Waite's decision and if so, wherein?

Mr. Taylor—In relation to this matter, I suppose you want something from me for the purpose of laying it before the public?

Mr. H.—Yes, sir.

Mr. T.—Then, while I am not averse to my views being made known to the public, and as you, I understand, are a United States officer, I may take the liberty of interviewing you.

Mr. H.—If you will answer my questions, I will answer yours.

Mr. T.—(By way of introduction), This is Mr. Penrose, one of our editors, whom I have invited to be present, as he is also a public man. Well Mr. Hollister, what do you wish to ask me?

Mr. H.—I have a number of questions written down, which, if you

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

please, I will present; and, to commence, I will ask, do you dissent from Judge Waite's statement of the scope and effect of the amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing religious freedom?

Mr. T.—Yes, sir.

Mr. H.—That Congress was thereby deprived of all legislative power over mere opinion or belief, but was left free to reach actions which are in violation of social duties or subversive of good order?

Mr. Penrose, Associate Editor of the Deseret News—That is, it is assumed that a religious people have the right of belief, but have not the right to carry out and practice their belief.

Mr. T.—**I regard that a religious faith amounts to nothing unless we are permitted to carry it into effect. Congress and the Supreme Court are carrying out the same principles that were practiced in the persecutions against the Huguenots in France, the Waldenses and Albigenses in Piedmont, the Non-conformists in England, and others who have been persecuted on account of their religion. All of those people had the right in their respective governments anywhere, and everywhere to entertain their religious beliefs, but it was the practice of that faith that made it offensive.** And I look upon this in the same way. Article I of the amendments to the Constitution states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." They will allow us to think—**what an unspeakable privilege that is**—but they will not allow us the free exercise of that faith which the Constitution guarantees. Here is the **injustice** and the **manifest breach of faith.**

Mr. H.—Is it not true that marriage is the basis of society, that out of it spring the social relations, obligations and duties with which governments must necessarily concern themselves? And is it not therefore within the legitimate scope of the power of every civil government to determine whether marriage shall be polygamous or monogamous under its dominion?

Mr. T.—I do not look upon it in that way. I consider that when the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted, those high contracting parties did positively agree that they would not interfere with religious affairs. Now, if our marital relations are not religious, what is? This ordinance of marriage was a direct revelation to us through Joseph Smith the Prophet, which we as a people believe in. I refer you to my Testimony given not long ago in a United States Court, and I will tell you now, as I there stated under oath, that I KNOW that God has given this to us for our guidance in these matters. My oath would be taken on other matters, why not on religion? You may not know it, but I know that this is a revelation from God and a command to his people, and therefore it is my religion. I do not believe that the Supreme Court of the United States nor the Congress of the United States has any right to interfere with my religious views, and in doing it they are violating their most sacred obligations.

Mr. H.—My idea of religion is this: that man acknowledges, loves, reverences, worships, and gives thanks to God; that constitutes religion. Worship may take various forms of expression, but where did it ever, how can it, take the form of marrying and raising families—either single or plural families?

Mr. T.—Mr. Hollister, are you a believer in the Bible?

Mr. P.—Mr. Hollister's question is answered by the Bible, which plainly says—that marriage is ordained of God, etc.

Mr. T.—Now, Mr. Hollister, I have so far answered your questions, will you answer mine?

Mr. H.—In one sense I do. I believe that part of the Bible that my reason approves of.

Mr. T.—It would not be of any use arguing with you on this subject then; but as my opinions are desired for the public, I will state that I believe in the Bible, and believing in it I believe in those principles therein set forth.

Mr. H.—If marriage can be legitimately called religion, what human relation or pursuit may not be so called? And if everything is religion, and the State is prohibited from interfering with it, what place is there left for the state?

Mr. T.—I do not know of any particular necessity for the state interfering with religious matters; the Constitution declares it shall not.

Mr. P.—That is easily answered. When one's religion assumes to interfere with the rights and liberties of others.

Mr. T.—Whose rights do we interfere with? That is the question I was going to ask you?

Mr. H.—I consider that you interfere with men's rights and women's rights and children's rights.

Mr. T.—How can we interfere with men's rights or with women's rights if all enter into it voluntarily? The man is not injured by it, for he assumes premeditatedly and knowingly the responsibilities that he voluntarily enters into; the woman's rights are not interfered with, for her actions are as the man's—voluntary, and she understands the nature of the covenant as well as the responsibility she assumes.

Mr. H.—I think it interferes with the rights of men and women, because when a man marries a second woman, some other man must do without any. Travelers such as Livingston and Sweinfurth tell us that the slave trade in Eastern and Central Africa has been supported for ages by the demand of plural wives or concubines in polygamous Asia. You believe that Mormonism will be universally received, but polygamy cannot become universal, because the sexes are born in about equal numbers. How can a principle, not of universal applicability, be philosophically sound, or sound in any sense?

Mr. P.—What need of going out of Utah?

Mr. H.—If you are going to defend polygamy as a sound philosophical principle, I don't see how you can avoid going out of Utah.

Mr. P.—But we only practice it as a part of our religion.

Mr. H.—But if it is a true principle it must be of universal applicability?

Mr. P.—There are certain principles of our faith that must be believed in and practiced before the principle of polygamy, and therefore it could not apply to any but believers in those principles as well as polygamy.

Mr. T.—I do not think it necessary to enter into a discussion on these points. I speak of facts and consequently I do not think they can be successfully controverted. Those theories are too visionary and too far in the future. It is well known that there are scores of thousands of women in these United States who cannot obtain husbands and the same also in England and other Christian countries. And furthermore, we regard the plural order of marriage as being voluntary, both on the part of the man and the woman. If there should be any disparity, as you refer to—if there should not be two wives for one man, why then he could not get them.

Mr. H.—Is it not a trespass on the rights of others? Those of men, because when a man marries two women, some other man must do without any? Those of women, because they are each entitled to a husband, and because the essence of conjugal love is exclusiveness; those of children, because they cannot have that care from a polygamic (father) they ought to and do have from a monogamic father?

Mr. Calder—Let me ask you, Mr. Hollister, if you think a person has the right to practice polygamy in our faith unless he accepts Joseph Smith as a prophet of God?

Mr. H.—No, nor then either.

Mr. C.—How then can it affect others that do not believe in him?

Mr. T.—You propose to interview me in relation to this matter; and on the other hand I propose to interview you. You give me credit for my good faith; I give you credit for yours. You are a United States officer, and I am a believer in the United States government. I have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States government, not being American born, and I have always admired its institutions; and I have been very desirous to see the practice and carrying out of these fundamental principles of our government; I have been anxious to see public affairs conducted in an honorable, intelligent, correct, philosophic, patriotic and statesmanlike form in all things. These have been my sentiments, I presume they are yours. **I would like to see the Government take a course that would be calculated to promote union, confidence and fellowship among all classes. I am not one of those that feel like damning and destroying those that do not believe as I do. I believe that God is the Father of all; and I believe that this government was instituted by God for certain purposes, in the interests of humanity; and I wish to see things conducted in that manner that will tend to promote the happiness and well-being of all grades and classes, irrespective of creed. I think, and know in fact, we are misunderstood in many respects. Some people think we are enemies to this government. I can truthfully say I never was an enemy to the government, neither have I ever entertained a feeling of enmity in my heart. I do not think for one moment that either Joseph Smith or Brigham Young was an enemy to the government; neither do I believe that any of our leading men, comprehending correct principles, ever feel inimical to the government of the United States. Joseph Smith had a revelation.** Could he help that? If the Lord spake to him was he to blame? I believe that revelation. You do not. That is all right. One is a Baptist, say, another a Presbyterian, etc., etc.; that is his individual business, not mine. I look upon it that we are all the children of the same Parent, all having a perfect right to His mercy and full freedom of action without distinction. And I would be much pleased to see correct principles established in the United States, and thence spread throughout the world. That is my political faith, Mr. Hollister.

Mr. H.—Can religious belief, in your opinion, be accepted by any government as justification of an act which it has by law made criminal without abdicating its functions as a government?

Mr. T.—Well, that would be a question admitting of a great deal of argument, depending altogether upon circumstances. If the government sets out in the first place with a Constitution guaranteeing to all men freedom in regard to their religious right and then violates that Constitution, the government then becomes the transgressor, not the parties. For instance, referring to the government of the United States; do you believe that its Constitution is binding upon Congress and upon the Supreme Court?

Mr. H.—Yes, sir.

Mr. T.—Then, although I am sorry to say it, yet I believe that **both of these exalted branches of the government have violated their most sacred obligations to sustain that instrument.**

Mr. H.—Can your people longer entertain a reasonable expectation of changing, or materially modifying, the sentiment of the American people on this subject?

Mr. T.—Unless they go back to first principles we cannot. We can have but very little hope unless they recognize the validity of the Constitution, and do not tamper with that sacred covenant.

Mr. H.—If not, can you expect as a people to practice polygamy indefinitely, hedging it about with secrecy, and when questioned judicially, evade or deny it?

Mr. T.—In relation to our expectations pertaining to that, the U. S. Judiciary as well as all the powers of this government are in the hands of God, and we are in the hands of God, and we and they also must abide the issue.

Mr. H.—Viewed socially or philosophically, apart from all religious consideration, do you regard polygamy as worthy of perpetuation at the cost of perpetual antagonism between your people and their countrymen?

Mr. T.—However we may respect the government and its institutions I would respectfully say **we are not the parties who produce this antagonism;** it is men who place themselves in antagonism to the Constitution of the United States. We are governed by the law of God, which is not in violation of that Constitution. Our revelation given in August, 1831, specifically states that if we keep the laws of God we need not break the laws of the land. Congress has since, by its acts, placed us in antagonism to what we term an unconstitutional law, and it now becomes a question whether we should obey God or man.

Mr. H.—But in taking that position do you not set yourselves up as the Judges of the Constitution, whereas the laws (Sec. 709 R. S.) make the Supreme Court the judge of the constitutionality of the laws of Congress?

Mr. T.—Without any interpretations from the Supreme Court, I take it that the words themselves are explicit on this point requiring no interpretation, and any interpretation could not make them plainer. We take them to mean what they say. When the Constitution says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, we take it to mean what it says. Congress, indeed, can pass laws, and the Supreme Court can sanction those laws; but while they have the power, being in the majority, the justice of those laws is another matter.

Mr. H.—Viewed as above do you regard polygamy as superior to monogamy as the form of law of marriage, and if so wherein?

Mr. T.—I consider it altogether superior to the law of monogamy in a great many particulars. First, I base it upon the will and command of God both in ancient and modern times; second, I base it upon the natural results of monogamy. There is in all monogamic countries, the United States not excepted, a terrible state of things arising from the practice of monogamy, infanticide and foeticide prevailing to an alarming extent. Statements are on record of reliable men, such as physicians, statesmen and others, to the effect that they feared that, in consequence of such practices, the original stock of people in certain districts would run out. It is said that they arrange the size of their families to suit themselves, generally calculating to have about two children, and the rest must be killed either before they come into the world

or afterwards, thus making murderers and murderesses of all who engage in it, imbruing their hands in the blood of innocence and taking the lives of those whom God committed to their care. And it must be admitted that whoredoms and other abominable practices, which are offensive to good or civilized society and contrary to the laws of nature, are carried on extensively, and that people are doing far worse things, according to their own admissions, associated with monogamy than we are even charged with. And that while these things are sanctioned and protected to a certain extent by government—at least winked at, all those highly moral and religious principles, ordained of God, by which men ought to be actuated, are trampled under foot. A man marries a wife, he does not calculate to be true to her, but associates with lewd women, of whom there are thousands upon thousands in the United States. Polygamy protects its offspring; monogamy does not. How many are there now in Washington, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and other cities that make it a practice of cohabiting with other women, to whom children are born, the results of their adultery, whom they do not acknowledge, but who are turned out upon the streets to become waifs in the shape of newsboys, street-sweepers, etc., outcasts and pariahs of society, augmenting also the criminal classes and the paupers, leaving other people to provide for their illicit offspring; and it is not an unfrequent thing for such children, while engaged sweeping the street crossings, to ask their own father for a penny, the child not knowing the father nor the father the child.

Mr. H.—Do you consider these evils the necessary concomitants of monogamy more than of polygamy?

Mr. T.—These are the results of monogamy, whether necessary or not, and these are the evils associated with it. We acknowledge our children, we acknowledge our wives; we have no mistresses. **We had no prostitution here until it was introduced by monogamy** and I am now told that these other diabolical deeds are following in its train. The courts have protected these people in their wicked practices. We repudiate all such things, and hence I consider that a system that will enable a man to carry out his professions, and that will enable him to acknowledge his wife or wives and acknowledge and provide for his children and wives, is much more honorable than that principle which violates its marital relations, and, whilst hypocritically professing to be true to its pledges, recklessly violates the same and tramples upon every principle of honor, which sits down and coolly and deliberately decides how many children shall be murdered and how many shall live. The one, Mr. Hollister, is a great deal better system than the other. Before monogamy came here we had no houses of ill fame, and our women were not seduced.

Mr. H.—Does not the Bible which gives the first account of polygamy also give us the first account of prostitution?

Mr. T.—To a very limited extent, but it was punishable by death in connection with the polygamic law.

Mr. H.—Then prostitution is not necessarily a concomitant of monogamy any more than it is of polygamy?

Mr. T.—O yes, it is, for under the polygamic law adulterers were punished with death. And it is known to the world that prostitution is a concomitant or outgrowth of monogamy to be found in all monogamous countries, and is really one of the prominent institutions of monogamy, having been licensed in some parts of the United States, and it is also licensed in France and other "Christian" countries.

Mr. H.—I might reply to this that Christian nations regard prostitution as an evil, to be regulated where it

cannot be suppressed; that it is nowhere among them encouraged, but universally frowned upon; that it were better for man to put more restraint upon his passions, than to provide the means of satisfying them under the cover of law or religion.

Mr. T.—I think it better to honestly and honorably carry out our professions, than to act the part of hypocrites whether as individuals or nations.

Mr. H.—But if we want to get through we must confine the discussion to the line of my written questions. Otherwise it would be endless. I will therefore ask—was not the great object of the institution of polygamy to rapidly increase the number of the adherents of your church, and is not that object accomplished as far as is practicable in that way?

Mr. T.—The object as well as the institution was designed by the Almighty and not by man. I believe that the revelation on marriage to Joseph Smith was given by the Lord, and I not only believe it but I know it, and it is sufficient for me to know that He has His own purposes in doing so; and furthermore, our covenants are associated with eternity as well as time.

Mr. H.—If you marry for eternity how is it you divorce so commonly?

Mr. J. F. Smith (who had come into the office)—The same authority (as was given by the Lord to Peter) that has power to unite or bind together has power to loose. Furthermore, our divorces are not so common.

Mr. P.—If the object was to increase the number of people it did not originate with Joseph Smith, but from the Lord; this revelation is not the product of man but of God, and whatever the object of it was, the object was in the mind of God and not in the mind of man.

Mr. H.—Is it not a great trial to both men and women to enter into the practice of polygamy?

Mr. T.—I don't think it is much of a trial; our people enter into it quite readily. Perhaps not more so than to enter into monogamy, judging from the number of unmarried persons everywhere. I suppose in New York alone there are not less than 40,000 men who are unmarried, and with plenty of women with whom they might enter into marital relations.

Mr. P.—Whatever trials there are in monogamy to some extent are enlarged in polygamy; and whatever benefits there are in monogamy are enlarged in polygamy.

Mr. H.—I got the impression, from reading your published discourses, that its practice was anything but pleasant to either men or women.

Mr. T.—That is in part correct. It was a very great trial for Joseph Smith, and for the Twelve Apostles and others, to shoulder the responsibility of introducing a system that was at variance with our customs and traditions, and those of the people of the world. There is where the trial comes in; but we felt that we would rather do that than disobey the command of God.

Mr. H.—It is not on record that Joseph Smith enjoined this on the people as the command of God.

Mr. J. F. Smith—It is recorded, but the records are not published. And as to the trials attending it, there is this which I think should be mentioned: There are the increased responsibilities of a numerous family, which religious conviction alone could enable a man to assume; and perhaps it is hardly necessary to say that only such convictions could induce women to enter into it.

Mr. H.—I have an idea that the majority of the women are so influ-

enced, but cannot say as to the men; some may possibly be, but not all, by a great way.

Mr. P.—I admit that to a small extent, but that does not affect the principle. Exceptions of that kind exist in every denomination.

Mr. H.—You say it was commanded by revelation from God. Was not Joseph Smith in the habit of praying for revelations when at a loss how to proceed?

Mr. T.—Yes, sir, and so were the other prophets of whom we read.

Mr. H.—Then I will ask you, wherein it would be more improper or impracticable to get a revelation forbidding it than it was to get one enjoining it?

Mr. J. F. S.—That would be assuming that Joseph Smith's revelations was the product of his own imagination; such a thing we cannot admit.

Mr. H.—Have not all nations had revelations according to the light of the best minds of those nations at the time?

Mr. P.—No, far above the light of the best minds.

Mr. T.—You, not being a believer in the Bible, of course, it would be difficult for you to understand our position. We believe in God's speaking and directing, from time to time, as He may deem fit; in fact, our church is founded on the principle of revelation.

Mr. H.—How many in your judgment do the inherents of your church in Utah number?

Mr. T.—I do not know positively, probably about 150,000. You have your source of information as well as I have.

Mr. H.—No. I have not access to the Church records; you must have all the members recorded who are more than eight years of age.

Mr. T.—That is as near as I could give it, which is about correct.

Mr. H.—How many of the men of marriageable age are practical polygamists?

Mr. T.—That I could not say, I have no idea.

Mr. H.—Mr. Cannon I understand said in Washington, before a committee, one in every ten; did he say so?

Mr. T.—I think he did.

Mr. H.—Would that in your judgment be correct?

Mr. P.—It is a difficult thing to get at, there being no statistics kept that I am aware of.

Mr. H.—I am not trying to catch you on any record question, I am seeking information simply that would be of general interest in the present state of this controversy.

Mr. T.—Oh, Mr. Hollister, we are not afraid of being caught, we have nothing to conceal from the world. We are quite willing they should know about these things.

Mr. H.—Are there more marriageable women than men in the Church in the aggregate?

Mr. T.—You have the same opportunities and advantages of arriving at such conclusions as we have.

Mr. H.—I think not. You must have records, and it seems to me that somebody must have some substantially correct idea about these statistical matters. I am trying to ascertain whether the practice is increasing or not.

Mr. T.—It would be a very difficult thing to answer a question of that kind.

Mr. H.—Are there as many polygamous marriages in proportion to the

whole number of people as there were ten or twenty years ago?

Mr. T.—I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. H.—Is there not a growing distaste to it among the younger members of your church?

Mr. T.—I think not.

Mr. P.—Such assertions have been made, but I think it a great mistake. I find that among the young people there is a better understanding about the principle of plural marriage than ever before, and consequently their belief in it is more widespread.

Mr. H.—I have been told differently in my travels through the Territory.

Mr. P.—Of course there are some who do not believe in it, and you, doubtless, have met such persons.

Mr. H.—You yourself, Mr. Taylor, have not married since the law was passed proscribing polygamy?

Mr. T.—No, sir.

Mr. H.—Why not? From respect of the law?

Mr. T.—I do not think I should have considered consequences if I had thought it my duty to take another wife. I am pretty well on in years, upwards of seventy.

Mr. H.—But the law was passed in 1862, 16 years ago.

Mr. T.—It was not out of respect to the law; for I consider the law a most unjust one. And I may say that I always entertained a great deal of respect for the Supreme Court of the nation until some little time ago, when it was dragged into politics, and its decisions given according to a direct, distinctive, political line drawn between the members of that august body, as might have been expected from any other politicians; I then felt that the glory of our judiciary had departed, and I had not much confidence in regard to their acts afterwards.

Mr. H.—You allude to the electoral commission, it is not apropos to the purpose of this interview, but I will say that every man has his political bias, or conscience, to which he could no more be untrue than you can to your religious bias or conscience. If he were, he would be worse than crucified, covered with such odium and contempt as no sensitive man could live under. The members of the Supreme Court I believe simply decided in that case in accordance with their consciences, which were of course in accordance with their political faith.

Mr. T.—You say the Judges cannot give up their political bias, yet we are called upon by them to give up our religious bias.

Mr. H.—To return, I was in hopes you would say the reason you had not taken another wife since 1862 was out of respect to the law.

Mr. T.—If that were so, I should be a hypocrite; but what has political bias to do with justice and equity? Is that a reason for that august assembly to **pervert the law?**

Mr. H.—Will not Judge Waite's decision throw an apple of discord among your people, if you do not cease the practice of poylgamy, by strengthening those, if any, who are opposed to it; and is there not ground to hope or fear that its opponents may ultimately be in the majority in the Church itself?

Mr. T.—No, sir; no ground, to either hope it, or fear it; quite the opposite. I would state that if the United States thinks that by prosecution or persecution, or through proscription they can control the enscience of men, they have then discovered a phase in human nature entirely new and unheard of before.

Mr. H.—They do not propose to control their consciences but their acts.

Mr. T.—**But that is all so much bosh, you know;** that is tantamount to saying, we will allow you to think but not to act, it does not give the liberty that the Constitution prescribes to allow free action in the exercise of religious convictions. Do you think that law can control conscience?

Mr. H.—It does not propose to, but it cannot accept the verdict of the individual conscience against that of the **general conscience.** If you may set your conscience above the law, I may, everybody may, and there is then an end of law; there is anarchy.

Mr. T.—Excuse, but that is the argument Judge Waite has introduced. He has cited the practice of the Suttee, saying that if they could do that in the name of religion, anything else might be done. You, I understand, Mr. Musser (who was present), have been in India, let me ask you a question. I believe there are some 150 to 180 millions of polygamists, in practice and theory, in that country under the British Government, does that government interfere with their polygamous marriages, or protect them therein? That Government has, and very properly, too, prevented the destruction of life by the immolation of widows, but not the propagation of life through the practice of polygamy; that I believe is sustained by the law, and Christian missionaries who have been brought face to face with this principle in India, have defended it, and commended the action of the British Government in its protection. The United States Government has, however, proscribed us in the enjoyment of the same right because we are a handful of people.

Mr. Musser—The British Government in India does protect polygamy by law, whilst it enforces the law against Suttee.

Mr. H.—India is an old and populous country, and it is perhaps impossible for the British Government to change its customs in this respect. This is a young country with a great future before it, and polygamy is yet in its infancy, which are sufficient reasons for a different policy. It is deemed the part of wisdom to start right, and your being small or large, weak or strong, cuts no figure in it. Not only polygamy, but the principle of ecclesiastical control in secular affairs presents an antagonism to our institutions that is as complete as can be imagined. It must be modified in some way or great trouble will one day ensue. It cannot reasonably be complained of, it seems to me, that we should seek to suppress polygamy, at least, by force of law in its infancy.

Mr. Musser—But Suttee was, if anything, a custom to which the natives of Hindostan were more devotedly attached than to polygamy, and the government has suppressed that.

Mr. Taylor—You say you think it wise for the government to endeavor to suppress polygamy. I think they should first manifest their antagonism to the practice of infanticide and foeticide and the prevailing prostitution, and instead of prosecuting and proscribing us, they should assist us in removing these contaminating influences from our borders. Furthermore, while Great Britain is a monarchical government she can tolerate 180,000,000 of polygamists, and throw around them the protecting aegis of the law, while the United States, a republican, and professedly a free government, is enacting laws prosecuting and proscribing so small a number as 150,000 in her territory; this does not speak well for the administration of repubicanism.

Mr. H.—Shoud Congress amend the law so as to make the offense continuous, and thus annul the statute of limitations as regards this offense, and should your leading men be convicted and imprisoned, would not that stop the further contraction of polygamous marriages?

Mr. T.—The uniform testimony of both sacred and profane history among all nations answers no. I am very sorry that Congress, through its unwise action has placed us in an attitude of hostility. Polygamy is not a crime per se; it was the action of Congress that made polygamy a crime. As before stated, the British Government allows one hundred and eighty millions of their people to practice it, and by law, protect them in it. It is very unfortunate that our republican government cannot be as generous to its provinces as a monarchical government can to its colonies, being placed in this position by their action, and having a commandment of God which is binding upon us, not only in time, but in eternity. We have a great reverence for the admonition of our Savior, who says, **"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."** Furthermore, Daniel, three Hebrew children and others, it would seem, were governed by the same principle, and absolutely refused to be governed by the dictum of their oppressors.

Mr. H.—If you persist in the future as in the past in this practice, what kind of an ultimate outcome do you anticipate. Could you not consistently surrender polygamy on the ground that there is no prospect of changing the opinion and law of the country against it, and that nullification of the laws is sure to result disastrously in the end to the nullifiers?

Mr. T.—Not so much so as the nullification of the Constitution; but we leave that with God. It is His business to take care of His Saints. An eminent poet has said: "Do what is right, let the consequence follow."

Mr. Musser—I think the Lord could better answer that question.

Mr. H.—**"The Lord" is a foreign power to this government, in the sense in which you constantly refer to him.**

Mr. T.—I am afraid he is, and there lies the difficulty. When nations forsake God we cannot expect them to act wisely. In doing what they have done, they have opened the flood gates of discord to this nation which they cannot easily close. We are now proscribed, it will be others' turn next. Congress has assumed a most fearful responsibility in breaking down its Constitutional barriers; but the flood gates once opened, it becomes quite a problem to say where the proscription will end. Others may not receive these infringements on their religious rights quite as peaceably as we do; if Congress and the nation can stand it, we think we can.

Mr. H.—You hold then, that your Church possesses the oracles of heaven exclusively, and that the condemnation of polygamy by all Christian nations is without reason and wisdom, and contrary to the spirit of revelation?

Mr. T.—We most assuredly do.

Mr. P.—Noah would have made the same answer to that question.

Mr. H.—If capacity or adaptability to universal application be a good test of the soundness of a principle of this nature, and polygamy will not stand the test, does not a doubt as to the fact of God's having commanded the Mormons to receive and live it justly arise?

Mr. T.—Your hypothesis we do not acknowledge.

Mr. H.—You claim, then, polygamy as a principle is of universal applicability, and could be universally practiced.

Mr. T.—Yes, sir. It is the normal condition of mankind and has been practiced from time immemorial by almost all nations. Monogamy is but the outgrowth of a system where corrupt Christianity affiliated with a debased paganism. **Why, sir, three-fourths of the human family as near as**

can be told, are acknowledged polygamists today, and the balance corruptly so, though professedly monogamists.

Mr. H.—Is it not possible that there is some mistake about it?

Mr. T.—I might answer that by asking you if there is any mistake about the authenticity of the Bible.

Mr. H.—Do you really believe that God has actually commanded you to practice polygamy—don't you men ever have a doubt of it?

(Mr. Taylor, a few parties having come in on business, called a vote of those present as to whether they knew that the principle of plural marriage was of God or not. The vote was unanimously in the affirmative.)

Mr. H.—If not, why did your constitutional convention in February, 1872, agree by a two-thirds vote, to submit the question of its abandonment, in case Congress should make that a condition of admission into the Union, to the test of a popular election, and why did the people vote unanimously in favor of it?

Mr. P.—They did not.

Mr. H.—They agreed to submit to the people whatever Congress should make a condition of admission into the Union.

Mr. P.—We did that to meet the minds of a few members, but there was no promise of compromise in any shape.

Mr. H.—In the Deseret News of June 3, 1872, the editor, whom I presume was Mr. Cannon, said that the Mormon representatives who had returned from Washington had assurances from the House Territorial committee that a Bill for the admission of the State of Deseret would be reported favorably at the next session, provided polygamy were absolutely and unconditionally renounced. Does not that show that you understood precisely the terms of admission and meant to comply with them by renouncing polygamy?

Mr. P.—No. It was only an item of news.

Mr. H.—Then you admit that the calling of a constitutional convention by the legislature, the meeting of that convention, framing a constitution, its submission to and adoption by the people, the election of a state Legislature and other officers, the meeting of that legislature, its election of senators, and their going to Washington to urge upon Congress the ratification of these proceeding was a farce.

Mr. T.—Its object was to obtain the views of Congress and the conditions it would impose before admitting us as a State and then lay them before the people, but I acknowledge it ended in a farce.

Mr. H.—The proceedings at that time created the impression that you would give up polygamy for Statehood; it was general and I am sorry if it was not justified by your real intentions.

Mr. T.—You are mistaken on that point, our people never entertained such an opinion.

Mr. H.—Section 5 of the ordinance providing for submitting to the people such terms as Congress might prescribe was adopted in the convention by a vote of two to one, and the people sanctioned it by 25,000 votes. And you, Mr. Taylor, advocated the retention of this section in the ordinance.

Mr. T.—No, sir, I was not a member of the convention.

Mr. H.—Then it was another man of your name.

Mr. J. F. Smith—He was from the south.

Mr. P.—The entire proceedings were intended merely to give Congress a

chance to admit us, or show why we were not admitted.

Mr. H.—Is not, in fact, what you call revelation, the expression of the crystallized public sentiment of your people; and if a majority of them should desire to abandon polygamy, would what is called revelation deter them from doing so?

Mr. Calder—Mr. Colfax, when he was here, and as he was leaving, said to President Young, Mr. Young, you say Joseph Smith had a revelation instituting polygamy; my advice to you is to get a revelation to do away with it.

Mr. H.—My idea of revelation is embodied in my question. In your case I look upon it as the crystallized expression of the highest wisdom of your people, speaking through your organ, the head of the church.

Mr. T.—Of course you are not a believer in revelation?

Mr. H.—Not in the sense in which you use the word, nor perhaps in the sense in which it is ordinarily used.

Mr. T.—Then I do not see that you can consistently apply your ideas to our faith, at least we cannot acknowledge them.

Mr. Penrose—Joseph Smith received a revelation written on gold plates and he and three others saw it together. It was just as tangible as that which Moses received written on the tables of stone; and it was not the crystallized opinion of our best men, it was a fact.

Mr. H.—If it is a fact, then it can be proven.

Mr. Penrose—It can be proven; the Lord very wisely caused to be taken the evidence of eye and ear witnesses to the fact, and their testimony is published.

Mr. H.—No evidence imaginable would convince me of it. If I saw it I should think some hallucination had possession of my senses.

Mr. J. F. Smith—It is very unfair, Mr. Hollister, in you to even think that a people who have suffered as we have for our faith, having been driven five different times from our homes, and suffered even to martyrdom, should be insincere in our belief. Questions you have asked here repeatedly imply that we could get up revelations to suit ourselves.

Mr. H.—My questions imply this: that when your best minds agree upon a certain policy, that you believe it is the voice of God, or inspired by him. In that sense I assent to it. The great political acts of a people are inspired in the same sense, as we say, THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE IS THE VOICE OF GOD; and that, I suppose, is the basis of all revelation. You put it forth in the name of God, and can believe that is the word of God to you. I don't doubt it at all, put in that way.

Mr. J. F. S.—To give you an idea of what we conceive to be revelation, allow me to state the manner in which Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon, as we are informed by those who know the facts. So far from it being the crystallized thought of our best men, or of Joseph Smith, he translated that book by means of an instrument called the Urim and Thummim, or Interpreters; the translation or words appeared on that instrument in the English language, which Joseph read off to the scribe, who wrote it down. He had no agency in the matter; the translation was given him through the Urim and Thummin by the gift and power of God.

Mr. T.—Mr. Hollister, you place yourself in the position of the scientists of the present day—your notions are predicated upon your own theory; we differ from you in that respect; ours is framed on the belief that God has spoken to us his people, and that

he does and will continue to speak to us.

Mr. H.—What effect, on the whole, do you apprehend Chief Justice Waite's decision will have on the question.

Mr. T.—I don't know that it will have any effect, except to unite us and confirm and strengthen us in our faith.

Mr. H.—If the law is not complied with, don't you see that you leave the government no alternative but to use force?

Mr. P.—We leave that to them and the Lord.

Mr. J. F. S.—In the first place they had no occasion to make the law, because our principles had neither violated nor even jeopardized the rights of "Life, liberty or the pursuit of happiness" of any people. They passed that law to ensnare us, just as a certain law was passed to entrap Daniel.

Mr. H.—That is setting yourselves up to judge what laws Congress has a right to pass, Congress is the only legitimate judge of that, representing as it does a majority of the people. (Mob rule).

Mr. T.—**You have got the wrong end first. The people used to be spoken of as the sovereigns, and the public officers as their servants, but let me draw your attention to the fact the government appointed a polygamist as Governor of this Territory, and retained him in office, and it was while he was Governor (1852) that the revelation was published.**

Mr. H.—It was in 1850 he was made Governor.

Mr. T.—He was re-appointed after the publication of this revelation to the world, and furthermore, previous to President B. Young's re-appointment as Governor, Elder Orson Pratt went to Washington and made public proclamation there of this doctrine, when Congress was in session, and ten years afterwards they made this law. I do not wish to cast any reflections, but I am sorry to see things taking the course they are. **So far as we are concerned, I think we can get along, and I would remark that we are not insensible of the fact that it is not polygamy you are fighting, it is the people called "Mormons".**

It was not in consequence of polygamy that we could not get protection in Missouri. Neither was it because of polygamy that we were driven from Illinois and failed to obtain redress for the wrongs we suffered. We had a right to protection, we had purchased lands of the government and paid for them.

Mr. H.—I have always understood that polygamy, practiced but denied, was the chief occasion of the troubles at Nauvoo. William Law, deeming himself injured by approaches made to his wife, started a paper, in which the affidavit of 12 or 16 women was published to the fact of the practice of polygamy in Nauvoo; thereupon the City Council had the paper destroyed, and the troubles began which ended in your expulsion.

Mr. T.—Your information is incorrect. The paper was an infamous and libelous sheet, started by a few unprincipled men for the purpose of making trouble and scandalizing the people, so much so that the whole community were indignant at being thus libeled and defamed, and sent in a petition to the City Council that some measures might be taken to protect them against these glaring and infamous falsehoods. The City Council having the power, by their charter, to declare and abate nuisances, declared that paper a nuisance and ordered its removal by the marshal, who proceeded to carry out the orders of the Council. The city Council did this with its eyes open, fully understanding the strong bias entertained by the people

in favor of a free press, and considering itself capable of judging between liberty and licentiousness, that City Council considered itself amenable for its own acts. I was a member of that Council, and know about the matter. That Council was willing to submit to the law, and in answer to a requisition did appear before Squire Wells, as we then called him, who was not then a member of our Church. Afterwards Governor Ford sent a committee to wait upon Joseph Smith, requesting him to send a committee with papers and evidence in relation to the matter then in question. Dr. Bernhisel and myself were appointed that committee. Governor Ford stated that he wished to conciliate the mobocratic feeling that then prevailed, and although the City Council had submitted to an investigation, and entered into recognizances according to law, to meet the wishes of the mob, he desired us to request the City Council, Joseph and Hyrum Smith to comply again with a requisition issued by an officer in Carthage. I then asked if we were to come prepared to protect ourselves, which we were amply able to do, but he said it would not be wise to do that in the present state of excitement. I then asked him what guarantee we had for our protection among this lawless body of men? He then said, **"I pledge you my honor and the faith of the State, that they shall be protected."** The Governor left them to their fate, and they were soon after murdered in cold blood. I saw them shot down under the violated pledge, the guards left by the Governor being among the active agents of this murder. I have reason to remember that, for I was shot five times myself, not being there as a prisoner, but as a friend of the victims.

Mr. H.—There is no one who attempts to justify such things.

Mr. T.—I mention them to show that it was not polygamy that occasioned these outrages, but a hostility to our religious faith. Did we have any redress? No. Were these murderers ever brought to justice? No. In speaking to some of the Judges on a certain occasion, I asked them why they did not bring these men to judgment, telling them that if they wanted their names I could furnish them, for I saw them. Why was it no person was dealt with for that act? Because we were "Mormons"; and, as I have said, the reason we left Nauvoo was not because of polygamy, but because a mob murdered some of our best citizens, and they were afraid of being brought to judgment; and to avoid this we were driven from the state. That man's father (pointing to Mr. J. F. Smith) I saw fall. Has the United States more cause for complaint than we have? I with others left my home, a good comfortable home, a great deal better than I have ever had here, well furnished throughout, with stoves in the rooms, with carpets on the floor and crockery ware in the cupboards and entering into my carriage drove off from these scenes of injustice, rapine, inhumanity and bloodshed. Why? I could not be protected; because I was a "Mormon", and not because I was a polygamist. I could refer you to similar cases. One I will mention, which was perpetrated in Missouri, known as the Hawn's Mill Massacre, in which there were some eighteen men, women and children killed in cold blood, and their bodies thrown into a well. Could we obtain redress for that? We appealed to the Justices, to the Courts, to the Legislature and to the Governor, and finally to the President of the United States. When the last was appealed to, who was Martin Van Buren, his reply was, **"Gentlemen, your cause is just, but I can do nothing for you."** And let me ask whose rights have we interfered with in this Territory? Has not every one perfect liberty, religious and political? Why should they make attacks upon us? Are these things not known to the U. S. Government and to those

Judges of the Supreme Court? And the same thing is going on now. It is asserted they are packing juries today for the purpose of condemning men. There is a gentleman just gone out, Mr. Burton, against whom there is an indictment for murder, while acting under the direction of Judge Kinney and acting Governor Fuller. Mr. Henry W. Lawrence was the marshal and Mr. Burton was his deputy; and some twenty years afterwards the District Attorney, Mr. Van Zile—and I was sorry to hear it, for I had formed a better opinion of that gentleman; but he, I am told, by good authority has stated that he is going to prosecute this man to the utmost extent of his power, and to do this he was going to Washington to try to raise $10,000. Of course I do not know whether this is so or not, for I have only the statements of men; but there are some things very suspicious attending their way of doing business, and this is strikingly manifested in the large majority of odd numbers, being our enemies, that go to form the complement of jurors.

Mr. H.—I don't see how there can be any unfairness in the drawing of jurors, as the Poland Bill directs explicitly how it shall be done. Mormons greatly preponderated on the last grand jury,

(Mr. Penrose here produced the list of the Grand and Petit jurors for the next term of court which showed that there were thirteen "Gentiles" to five "Mormons" on the Grand jury, and twenty-nine "Gentiles" to eleven "Mormons" on the panel for the Petit jury), and said that if the box containing equal numbers of names of "Mormons" and "Gentiles" had been properly shaken so that the slips were thoroughly "mixed and mingled", as required by law, instead of being gently lifted up and down a few times, it would not be at all likely that such a preponderance of "Gentile" names would be drawn, as had been the case repeatedly when indictments and trials of important cases against the "Mormons" were anticipated. It is not unfrequent in political jugglery to resort to such trickery, but when the lives and liberties of men are concerned, it becomes a matter of more serious consequences.

Mr. H.—I know nothing personally of these things, and I believe that if the officer who drew the jurors were present, he would convince you all in five minutes that there was no trickery about it. As to your being driven out of Illinois, I do not think either side was free from wrongs, from hatred and prejudice. And as to getting redress, I might say that you have avenged yourselves. I believe more Gentile blood has been shed by Mormons than Mormon by Gentile.

Mr. T.—Your expressed belief in regard to the blood shed by "Mormons" is altogether erroneous and without fundation in fact.

Mr. H.—I do not regard polygamy, either, as the only objectionable feature of Mormonism. We object, almost equally, to your doctrine of ecclesiastically controlling all secular affairs. I consider that church and State ought to be separate. If marriage is a part of religion, digging potatoes is.

Mr. T.—In regard to this I don't see the wisdom of so much interference by government; **the people have rights which ought to be respected as well as those of the government,** as it is for their interests they are supposed to be operating. But these gentlemen are waiting to attend a bank meeting; Mr. Hollister, if you are satisfied, let us close the interview.

—Deseret Evening News, January 25, 1879.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. FEBRUARY, 1945. No. 9.

"CULTISTS" AND MARK E. PETERSEN

To the public, "Cultists" are known as Mormons who continue to adhere in their faith to the principle of Celestial or plural marriage. In his letter to the United Press (TRUTH 10:207-8), Mark E. Petersen states, "All cultists who have held membership in the L. D. S. Church have been excommunicated by the Church".

That this statement is untrue is abundantly testified to by the list of members of the Church published by the Salt Lake Tribune, October 10, 1910 (See TRUTH, 10:214-15), who had entered plural marriage since the Manifesto of 1890; and by the hundreds who have entered the law since the Tribune publication, and but a very few of whom have been acted on by the Church. Many of these Saints are still holding official positions in the Church.

Quite frequently we are confronted with the notice of the death of some leading brother whose life was characterized by the living of this holy principle of marriage. Some months ago (TRUTH, 4:194) the death of Patriarch William Moroni Daines was announced in the columns of the Deseret News. Patriarch Daines, the News stated, was survived by two wives, 17

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

THOSE who love the truth are scarce. There are, however, a great many scattered all over the United States who believe "Mormonism" is truth, but have not moral courage to embrace it; but if it is policy they dare once in a while to say a few words, but in a kind of milk-and-water way: they dare not say much, because it is unpopular; and many dare not read a "Mormon" paper; it is unpopular.

I have met men in the world as much my friends, apparently, as those that are in the Church; and they have handed out means to me when I was in need. One man wrote to me that he would be glad to see me; but if I would not let the people know who I was, he would be obliged to me. I told him I did not go to such places for I was a "Mormon" outside and in, and I could get along in the world by holding my head up, and I despised men who will go crawling and cringing around.—John Taylor (J. D., 5:120-2.)

children, 56 grandchildren and one great grandchild. "His entire life", said the account, "was devoted to the serving of the Church and community". He had been a Patriarch in Franklin Stake since 1905. He had married his first wife January 18, 1883, and his second wife (while the first was living), December 13, 1899—nine years after the Woodruff Manifesto.

To be a fully qualified Patriarch one must live the patriarchal law which is the law of Abraham, or plural marriage. Elder Daines was not excommunicated from the Church, but retained his ecclesiastic position for over forty years after entering the principle of plural marriage and until the time of his death.

Even Mark E. Petersen will not say that this case was not well known to the authorities of the Church.

Recently the notice of death of William E. Chatwin was announced in the press. He had been an active L. D. S. worker, helping to colonize Ashley valley and Tropic in Garfield county. He was survived by two wives, one of whom he married in 1905 and the other in 1914. He, though a Cultist in the sense Elder Petersen uses the term, had not been excommunicated, but retained his position in the Church until death.

In his letter Elder Petersen made the astounding statement that the Church had appointed men "to search out the cultists, turning over such information as they gather to the prosecution for their use (in the courts). **These men have also been appointed by the Church to do all they can to fight the spread of polygamy.**" Why should the church of Jesus Christ, having had as one of its tenets the doctrine of plural marriage, now appoint men to stop the spread of it?

We are reminded of the sycophantic apostates who, after the crucifixion of the Savior, in their efforts to curry favor with the enemies of Christianity and save their own lives, assisted in running down the true Saints and having them persecuted and killed.

In the early days of Mormonism the sectarian pulpit pounders reasoned that while it was all right for Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David and others to practice the principle of plural marriage an enlightened knowledge forbids its practice today. The Church now takes a like position. That which it permitted and even inforced as a necessary law leading to exaltation a few years back is now fought with a cunning viciousness. Cannot the Church tolerate its own doctrine? It announces as an Article of Faith, "We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, **and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where or what they may.**" If in very deed it allows others to worship as they choose why now turn mobocrats against a small group of Saints advocating the same principles it formerly advocated? Is it any worse for John Jones to live in plural marriage today and advocate it as a doctrine of religion than it was for Heber J. Grant to do the same thing a few years back. "Well", says President Grant, "it is now against the law and we, being a law-abiding people, are now opposed to it." Well, wasn't it against the law when the President took his two plural wives, as he has testified doing, in 1884? And was it not against the law when in 1899 he was arrested and paid a fine in the District court for living it? And wasn't it against the law in 1904 when, a warrant being sworn out for his arrest for unlawful cohabitation, he fled to Europe to avoid arrest? Surely there is no justification in the present stand of the Church. Let non-Mormons enforce the law against Mormon religion and let the leaders of the Church stand by their guns in sustaining every element of the Gospel, even at the cost of their lives if necessary.

Don't turn mobocrats as the letter of Mark E. Petersen indicates is being done at the present time.

For thirty-eight years (1852 to 1890) the Church championed the doctrine of plural marriage. For twenty-eight years (1862 to 1890) in its championship of this principle the Church ignored the laws of the land against the practice of the principle—the Morrill, Edmunds and Edmunds-Tucker Acts—including decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. The leaders received four revelations confirming the irrevocability of the law. Some of the brethren surrendered their lives and more than 1300 of them served prison terms, in their efforts to keep the law alive. No sacrifice was considered too great for them to make, and now the leaders prate about their being a law-abiding people and are willing to surrender their chance for exaltation rather than be at outs with the world.

Even after the Woodruff Manifesto when the Church returned the law of plural marriage back into the hands of the Priesthood and this latter body carried on, the Church accepted those entering the law as officers all along the line. This situation prevailed until recently when, according to Mark E. Petersen, "men were appointed by the Church to do all they can to fight the spread" of the principle. Of course, before this last gesture such self-appointed agents as Francis M. Lyman, Heber J. Grant, James E. Talmage, and others, did what they could to have the system stopped. But why fight an eternal principle? Some of the leaders now engaged in fighting it in earlier days fought the laws prohibiting the practice. Why the change? What is there intrinsically wrong in plural marriage when engaged in primarily to propagate life?

The protestant churches are opposed to the doctrine of Celibacy as practiced by the Catholic priesthood. Suppose the United States or the different states enacted laws enforcing marriage upon the Catholic clergy. By any stretch of imagination can it be supposed that the Catholics would surrender their marriage laws in order to harmonize their lives with the abortive laws of the State? As Celibacy is a Catholic institution so marriage, including plural marriage, is a Mormon doctrine. Suppose celibacy carries the greater appeal to the masses, is that any reason why marriage should be denied the minority?

Mark E. Petersen claims to be an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ. We remind him of an ancient Apostle—Paul—giving as one of the evidences of departure from the faith, the **"forbidding to marry"**. (1 Tim. 4:3). This was confirmed to the Latter-day Saints by a revelation from God to Joseph Smith (D. & C., 49:15), **"And again, verily I say unto you, that whoso forbiddeth to marry IS NOT ORDAINED OF GOD, for marriage is ordained of God unto man."**

Elder Petersen may say, "We do not forbid men to marry". But what about women? Every person with a grain of sense knows that there are not men enough eligible for marriage to mate singly with the disproportionate number of unmarried women that now and always have existed.

Elder Petersen's doctrine denies the right of marriage and the right to motherhood to myriads of such women today. How can he justify his position? Without any hesitancy we hold that he, with his associates who sustain his position, are guilty of apostasy from one of the vital principles of the Gospel revealed to man in this present dispensation.

Elder Petersen, are you a Catholic or a Mormon? Should you have a defense to offer we shall be pleased to publish it in the columns of TRUTH.

INSPIRATION—FROM WHAT SOURCE?

Having forfeited, by reason of their rejection of the Gospel, all right to revelation from the heavens to assist them in guiding the affairs of the Church, the leaders have fallen back upon the claim of what they term Inspiration. We do not question the truthfulness of this claim, for, as we understand, everything men say or do is inspired. The only question is, from what source does the inspiration come? No doubt Brigham Young was inspired to lead the Church from Nauvoo into these mountains and that inspiration came from the Lord; while President Buchanan was inspired to send out Johnson's Army to destroy the Saints, and that inspiration came from the Prince of Darkness.

At the recent conference of Ensign stake held in Barrett Hall (December 10) President J. Reuben Clark is reported to have related how at an October semi-annual conference of the Church he had been inspired to present the general officers of the Church to be voted on by the Saints, the voting taking place on the 5th inst. instead of the sixth, according to precedent. Giving as his reason for this unusual change in the time of voting the speaker stated that the "Polygamists" were expected to be present on the 6th to vote against the President. Commenting upon this change, after the meeting, President Ivins stated, "I guess the Lord is smarter than the devil yet."

We know of nothing nor have we heard of any design on the part of the "Polygamists", or the "Cultists", or the "Fundamentalists", or any other group of people to cast their votes against any of the leaders of the Church. At the previous general conference (April, 1940) one member of the Church, an High Priest but not a "Polygamist", did vote against the First Presidency. He was immediately ushered out of the hall by the local police who had been stationed in the Tabernacle by the brethren to protect them from an imaginary foe. We have read that "The wicked flee when no man pursueth", while "the righteous are bold as a lion".

It was announced later in the conference that the man offering the opposing vote was an excommunicant and therefore had no right to vote. This, however, was not true. He was in full fellowship, but to justify the statement, he was, some months later, called before the brethren and excommunicated.

We are led to inquire, "Why vote if all are forced to vote in the affirmative? What is a vote for? As the late Bishop Heber Bennion wrote:

> *** * * the Lord has said that all things should be done by common consent in His church. (D. & C., Sec. 26). But if we are not free to vote yes or no according to our free and untrammelled choice, it is not common consent. The privilege of voting but one way is a snare and a delusion, a mockery of freedom; it must be not only free in theory but in practice. * * * for an invitation to vote is an invitation to differ, and if it is wrong to differ with authority, it is wrong to tempt us to differ.—Supplement to Gospel Problems, pp. 68-9.**

There is no getting away from this logic.

This inspiration President Clark speaks of sounds like a fable, and is a fair example of the source of inspiration that comes to the leaders whose labors are directed toward destroying vital principles of the Gospel in order to court the friendship of the world. It is inspiration such as led Bishop Charles W. Nibley to declare that sugar prices would not be lower for many years (sugar was selling as high as 26c per pound), and "Now is the time to build more factories as fast as proper locations can be discovered". This frenzied grab for sugar profits was but the prelude to a broken bubble which left the Bishop stripped of his fortune, and embroiled the Church in endless financial difficulty. Such inspira-

tion is the inevitable result of a falling away from the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A WORTH WHILE PRESS

The PROGRESSIVE OPINION, published in Salt Lake City by Mr. and Mrs. C. N. Lund, shows itself to be a really "Progressive" weekly. Unlike most of Utah's press it has a keen sense of justice and is well equipped with the "milk of human kindness". We clip from its recent issue (January 5) the following humane comments:

QUITE A DIFFERENT BRAND OF "CRIMINALS"

A number of Utah people, referred to as polygamists, are on their way to prison. They are quite different from the common criminal classes. They are people who some time ago formed themselves into a worshiping congregation. They hold regular Sunday meetings, partake of the sacrament, bear testimonies, preach gospel sermons. They keep the Word of Wisdom, say their prayers, pay their tithes, keep the Sabbath day. They have "overcome the world" to the extent that they are clear of the social sins such as destroying the germ of life and preventing birth of children, infidelity in marriage, divorce and prostitution They do not go to their punishment as criminals generally do, abashed and ashamed; they go erect with clear countenances and feel that they are martyrs. Quite a different brand of "criminals". Our hearts go out to the children. We plead for them. To realize the worth of little children read Book of Mormon, III Nephi, Chap. 17, verses eleven to the end of chapter, which is one of the divinest chapters in any of the world's holy books.

We might add by way of more fully expressing the disgusting inconsistency of the entire situation, that of the 18 husbands and fathers sentenced to various terms in the County, State and Federal prisons, there are 61 attached mothers (some of whom are also under prison sentence), 310 children, 227 under eighteen years of age and of whom 115 are in school, over 100 being under school age. Nineteen of these children are in the army while their fathers are being imprisoned for siring them. These citizens paid into the State Treasury over $5000 in taxes for the year 1944. Not one of these men has ever been convicted of a crime.

Which other of the warring nations would thus treat those of its citizens engaged in contributing so much to increase the population with strong, normal and patriotic boys and girls?

THE DEARTH IN BIRTHS

COLLIER'S (December 2, 1944) publishes a revealing article on "Fewer Babies—and Why". We read:

Alarmed about falling United Kingdom birth rates, the British government has appointed a Royal Commission to dig up the answers, if possible. Despite the wartime birth boom, the British birth rate has gone down from 3.51 children per married couple in 1909 to 1.79 now. * * *

Most of the married couples questioned in confidence blame their few children or their lack of children on such hard-pan factors as fear of unemployment, shortage of decent housing (badly accentuated by the Big Blitz of 1940-41 and the roblitz of 1944), the high cost of living, and the fear that this is not the last war, no matter what the politicians say.

So the best guess seems to be that most British husbands and wives are determined to have very few children per couple until and unless they can be reasonably sure that children of large families will have a fair break in the world. Neither the exhortations of the clergy nor the pleas of the government seem able to shake that determination.

The problem of a declining birth rate is engaging the attention of European nations generally and is one to which the American nations—particularly the United States—should be giving serious attention. The birth rate in the United States 1921 to 1940 declined from 24.2 per thousand population to 17.9.

The British, according to Collier's, is giving "serious consideration to various incentives to parenthood, such as maternity allowances, more or less disguised baby bonuses, more ambitious plans for lower cost health supervision of children, and so on."

While American statesmen and politicians are concerning themselves with the problem of this decline in population, here in one corner of America—in the Rocky mountain states—pseudo-reformers, churchmen and ambitious "ward heelers" are engaged in prosecuting and persecuting men and women whose lives are devoted to the rearing of large and noble families of strong, healthy children. These people have no part in the schemes of modern married derelicts to use birth control methods, except methods of "self-control" when it is deemed wise and prudent to allow women a rest from too frequent motherhood.

These people regard marriage a sacred pact between them and their God, to use their reproductive powers in increasing and improving the human race. Their families, as a rule are large, well provided for and well educated in the essentials of life. They ask not for "maternal allowances", "baby bonuses", etc., though such a request would be eminently just and proper; all they ask is to be left alone to do their part in stabilizing and rendering patriotic service to their government, while at the same time building up the kingdom of God.

The right to seek motherhood is sacred to every normal woman as every normal man may seek fatherhood. And yet from the beginning of time, from one cause or another, the sexes (though born about equal in numbers) are unequal at marriageable age—the female predominating. The maternal instinct does not confine its demands to married women. Woman comes into mortal life to perpetuate her kind. She must have that opportunity. The ever increasing surplus of the female over the male renders it impossible for millions of women today to attain to motherhood under the silly and outmoded laws of monogamic marriage now on the statute books of most of the States.

There must be another way provided for women to respond to this high mission that is inherently a part of her nature. The problem is more serious than politicians will admit, but it has got to be met with common sense and honor. Clifford R. Adams, Ph. D., Director Marriage Counseling Service, Pennsylvania State College, tells us:

> **For one thing, somewhere between 2,000,000 and 5,000,000 of the marriageable women in America today are bound to remain spinsters because of the male-female imbalances that will result from the war; the widening proportion of women to men, especially in the South and in New England; and the fact that a growing number of our men (more than 10 per cent) stubbornly prefer bachelorhood. But more to the point is the grim prospect that millions of the women that do marry will end up in the divorce courts. The rise of our divorce rate is frightening. One marriage in 5 or 6 landed on the rocks in 1940. By 1946 it is expected to be 1 in 4. And if long-range trends continue, the rate will be 1 in 2 in 50 years.—The American, December, page 32.**

ISRAEL BARLOW GOES ON

In the death of Israel Barlow on January 7th there passed from mortality one of the stalwarts. Born in 1864, at Bountiful, Utah, he came upon the scene, in his maturity, when the policy of the Church was changing from "fundamentalism" to that of catering to the world for its friendships. His stamp of religion was to become out-moded in the Church. And since he refused to surrender his faith which was the faith of the Fathers, he came in for a great deal of criticism from the leaders of the Church. However, he did not change but continued to advocate the principles of the Gospel as he interpreted them from the teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith and his successors in the Priesthood, throwing a mantle of protection about his brethren who were then under impeachment investigation by members of the Quorum of Twelve.

Shortly before his death, Elder Barlow, addressing his old friend, Nathan

Clark, who was visiting him at the hospital, said:

I am glad that you have come—I have prayed for you all day.

There are some things that have been on my mind because I realize the condition I am in, I am dying. I wish to say while in my right mind that in my course of life, I have made some mistakes. If there is any person that I have wronged, I here and now ask their forgiveness. I hold no ill will against any of God's children.

I am thankful above all things else for the blessings God has given unto me. I acknowledge His goodness in all the affairs of my life.

I am very thankful for my family, my noble sons and daughters, who have stood by me during my sickness and have done everything they could for my comfort, and I wish to leave to them my blessing and to bequeath to them my last testimony, which is the richest heritage that a loving father can give to his children: that God is our eternal Father, that Joseph Smith is a Prophet of God, that this generation shall have the word of God through him; that if any person gets the highest exaltation in the Kingdom of God he will have to be true to the revelations of God; for I know that all the revelations Joseph Smith received are true; and further,

I was called to the bedside of John W. Taylor in his last hours of life, as a witness to receive his last testimony in which he said, "This Gosepl of Jesus Christ in which we believe is all true (including the revelation which his father received in 1886 pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant. He wanted to leave witnesses that his children might know after his death that he died in full faith, President Joseph F. Smith having placed his hands upon his head and reconfirmed all his former blessings upon him.)

"I now stand at the portal of the grave, yet I am as calm as a summer's morning. I have no fear. 'I have a conscience void of offense towards God and towards all men.'

"I have fought the fight and have kept the faith, and though after my skin-worms may destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and not for another."

To my friends, I wish to say that I appreciate your friendship to my brothers and sisters in the flesh, you have received a valuable heritage. I am proud of it.

To my children, I wish to say I love you with the pure love of charity, which is the pure love of God. Be kind, considerate, and love each other, and be happy. I appreciate you more than words can express.

I bid you farewell. I'LL BE WAITING FOR YOU.

THE DESERET NEWS

Sister Emma Sturm, on behalf of her deceased husband, George Sturm, has presented to the Priesthood Library a copy of the first issue of the DESERET NEWS, dated "G. S. L. City, Deseret, June 15, 1850. Vol. 1, No. 1. By W. Richards." The paper, a weekly of eight pages, is 7½ by 10 inches, published in magazine form. The paper is yellow with age, the type large and clear. The information published encompassed a broad field gleaned from New York papers and other sources. Subscription rates: "Terms, 6 months, $2.50; invariably in advance. Single copy 15 cents. Advertising, $1.50 per square lines, and 50 each succeeding insertion. $1.00 for half square, or 8 lines.

"Travelers and Emigrants, 25 cents per copy, with the insertion of their names, place of residence, time of arrival and leaving. Companies of 20 and upwards entered at once, 20 cents each."

"City Subscribers can have their papers delivered for an additional 50 cents for the term; provided enough wish it, to employ a carrier."

"Wanted, at our office, flour, wheat, corn meal, cheese, tallow and pork in exchange for the News."

We publish an article from this first issue of the NEWS under its heading, "A Singular Story":

A SINGULAR STORY

The Washington correspondent of Mr. Lippard's paper, the "Quaker City", communicates the following curious account of a recent remarkable dream of Mr. Calhoun's. We have not

much faith in supernatural appearances, or in Washington correspondents, but if anything could lead the ghost of the "Father of His Country" to revisit the realms beneath the moon, it would be thought that his beloved country was in danger of Disunion, which is but another name for Civil War—. We give the story for what it is worth:

Washington, D. C., Jan. 12, '50.

Mr. Editor—The other morning at the breakfast table, our friend, the Hon. John C. Calhoun, seemed very much troubled and out of spirits. You know he is altogether a venerable man, with a hard, stern Scotch-Irish face, softened in its expression around the mouth by a sort of sad smile, which wins the hearts of all who converse with him. His hair is snow-white. He in tall, thin and angular. He reminds you very much of Old Hickory. That he is honest, no one doubts; he has sacrificed to his Fatalism the brightest hopes of political advancement—has offered up on the shrine of that iron Necessity which he worships, all that can excite ambition—even the Presidency of the United States.

But to my story. The other morning, at the breakfast table, where I, an unobserved spectator, happened to be present, Calhoun was observed to gaze frequently at his right hand, and brush it with his left, in a nervous and hurried manner. He did this so often that it excited attention. At length one of the persons composing the breakfast party,—his name I think is Toombs, and he is a member of Congress from Georgia—took upon himself to ask the occasion of Mr. Calhoun's disquietude. "Does your hand pain you", he asked.

To this Calhoun replied in rather a flurried manner, "Pshaw! it is nothing! Only a dream, which I had last night and which makes me see perpetually a large black spot—like an ink blotch—upon the back of my right hand. An optical delusion, I suppose." Of course these words excited the curiosity of the company, but no one ventured to beg the details of this singular dream, until Toombs asked quietly:

"What was your dream like? I'm not very superstitious about dreams; but sometimes they have a good deal of truth in them."

"But this was such a peculiarly absurd dream", said Mr. Calhoun, again brushing the back of his right hand—"however, if it does not too much intrude upon the time of our friends, I will relate it."

Of course, the company were profuse in their expressions of anxiety to know all about the dream. In his singularly sweet voice, Mr. Calhoun related it:

"At a late hour last night, as I was sitting in my room engaged in writing, I was astonished by the entrance of a visitor, who entered, and without a word, took a seat opposite me, at my table. This surprised me, as I had given particular orders to the servant that I should on no account be disturbed. The manner in which the intruder, so perfectly self-possessed, taking his seat opposite me, without a word, as though my room, and all within it, belonged to him, excited in me, as much surprise as indignation. As I raised my head to look into his features, over the top of my shaded lamp, I discovered that he was wrapped in a thin cloak, which effectually concealed his face and features from my view. And as I raised my head he spoke—

"'What are you writing, Senator from South Carolina?' he said.

"I did not think of his impertinence at first, but answered him involuntarily—

"'I am writing a plan for the Dissolution of the American Union.' (You know, gentlemen, that I am expected to produce a plan of Dissolution, in

the event of certain contingencies!)

"To this the intruder replied, in the coolest manner possible:

" 'Senator from South Carolina, will you allow me to look at your hand, your right hand?'

"He rose, the cloak fell, and I beheld his face. Gentlemen, the sight of that face struck me like a thunder clap. It was the face of a dead man, whom extraordinary events have called back to life. The features were those of George Washington, yes, gentlemen, the intruder was none other than George Washington. He was dressed in the Revolutionary costume, such as you see preserved in the Patent Office—

Here Mr. Calhoun paused, apparently much agitated. His agitation, I need not tell you, was shared by the company. Toombs at length broke the embarrassing pause. "Well, w-e-l-l, what was the issue of this scene?" Mr. Calhoun resumed:

"This intruder, I have said, rose and asked to look at my right hand. As though I had not the power tc refuse, I extended it. The truth is, I felt a strange chill pervade me at his touch; he grasped it, and held it near the light, thus affording me full time to examine every feature of his face. It was the face of Washington. Gentlemen, I shuddered as I beheld the horribly dead-alive look of that visage. After holding my hand for a moment, he looked at me steadily, and said in a quiet way—

" And with this right hand, Senator from Carolina, you would sign your name to a paper, declaring the Union dissolved?'

"I answered in the affirmative, 'Yes, and, if a certain contingency arises, I will sign my name to the Declaration of Dissolution.' But at that moment, a black blotch appeared on the back of my hand, an inky blotch, which I seem to see even now, 'What is that?' cried I, alarmed I know not why, at the blotch upon my hand.

" 'That', said he, dropping my hand, 'that is the mark by which Benedict Arnold is known in the next world.'

"He said no more, gentlemen, but drew from beneath his cloak an object which he placed upon the table—placed it upon the very paper on which I was writing. That object, gentlemen, was a skeleton.

" 'There', said he, 'there are the bones of Isaac Hayne, who was hung in Charleston by the British. He gave his life, in order to establish the Union. When you put your name to a Declaration of Dissolution, why you may as well have the bones of Isaac Hayne before you. He was a South Carolinian, and so are you! But there was no blotch upon his right hand—'

"With these words the intruder left the room. I started back from the contact with the dead man's bones and —awoke. Overworn by labor, I had fallen asleep and been dreaming. Was it not a singular dream?"

All the company answered in the affirmative. Toombs muttered, "Singular, very singular!" at the same time looking rather curiously at the back of his right hand—and Mr. Calhoun, placing his head between his hands, seemed buried in thought.

Mr. John Caldwell Calhoun was one of the early statesmen of our country. He was once Secretary of War, also Vice-President of the country. He took a positive stand in justifying a secession of the southern states from the Union. Mr. Calhoun died at Washington, D. C., March 31, 1850, of pulmonary disease, combined with a cardiac affection. An ordinance of secession was passed by the South Carolina Legislature December 20, 1860.

HAVE FAITH AND KEEP IT

(Contributed)

We have seen several references made to the old Biblical story of Joshua and his Hosts who for six successive days marched around the city of Jericho.

They apparently were trying to give this mighty enemy what might be termed the "absent treatment".

No guns, arrows, or weapons of war appeared to have been fired or thrown, but there must have been some mighty hard wishing and a will to win. On the seventh day, we read, they circled the city seven times, the priests making loud ado on their trumpets. Then the walls of the city crumbled. With this obstacle removed, Joshua and his cohorts quickly conquered the terrified enemy.

It was quite a miracle—the wishing away of those walls of opposition—even in those days of strange events.

Suppose after the fourth or fifth day, these warriors had wearied and retired; suppose the leader had lost faith and given up the task—perhaps these very walls would still have been standing today.

A lot of us can take a moral from this "parable"—we are all prone to lose faith in ourselves, in our work, in our fellow men and in our chances of getting somewhere.

Like the Walls of Jericho, there often seems not one but many high, thick walls . . . so many and so high that we don't feel we can climb over them.

But let me tell you that some of these walls you have built yourself—and only you, yourself, can destroy them.

Faith is a sacred word—a word most of us save for Sunday. But what more of us need is to use this FAITH every hour of our day—every day.

If things don't go right, you feel discouraged. Well, there is just one cure—it must come from within you. Look at your problem. Study it. And nine times out of ten, you'll find that you haven't been trying as hard as you should—haven't seen yourself as you should—in other words, haven't had faith in yourself and your God.

MARRYING AND GIVING IN MARRIAGE

A sign of this age coming to a close would be, according to Jesus, a repetition of those conditions which existed in the days of Noah. "They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage." (Matt. 24:38). This is not a reference to the orderly eating and drinking within the home for the purpose of sustaining life, but rather a clear reference to the orgies of eating and drinking as a sensuous pleasure in the life of individuals who make it an end rather than a means of sustenance: living to eat and drink rather than eating and drinking to live.

"Marrying and giving in marriage" has a similar meaning in that it refers to an exchange or swapping of wives and husbands as a Bible scholar aptly brought out some years ago. This statement of Jesus is very interesting in light of the present soaring divorce rate.

Dr. Paul Popenoe, director of the American Institute of Family Relations, declared the trend in some sections of the nation is toward more divorces than marriages after the war. In a lecture at the University of California in Los Angeles, he said that **Los Angeles now has a divorce rate half again as high as that of Reno, Nevada, and this dispite California's restrictions of one year's wait for final decree.**

For the first six months of 1944 Reno had 6,712 marriages and 3,040 divorces with a rate of 46 per cent of divorces. In the same period Los Angeles had 16,578 marriages and 11,797 divorce applications or a **divorce rate of 71 per cent.** What is true in that

city is also reflected in high percentages in many other cities of our nation.

It would be interesting to know, of those who are listed among the marriages, how many were divorcees exchanging wives and husbands: a situation which Jesus declared would be a duplication of conditions prior to the Deluge and a warning of the end of the present age.

Home life is the foundation on which this nation is built. The present divorce rate is a clear indication of the rapid decline of real and true home life in our land, and bodes ill for our immediate future. But for the fact that God is to intervene in our behalf and bring to an end the present orgy of riotous living with all its evils, the future outlook would be dark indeed. **Many will perish in the troubles that will bring this age to a close, but out of it all there will come a people cleansed and purified in the fires of affliction.**—From Destiny, October, 1944.

APPRECIATION

Letter of appreciation that counts. Many of them are coming in. This is from the State of Washington:

"Dear Mr. Musser,

"I am enclosing a draft for $25.00 as a donation to the expense fund for the defense of you people in the courts, and I will send more later on.

"I consider this is in defense of the Constitution of the United States and the religious rights of every red blooded American, and I have called you people "Just That!" I want to be numbered with you. I think the trying times you people are going through is just a continuation of the persecution that started with your beloved Prophet, Joseph Smith, and which has followed the Mormon people clear across the United States. But I can't conceive of the true Gospel of Jesus Christ being taken from the earth again. God bless you in your fight for religious freedom."

THE GOSPEL UNCHANGEABLE

The gospel is divine truth, "it is all truth existent from eternity to eternity". The laws contained in the gospel are God's laws. THEY ARE NOT TO BE CHANGED OR MODIFIED TO SUIT THE WHIMS OF INDIVIDUALS and are designed to develop our inward souls through proper observance of and respect therefor. Any conduct on the part of an individual that does not advance him toward the goal of eternal life is not only wasted energy but actually becomes the basis of sin.—Elder Harold B. Lee (Deseret News Church Edition, Jan. 13, 1945.)

NOT WHAT HE THOUGHT

At a Washington dinner it was the lot of a pretty little lady to be taken into dinner by an eminent bachelor judge, who was forever worrying about his health.

She managed to keep him entertained until the dessert arrived, when suddenly he laid down his knife and fork and muttered anxiously:

"Madam, I fear I must ask you to excuse me. What I have been fearing has happened. I have suddenly developed a severe attack of paralysis of the lower limbs."

"Oh, please don't distress yourself!" exclaimed the lady. "It was my leg you were pinching not your own!"

BUT HERE'S THE BROOM

The salesman waxed eloquent about the merits of a vacuum cleaner, but the village housewife wasn't impressed. She suggested that he talk less and show her what the machine could do.

Beaming broadly, the man fitted up the cleaner, thrust his arm into the chimney of the open fireplace and brought out a handful of soot, which he scattered over the carpet.

He then shoveled up some ashes from the grate and sprinkled them on the rug.

"Now", he said, smiling triumphantly, "I'll show you what this vacuum cleaner can do. You'll be surprised, madam. Where's the electric switch?"

"Switch?" echoed the surprised woman. "We use gas!"

MY RECOMPENSE

The following lines dedicated to the memory of her son, John A. Bistline, Jr., of Providence, Utah, written by his mother, bares the feelings of a noble woman. John was reported killed in December while on duty in the South Seas area.—Editor.

Dear Lord, thou gavest me a son.
A fine, upstanding, manly son he was.
A son whom everyone could love. And did.
A son of whom I could be justly proud.

My country took away my fine, young son.
They said they needed him to stem the tide
Of fear and hate, of tyrany and sin—I know
'Tis true these things must needs be stopped somehow.

His country called and unafraid, he went
To make a world where freedom might endure.
Freedom of speech, from want, from fear, they said.
Freedom to worship thee, as thou dictates.

They took his life, my buoyant, happy son.
It was thy will, I know, else had he lived.
But grant me this one plea, I humbly pray,
Let not his sacrifice a hollow, vain thing be.

My country took my son. Inspire it
To give me truly this; in recompense:
Freedom to worship thee, not as they will
But as my conscience dictates unto me.

—"Aunt" Jennie.

JONNIE'S HOME

Inspired by a dream of his son "Jonnie" reported killed in the service, the father wrote:

I saw him ride a monster from the sea
On to a wave swept island strand.
There came a blast of fire and steel—
I saw his red blood trickle on the sand.
Alas, the fearful tragedy was done,
In hopeless grief I cried aloud:
"My son! my son!! my son!!!"
No tongue can tell what dread despair could be
If my boy had failed to speak to me—
"Shucks, Dad, there's no death, no pain.
Go tell 'Mom' her boy is home again."

—John A. Bistline, Sr.

PERHAPS

The man who proudly boasts that "he runs things in his home" usually refers to the carpet sweeper, the washing machine and the errands.

A NEW YEARS WISH

I'D LIKE TO BE

. . . the sort of friend that you have been to me,
I'd like to be the help that you are always glad to be.
I'd like to mean as much to you each minute of the day,
As you have meant, old friend of mine, to me along the way.

I'D LIKE TO DO

. . . the big things and the splendid things for you,
To brush the gray from out your skies and leave them only blue.
I'd like to say the kind things that I so oft have heard,
And feel that I could rouse your soul the way that mine you stirred.

I'D LIKE TO GIVE

. . . you back the joy that you have given to me,
Yet that were wishing you a need, I hope will never be.
I'd like to make you feel as rich as I who travel on
Undaunted in the darkest hours with you to lean upon.

I'M WISHING

. . . at this very time that I could but repay
A portion of the gladness that you have strewn along my way,
And could I have one wish this year, this only would it be,
I'd like to be the sort of friend that you have been to me.

—Anonymous.

MY PRAYER

(By Barr W. Musser)

Help me, dear Lord, to find Thy Way;
To do Thy Will. Give me new strength
To carry, not my load alone,
But part of his whose strength is gone;
Give me the will to work,—
The power to serve,—
The right to play;
Fill my heart with love.
For these I pray.

WE WANT TO KNOW

Why so many females despise the kitchen and everything connected with housework, yet insist upon wearing sausepan hats, dish towel scarfs, and hairdresses which resemble mops.

Always listen patiently to the opinion of others; chances are you won't derive any benefit therefrom, but it will please them.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. MARCH, 1945. No. 10.

Temples and Ordinances

Traditions have grown up among the Latter-day Saints that Celestial or plural marriage can be performed by only one man—he who holds the Presidency of the Church—and that such ceremonies must be performed in the Temples. Members of the Church argue, without giving study or thought to the question, that the present president of the Church, by reason of his position, is the President of Priesthood; and since he has declared against the principle of plural marriage and the temples are closed to such marriages, none can legitimately be performed.

In the columns of TRUTH and in other works we have shown the fallacy of these conclusions. We have shown:

1. That the present President of the Church is not the President of Priesthood, and therefore, is not that ONE MAN who holds the keys to the sealing powers of Elijah. (TRUTH, 8:169-181; 9:165-70).

2. That the temples are not the only places where such ceremonies are legitimately performed.

The Church leaders have bitterly fought our contention without offering proper reasons.

During the vicious persecutions of the Government in the early eighties President John Taylor saw to it that many men bearing the higher order of Priesthood were endowed with the Priesthood of Elijah with instructions to perform such marriages both in and out of temples. As a verification of this contention we present herewith a complete copy of President Taylor's testimony in the Court files in the case of the United States against Rudger Clawson on the charge of Polygamy (October 17, 1884), taken from the files of the Deseret News of October 18, 1884, wherein President John Taylor was the chief witness.

We also give a brief excerpt of the evidence given by George Q. Cannon, First Counselor to President Taylor, on the same subject as recorded in the same issue of the News. (William H.

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

Dickson was the Government prosecutor):

THE POLYGAMY TRIAL

Friday Afternoon's (Oct. 17, 1884) Proceedings—President John Taylor, Judge Elias Smith and President A. M. Cannon on the Witness Stand.
(From Deseret Evening News, Oct. 18, 1884)

Last evening's news contained a report of the Proceedings in the Clawson polygamy trial up to President Taylor's taking the witness stand. As the latter part of it only stated facts in general, owing to the paper's going to press before the details could reach us, we will now go back a little and give the particulars.

Judge Zane ruled that the question put by the prosecution to Bishop H. B. Clawson was a proper one, viz: "Did you ever hear the defendant say anything as to his belief or unbelief in the doctrine of plural marriage as taught by the church?"

Bishop Clawson answered that he had no recollection of anything of the kind; nor did he remember testifying anything of the kind before the Grand Jury; had heard the defendant preach, but did not recollect ever hearing him allude to plural marriage; the defendant never told me of his intention to enter the polygamous state, with Lydia Spencer or anyone else; have never cautioned him not to, nor heard him say that to do so was a religious duty, as I remember; don't remember, except one or two points, what I testified before the Grand Jury, and those points I have stated.

Mr. Bennett—We object to all this; we don't know what is in those Grand Jury minutes; they may have been made up on the street, and I apprehend they were. (Laughter).

Mr. Dickson—Why?

Mr. Bennett — Everybody denies them.

* * *.

Mr. Dickson (slightly staggered)—If necessary we will call the clerk who took them and have them corroborated.

The witness was here shown what purported to be his evidence before the Grand Jury, and after reading it emphatically reiterated that he did not remember saying anything of the kind.

President John Taylor

was then called, and, being sworn, was asked to take the stand. The court room was now crowded, many coming in with and after the President, and the most intense interest was manifested on all sides.

Q.—Is your hearing good, Mr. Taylor?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—How long have you occupied the office of President?

A.—Well, I cannot say precisely. The records will show.

Q.—Quite a number of years, is it not?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You are familiar with the laws and revelations that have been given to the Church?

A.—Not as familiar as I might be, perhaps; but I know a number of them.

Q.—Do you know of the sacraments that are observed by the Church, or the observance of which is taught by the Church?

A.—I do not know what you refer to.

Q.—Is there a sacrament of marriage or a ceremony, as taught by the Church?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—The law of the Church is opposed to and forbids intercourse between the sexes—that is outside of the marriage relation?

(Question objected to as immaterial; objection overruled as usual).

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Do you know, Mr. Taylor, who the officiating priests or ministers in the Endowment House in this city were during the year 1883?

Mr. Bennett—We object to that, if your honor please. There is no proof before the court that there is any Endowment House.

Mr. Dickson—Well, I may ask him—is there an Endowment House in this city?

(Question objected to as immaterial).

Mr. Dickson—Where are marriages in the Mormon Church—that is, by members of the Mormon faith—celebrated, in the Endowment House or elsewhere?

A.—Sometimes they are, and sometimes elsewhere.

Q.—Where else, if not in the Endowment House?

A.—I do not know that I can say. There is no specific place appointed in which marriages occur.

Q.—There is a doctrine of the Church, is there not, Mr. Taylor, of plural marriage?

Mr. Bennett—We object to that, if your honor please.

Mr. Dickson—We expect to follow this up, if the question is answered in the affirmative, by showing that plural marriages are celebrated in the Endowment House only. If I am correct about this, Mr. Taylor can state so; if I am not, he can correct me. **But I expect to follow up this and show that plural marriages are required by the laws of the Church to be celebrated in the Endowment House.**

Mr. Bennett (to President Taylor, who seemed about to answer)—Be kind enough to answer slowly.

Mr. Dickson—**If I can succeed in showing that plural marriages are required to be celebrated in the Endowment House, or some Endowment House, this testimony will be made very material by subsequent proof which we have.**

Judge Zane—Well, state your question.

Mr. Bennett—Read the question, Mr. Reporter.

The Reporter—The question is—There is a doctrine of the Church, is there not, Mr. Taylor, of plural marriage?

Judge Zane (to witness)—You may answer that.

A.—Certainly.

(Exception taken).

Q.—What is your answer to that?

A.—Why, certainly there is.

Q.—Well, now, does not the Church require that when members of its faith are about to enter into plural marriage, that such marriage shall be performed in some one of the Endowment Houses?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Are not the plural marriages entered into by the members of the Church, so far as you know, performed in the Endowment House?

(Question objected to as immaterial and irrelevant).

Mr. Dickson—It will show what the general custom is, if any.

Judge Zane—You may answer the question.

(Exception taken).

Mr. Dickson (to the reporter)—Just read the question.

The Reporter—Are not the plural marriages entered into by the members of the church, so far as you know, performed in the Endowment House?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Where are they performed?

Mr. Bennett—Same objection. I do not like to object to every question, but this whole line is irrelevant. This man (the defendant) is not indicted for being a member of the Mormon Church.

Mr. Dickson—Where are they performed if not in the Endowment House?

(Exception taken).

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Do you know of any plural marriage having been entered into by members of the Church outside of the Endowment House?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Who? When?

A.—I could not say.

Q.—Do you know of any plural marriages entered into by any members of the faith, residents of the Territory of Utah, ever having been performed and entered into outside of any one of the Endowment Houses, within the past three years?

(Question objected to as immaterial and irrelevant).

Judge Zane—You may answer the question.

(Exception taken).

Question repeated.

A.—I have recollection of many such.

Q.—Have you any recollection of any such within the past three years?

A.—I could not answer at present.

Q.—Well, it is your present recollection we have to take.

A.—Very well, I have no recollection at present.

Q.—Is there any place called an Endowment House, a temple, or known by any other name, which is set apart as a place for the celebration of plural marriages?

(Question objected to).

Judge Zane—Well, he may answer the question.

(Exception taken).

Question repeated.

A.—Not specifically.

Q.—What do you mean by that answer?

A.—I mean by that answer that there are a great many things performed in those houses.

Q.—I do not ask you if it is set apart exclusive of other things. We understand that. I repeat the question—is there any place which is set apart as a place for the celebration of plural marriage?

A.—There is no specific place set apart for the celebration of marriages.

Q.—You mean by that, do you not, that there is a place in which other rites of the Church are performed?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is there not a place set apart for the performance of the rite of marriage in connection with other rites of the Church?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What is the place, or are the places?

A.—Well, one place is the Endow-

ment House, other places are our temples.

Q.—Now, then, I will ask you, to get at it, when the Temple at Logan city was completed for the celebration of the rites of the Church?

A.—I cannot say precisely.

Q.—I do not ask you to say within a week, or two weeks, or a month.

A.—I do not keep those things in my mind.

Q.—Was it not in June last? You were there when the temple was dedicated, and you took part in the dedication rites?

A.—I took part in the ceremonies.

Q.—As President of the Church?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Can you tell when that was?

A.—The records will show. I do not carry them in my head.

Q.—It was this year?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was it not in the summer season? Don't you remember whether the trees were in foliage or not?

A.—I can furnish you the time if you get the records.

(Here President Taylor said that if Mr. Nuttall was in the court perhaps he could tell.)

Mr. Nuttall by permission of the court, here spoke up and said: In May last.

Q.—Now, prior to that time, President Taylor, what Endowment Houses were there in the Territory?

A.—Only one.

Q.—Where was that?

(Question objected to as immaterial).

Mr. Dickson—I expect to show that this was the only place where this marriage question, if performed at all, that it must have been at the Endowment House in this city or the temple in this city.

Judge Zane—You must answer the question.

(Exception taken).

Q.—There was only one Endowment House. Where was that?

A.—In this city.

Q.—What temples were there prior to the time the Logan Temple was completed?

A.—There was a temple down at St. George.

Q.—Was there any other?

A.—There were no others in this Territory.

Q.—Then, prior to the time when the Logan Temple was dedicated in May last, I understand you to say that there was no place set apart for the celebration of the rites of matrimony except the Endowment House and the temple at St. George?

A.—I think you misunderstand me, sir.

Q.—Well, be kind enough to correct me if I do.

A.—I do not wish to be understood that any place was set apart for the purpose of matrimony, not for that exclusively.

Q.—But I understood you to say that there are places set apart for the performance of matrimony and other rites, and that these places were the temple and the Endowment House. In what county is St. George, where this temple is?

A.—Washington county, I think.

Q.—Now, are there no other places than those that you have mentioned where the Church authorizes the rite of

plural marriage to be performed?

A.—**The rite of plural marriage can be performed in other places. There is no place set apart specifically for it.**

Q.—Is there any other proper place for the performance of these rites?

A.—**As I have said, there are places that are appointed for a great many ceremonies, among which is the ceremony of marriage. The ceremony of marriage can be performed outside of any of these places.**

Q.—I am speaking of plural marriage?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Does the Church allow members of its faith to enter into plural marriage, according to circumstances?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Where? Any place, indoor or out of doors?

(Question objected to).

Q.—Under what circumstances does the Church authorize the performance of the ceremony of plural marriage outside of the Endowment House or temples of the Church?

(Question objected to as immaterial and irrelevant).

Judge Zane—Answer the question.

A.—I do not know anything special about the matter.

Q.—Mr. Taylor, if members of the faith, a man and woman, members of the Church, were living, for instance, in this city, within convenient reach of the Endowment House, desired to enter into plural marriage, would not the law of the Church require them to have the ceremony performed in the Endowment House?

(Question objected to).

A.—Not necessarily so.

Q.—Would they not require a dispensation from the Church to authorize its celebration elsewhere?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Under what circumstances would the dispensation be granted?

(Question objected to).

Judge Zane—For what purpose do you ask this question?

Mr. Dickson—For the same purpose, all tending to show that this marriage must have been performed in the Endowment House in this city.

Mr. F. S. Richards—It has already been shown that marriages could be performed elsewhere than the Endowment House?

Judge Zane—Answer the question.

(Exception taken).

Mr. Dickson—What are the circumstances necessary to the obtaining of a dispensation?

A.—It would be very difficult to say. There might be twenty or thirty different circumstances.

Q.—Well, do you know of some circumstances that would authorize such a dispensation?

A.—I do not know particularly.

Q.—Did you say it would require a dispensation?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—For the performance of the act, but not for a specific place?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—If parties are living here in Salt Lake City, members of the Mormon faith, a man and a woman who are desirous to enter into plural marriage, would they not be required in the absence of a dispensation, to have the ceremony performed in the Endowment House?

President Taylor—In the absence of a

dispensation?

Q.—In the absence of a dispensation authorizing the marriage elsewhere?

A.—It would be the authority to get married that would pass, no matter where it was.

Q.—Who gives the authority?

A.—I give that authority.

Q.—In all cases?

A.—Generally in all cases.

Q.—Is there any other person authorized to grant the dispensation?

A.—There are persons I might appoint.

Q.—Have you conferred upon any person that authority within the past three years?

(Question objected to as immaterial and irrelevant).

A.—Yes, sir.

(Exception taken).

Q.—Who?

A.—Sometimes Joseph F. Smith, sometimes George Q. Cannon.

Q.—Do you remember any others upon whom you conferred that authority within that time?

A.—I do not remember any at present.

Q.—When this authority is conferred upon any one by you, is it an authority limited to some particular case, or a general authority?

A.—It would be a general authority until rescinded.

Q.—Give me the names, if you can, of the parties or ministers, or whatever name they are known by in the Church, in this city, who were authorized to perform plural marriages within the past three years?

(Question objected to as immaterial).

Mr. Dickson.—It may be that he is one, and I may follow it up by showing that he was present at that marriage.

Mr. Bennett--Oh, anything maybe. The question is whether it is lawful.

Judge Zane—I do not see that it is not material if followed up. He may answer the question.

(Exception taken).

Question repeated.

A.—I could not give you these names.

Q.—Can you give me any of them?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Can you not give the name of any person in the Church who was authorized to celebrate plural marriages within this period of time?

A.—I will state in relation to these matters, that I have nothing to do with the details.

Q.—I understand it is you from whom the authority comes?

A.—Yes, sir; but I have nothing to do with the details of the matter.

Q.—But you are the person who confers the authority?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then you do know upon whom you do confer authority?

A.—**There are hundreds of people who have authority.**

Q.—In this city?

A.—Well, there are a great many in this city.

Q.—How many?

A.—I could not say.

Q.—Do you keep any record of the appointments?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You do not know at any time who is authorized to celebrate plural marriages?

A.—No, sir; I do not know.

Q.—Is there no means by which you can inform yourself?

A.—There may be.

Q.—Do you think you could find out?

A.—I might by asking the parties.

Q.—But if you don't know who to ask?

A.—Then I would not know who to ask.

Q.—Then I understand you to say you do not know who they all are?

A.—I do most emphatically.

Q.—There are persons; but with your unaided recollection you are unable to say who is or who is not authorized to administer that rite?

A.—I do not understand you.

Q.—If I understand you aright, by your unaided recollection today you are unable to say who is or who is not authrized to celebrate the rites of marriage in the Church?

A.—My recollection would tell of hundreds if I could remember their names that would be authorized, but my recollection would not tell me who is or who is not.

Q.—Your recollection would not give all who are? Is there any means by which your recollection could be refreshed?

A.—I do not know. I could investigate.

Q.—There is no records kept?

A.—Don't have any such records.

Q.—Then if you don't know the names of the persons who celebrate the rites, and there is no record of it known to you, how can you tell whether a marriage is celebrated?

A.—I have nothing to do with details.

Q.—Is it a matter of no concern to the Church whether these marriages are celebrated by persons authorized or not?

(Question objected to and sustained).

Q.—During the year 1883 give me the names of persons who were authorized to celebrate plural marriage in the Endowment House of this city?

A.—I could not tell you, sir.

Q.—Can you ascertain?

A.—I presume I could ascertain.

Q.—In what way?

A.—By asking, as I said before. I answered that question before.

Q.—Is there any record of marriages?

A.—I am not acquainted with the records.

Q.—Do you know whether a record of marriages is kept?

A.—It is very probable there is.

Q.—Can you say whether there is or not?

A.—I think likely there is.

Q.—Did you ever see it?

A.—I do not know that I have.

Q.—If you wanted to see it is there any means of ascertaining where it is?

A.—I could find out by inquiry.

Q.—Will you be good enough to do so?

A.—Well, I am not good enough to do so.

Q.—I understand, then, that unless

you are compelled to do so, you would refuse?

(Question objected to).

Mr. Dickson—I have the right, I presume, to ask the witness, whether or not he could ascertain where the records are, or whether he refuses to do it?

A.—I do not know anything about the records. They are not in my custody.

Q.—I understand you to say you could inquire as to their whereabouts. Will you be good enough to do so and give us the information?

A.—I do not think I am good enough.

Q.—Who is the custodian of the records?

A.—I cannot tell you.

Q.—Did you ever know who the custodian of the records was?

A.—I do not know that I ever did.

Q.—Do you know you don't?

A.—Yes, I know that I don't.

Q.—You know that you have never known who the custodian was? Did I understand you to say that you have never seen the record?

A.—I do not think I ever have to the best of my knowledge.

Q.—Have you ever given any directions as to the custody of the record?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—At no time?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Have you ever inquired of any one where the record was?

A.—I could not say positively whether I have or not.

Q.—What is your best recollection?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—Do you not know whether you have inquired as to the record? Have you ever inquired as to the custodian of the record?

A.—I do not think I have.

Q.—Have you ever been told who the custodian of the record was?

A.—Not to my recollection.

Q.—Do you know whether Elias Smith, Sen., during the year 1883, was authorized to celebrate plural marriages in the Endowment House of this city?

A.—I don't, sir.

Q.—Do you know whether Angus Cannon, Sen., was?

A.—I do not.

Q.—Do you know whether there is any person or number of persons, body of persons, in the Church, who are authorized to direct the custody of the records?

A.—I do not.

Q.—Do you know whether there is any regulation in the Church, or adopted by any one in authority, with respect to the records?

A.—I am not acquainted with anything pertaining to the records.

Q.—Has anyone not authorized the right to celebrate the rites of matrimony?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—It must be some one upon whom authority has been conferred by you?

A.—No, sir, not by me.

Q.—Who confers the authority?

A.—SOMETIMES OTHERS.

Q.—Well, who else besides yourself?

A.—Well there are others besides myself.

Q.—Who in this city besides your-

self?

A.—Quite a number.

Q.—Who in this city is authorized to celebrate plural marriages?

A.—**A great many have been appointed—hundreds.**

Q.—Can you give me the names of those in this city who are now authorized to perform plural marriages?

A.—I could not.

Q.—Do you mean there are so many?

A.—There are a great many that would be authorized under certain circumstances.

Q.—Is it not a fact, Mr. Taylor, that plural marriage is a secret rite, a secret ceremony?

A.—It is a secret to some and not to others.

Q.—I of course exclude those who were present.

(Question objected to; overruled).

Q.—With the exception of those present—parties to the contract—is not that a secret ceremony?

(Question objected to).

A.—Not necessarily so.

Q.—What do you mean by that answer?

A.—There might be a great many others acquainted with the circumstance and who could be present if they desired.

Q.—Is that confined to members of the priesthood, or those in authority in the Church?

A.—No, sir; those who were properly recommended could be there.

Q.—Those in whom the Church had confidence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are not the parties who enter into the contract of plural marriage and those who are present in officiating sworn to secrecy?

(Question objected to as immaterial).

Mr. Dickson—I think we are entitled to know how these marriages are celebrated, what ceremony has to be gone through and observed from the time parties enter upon it until it is concluded.

Judge Zane—You may answer the question.

(Question repeated).

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Is secrecy enjoined upon such?

(The same objection made).

A.—Not that I am aware of.

Q.—What is the ceremony of plural marriage?

A.—I do not propose to state it.

Q.—Do you decline to answer?

A.—I do.

Mr. Bennett—We object, your honor.

(Question withdrawn).

Q.—Are you acquainted with the defendant?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you known him?

A.—A number of years.

Q.—You have been on speaking terms with him?

A.—Oh, yes, all the time.

Q.—Have you ever had any conversation with him about his marriage relations?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you ever hear him say any-

thing about it?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Do you know whether he had taken a plural wife or not?

A.—I don't.

Q.—He is a member of your Church, in fellowship?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You knew there was an indictment out against him?

A.—I have heard of it.

Q.—Did you ever ask him whether he had entered into plural marriage or not after you had ascertained that he had been indicted?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—You have met him since his indictment was found?

A.—I do not remember.

Q.—Have you any means of knowing whether or not he has entered into plural marriage?

A.—I do not know that I have.

Q.—Do you know that you have no such means?

A.—Yes.

Examined by Mr. F. S. Richards—President Taylor, in your direct examination you spoke of having appointed or authorized persons to celebrate plural marriages. State whether or not such authorization or appointments extended only to the plural marriages, or whether the appointees had the authority to celebrate first marriages also. In other words, was the authorization general as to marriage, or confined to plural marriage only?

A.—It was general in all these matters, and things performed in the house.

Q.—And as to all classes of marriage, Mr. Taylor?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Whether plural or first marriages?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—You also made some references to authorization or recommendation of parties to the buildings at which these ceremonies are performed. State also whether the regulations and recommend you refer to applies equally to parties who go to celebrate marriages, first marriages, or plural marriages, or whether there is any distinction?

A.—There is no distinction.

Q.—Mr. Taylor, I will also ask you whether such authorization or recommendation that you might give to individuals would designate the purpose for which they go to the house?

A.—No, sir, it would not.

Q.—Would it even show that they went there for the purpose of marriage at all?

A.—No, sir.

Q. Are there not various other rites and ordinances performed in these houses aside from marriages?

A.—Yes, sir.

Q.—Then in giving an authorization to go there, you would not signify or indicate for what purpose?

A.—I do not know for what purpose they go.

Re-direct by Mr. Dickson—You stated in answer to Richards' question as to the scope of authority?

A.—My answer was that it pertained to all matters performed in the House. I refer to the Endowment House or to the Temple.

President Taylor having exchanged a few words with Judge Zane, left the room, and with him the interest for a large number went also, for they passed out in swarms after him.

Testimony Extracted From Answers to Questions Propounded the Same Day to President George Q. Cannon

Q.—Can you give me the names of those authorized during the year 1883 to celebrate plural marriages in this city?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—Do you not know the names of any?

A.—I know the names of several who might solemnize marriages, but whether they do solemnize them I do not know. There are, I say, several authorized; but I do not think, unless it be in the case of Mr. Riter of whom I have spoken, I have solemnized any marriages.

Q.—Who else solemnized marriages during 1883?

A.—I think Mr. Taylor.

Q.—Anybody else to your knowledge?

A.—I suppose any of the Twelve have the right to solemnize marriages.

Q.—You say they have the right to solemnize plural marriages?

A.—I do not know of any distinction. Formerly the Apostles were the one who attended to these marriages, but LATTERLY A GREAT MANY OTHERS HAVE BEEN AUTHORIZED.

Q.—Give me the names of the Apostles?

A.—Wilford Woodruff, this city, Lorenzo Snow, Brigham City, Erastus Snow, St. George, F. D. Richards, Ogden, Brigham Young, this city, Albert Carrington, this city, Moses Thatcher, Logan, F. M. Lyman, Tooele, John H. Smith, in England on a mission, George Teasdale, Nephi, and Heber J. Grant, this city.

Q.—In order to authorize a Bishop to solemnize marriage the authority must be conferred upon him by the President?

A. Technically it ought to be.

Q.—Well, are the Bishops authorized to celebrate marriages in the Endowment House as well as elsewhere?

A.—Some are. Etc.

(Speaking of this experience in the courts, a few days later, President Taylor made the situation clearer in the following statement which should, for all time, set at rest the questions involved):

"Another thing: I was lately called upon as a witness—perhaps you may have seen some account of it in the papers—and I want to make some explanation in relation to the matters that I then presented, because they are not generally understood: I was required to divulge certain things. I did not know them to divulge. Perhaps some of you have had people come to you with their confidences. I have. But I don't want to be a confidant. Why? Because if they made a confidant of me and I was called before a tribunal, I could not, as an honorable man, reveal their confidences, yet it would be said I was a transgressor of law; but no honorable man can reveal confidences that are committed to him. Therefore I tell them to keep their own secrets, and remember what is called the Mormon creed, "Mind your own business", I don't want to know the secrets of people, those that I cannot tell. And I could not tell very much to that court; for I have studiously avoided knowing any more than I could possibly help about such matters. I was asked questions about our temple, which of course I could not divulge. I was asked questions about records which I could not tell them, because I did not know. I have studiously avoided entering into a knowledge of these matters. They did not

build our temples. We have never had any revelations from God, through them! We may have had from the devil (laughter), but never have had revelations from God through them. And I think there are some things we have a right to guard sacredly in our own bosoms. We are told, "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him; and He will show them His covenant."

"Now, if the Lord will commit a secret to me I don't think I should tell it to any one; I don't think I would, not unless He told me to. Then I do not want to know your secrets. I was asked if certain ordinances could be performed in different places. I told them, yes, under certain circumstances. "Where", I was asked—"Anywhere besides in temples?" Yes. "Anywhere besides the Endowment House?" Yes. "Where, in some other house?" In another house or out of doors, as the circumstances might be. Why did I say that? Is not a temple the proper place? Yes; but it is said in our revelations pertaining to these matters:

> **"'Verily, verily, I say unto you, That when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men, to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might, and with all they have, to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them, and hinder them from performing that work; behold, it behoveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings.'**

"Thus under such circumstances we perceive that our operations elsewhere will be all correct; it makes no difference. It is the authority of the Priesthood, not the place, that validates and sanctifies the ordinance. I was asked if people could be sealed outside. Yes. I could have told them I was sealed outside, and lots of others.

"I want to show you a principle here, you Latter-day Saints. When Jesus was asked if he thought it was proper for his disciples to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath day, He told them "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." What else? I will say that man was not made for temples, but temples were made for man, under the direction of the Priesthood, and without the Priesthood temples would amount to nothing.

"I speak of these things for your information; but men are not authorized to act foolishly about these matters. The temples are places that are appropriated for a great many ordinances, and among these ordinances that of marriage; but, then, if we are interrupted by men who do not know about our principles, that is all right, it will not impede the work of God, or stop the performance of ordinances. Let them do their work and we will try and do ours."—Journal of Discourses, 25:355-6.

ETERNITY

What is eternity? It is duration. It had no beginning and it will have no end. What is the priesthood? It is everlasting; it had no beginning and it will have no end. What is the Gospel? It is everlasting; it had no beginning and it will have no end. What is matter? It is eternal. What is spirit? It is eternal. God did not make this world out of nothing; that would be impossible. But the Christians say, nothing is impossible with God. He made the world out of matter that existed before he framed it.—John Taylor (July 6, 1845), "Times & Seasons", 6:1100.

The Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution of the United States—all milestones in the progress of civilization—will not be allowed to perish from the earth by those who have benefited by them. The would-be Feudal Lords will be vanquished by men who are fighting for the belief that **all men are created free and equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights!**

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY
By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. MARCH, 1945. No. 10.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

HENCE 'tis the common observation here, that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. 'Tis a glorious task assign'd us by Providence; which has, I trust, given us spirit and virtue equal to it, and will at last crown it with success.—Benjamin Franklin, 1877.

OUR POSITION

Through the action of the Church as explained by its press agent, Mark E. Petersen of the Quorum of Twelve, in inaugurating the prosecutions against those believing in its original doctrine of marriage great interest is being aroused among the people of the nation, as well as in Europe and elsewhere. An inquiry coming from a stranger in Chicago fairly epitomizes the nature of the inquiries being made:

"I would like to know something more of your objectives than those reported in the newspapers."

The answer, while new and some times startling to the people of the world, to real Latter-day Saints is quite simple and easily comprehended:

The appellation "Fundamentalists" has been attached to a group of people whom the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, known as the Mormon Church, has ostracized for adhering to its original doctrines.

These ostracized Mormons believe in the gospel of Jesus Christ as established by the Mormon Prophet, Joseph Smith. Their faith comprehends the Articles of Faith as promulgated by the Prophet, the Ten Commandments, (Exodus 20), along with all other teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Articles of Faith are as follows:

1. We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

2. We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression.

3. We believe that through the atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel.

4. We believe that the first principles and ordinances of the Gospel are:—(1) Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; (2) Repentance; (3) Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; (4) Laying on of Hands for the Gift of the Holy Ghost.

5. We believe that a man must be called of God, by prophecy, and by the laying on of hands, by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the

ordinances thereof.

6. We believe in the same organization that existed in the Primitive Church, viz: Apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.

7. We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.

8. We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God.

9. We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.

10. We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion will be built upon this (the American) continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and, that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.

11. We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.

12. We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law.

13. We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul, We believe all things, we hope all things, we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praiseworthy, we seek after these things.—JOSEPH SMITH.

The "Fundamentalists" believe the gospel to be unchangeable and eternal; that the ordinances as established can neither be added to or taken from short of revelation from the Lord given through His constituted authority on earth.

Among the higher principles of the gospel are those of the United Order (or the Order of Enoch) and the Order of Celestial or Plural Marriage; that Celestial marriage, as the term implies, contemplates marriage for eternity and that plural marriage is a necessary element thereof. We believe that in introducing this order of marriage in Abraham's dispensation the Lord brought into his family life the woman Hagar, who became one of his legitimate wives under the law of God; that the Lord not only approved of this plural marriage but really instituted it, as the revelation reads:

> **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. Was Abraham, therefore, under condemnation? Verily I say unto you, Nay; for I, the Lord, commanded it.—Doctrine and Covenants, 132; 34-5.**

We believe that while the entering into this order of marriage is strictly voluntary on the part of the adherents, yet compliance with the law is necessary to obtain the highest exaltation in the kingdom of God.

We believe that the first amendment to the Federal Constitution, known as the first clause in the Bill of Rights, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof", means just what it says,—that men are free to believe and act in accordance with that belief, in so far as their actions do not infringe the rights of others.

We are opposed to the statement made by an early Federal official sent to Utah, that "The Lord is a foreign power to this Government", (See TRUTH 10:235), holding that it is the Lord's government and that when His kingdom is fully set up, which must inevitably occur, He will be the king thereof; and that then laws will be enacted for the protection of all men irrespective of their financial, social, political, or religious standing in the community.

We hold for the rights to Motherhood; that no normal woman shall be denied this right under whatsoever

form of family life it may be feasible. That if more than one woman agree upon a certain man to be their husband and the father of their offspring, (none of them having vowed to any other man), and he agreeing to the arrangement, they have a right so to do, and it is the business of no other person. On the other hand, if people choose monogamy or celibacy as their ideal in the family arrangement, it is their affair and they should not be interfered with in the exercise of that privilege; but that prostitution should be legislated a capital crime in accordance with the original law promulgated by God and perpetuated in the laws of Moses, (Gen., Chapt. 20; Num., Chapt. 25).

We believe that the Order of plural marriage for the purpose of perpetuating the race is sociologically and biologically sound, and is the only safe and sane doctrine that can be adopted to absorb the great army—ever increasing in number—of unmarried marriageable women; that in this process of absorption the individual and society are benefited, no one is injured, and the Government is being populated with a strong and stalwart race of people.

We know that the prevailing social diseases, now rapidly sapping the lifeblood of society in the so-called civilized world, is not the product of the Order of Plural Marriage as revealed by the Lord, but finds its roots in monogamy and celibacy. The writer, over seventy years of age and raised in a community the majority of whom were of polygamous faith, does not recall a single instance of venereal disease among those living in plural marriage, while with monogamists and celibates the facts are the direct opposite.

At a recent trial of fifteen men charged with Unlawful Cohabitation, or polygamous living, the defense attorney referred to a list of 886 cases gleaned from the police court files for 1943, of men and women "**respected citizens of Salt Lake City**", caught-in-the-act cases of prostitution, frequently involving fathers and mothers who were living the monogamous theory. They were given private hearings and fined from $5.00 to $50.00 each and turned loose to continue their lecherous trade, while the defendants charged with Unlawful Cohabitation were adjudged guilty in open court and sentenced to from one to five years in the State Penitentiary. The group of fifteen were bringing healthy children into the world, supporting and educating them, with their mothers, while the 886 were prostituting virtue, ruining families, engendering disease and destroying life—the latter moral lepers and the others respectable citizens and builders of empires.

Celestial or plural marriage with the Mormons means continuing the marriage ties into eternity. These ties continue beyond mortal life. Holding to these views the marriage relation assumes a more serious phase and greater thought is given to the selection of eternal companionships. Few divorces ever occur among this class of people.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the majority of the leading men and women in this intermountain community, for the past three-quarters of a century, were either in plural marriage or born of polygamous parentage. United States Senators and Congressmen, Governors, State Legislators, Bankers, Professional and Business Men, Farmers, Educators, etc. (Brigham Young, an acknowledged polygamist, was appointed the first Governor of Utah by the President of the United States. Though known to the President to be a polygamist he was given the second appointment).

A system that produces this quality of timber must be good and worth a try-out.

The question is frequently asked: "How is it possible for a man in present economic conditions, to raise large families and adequately support them. Companion principles of the Gospel, as indicated above, are the United Order and the Order of Plural Marriage. The two go hand in hand. The United Order furnishes a cooperative plan of living where all work cooperatively and, insofar as their just needs and wants are concerned, share and share alike. This plan is now in vogue among the so-called "Fundamentalists" and is solving the economic problems arising in the raising of large families and adequately caring for them. The United Order is God's economic law to the nations when they are prepared to receive it.

An old Mormon motto is: **"Mind your own business."** We believe in this motto. We believe there is intrinsic good in all men and all religions; that, given freedom to work out their religious philosophies, the errors will ultimately sink into oblivion while the good will solidify into a permanent faith. Men should be allowed the privilege of worshiping God or not worshiping Him, as their consciences dictate, without interference from any earthly source. It is their individual business. They must not be molested in it. Let the "hands-off" sign be strictly adhered to in the legitimate channels of life and society will purify itself.

It is to be regretted that the Church that once fostered and fought for the survival of these principles; that was driven from its birthplace—New York—to this mountain country under the most vicious persecutions known to mankind and by the hands of so-called Christians, being forced to give up homes, freedom, and life itself for their religion, should now turn to be persecutors, appointing sleuthing scoundrels, sneaks and detestable informers to seek out those adhering to the original faith, to immolate them upon the cross of hatred and prejudice; their goods given to despoliation and their precious children scattered to the four winds!

Meantime these "Funadmentalists" are bravely bearing their crosses with light hearts, rejoicing in the part they are called upon to play in this unique drama of life. With Bunyon they say, **"While we cannot observe man's laws that conflict with the laws of God, we can suffer."** Still we had hoped that an advanced order of Christian civilization would, in this age of wonders, have developed a greater degree of tolerance.

THE LORD A FOREIGN POWER IN THE GOVERNMENT

During the interview between O. J. Hollister, a Government official and correspondent for the New York Tribune, January 13, 1879, on the subject of the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court against the Mormon marriage system, in the George Reynolds' case (TRUTH 10:225), the following colloquy took place:

Mr. Hollister—If you persist in the future as in the past in this practice, what kind of an ultimate outcome do you anticipate? Could you not consistently surrender polygamy on the ground that there is no prospect of changing the opinion and law of the country against it, and that nullification of the laws is sure to result disastrously in the end to the nullifiers?

Mr. Taylor—Not so much so as the nullification of the Constitution; but we leave that with God. It is His business to take care of His Saints. An eminent poet has said: "Do what is right, let the consequence follow."

Mr. A. M. Musser—I think the Lord could better answer that question.

Mr. Hollister—"The Lord" is a foreign power to this government, in the sense in which you constantly refer to him.

Mr. Taylor—I am afraid he is, and there lies the difficulty. When nations forsake God we cannot expect them to act wisely. In doing what they have done, they have opened the flood gates of discord to this

nation which they cannot easily close. We are now proscribed, it will be others' turn next. Congress has assumed a most fearful responsibility in breaking down its Constitutional barriers; but the flood gates once opened, it becomes quite a problem to say where the proscription will end. Others may not receive these infringements on their religious rights quite as peaceably as we do; if Congress and the nation can stand it, we think we can.

Mr. Hollister—You hold then, that your Church possesses the oracles of heaven exclusively, and that the condemnation of polygamy by all Christian nations is without reason and wisdom, and contrary to the spirit of revelation?

Mr. Taylor—We most assuredly do.

Mr. Penrose—Noah would have made the same answer to that question.

God created the world. His "Only Begotten Son", Jesus Christ, is the ultimate king of the world. All Christians acknowledge this in a half-hearted manner looking forward to its consummation, and yet we are told, "The Lord is a foreign power to this Government!" On our coins we impress the words, "In God We Trust", yet God is a foreign power. How can we trust a foreign power? One of our Presidents (Theodore Roosevelt), chagrined at the obvious inconsistency in the situation, ordered the words, "In God We Trust", stricken from the coins. He held that public actions and the trend of private interests belied such a claim. His order, however, caused such a furor from the pulpit pounding and stamping populace, he was compelled to order the return of the pharisaical and hypocritical inscription. And today, "In God We Trust", though claimed to be a "foreign power", embellishes our coins.

Speaking of the American continent, of which the United States forms a part, the Lord said:

*** * * that whoso should possess this land of promise, from that time, henceforth and forever, should SERVE him, the true and only God, or they should be swept off when the fulness of his wrath should come upon them. * * ***

Behold, this is a choice land, and whatsoever nation shall possess it shall be free from bondage, and from captivity, and from all other nations under heaven, if they will but serve the God of the land, who is Jesus Christ, who hath been manifested by the things which we have written.—Book of Mormon, Ether 2:8, 12.

This is God's decree. Those failing to heed it must suffer the consequences.

On the subject of legislation. Some who are being illegally prosecuted (so far as inherent rights are concerned), are asking for relief. Legislators, elected by the people to protect their rights in establishing wholesome and just laws, are taking the position of that despicable officeseeker, President Martin Van Buren. When appealed to by Joseph Smith for the redress of wrongs committed against the Mormon people, he said: "Your cause is just, but I can do nothing for you. If I go for you I will lose the vote of Missouri." He very properly lost out in the next election.

We hold that every member of the Legislature is bound, under his oath and by the fact of his election, to pro- State irrespective of his religious betect the rights of every citizen of the lief, or his social, political or financial standing. Let that citizen be the most illiterate, the least progressive, the most despised, his inherent rights must be protected. The so-called "Fundamentalists" are not asking for charity, they ask for their rights and nothing more. THEY DEMAND THEIR RIGHTS. They demand the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. Since the living of their religion interferes with no other person's rights, their demands are natural and wholesome and must be respected or the institutions of free government will ultimately fail.

The Legislative Assembly of Utah should consider these facts. If freedom means anything to them they must grant freedom and uphold its sacred rights. We do not ask that they

believe as we do or accept our social or religious standards, but they must not deny our plea for freedom to carry on a God-given right, a Bible sustained right, a natural right—the right of parenthood.

The Lord is not a foreign power to this government—He is THE power; and those who refuse His guidance must take the consequences.

> **There was in a city a judge which feared not God, neither regarded man. And there was a widow in that city, and she came unto him, saying: Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for awhile, but afterward he said within himself: Though I fear not God, nor regard man, yet because this widow troubleth me I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.**
>
> **Thus will I liken the children of Zion. Let them importune at the feet of the Judge; and if he heed them not, let them importune at the feet of the governor; and if the governor heed them not, let them importune at the feet of the president; and if the president heed them not, then will the Lord arise and come forth out of his hiding place, and in his fury vex the nation; and in his hot displeasure, and in his fierce anger, in his time will cut off those wicked, unfaithful, and unjust stewards, and appoint them their portion among hypocrites, and unbelievers; even in outer darkness, where there is weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth.—Doctrine and Covenants, 101:82-91,**

TWISTINGS AND TURNINGS

Brigham Young once told of a shop in New York City bearing the window sign, **"All Kinds of Twistings and Turnings Done Here."** President Lorenzo Snow is reported as having once said after the Manifesto of 1890 that in order to live up to the full standards of Mormonism one must outgrow the Church.

This truth is obvious to those realizing that "All things shall be done by **common consent** in the Church (D. & C., Sec. 26)". Under this rule the vote of the least faithful and the least intelligent in the Church must be accorded the same force and authority as the vote of the leader of the Church, or as a Prophet of God holding membership therein.

In all ages of the world the paradoxical situation has occurred that those of the Saints who live the full Gospel must, to a greater or less degree, outgrow the Church whose conception of truth is controlled by "common consent" and whose ideology shifts from one position to another as the minds of men vary and change.

As is appropriately shown by Brother Widtsoe in "Evidences and Reconciliations" (February Improvement Era, 1945, page 85), men in full faith cannot outgrow Mormonism or the Gospel. Truth cannot be outgrown, no more than one can live up to the full teachings of the Church in the present day without veering away from some of the principles of the Gospel.

President George Albert Smith, of the Quorum of Twelve, at the special New Years Eve program arranged for President Grant in the Ensign Ward, is reported as urging the Saints "return to the study of the Bible and church revelations for the secrets of the world's situation today."

This very sound advice should be extended, and probably was in the speaker's mind, not only to solve the world's troubles but also to guide the Saints in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We vividly recall the counsel, delivered with vehement force, of Stake Presidents and Bishops to those being tried on the charge of apostasy for insisting on living the Gospel as revealed: **"Forget the Bible, Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants and follow your present leaders!" "Don't read the Doctrine and Covenants for six months; by that time you may get a little sense!" "The Doctrine and Covenants is not on trial and we don't want it referred to in this case!", etc., etc., etc.!** Those leaders had not outgrown the Church but were repudiating Mormonism. A

goodly number of this kind are now in responsible positions in the Church.

In the case of Elder Reed Smoot, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the U. S. Senate (1904-5), some of the leading brethren called to Washington to testify showed their dexterity in applying themselves to this "twistings and turnings" doctrine. In trying to justify the action of the Church in surrendering the Patriarchal order of marriage, their own actions belied their church teachings, and made a very embarrassing mess of the position of some of the leaders.

A brief excerpt of the evidence of President B. H. Roberts of the First Quorum of Seventy, and Assistant Church Historian, is illustrative. It will be noted that in that early day the Manifesto, which by the Saints generally and by many of the leaders, was regarded as a revelation from the Lord, was entirely divested of such Divinity:

The Chairman: In living in polygamous Cohabitation you are living in defiance of the Manifesto of 1890, are you not?

B. H. Roberts: Yes, sir. In defiance of the action of the Church on that subject.

The Chairman: And that was divinely inspired, as you understand?

Mr. Roberts: I think so.

The Chairman: And you are clearly living in defiance of the law of the land?

Mr. Roberts: Yes, sir.

The Chairman: Then you are disregarding both the law of God and of man?

Mr. Roberts: I suppose I am.

Senator Overman: You say the Manifesto was a revelation of God?

Mr. Roberts: NO, SIR.

Senator Overman: What do you mean by being inspired of God?

Mr. Roberts: I believe that a REVELATION FROM GOD, OF COURSE, IS A DIRECT, UNCOLORED COMMUNICATION FROM THE DIVINE TO MAN. I believe that a MAN MAY BE AN INSPIRED MAN, BUT YET MORE OR LESS OF THE HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MAN MAY ENTER INTO HIS ACTIONS. I believe, however, that THIS MANIFESTO WAS AN OFFICIAL ACT OF THE CHURCH, that the Church was perfectly competent to pass it, and I believe it binding upon the members of the Church.

Senator Overman: That it was a human institution, rather than from God?

Mr. Roberts: I would not like to say that it was not inspired of God. I rather think that President Woodruff, to meet the hard conditions confronting him, was inspired of the spirit of the Lord to take that course.—Reed Smoot Investigation, Vol. 1: 718-719.

BISHOP EARL ON POLYGAMY

Our good friend, Bishop Sylvester Earl (though he may not be acquainted with us), passes on a kind word for the so-called "Fundamentalists" who are under trial in the courts of Utah and the Nation for living their religion as upheld by the Holy Bible and in accordance with revelations to the Prophet Joseph Smith. His contribution to the PROGRESSIVE OPINION of January 19, 1945, follows:

EARL EXPRESSES HIS PERSONAL IDEAS ON POLYGAMY

Editor, Progressive Opinion:

In your excellent paper, you draw a fascinating, true and comprehensive pen picture of so-called polygamists going to prison. I would like to raise my voice in behalf of those God-loving people. After 15 or more years of personal interest in this class my contact with many of them, as also the information I glean from what would seem reliable sources, I am forced to the conclusion that they are living as nearly as possible the requirements of the plural marriage covenant as recorded in the "Doctrine and Covenants", Section 132. That's why they take their persecution with a smile.

They are hated and hounded by a certain class of professed Christians who should be their friends, but who are, on the contrary, their most bitter enemies. Even after the manifesto it was solemnly proclaimed from the pulpit that the time would come when this people would have to abide this covenant or be damned. Up to and during the administration of Joseph F. Smith the plural marriage covenant was held in reverence in the hearts of this people.

Later it was proclaimed in public meetings to be revoked, but by what authority it was killed has never been disclosed. Of one thing, however, I feel assured, and that

is that God's judgment will fall heavily upon those who persecute these good people, and heaviest of all on those who profess the faith and yet transgress the law.

—Sylvester Earl.

We thank Bishop Earl and also the publishers of PROGRESSIVE OPINION for this humane and very sensible gesture.

THE RIGHT TO MOTHERHOOD

The following correspondence between our friend, Edward Midgard of Seattle, Washington, and Roger N. Baldwin of American Civil Liberties Union of New York, is self explanatory and should arrest the attention of all fair-minded persons.

That Mr. Midgard fully grasps the real issues involved must be apparent to the unprejudiced mind. The right to Motherhood, while at present denied thousands of the class of women best qualified to give the nation strength and virility, must yet be recognized and properly rewarded. The question will not be fully settled until it is settled right. Women, as well as men, must have their physiological and emotional demands recognized along legitimate channels, and until the ban is lifted against this accomplishment our national progress is appreciably stayed.

The little group of Mormon "Fundamentalists" now on trial in the Utah courts for insisting upon this human right may go to prison as John Bunyon went to prison. But the question is then not settled. Inalienable rights cannot forever be denied.

The efforts of our friends, such as Mr. Midgard, to assist us in this fight, are greatly appreciated.

December 10, 1944

Mr. Roger N. Baldwin
American Civil Liberties Union
170 Fifth Avenue, New York

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

News that you would speak in Seattle on "What Chance for the Four Freedoms?" brought me to your meeting last Monday. Such an address, I thought, might very aptly voice some concern for the vital right to motherhood and family life now being denied to a number of American women by the courts of Utah, a matter so far handled by the defense chiefly as a question of religious freedom.

From my attendance I learned that your organization now is much concerned about rights of Negroes, Japanese, Jews and other special racial groups among us. Most of the evening and nearly all the literature on display were devoted to such issues. But about this threatened right of white American women to bear and rear children from the mate of their preference, a right which I assert to be inalienable although it is still being trampled under foot by irrational laws and in courts guided by popular prejudice rather than by wisdom, about this I heard nothing from you yet. You had several letters from me on this subject since March.

Let me now add that in reality this is not merely the freakish case of a small number among the Mormons. The issue involved in their trials is of far greater significance than this apparent argument about the limits of sectarian self-determination. Seen in proper perspective, a national issue of the first order confronts us. For along with these few Fundamentalists many thousands of other American women as permanent surplus on our marriage market (what a civilized institution!) are here doomed to spinsterhood and childlessness by unsound laws and by unimaginative court decisions.

These women, it is true, do not revolt. A moral code so devised keeps most of them in check. Besides, our women generally are still too shortsighted, if not outright selfish. Rather would they have 600,000 of their sex constantly condemned to a life biologically and emotionally incomplete than seek to cooperate with their sisters in a sensibly enlarged family life so as to render service to each other and to their nation.

Not so the women of Utah here censured and sentenced. While the prev-

alent attitude of our women tends to make this nation's homes ever less stable and ever less fruitful, these adherents to a simple faith undertake to live a sociologically superior family life where primitive jealousy is being overcome by the spirit of mutual aid, where the main thing in matrimony is motherhood, where homes but seldom break up in divorce.

The real offense for which these families are made to suffer is that by their more cooperative "celestial marriage" they embarrass the social mediocrity which we label "holy matrimony". You will be shown forbearance as a sinner who fails to live up to this standard of ethical mediocrity, but you become a damned heretic if you attempt to prove that something better and finer than the present American home is possible.

Since as yet shame about this persecution of mothers in our country does not seem to enter into the picture for most of my fellow citizens, I move that we awaken at least to the Soviet Union's challenge in the way of protecting and promoting motherhood. We shall not escape life's eternal contest, war or no war. Therefore a timely warning: Let nobody thwart or discourage our women in their healthy disposition to motherhood, under whichever form of family life it may be feasible, lest the blame for his nation's eventual downfall be upon him!

How about Mothers' Rights for America, Mr. Baldwin?

EDWARD MIDGARD

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
170 Fifth Avenue—New York City

December 18, 1944

Mr. Edward Midgard
1812 Twelfth Ave.
Seattle 22, Washington

Dear Mr. Midgard:

I appreciate fully the argument you set forth in your letter of December 10th. I heard it much more feelingly put by some of the defendants in Salt Lake City whom I met.

You raise a very difficult moral and legal question and one which admits of very little intervention on grounds of civil rights. We are of course obligated to defend the advocacy of polygamy, but its practice is something else again and not in our field. There is the question, however, in regard to the legal aspects of plural marriages in Utah and elsewhere, since only one of them is contracted by license, the others being private church unions. Whether the law can intervene in such cases where its letter has not been violated is a question somewhat complicated by statutes other than those aimed directly at polygamy.

I am doubtful whether there is any ground for our intervention there.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ROGER N. BALDWIN

December 28, 1944

Mr. Roger N. Baldwin
American Civil Liberties Union
170 Fifth Ave., New York

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

Thank you for your kind reply of December 18. I'm glad that you took occasion on your recent trip to meet the persecuted families of Utah and there had my argument for the right to motherhood put before you much more feelingly, as you say, than I can do it.

Still I must regret that evidently neither I nor the persecuted parents themselves have succeeded to arouse you to outright indignation about this denial of the right to motherhood and family life. I mean to such indignation as would compel in you action on their behalf.

What can there be difficult morally about so simple and basic a human right as the right to motherhood ex-

cept that morally confused and prejudiced minds still hesitate to recognize this right as such? This apparent attitude that a woman is not entitled to motherhood and family life unless she can market her person to some man in the prescribed monogamous manner I must denounce as a barbarity and an anachronism of the first order. Such attitude seems to me utterly irreconcilable with our proclaimed conception of basic human rights: "right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness".

If the matter were handled by the defense in this light it would be very simple, or at least greatly simplified. And I am most anxious to see the United States Supreme Court render a decision in connection with these Fundamentalist trials as to whether a physically and mentally qualified woman has the right in this country to motherhood per se, also to a family life serving this motherhood as the circumstances make it possible.

Of course, the matter becomes complicated in this instance because these Bible-firm Fundamentalists insist on advertising their family life as "polygamy" and as "plural marriage". As for the unhappy effect on their non-sympathetic fellow-men, they might just as well speak of their "harem". I have been trying to dissuade them from waving this red rag of polygamy before their detractors. To no avail, it seems. Chiefly, if not solely, they seek to prove themselves justified from the Old Testament. I am afraid this scriptural over-confidence of theirs will prove their undoing, that is, unless the modern right to motherhood is yet made **the main point** in their defense. The Bible may mean a lot to many people in various ways, but it is not recognized as a law book by our courts. This I find perfectly proper. We do not live in Abraham's time.

I had hoped, Mr. Baldwin, to have the cooperation of your organization, or of you personally at least, in this good fight for the recognition of the right to motherhood (as I had your help here 14 years ago when we succeeded in federal court to lift the ban against Dr. J. Rutgers' book, The Sexual Life in its Biological Significance, which I imported then).

While a spark of life remains in me I shall not cease to assert that what really matters is not marriage of one kind or another but MOTHERHOOD—Quality Motherhood—and that to try and withhold the right thereto from any fit woman of our breed and nation is an infamy as well as national insanity.

This fight of the ages over so vital an issue is not going to be won by him who can best quote from the Bible. But neither can it be decided for good on mere legal technicalities. It will take clear vision as to the ultimate consequences, and it will take holy wrath to put that vision across.

Sincerely,

EDWARD MIDGARD

"I, TOO, AM A MAN"

(Contributed)

For years TRUTH has propounded spiritual authority and sapient arguments justifying the Patriarchal order of marriage. To the true saints these reasons are full, complete and satisfying, and they need no more evidence to convince them of their soundness. They remain firm in their belief that however they are shaken by the blasts of misfortune, everything eventually will be for their good.

On the top step of the ladder of folly stands the fool who thinks himself smart. The sensible man does at the beginning what the fool does at the end. The social flunky is never enthusing or inspiring, because he cannot imbue one's soul with zeal in behalf of lofty principles. It is only when a man knows his relations to his

environment—to all there is in Nature, for him to make no distinction between honest men who are equal. He will neither hold the meanest in contempt nor regard the mightiest with awe.

Long ago a shoe cobler often visited the Roman Senate Chamber, and one of the Senators asked him why he came there. He answered: **"I, too, am a man."** Search back far as the knowledge of the human race goes into the past, and you will not find a more dignified expression for equality. That cobler encompassed the whole human life, and told it in less than a half dozen words. Neither the exaltation of office, the arrogance of a despot, the insolence of the rich, nor the demeanor of titled dignitaries impressed him differently.

There are many who today flout and denounce the principles advocated in TRUTH but who some years ago pleaded for, fought for, and lived in them. Then there is the spiritual skeptic. He dismisses gospel truths with a shrug and irreverent giggles or harsh condemnation. Nothing appeals to him except secular and temporal evidence.

There is a saying that "every species of male, including man, is polygamously inclined". If this be true, where should we look for responsibility? If man has natural polygamous instincts, then Nature made him so; and if Nature created him in this fashion, she also intended him to carry out her design. That is just what most men would do had they the courage to disregard social conventions. We've all heard such remarks as "A polygamist is such for lust and lust alone." Such statements are lallations too puerile for thinking persons to voice.

What, may we ask, is lust? Is it a result of being what is known as over-sexed? Most of the outstandingly brilliant men of history, those of great mental accomplishment, were over-sexed. A so-called over-sexed man is the normal type. Ask the stock raiser which of his animals he selects for breeding purposes. Sex may be compared to air, water and fire. Without all or any one of the three life would cease to exist on this earth. When these mighty requisites for human existence and perpetuation break the bounds of man's control the results are devastating, but when harnessed for the good of man no more essential servants ever requited human necessities.

A monogamist may be equally oversexed. For men of this type, is it not far better to regulate their lives in a clean, decent manner and raise healthy, virtuous children who are a credit to the nation, than, on the other hand, engage in licentiousness with numerous indiscriminate women to gratify their sensuality?

The polygamist believes that man should not waste his substance on unproductive association with a wife; that when a woman is past the age of producing, or is enceinte, all sexual association with her husband should cease. He believes that so long as a husband remains virile he should take other wives, if he can find them, to carry out in full his earthly destiny, and that the more firmly he adheres to this rule the greater will be his exaltation in the eternal life.

Opposed to this belief is the monogamy ideal that one, two, or three children are the limit for a family. While making an effort to regulate or control births much of one's married life is spent in the act for sexual gratification only. Contraceptions of all types are used, which eventually result in illness, many wives submitting to operations as a result of their unnatural activities. The husband seeks out other women for voluptious pleasures, and so we get the condition which exists today of adultery, fornication, prostitution, debauchery, rampant veneral disease, divorce and general social chaos.

Lawmakers and law dispensers ignore this condition, never taking into consideration the results of this minatory type of marriage, but choose rather, through popular opinion or pressure from powerful groups to impose laws upon those who because of religious precepts engage in clean, harmonious married life, produce many fine children who are a credit to their country. The hundreds of young men and women, the progeny of the plural form of marriage, are eagerly sought after to take their places in the ranks of the various services of their country, and this is as it should be. Many of these have attained to high rank; not a few have been cited for outstanding behavior in action, and some of them have made the supreme sacrifice. But the inconsistency of it all is that they take the men who sired these fine youth, prosecute and sentence them to long jail terms. It's a wonder that the symbol of justice does not drop the scales at her feet and tear the blindfold from her eyes to wipe the tears of shame from her cheeks.

The sanguinary persecution of the Saints in the early history of the Church failed to halt their true belief, and that of today will have similar effect. A prominent citizen, in answer to a question as to his opinion of the prosecution directed at the so-called "Fundamentalists", said: "They are breaking the law and should be punished, but I cannot see any of them as criminals." A similitude can be found in the incident of Pontius Pilate: With all the bitter antipathy that Pilate had for Jesus and with all his searching scrutiny for flaws in the Savior, the worst he could say of Him was: "I find no fault in this man."

The feet go where the mind dictates. It is no disgrace to be knocked down, the shame of the fall will lie in one's failure to get up again. The virtue of grit enables a man to face trouble and suffer punishment heroically and without flinching. One year more of life ought never make a man feel older and more decrepit, but that he is another year riper in experience. Patience is the key to joy, and haste unlocks the door of sorrow. Honesty is the best chapter in the book of duty, and no man knows whether or not he is honest until he has tasted adversity. Let every man write this precept in his heart and live by it, and remember that the test for generosity lies not in what one gives, but with what he has left.

A sincere man looks you in the eye, and says plainly what he thinks and never backs up from the stand he has taken, when he knows he is right. He does not care what your religious or political beliefs are, just so you are earnest, serious and truthful. He believes with acceleration in a square deal, and thinks tears are welcome showers when they cause the seeds of sympathy to sprout in the human heart.

So, with all the determination we can muster, let's carry on, never overlooking that great attribute faith. It is a beautiful word, exemplified from the simple little child hanging its stocking over the fireplace, to the Three Wise Men following the Star.

REVELATION

I was well versed in the scriptures myself when this Gospel came along, but I was as ignorant as a brute about these things, and so is everybody else. I have not come in contact with a man who understood correct principles in relation to the principles of the Gospel, or who knew the way to enter into the kingdom of God. Who could know it without God revealing it? And it is to that revelation that we are indebted for the intelligence we have received concerning these matters, and to the spirit of prophecy and revelation that has been communicated with it.—Elder John Taylor (Aug. 23, 1857), J. of D., 5:147.

PROGRESS OF THE COURTS

The cases of two members of the so-called "Fundamentalist" group, Fred M. Jessop and Edison P. Jessop, of Short Creek, Arizona, charged with Unlawful Cohabitation in the Fifth District Court at St. George, Utah, were dismissed by District Judge Will L. Hoyt on February 7th.

Motion for dismissal of the charges was made by the prosecution after a request for additional time to prepare evidence against the two men was objected to by the defense, J. H. McKnight, defense attorney, reports.

These were two of the some fifty cases initiated last March in the Federal and State courts of Utah, with the help of the Mormon Church against men and women accused of teaching and living the original doctrines of the Church.

Appeals are on their way to the Supreme Court of the United States of the nine Mann Act and Lindbergh Kidnapping cases from the U. S. Federal Court of Appeals, and of the fifteen Unlawful Cohabitation cases from the decisions of the lower courts.

The conspiracy cases involving thirty-one defendants are being appealed from the Third District Court to the Supreme Court of Utah. To date all defendants are out of prison on bail.

HELPFUL NEWS: Comes a letter from the outside. **"Dear Friends: We enclose our check for $100 to assist in meeting expenses of your law suits. May you win and thereby re-establish human and religious liberty in the courts of the land."** Others can help very materially by following this example either in larger or smaller amounts. We are grateful to our friends who are helping to bear the burden of this fight.

So long as we love we serve. So long as we are loved by others I would almost say we are indispensible; and no man is useless while he has a friend—R. L. Stevenson.

PRAYER OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

MAY the God of Wisdom, Strength, and Power, the Lord of the armies of Israel, inspire us with Prudence in this Time of Danger; take away from us all the Seeds of Contention and Division, and unite the Hearts and Counsels of all of us, of whatever Sect or Nation, in one Bond of Peace, Brotherly Love, and Generous Public Spirit; May He give us Strength and Resolution to amend our Lives, and remove from among us every Thing that is displeasing to him; afford us his most gracious Protection, confound the Designs of our Enemies, and give Peace in all our Borders, is the sincere Prayer of

A TRADESMAN OF PHILADELPHIA

BIG AND LITTLE CRIMES

A young man is serving a long prison term for raising a $5 check to $15. The Power and Light Company watered their stock $27,000,000 more than it was worth and for 23 years took excess profits of $1,500,000 a year from their trusting patrons which they must now give back. None of them will ever go to jail. The boy sinned just once for $10. The company has "sinned" every day for 23 years to gain $23,000,000! Can't the directors keep it obedient to regulatory law just once?—Progressive Opinion.

A FINE RECORD

The federal office of Soil Conservation in the Keith Building, holds a record that is very much worth talking about. There are eleven employes in the office, six men and five young women, and not a smoker among them. Outside of church offices we doubt if there is another office in Salt Lake with such a record. And most of them are non-Mormon and from out of the State.—Progressive Opinion, 9-16-43.

EARTH BOUND?

When mortal clay, toil-worn and weary,
Sinks to rest with sleep numbed ears,
The tireless spirit springs, unfettered,
To greet loved friends of loftier spheres.
There with dear comrades to mingle,
Renewing shattered faith and hope.
Throwing off earth's cloak of darkness,
To view creation's broader scope.

In that sweet world where love undaunted,
Burns with purer, steadier flame,
And like eternity is ageless,
Loneliness can hold no claim.
Companions parted, cling together,
Joyous in their unity,
Till earthly flesh from sleep returning,
Binds again the soul set free.

Precious memories lost to mortals,
Fail to brighten lonely hours.
Chained by earthly dross and weakness,
We dwell, immune to holier powers.
If the joys of but a moment,
Thru the mortal veil could break,
Half the torture of aloneness,
Would be gone when we awake.

Can a mortal gain perfection
Till at length the mists are blown,
And united soul and body,
Recalls some joy the soul has known?
Could the curtain e'er be parted,
And loved ones beyond the veil
Send us whispered words of courage,
While we grope along the trail?

Are our hopes but foolish dreamings,
Are we bound till death sets free,
And earthly span, tho truly tiny,
Stretch to seem eternity?

—Alyne Jessop.

Mountaineer: "Doc, I want you to look at my son-in-law. I shot at him yesterday, and took a piece out of his ear."

Doctor: "Shame on you for shooting at your son-in-law."

Mountaineer: "But, Doc, he wasn't my son-in-law when I shot him."

A favorite story in London is about a little old lady who was walking along a street when there came a terrific clap of thunder. As the old lady cowered in fright, an urchin said to her: "Don't be afraid, lady, it ain't 'Itler, it's God."

He who jumps at conclusions, jumps at delusions.

THE BEGINNING AND THE END

My days begin with Baby's warming smile,
So if the world is cold and friends forget,
I know there is a bit of goodness yet,
And one white room where living is worth while.

My days end with a baby's laughter, so
If my long night is troubled with dark dreams,
I know one temple where the future gleams
With hope, and happiness is all aglow.

—Anne Campbell.

The possession of talent seldom means the possession of judgment.

They like our book!

Celestial or Plural Marriage--

The Mormon Marriage System

NO LIBRARY IS COMPLETE WITHOUT IT. $1.50 POSTPAID TO ANY PART OF THE WORLD.

An order received from an Engineer in Washington:

"Dear Brother:

"I enclose P. O. Order for $1.50 for which send to (Address given), one of your books on Celestial or Plural Marriage.

"This Brother and I have been reading the book I have and he wants one also.

"I would not take $1000 for my book if I could not get another. Keep up the good work and I know God will bless you."

TRUTH PUBLISHING COMPANY
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City 3, Utah

CHRISTUS CONSOLATOR

Beside the dead I knelt for prayer,
And felt a presence as I prayed.
Lo! it was Jesus standing there.
He smiled: "Be not afraid!"

"Lord, Thou hast conquered death we know;
Restore again to life", I said,
"This one who died an hour ago."
He smiled: "She is not dead!"

"Asleep then, as thyself did say;
Yet thou canst lift the lids that keep
Her prisoned eyes from ours away!"
He smiled: "She doth not sleep!"

"Nay then, tho' haply she do wake,
And look upon some fairer dawn,
Restore her to our hearts that ache!"
He smiled: "She is not gone!"

"Alas! too well we know our loss,
Nor hope again our joy to touch,
Until the stream of death we cross."
He smiled: "There is no such!"

"Yet our beloved seem so far,
The while we yearn to feel them near,
Albeit with Thee we trust they are."
He smiled: "And I am here!"

"Dear Lord, how shall we know that they
Still walk unseen with us and Thee,
Nor sleep, nor wander far away?"
He smiled: "Abide in Me."

—Rossiter Worthington Raymond.

ANOTHER CHRISTMAS HAS PASSED

Our darling's blue eyed doll is bust
And teddy squeaks no more;
The soldier met a warrior's fate,
His head lies on the floor.
We miss the darky's courtly bow,
Stilled are his nimble feet;
The air gun was a wow until
It winged our birdie sweet.
Now Junior, back in school, dreams of
Departed glory gay.
Glad Christmas comes but once a year,
Perhaps it's best that way.

—The Gilcrafter.

A certain small restaurant was kept by a man who prided himself on his cooking. He was amazed to hear a young salesman criticize a pie, one day.

"Pie, young fellow? Why I made pies before you were born."

"O. K. But why sell 'em now?"

When you stop to think, don't forget to start again.

A LIFE LESSON

There! little girl; don't cry!
They have broken your doll, I know;
And your playhouse, too,
And your tea set blue,
Are things of the long ago;
But childish troubles will soon pass by—
There! little girl; don't cry!

There! little girl; don't cry!
They have broken your slate, I know;
And the glad, wild ways
Of your schoolgirl days
Are things of the long ago;
But life and love will soon come by—
There! little girl; don't cry!

There! little girl; don't cry!
They have broken your heart, I know;
And the rainbow gleams
Of your youthful dreams
Are things of the long ago;
But heaven holds all for which you sigh—
There! little girl; don't cry!

—James Whitcomb Riley.

WHAT YOU HAVE EATEN

If you are a man 75 years of age, you have eaten about 110 tons of food since you were born,—an amount equal to 1,500 times your own weight (provided you weigh not more than 146 pounds). The single slices of bacon you have eaten, placed end to end, would extend for four miles. Just think of having consumed 5 tons of sugar, 5 tons of fish, three-fourths of a ton of salt, 400 pounds of cheese, and 1,000 dozens eggs. The vegetables would fill a train 3 miles ling. The bread, if it could be reassembled in loaves, would fill a good-sized warehouse.

THE RETORT DISCOURTEOUS

The two little colored boys had had a falling out, and were saying unkind things to and about each other, their kinfolks, their friends, anything that would leave a sting.

"An' look at you' mammy", added Sambo. "She takes in washin', don' she?"

"Sho she do", replied Hambone, defiantly. "You don't think she's lev it out on de line lessen you' pappy wuz in jail, does you?"

TSK! TSK!

Yes, the smallest things seem to upset my wife. The other day she was doing a cross-word puzzle and she asked me, "What is a female sheep?" I said, "Ewe", and she burst into tears.

The more arguments you win, the less friends you'll have.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE AND AS THEY WERE AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. APRIL, 1945. NO. 11.

Plural Marriage in Utah

Taken from "WHAT THE WORLD BELIEVES", Published in New York in 1886; Written by Franklin D. Richards, of the Quorum of Twelve, and Assistant Church Historian

The establishment of the plural marriage system among the Mormons has been a work of years. It was no sudden social revolution, but has been a steady growth. The "Revelation on Celestial Marriage" was made known at first to but a few and to them in secret. Their testimony as to its effects on their minds is on record. Trained in modern Christian traditions and and reared in monogamic society, they were shocked and amazed. Strange to say, the women were scarcely more averse to it than the men. The Apostles and others to whom it was explained by Joseph and Hyrum Smith in 1843, were sorely troubled until, as they say, by prayer and investigation they became thoroughly convinced as to its rightfulness and divinity; and their wives imbued with the same earnest desires after truth, accepted the revelation and consented to its practice. In a few instances the women, guided by feeling instead of faith, and by involuntary repugnance rather than reason, rejected and opposed it until the power of example and the desire to obtain as many blessings as their neighbors, overcame their objections, and they joined in assisting to make it practicable and honorable.

Here came in the exercise of charity, forbearance, patience, and self-sacrifice as remarkable as it would be considered admirable in any other cause. Loving wives gave to their husbands others in what they understood to be sacred wedlock, like the holy women of old; and in doing so, claimed to have received divine manifestations of approval which softened the trial and sanctified the sacrifice.

The tragic death of the Prophet and Patriarch and the exodus from Nauvoo, with the subsequent toilsome march across the wilderness to the

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

vales of the Rocky Mountains, somewhat retarded the increase of Plural Marriages, but at the same time spread a knowledge as to the doctrine and the relations existing under it, because everybody became acquainted with his neighbor's affairs.

In 1852 the revelation was made public both to the Saints and to the world. The example of men and women, recognized as good citizens and worthy and leading members of the church, who lived in harmony and advocated the system, aided the exposition of the doctrine by the preaching of the Elders in establishing the practice among the general community. Only those considered worthy were permitted to engage in it, and the ceremony of sealing in each case, whether of a first wife or a plural wife, being exactly the same and solemnized in the name of Deity for time and all eternity, thus laying hold upon the world to come, it came to be viewed as a mark of distinction and a sacred privilege to be practically connected with what was called the **"Eternal Order of Patriarchal Marriage"**, in which were the "blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." The term polygamy is not considered by the Mormons as properly applied to their marriage system. They call it Celestial Marriage, because it is an eternal contract under divine regulation; and think that "Plural Marriage" is more appropriate to them than "Polygamy".

The Bible,—King James' translation, —has been one of the great instruments in the establishment of Mormon Polygamy. A plurality of wives being permitted in patriarchal times, provided for and regulated under the Mosaic law, and permitted and not anywhere forbidden under the early teachings of the Christian dispensation, the Bible as a whole is polygamous in its tendency, viewed apart from modern ideas, bias, and interpretations. The Mormons are a Bible believing people; and they repudiate the commentaries, spiritualizations, and renderings of the divines of all the sects, taking its language, pure and simple, as a guide as to what God revealed in the times and for the people when its several books were written. And they think that what a Being who never changes, sanctioned and did not forbid ages ago, cannot be essentially evil in these latter days.

Thus it has gradually grown among the Mormons until, to the astonishment of Christendom, women of ability, fine feeling, and gentle training have become the most ardent advocates of a system that revolts the civilized world. In addition to the religious zeal and fervent faith which actuate these women, they claim to have learned by experience and observation many practical advantages to their sex growing out of the system. While they have to share the time at the disposal of their husbands with others, dependent upon his care and objects of his affection, they are protected during anticipated maternity and other seasons from associations which for their own good and that of their progeny are better to be discontinued. They become more self-reliant, devoted to their children and better able to bear the cares of maternity than their monogamic sisters, and they learn to appreciate these advantages. They smile at the idea, often advanced, that they have but a fractional part of a husband and say that this is a physical impossibility, and an error in principle and in fact. And they ask if each child has a fractional part of a mother, or their love or hers is lessened by increase of offspring. **To "love thy neighbor as thyself" is a Christian duty, and they consider they cannot perform it more faithfully, in spirit and in act, than by willingly recognizing the right of other women holding the same relations and feeling the same love for their husbands as they do themselves.** The harem, a feature of Asiatic polygamy, is not an adjunct of Mormon plural marriage. Each wife usually has her own

home. Often it is her own property, held in her own right; for the laws of Utah are very liberal as to the property rights of women, married or single. If circumstances render this impossible or inexpedient, she lives in her own apartments with the control of her own children and affairs. Nowhere is the home principle cherished more than among the Mormons; for the family is considered as the present and future heaven. And as "the woman is the glory of the man", so the children are the glory of the mother and the basis of her kingdom with her "love" in the world to come.

Thoughtful young women, looking to eternity as well as time, believing that their happiness forever is involved in the choice of a husband, in many instances prefer to trust their destiny to an honorable, God-fearing, industrious man who has proven his integrity in the family relation, both to his wife and his children, rather than chance the risks of an untried and possibly unstable youth, who may turn out a blank in that which some call the lottery of wedlock.

The subjects of love, marriage, maternity, and conjugal and parental relations are freely discussed by ladies in the organization known as the Relief Society, which has its branches in every part of Utah, and has for its object the relief of the poor, and the intellectual and spiritual culture of its members. It is supplemented by the Mutual Improvement Societies for the younger ladies of the community. Principle instead of passion is advocated, and everlasting interests are held up as paramount.

The support of plural families is a puzzle to inquirers familiar with the struggles in monogamic society to support an ordinary family and keep up appearances. In the valleys of Utah there are opportunities for accumulating means other than by daily toil which enterprising men are not slow to take advantage of. And these are the class, as a rule, that enter into polygamy. The very courage and confidence which they must have to assume the cares, responsibilities, and extra burdens of extra families, are qualities likely to make them successful in the battle of life. And it is a fact well known to the people who live in connection of this marriage system, that these men of large families are "prospered" in their business undertakings; and the exigencies of the situation are a stimulus to energy and perseverence. The wives, too, learn to be economical and thrifty, and are mutually helpful, assisting each other in times of sickness and willing to share with each other in the comforts as well as toils of family life. These women are not butterflies of fashion, but working bees in the family hive. The increase, not the suppression of progeny, is their desire and ambition. Their pleasures are simple and are not the chief object of exertion and existence. All this must be taken into account in an endeavor to understand the workings of Mormon polygamy.

Of course there are cases of unhappiness and discord in polygamous relations. The people are human beings with like passions and feelings to others. Both men and women, in polygamy as in monogamy, sometimes act foolishly or wickedly or both. The very opportunities that polygamy affords for the exercise of patience, forbearance, charity, self-control, and regard for the wishes of others, are openings for indulgence in their opposites. But experience has demonstrated that those virtues are absolutely necessary to the very existence of plural families, to say nothing of peace and content, which are the groundwork of happiness.

Therefore the fact that such families have continued for periods extending from a few years to over forty years, repeating themselves in the succeeding generation, speaks more than theory or argument as to the exercise of those Christian qualities in homes

popularly supposed to be hotbeds of passion and breeding-spots of discord and contention. The teachers, whose duty it is to visit the church members and assist in the settlement of disputes, report that as a rule there is far less family trouble in the polygamous than in the monogamous households. As there is no rule or obligation that compels a plural wife to remain in relations which she desires to sever, fairness and proper deportment are rendered necessary on the part of the husband, in order to retain her allegience and her affections. When all its aspects are viewed impartially, there will be more general surprise that men will assume the multiplied responsibilities of Mormon polygamy, than that women can accept their position in the system.

The feelings and views of the Mormon women, today, on this subject, may be learned from the expressions of their representatives at the Ladies' Mass Meeting, held in Salt Lake City Theatre, March 6, 1886, the proceedings of which are published in pamphlet form by the Deseret News Company.

The large majority of the people of Utah are monogamous in practice. The female population is less than the male. "Celestial marriage", as the plural system is called, is only for persons of elevated character, recommended by the local and endorsed by the General Church Authorities. While all, with but a very few exceptions, believe in the rightfulness of plural marriage under given circumstances, all do not consider it obligatory upon them or that they are suited to its conditions and responsibilities.

The two classes are not divided on principle, but are different as to its practice. The polygamists are all disfranchised. (1) No one can vote or hold office who is a polygamist or who will not take an oath to obey the laws. The voters then, are monogamist, present and prospective. They have framed a State Constitution embodying provisions already in existence under the laws of the United States. They propose to execute them fairly as other laws are enforced, and not partially and in the spirit of persecution as the Edmunds law has been administered. Practically, every accused Mormon is considered guilty and is required to prove his innocence or suffer the extreme penalties. It is proposed to reverse this and give defendants in polygamy cases the same rights as other defendants.

The monogamous Mormons do not refer to matters of faith in the Constitution they have framed, for these are outside of politics. But they intend in good faith to carry out the provisions they have made under the State in deference to the pronounced decision of the vast majority of the nation, not as a religious but as a political measure. The polygamists have no voice in the matter, for they have no votes. The people who have broken no law claim the rights of citizens under the law, and they deny the justice of depriving them of political rights because of the alleged misdemeanor of others over whom they have no control.

(1) This was in Territorial days before Utah came into Statehood. The Territory was under Federal control, and drastic laws were enacted in Congress against the Mormons adhering to their system of marriage.

TWISTINGS AND TURNINGS

(Continued)

In the March TRUTH (page 271) we gave a brief item on "Twistings and Turnings", showing how the Woodruff Manifesto of 1890 so beclouded the religious atmosphere of Mormondom, that leaders of the Church testifying in the Reed Smoot case at Washington (1904) were forced to make embarrassing admissions on the meaning of the Manifesto, and their actions seemed contrary to such meaning. An excerpt of the testimony of President B. H. Roberts was presented.

In the current issue we give excerpts of the testimony of President Joseph F. Smith, showing his own inability to live the Gospel as he interpreted it and at the same time obey the Manifesto. Our very high regard for President Smith and his manly frankness while a witness in the Smoot hearing, bars any criticism from us of his attitude and answers to questions; still we are impressed with the jumble created by the Manifesto among that portion of the Saints that places the edicts of God above those of man. In order to conserve space we condense the President's statements without in the least altering the meaning thereof. We quote from Smoot investigation, Vol. 1, pp. 99, et. seq.

It will be noted that throughout the interview President Smith rigorously held to the fact that it was the RULE OF THE CHURCH that was being broken by those continuing their polygamous living, and NOT the LAW OF GOD. He had a clear understanding of the position of the Priesthood in the picture. The Patriarchal order of marriage is a law of the Priesthood (D. & C., 132:28, 58, 61), and was not intended for the Church at large, only as that organization would receive it by official vote. When the Church, in 1890, rejected the doctrine, with its active practice, the Priesthood, separate from and wholly independent of the Church, "carried on", and is still doing so. The Church, being a lesser organization, in breaking one of its rules in order to live the higher law of the Priesthood, President Smith was entirely justified. He was well within his rights as a servant of the Lord and was only engaged in carrying out the laws of his Priesthood which every faithful Latter-day Saint is bound to do; but on with the testimony:

Mr. Smith: I have never pretended to nor do I profess to have received revelations. I never said I had a revelation except as far as God has shown to me that so-called Mormonism is God's divine truth; that is all.

The Chairman: There is one thing I do not understand that I want to ask about. This manifesto suspending polygamy, I understand, was a revelation and a direction to the Church?

Mr. Smith: I understand it, Mr. Chairman, just as it is stated there by President Woodruff himself. President Woodruff makes his own statement. I cannot add to nor take anything from that statement.

The Chairman: Do you understand it was a revelation the same as other revelations?

Mr. Smith: I understand personally that President Woodruff was inspired to put forth that manifesto.

The Chairman: And in that sense it was a revelation?

Mr. Smith: Well, it was a revelation to me.

Mr. Taylor: Is the law of the Church, as well as the law of the land, against the taking of plural wives?

Mr. Smith: Yes, sir; I will say—

Mr. Taylor: Is that the law?

Mr. Smith: I would substitute the word "rule" of the church.

Mr. Taylor: Very well. Then to take a plural wife would be a violation of a rule of the church?

Mr. Smith: It would.

Mr. Taylor: Is the cohabitation of one who is claimed to be a plural wife a violation of the law or rule of the church, as well as of the law of the land?

Mr. Smith: That was the case, and is the case, even today.

Mr. Taylor: You have not in any respect changed your relations to these wives' since the manifesto or since the passage of this law of the State of Utah. I am not meaning to be unfair in the question; but only to understand you. What I mean is, you have been holding your several wives out as wives, not offensively, as you say. You have furnished them homes. You have given them your society. You have taken care of the children that they bore you, and you have caused them to bear you new children—all of them?

Mr. Smith: That is correct, sir.

The Chairman: Then you have five wives?

Mr. Smith: I have.

Mr. Taylor: How many children have been borne to you by these wives since 1890?

Mr. Smith: I have had eleven children

born since 1890. All of my wives bore children.

Mr. Taylor: Heber J. Grant is one of the Twelve Apostles?

Mr. Smith: Yes, sir.

Mr. Taylor: Is he a polygamist?

Mr. Smith: He so acknowledged, I believe, a few weeks ago.

Mr. Taylor: Where is Heber J. Grant now?

Mr. Smith: He is in Europe.

Mr. Taylor: For the Church?

Mr. Smith: Yes, sir.

Mr. Taylor: Do you know which of his wives, if either, went with him?

Mr. Smith: I could not say that I know positively, but I believe that it was his second wife.

The Chairman: Do you obey the law in having five wives at the same time, and having them bear to you eleven children since the manifesto of 1890?

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have not claimed that in that case I have obeyed the law of the land. * * * I do not claim so, I have said that I prefer to stand my chances against the law. * * * and I wish to assert that the Church has obeyed the law of the land, and that it has kept its pledges with this Government; BUT I HAVE NOT, as an individual, I have taken that chance myself. I understood that Apostle Grant merely announced the fact that he had two wives and that he had contributed $300.00 to a certain class in the University of Utah in honor of his two wives—$150 each. He announced it publicly. The anti-Mormon press of Salt Lake City took it up and made a great hubbub about it.

Senator Hoar: Now, between 1882 and 1885 and 1890 which was binding upon the conscience of the members of the Mormon Church, the old revelation or the Statute?

Mr. Smith: I think the leading authorities of the Church felt that the statute was binding, because it had become the confirmed law of the land. In other words the constitutional law of the land, having been so declared by the Supreme Court; but younger fellows like myself, Senator, were a little more difficult to control. I suppose I am the greatest culprit.

Senator Hoar: You are the head of the Church, and I ask you as the most authoritative and weighty exponent of its doctrines and belief, when in regard to personal conduct, the law of the land comes in conflict with the divine revelation received through you or your predecessor, which is binding upon the conduct of the true son of the church?

Mr. Smith: In this case—and I think you will accept it as the answer to your question—under the Manifesto of President Woodruff the law of the land is the binding law on the consciences of the people.

Senator Hoar: Before the Manifesto of Mr. Woodruff, is my question.

Mr. Smith: We were in something of a state of chaos about that time.

Senator Hoar: That is not the point. The point is, which, as a matter of obligation, is the prevalent authority, the law of the land or the revelation?

Mr. Smith: Well, perhaps the revelation would be paramount. I am simply expressing a view. * * * With another man the law would be accepted, and this was the position the people of the church were in until the manifesto settled the question.

Senator Hoar: * * * Suppose you should receive a divine revelation, communicated to and sustained by your church, commanding your people tomorrow to do something forbidden by the law of the land. Which would it be their duty to obey?

Mr. Smith: They would be at liberty to obey just which they pleased. There is absolutely no compulsion.

Senator Beveridge: Suppose them to be in conflict, Mr. Smith, which would control the conduct of the members of your church, the law of the land or the revelation?

Mr. Smith: I think under the discipline that we have had for the last twenty years our people would obey the law of the land.

Senator Beveridge: Mr. Smith, as a matter of conduct, where there is a conflict between revelation—or by whatever term it is called—and the law of the land, which, as a Church matter, does your Church direct the members to obey?

Mr. Smith: To obey the law of the land. That is what we have done absolutely.

The Chairman: Why is it necessary to continue to have issue by five wives in order to support and educate the children already in existence, why is it necessary?

Mr. Smith: It is only to the peace and harmony and good will of myself and my wives; that is all.

The Chairman: Then you could educate your children and clothe them and feed them without having new issue.

Mr. Smith: Well, yes; I possibly could, but that is just exactly the kernel in the nut. I have chosen not to do that, Mr. Chairman, and I am responsible before the law for my action.

The Chairman: And in not doing it, you are violating the law—

Mr. Smith: The law of my State.

Senator Overman: Is there not a revelation that is published in the Book of Covenants that you shall abide by the laws of the State and of the land?

Mr. Smith: Yes, sir.

Senator Overman: If that is the revelation, are you not violating the laws of God?

Mr. Smith: I understand your point, that the Church forbids me to violate the law, certainly it does—BUT THE CHURCH GAVE ME THOSE WIVES, AND THE CHURCH CANNOT BE CONSISTENT WITH ITSELF AND COMPEL ME TO FORSAKE THEM AND SURRENDER THEM.

Senator Bailey: "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away", and when the Lord gave this second revelation forbidding it—

Mr. Smith: HE DID NOT FORBID IT.

Senator Bailey: Well, he did, if the manifesto is based upon a revelation, because the manifesto declares against it.

Mr. Smith: The manifesto declares positively the prohibition of plural marriages, but the spirit and meaning of that revelation applied to unlawful cohabitation as well as to plural marriages.

Senator Bailey: That is what I was coming to now, Mr. Smith. Then, as I understand you, both plural marriage and unlawful cohabitation are forbidden by the statutes of Utah and by the revelations of God. Is that true?

Mr. Smith: That is the spirit of it, sir.

Senator Bailey: And yet you, as the head of the Church, are defying both.

Mr. Smith: Oh, no.

Senator Bailey: The statutes of Utah and the ordinance of the Church?

Mr. Smith: Not the ordinance at all.

Senator Bailey: If you will provide me with a better expression than that I shall be glad to adopt it. We will call it the law of the church.

Mr. Smith: Call it the rule of the Church, and I will understand.

Senator Bailey: But at any rate, it is a revelation forbidding alike plural marriage and unlawful cohabitation; and that revelation from the Lord is supplemented and reinforced by the statutes of the State of Utah.

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Senator Bailey: Is it true that the head of the Church in Utah is living in open and proclaimed defiance of the statutes of that State, and also in defiance of a revelation received by your predecessor—not your immediate predecessor, I believe, but a predecessor—and communicated to the Church and sustained by it? What I am trying to make clear is that it is a law not only of the State of Utah but also a law of the Church.

Mr. Smith: It is a rule of the Church. It (the manifesto) is equally binding on the Church, whether it is a revelation or a rule.

Mr. Worthington: And a man who disobeys it would be just as much out of harmony if it were a rule as if it were a revelation?

Mr. Smith: Just the same. The form of words that contains the manifesto, or is the manifesto, is a declaration by Wilford Woodruff, the head of the Church, that he will abstain from plural marriages and use his influence to prevent all others from entering into it.

Senator Bailey: But so far as that document is concerned, it nowhere indicates that there has been any light from heaven on the subject. It appears that it is in obedience to the law, and I rather think it puts the responsibility for discontinuing the practice of polygamy on the law of the land. I would not be sure, but I think maybe the concluding sentence indicates that it is a pure matter of obedience to the law; and while obeying the law is commendable, and I have no criticism about it, I am simply trying to—

Mr. Smith: It is certainly in pursuance of the decision of the Supreme Court declaring the law against plural marriages and against unlawful cohabitation constitutional, that the church was brought to the adoption of the rule of the church not to allow or permit any further plural marriages.

Senator Bailey: I understand; but that is a matter of law and not of religion.

Mr. Smith: Oh, no; it is a matter of religion.

Senator Bailey: At this time that the official declaration was made, it was not even the law of the church, I believe, until it was what you call sustained.

Mr. Smith: It was submitted to the entire church.

Senator Bailey: Yes. The very last sentence of it is:

"And I now publicly declare that my advice to the Latter-day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land."

He does not say that he has received a revelation that changes the law of the church. He simply says that he has come to a resolution to obey the law of the land. The instrument itself negatives that idea.

Now, I take it, if it had been a revelation, he would have used the language of a prophet rather than the language of a lawyer, and instead of declaring that inasmuch

as Congress had passed laws forbidding this he would have declared he had received a revelation. But so far as this question is concerned—so far as this official declaration is concerned—it is purely a question of law and not of conscience. Now, one other question, and that other question is suggested by that idea:

I noticed in response to Senator Hoar's question, Mr. Smith, you said as between a conflicting law and a conflicting revelation, the law would be binding on some and the revelation on others.

Mr. Smith: It might be, I said.

Senator Mailey: Do you mean by that that it would be binding as a matter of conduct or as a matter of conscience?

Mr. Smith: As a matter of conscience.

Senator Bailey: I cannot understand how a man who has any Christian faith can yield his conscience to the law, though I do understand how he can conform his conduct to it. I cannot quite understand how, if the revelation comes from on high, you could, as a matter of conscience, yield it to a law that is made by ordinary, every-day lawmakers, either in Utah or at Washington, though I understand perfectly well that as a question of good citizenship you would, in temporal affairs, yield to the law of the land. I will say to you very frankly that I do not have much patience with a doctrine which does not receive a revelation until there is a statute and where the revelation happens to conform to the statute. What I have been trying to fix in my mind is whether you taught that this was a revelation or merely a submission to the law. If it were a submission to the law, then it would be a question whether the Christian would submit to the laws of the land or to the laws of God. I do not pretend to judge about that, but when a sect teaches that an inspiration comes just after a statute has been passed and a report made to Congress, I do not quite understand that anybody is required to accept it as a revelation.

MAN IS WITHOUT EXCUSE

By Jacob H. Miller, B. D., Ph. D., N. D., D. C., Bismarck, North Dakota

(Contributed)

David declares: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."—Ps. 19:144.

Yes, Man Is Without Excuse

Daniel Warch, D. D., sums it up like this: "This divine constancy in the established order of Nature is one of the clearest and loudest voices with which God speaks to us in his works. It is one which the deaf can hear and the dull can understand. The inspired prophet in ancient time was instructed to adduce the constancy of the succession of day and night to confirm our faith in the stability of God's revealed word. Astronomers tell us with what exactness the covenant of the day and the night has been kept through the long succession of ages. And this is the more worthy of our reverent and thoughtful study because it is the covenant of order and harmony which binds the seasons in their course and directs the revolution of all worlds in their orbits.

"The vast globe of the earth swings in empty space with no support save the upholding word of the Almighty God. It flies in its orbit a thousand times faster than the swiftest railroad train. It rolls upon its axis so swift that a point on the surface at the equater moves as far from Boston to St. Louis in a single hour. It is this rolling of the earth on its axis that brings the day and the night. And the revolution is completed in absolutely the same time from age to age. The greatest astronomers the world has ever seen, Laplace and Arago and Herschel and Maedler, Skeptic and Christian alike, solemnly declare that the sidereal day has not varied in three thousand years the hundredth part of a second. If in ninety generations of men the day had grown longer or shorter by the hundredth part of the time that it takes the heart to beat once, astronomers could detect the change, and the covenant of the day and the night would be broken. But instruments that can meas-

ure the eighty-thousandth part of a second in space, and observations that have been continued three thousand years of time, can discover no variation.

"It is impossible for me to move my hand a single yard or walk the length of my room with a uniform motion. The inventive genius of man has never been able to make a wheel perform one revolution with perfect uniformity. The unseen hand of the Almighty has been turning the vast globe of the earth for three thousand years, and men have and the inanimate creation, with the nicest scrutiny till they have counted more than a million, and yet in all that time they have not detected the hundredth part of a second of irregularity. Every successive generation of observers finds the great earth-wheel rolling at the same rate, completing a revolution in the same time.

"The astronomer sits in his lonely tower and looks out upon the evening star. He remembers that in the tables of his sublime and mysterious science it was written by another hand a hundred years before that on that evening, at a particular moment, a small, round, dark spot would appear upon the edge of that planet, pass slowly across the face of it and disappear. He turns the great glassy eye of his telescope toward that bright orb, brings it to the center of his field of view, clamps the clock-work apparatus to hold it there, and then waits for the hour, the minute, the second to come.

"The heavens are calm and clear. The belted planet on which the eye of the telescope is fixed is four hundred million miles away in the pathless void, and beyond the fields of space are gemmed with countless worlds. All are upheld by one Infinite Mind. All are guided by one Almighty Hand. All are resplendent with the glory of one Supreme Creator. If He should forget one instant in a hundred years to roll the earth upon its axis or to wheel the planets in their orbits, that astronomer would look in vain for the spot to appear on the face of the evening star.

"But no: punctual to the instant of time, it touches the edge of the planet, advances and passes across the disk, and so proves that God's covenant of the day and the night remains unbroken. The Hand that holds the firmament of stars is not weary. The Mind that marks the course for millions of worlds can never forget, is never confused. No matter how vast the extent, how various the order, how complex and mighty the forces of orbs and systems and universes in existence, God governs them all with infinite ease. He will not suffer the day-spring to run before or fall behind its time the hundredth part of a second in a thousand years."

Truly, Man Is Without Excuse

Our philosophical knowledge takes too narrow and too low a range. There is need of a broader scope, and a higher aim. Education does not mean knowledge only. A person might have finished the best schools of learning, and yet not have the necessary knowledge to make use of his education.

Knowledge means more than the perusal of a certain course of study. It means more than believing a certain system of doctrine. It means more than a preparation for the life that now is. It has to do with the whole being, and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the PHYSICAL, the MENTAL, and the SPIRITUAL powers. It prepares the student for the joy of service in this world and for the higher joy of wider services in the world to come. Knowledge comes through a clear and certain apprehension of truth; backed or assured by a rational conviction. Such a knowledge will stand the storms of life. It will place a student upon a rock that will not be swept away by

the many changing traditions and philosophies of man.

The Book of Nature, which is spread open before man in living lessons affords a boundless source of instruction, in and through which the student of earth may apprehend the truth. On every leaf of the forest and stone of the mountains, in every shining star, in earth, sea and sky, the finger of design can be seen. With both animate and the inanimate creation with grasses, flowers, and trees, and with every little living creature, from the Leviathan of the sea to the mote in the sunbeam, the dwellers of earth may converse, gathering from each of them the secret workings of life. The glory of the heavens, the innumerable worlds in their orderly revolution, the balancing of the clouds, the mysteries of light and sound, of day and night, all are objects of study by the pupils of earth's school.

Paul the Apostle expresses it thus: "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse."—Romans 1:20.

Have faith in God. For "without faith it is impossible to please Him; for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him."—Hebrews 11:6.

HONESTY AND TRUTH

BY JOHN TAYLOR

I have been for some length of time past associated with the Gentiles. I have been engaged in battling corruption, iniquity, and the foul spirits that seem to fill the atmosphere of what you may term the lower regions, if you please; and the Lord has been with me, His Spirit has dwelt in my bosom, and I have felt to shout, Hallelujah! and to praise the name of the God of Israel, that He has been pleased to make me a messenger of salvation to the nations of the earth, to communicate the rich blessings flowing from the throne of God, and put me in possession of truth that no power on this or on the other side of hell can controvert successfully.

In regard to the world, the Elders who have been out, as I have, and as others have around me, know something of its nature and spirit, and the feelings by which the people are governed and actuated. Our young men and women, who have not come in contact with it, can scarcely conceive of the amount of iniquity, depravity, corruption, lying, deception, and abomination of every kind that prevails in the Gentile world.

Talk of honesty! It is a thing in theory; and they will preach about it as loud and as long as anybody. As a matter of theory, it is honorable to be honest—to be men of truth theoretically; but when you come to put your finger upon it, you cannot find it, it is like a shadow—it vanishes from your grasp.

Where are the men of truth—nationally, socially, religiously, morally, politically, or in any other way? Where are the patriots? Where are the men of God? I declare before you and high heaven, I have not found them. Sometimes I have thought I had got my hand upon one them, but they slipped out of my fingers.—(Aug. 9, 1857), J. of D., 5:113.

HOW BLANKETS WERE NAMED

Blankets were first made in 1337, in England, by Thomas Blanket and his brother. The coverings which make us scorn the blasts of winter have ever since been known by the name of their originators.

WHEN THEY MAY WED

In Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland and Mississippi, males 14 years of age and females 12 years of age are permitted by law to marry, provided they have the consent of their parents.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

By Truth Publishing Company

1153 Third Avenue

Salt Lake City, Utah

Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. APRIL, 1945. No. 11.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

THE greatest discovery of the next years will be along spiritual lines. Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of man and history. Some day the scientists of the world will turn to the study of the spiritual forces. When this day comes, the world will see more advancement in one generation than it has in the past four. —Charles Steinmetz, the famous inventor and research engineer.

A JURISDICTIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

Arguing the case of the so-called "Fundamentalists" before the Circuit Court of Appeals at Wichita, last November, defense attorneys assumed the position that the Federal court was without jurisdiction in the matter in so far as the Mann Act or White Slavery cases were concerned. The defendants, if guilty of a crime, were guilty only of an infraction of the State laws against polygamous marrying or "Unlawful Cohabitation". Having married the women they were accused of conducting over state lines under a religious ceremony, they were free to travel in any part of the United States without subjecting themselves to prosecution for White Slavery since that act could not be consummated with one's wife traveling with her husband over state lines in the regular course of legitimate business.

Asked for an example where other church laws may be brought to supersede Federal laws, sacramental. wines used in religious ceremonies by both the Catholic and Jewish churches, was mentioned. Suppose the Federal laws prohibited interstate shipment of wine to be used strictly in a religious ceremony could the Government legally prevent the securing of same?

The interpretation of the anti-polygamy law passed in 1862 was to the effect that while Congress could not interfere with one's religious belief, it could prevent action in line with that belief. Overt acts in harmony with belief might be legislated against. Thus the ordinance of Baptism, if legislated against, could be prohibited. One might believe in the sacrament of baptism and that short of partaking of that sacrament he would be damned, yet, under the Supreme Court decision he could be prevented from receiving it. Likewise the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Churches holding to the instruction of Jesus Christ to use

wine as a symbol of blood in the Sacrament might be prevented from doing so in sections where the majority enacted laws against the use of wine; but is that theory of law correct?'

Quoting the Rev. W. J. Canavan, J. C. D., in the Catholic "REGISTER" of January 14, 1945:

> **Negative laws bind more heavily than affirmative laws; divine laws, more than human; ecclesiastical, more than civil. In a collision of laws the higher law must be observed. In a possible case of civil laws conflicting with an ecclesiastical law, the Catholic must in conscience obey the Church law. FOR IT IS OF A HIGHER ORDER. An example of this was found several years ago when a state attempted to prohibit the use of all intoxicating beverages even for sacramental purposes. Churchmen were determined to say Mass, using wine, in defiance of the state law, because of the divine command: "Do this in commemoration of Me".**

This position is sustained by the Catholic Bishops in a letter drafted at Fulda, charging the German government with violation of the Berlin-Vatican concordat. This expression is noted:

> **But when the laws of the state conflict with the natural laws and God's commands, then God must be obeyed more than man. The letter, according to the dispatch, orders the faithful to follow the gospel and the commandments rather than man-made laws WHENEVER THE TWO CONFLICT.—TRUTH Vol. 1:61.**

Again, Father Marcean, of the Catholic church, in a radio talk in Salt Lake City, Nov. 6, 1938, stated:

> **God's laws must be obeyed whether civil or man's laws provide an opportunity or not. * * * We could not in justice to ourselves or the purposes of God place the civil law above the divine law, as the civil law is under the divine law and whatever authority it may have, it comes in consequence of the divine law. MAN MUST OBEY GOD AND HIS LAWS WHETHER THE STATE PERMITS IT OR NOT. Rulers are not and should not be permitted to be above the law and the principles of justice, as they are supposed to be the servants of the law and of the people.**

We regard the Catholic position sound: It was so regarded by our founding Fathers. Thomas Jefferson, an uncompromising champion of human liberty, said:

> **The rights of conscience we never submitted, we could not submit. We are answerable for them to our God. The legitimate powers of Government extend to such actions only as are injurious to others. * * * Constraint may make him worse by making him a hypocrite, but will never make him a truer man. It may fix him obstinately in his errors, but will not cure them. Reason and free inquiry are the only effectual agents against error.—A Review of the Reynolds case by George Q. Cannon, p. 19.**

James Madison, the fourth President of the United States, said:

> **That religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the FREE EXERCISE of religion, ACCORDING TO THE DICTATES OF CONSCIENCE; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity toward each other.—Ib. pp. 8 and 9.**

President George Washington was no less emphatic in his denunciation of restrictions on religious freedom. He said, as quoted by "LIBERTY" magazine, Vol. 35, No. 2, p. 4·

> **If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the constitution framed in the convention, where I had the honor to preside, might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE insecure, I beg you will be persuaded, that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of SPIRITUAL TYRANNY, AND EVERY SPECIES OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION. * * * I have often expressed my sentiments, that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.**

That this is good law is attested by Blackstone, the great English Jurist, who said:

If ever the laws of God and men are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the latter; that the law of God is, UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES, superior in obligation to that of man.—1 Black. Com. 16th. Ed, 58, N. (6).

True statesmanship will not allow prejudice to warp judgment, or to defeat the demands of justice. Because the Mormon marriage religion is unpopular with the masses affords no excuse for unlawful restrictions being placed on its free exercise. An example of lofty statesmanship is seen in a letter written by John Adams, the second President of the United States, to Thomas Jefferson, May 16, 1822, wherein he stated:

I do not like the late resurrection of the Jesuits. They have a General now in Russia, in correspondence with the Jesuits in the United States, who are more numerous than everybody knows. Shall we not have swarms of them here, in as many shapes and disguises as ever a king of the Gypsies—Bamfield Morecarew himself assumed—in the shape of printers, editors, writers, schoolmasters, etc. I have lately read Pascal's letter over again and four volumes of the history of the Jesuits. If ever any congregation of men could merit eternal perdition on earth and in hell, according to these historians, though, like Pascal, true Catholics, it is this company of Loyola. OUR SYSTEM, HOWEVER, OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY MUST AFFORD THEM AN ASYLUM. BUT IF THEY DO NOT PUT THE PURITY OF OUR ELECTIONS TO A SEVERE TRIAL, IT WILL BE A WONDER.—A Review of the Reynolds decision by Cannon, p. 38.

With such a pronounced aversion to this sect, statesman as he was, John Adams admitted that we were bound under our constitution to afford an asylum for this brotherhood; and he very properly did so. **Would to God such statesmanship would make its appearance in our law-making and interpreting bodies today!!!**

Added to this array of testimony we append words from our present President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, spoken at San Diego, October 2, 1935, to the world:

In the United States we regard it as axiomatic that every person SHALL ENJOY THE FREE EXERCISE OF HIS RELIGION according to the dictates of his conscience. Our flag for a century and a half has been the symbol of the principles of liberty of conscience, of religious freedom and equality before the law. * * * In our inner individual lives we can never be indifferent, and we assert for ourselves complete freedom to EMBRACE, to PROFESS, and to OBSERVE the principles for which our flag has so long been the lofty symbol.

A reasonable mind cannot avoid the conclusion that religious belief and actions based thereon, insofar as the action does not interfere with the rights of others, must be allowed and protected under our Constitution as well as under the rules of sanity. The courts, on their oaths, are bound to protect this right. Any religious act, however distasteful to the majority, but not otherwise harmful to mankind, must be protected and if attacked at all the weapons used must be arguments of reason and sanity and not the force of bigots.

In the old world men and women were subjected to the most frightful and inhuman treatment by the edicts of the majority, because their religious convictions caused them to disregard the desires of the majority. **Whistling on the Sabbath day, singing other than church psalms, riding horseback other than to church, kissing one's wife on that day, etc.,** met with heavy and most unnatural punishments. In England all were compelled to attend the State church and contribute to its upkeep, notwithstanding their strong aversion to that religion.

The Lord preserved the land of America as a place where human rights might be enjoyed with perfect freedom; it was intended as an asylum for the oppressed of all countries, and in framing the American Constitution the Lord inspired the founding Fathers to safeguard religious freedom with most zealous care. The clause for this protection was wrought into the Constitution during one of the greatest of hu-

man struggles. The champions contended for a government that all could be citizens of without qualms of doubt or hesitancy. Longacre, in his life of Roger Williams, a truly great champion of religious liberty, relates:

> **When the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in 1787, left the question of the establishment of a state church and of religious liberty untouched and undecided in the Constitution which it submitted to the people for ratification, the people of Rhode Island deliberately refused to ratify the Constitution, and served notice to the Federal Government that they would never ratify it unless and until a Bill of Rights was added that guaranteed absolute separation of church and state, the NONINTERFERENCE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN RELIGIOUS MATTERS, and the UNMOLESTED and FREE EXERCISE OF THE CONSCIENCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN RELIGIOUS CONCERNS.**
>
> After holding out three years Congress finally threatened the colony; bills of coercion were introduced and discussed; the boycotting of the colony was attempted by the other states, and even Washington was said to have become irked and impatient at the delay. Hamilton advocated coercing her, but the colony stood firm against surrender, demanding proper safeguards for religious liberty, and even threatening to arm against the states if coercion were attempted —"one man against sixty".
>
> It was James Madison and Thomas Jefferson that stepped into the breach in the critical moment. Jefferson said: "By the Constitution you have made, you have protected the Government from the people, but what have you done to protect the people from the Government?"
>
> These two champions of human rights, it is said, finally "persuaded President Washington to untie the Gordian knot by recommending the annexation of a Bill of Rights to the Constitution." This wise move resulted in adding the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as "the Bill of Rights". Rhode Island then (May 29, 1790) ratified the Constitution, appending to its ratification, however, the following admonition:
>
> **"That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, and not by force or violence, and therefore, all men have an equal, natural and unalienable right to the FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION, according to the dictates of conscience. and that no particular religious sect or society ought to be favored, or established by law in preference to others.—Life of Roger Williams. Longacre, p. 183-6.**

The sum total of this human contest brought into form this, the first clause in the Bill of Rights, **"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."** Such a guarantee, it was thought, would give ample protection to every citizen in his religious life. But that declaration, broad, full, definite, and sufficient as it seemed to be, was not broad enough to anticipate the bias, the prejudice, the political chicanery and the evil-minded purposes of men in the camp of the majority, who would seek the destruction of a small group of religionists, wresting from them their most precious heritage—religious freedom.

"You may believe as you choose", said the court, in effect, "but if you put that belief into action, even though to you it may be a command of God and it be your solemn conviction that unless you do put it into action you will be damned, we will employ the full powers of the government to destroy you and your church from off the face f the earth!" That is the sum of the freedom the God inspired Constitution of the greatest Republic on earth has resolved itself into, and that through the selfishness and wickedness of man!

The Latter-day Saints (now called "Fundamentalists") resent this high-handed, cruel, and wicked interpretation of constitutional law and claim the privilege of contending for their Godgiven rights.

HUMAN SACRIFICES AND THUGGISM

In the case of the United States against George Reynolds of the Mormon Church, on the charge of polygamy, as defined by the Morrill Act of 1862, the defendant was adjudged

guilty in the Territorial District Court of Utah. The indictment was brought October 30, 1875. In an appeal taken to the Supreme Court of the Territory the decision of the lower court was sustained. From this decision an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States which, on January 6, 1879, affirmed the judgments of the lower courts. The opinion of the court was delivered by Mr. Chief Justice Morrison Remick Waite.

At the time this case was brought before the court a very strong prejudice against the Mormon people had been whipped up in the nation. The faith of the Mormons introduced a new element in religion—that of latter-day revelation. Under the operation of the Priesthood the Saints were united in their faith; in their economics they held to the theory of the United Order, in general, as it existed in the Apostolic dispensation where "all things were had in common"; and in their family relations, marriage was performed—not for life only—but for eternity. They believed in the Patriarchal order of marriage such as Abraham and other ancients practiced. They believed in the gathering of the Saints out of Babylon to a Zion located in the United States, where a New Jerusalem would eventually be built, looking to the time when Christ would reign personally on the earth as the King of kings.

These doctrines, while scriptural, were against the prevailing faiths in Christendom. Bias, born of jealousy, departed from reason and satanic hatred was aroused against this small group of religionists. Then, too, Utah was being governed by Federal appointees—for the large part, "Carpet-baggers", worn out politicians, whose only opportunity for a political plum lay in such a field. This class of office-seekers was determined to overshadow Utah with their exclusive authority, and Washington was literally beseiged by lobbyists working for adverse action against the Mormons. Nothing too untruthful or hateful could be said of them, and practically nothing could be charged that was not believed.

It was in the midst of this tumult of expressed hatred that the Reynolds case came before the Supreme Court at Washington; and as reluctant as we are to impugn improper motives to the members of that august body of men, we cannot feel they were entirely unbiased in the treatment of the case.

The Supreme Court, in its decision, made the startling announcement "That polygamy has always been odious among the northern and western nations of Europe", and, of course, this is another reason why the Americans should ban it. But did the Court stop to reflect that the nations of Europe have always considered democracy odious? What has such a puerile thought, even if true, got to do with the rights of conscience?

To the plea that freedom of religion was granted by the Federal Constitution came the reply, "Freedom to believe, but not to act". The court, following the line of argument of the Attorney General, reasoned that under the Mormon theory one might practice Sutteeism and Thuggism in the name of their religion and demand the protection of the Government under the guarantees of the Constitution. It was that theory, as we read the decision in the case, that made the decision. Of course, in this day and age of enlightenment one would not expect that line of reasoning; and yet, paradoxical as it appears, the same argument is put forth and the same reasoning is resorted to today in cases against the Mormon marriage system. It was urged against Johnson and Spencer a few years ago at Kingman, Arizona. It was urged in the Federal and State courts here, but recently, where similar cases were involved. But why try and associate the Mormon marriage system with Sutteeism or Thuggism as these heathen prac-

tices were carried on in India and other countries many years ago?

What is the encyclopedic meaning of Suttee?:

> **Suttee (an English spelling of the Sanskrit SATI, "a virtuous wife"), a usage long prevalent in India, in accordance with which on the death of her husband the faithful widow burned herself on the funeral pyre along with her husband's body, or, if he died at a distance, was burned on a pyre of her own. The practice was in use in India as early as the times of the Macedonian Greeks (168 B. C.), and was based by Hindus on various of their sacred books and laws, etc. * * * Self-immolation, though not enforced on an unwilling victim, and not practiced except in certain castes and families of old descent, was almost made incumbent on well-born widows by force of public opinion, unless they were willing to risk their own happiness here and hereafter. In 1823 there were 575 widows burned in Bengal Presidency, 310 within the jurisdiction of Calcutta court. These ranged from 60 to less than 20 years of age. Lord William Bentinck's efforts to end these sacrifices first met with fierce opposition, until now the custom is practically extinct except for an occasional case of suttee in native territory outside of the British area. (On the death of Sir Jung Bahadur, prime-minister of Nepal, in 1877 several of his wives immolated themselves.)**

> **Thugs (from the Hindustani THAGA, "deceive"), the name for a religious fraternity in India, which, professedly in honor of the goddess KALI, the wife of SIVA, was addicted to the committal of murders, and lived upon the plunder obtained from its victims. They killed by strangling and poisoning. They considered their murders pious rites, and their profession more than respectable. The con-fraternity appears to have come into existence under the early Mohammdan rulers of India. It was Lord Bentinck who also destroyed this custom.**

It may not be surprising that our law-makers cannot discern the difference between plural marriage under the Mormon marriage system and India's Suttee and Thuggee. Many of them are not overly intelligent and most of them are doubtless imbued with political ambitions which depend on mass prejudice for jobs. However, it is to be wondered at that our judiciary is incapable of weaning itself from this palpable error. These men are presumed to hold their positions because of their even balance and judicial acumen. Of all men they are expected to be unbiased and fair. To them is given the sacred duty, as voiced by Jefferson, of "protecting the people from their government". The mantle of their wisdom and authority is expected to cover the weakest citizen from unlawful encroachments of the masses. They should be as pure in their decisions as the dews of heaven. Their acts should be so open and clear as to exclude all suggestion of bias.

While Suttee and Thugee, with other human sacrifices, means to depopulate, to murder, to rob innocent people of their natural rights to "enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness", plural marriage under the Mormon system is the direct opposite. Instead of taking and destroying life it gives life; instead of tearing down it builds up; instead of mothers sacrificing their babies in the Ganges as in India, they are taught to cuddle them at their breasts, love and cherish them as gifts from God. Using the words of George Q. Cannon:

> **The practice of Thuggism, if carried out, would blot man from existence, would convert the earth into a wilderness, would, in fact, destroy the work of the Great Creator; while marriage, as an old English writer (Jeremy Taylor) beautifully and truthfully says, "Is the mother of the world and preserves kingdoms, and fills cities and churches, and heaven itself. Like the useful bee, it builds a house, and gathers sweetness from every flower, and labors and unites into societies and republics, and sends out colonies, and feeds the world with delicacies, and obeys and keeps order, and exercises many virtues, and promotes the interests of mankind, and is the state of good to which God hath designed the present constitution of the world.**

Such is marriage, whether Monogamic or Plural, when entered into and carried on under the spirit of the Mormon marriage system.

We, of course, appreciate the modern tendency shown in monogamy to restrict birth by contraceptive means; and

that to become pregnant many wives and more husbands, regard it a serious accident or mishap. Not so with Mormon plural marriages whose grand purpose is children, is to build the "waste places of Zion" with a virile, healthy, race of men and women to man the "ship of state" and keep it afloat while earth's convulsions, as at present, are tearing the elements apart.

One may see no reason to restrict the Chinese placing rice on the graves of their departed for their sustenance enroute; to the American Indians having their horses, saddles and other accoutrements interred with them to assist in their contemplated journey heavenward; or to the placing of floral contributions, at fabulous expense, on the earth covering the Christian burials, for the corpse to smell and derive pleasure from, but when human life must be sacrificed to meet a religious ideology it is time the law steps in with its restraining powers. In other words, where the practice of religion breaks out in overt acts of thieving, arson, murder, etc., corrective legislation is proper. A true Christian civilization cannot tolerate such acts. But what is there in the family life of Abraham, the "Father of the faithful", or in that of Jacob, the father of the covenant race, that modern society should stand aghast at? Modern society is not asked to adopt Abraham's or Jacob's theory of family life, but only to permit the free scope with those worthy of and willing to adopt it in their lives. Plural marriage adherents do not bother celibates nor monogamists so long as they obey the laws of chastity, then why should these two classes interfere with patriarchal marriage groups, the beauty and strength of which is founded on the laws of chastity? Let them alone. Expose them to the light of reason and biological science all you want to—you Christian ministers and sociologists—and sooner or later the truth will be made clearly apparent.

THE GRAND SYSTEM OF MORMONISM

What potent faith had come into the world that a people should thus live and die by it?

Show us this new temple of theology in which the sisters had worshipped.

Open the book of themes which constitute the grand system of Mormonism.

The disciples of the prophet believed in the Book of Mormon; but nearly all their themes, and that vast system of theology which Joseph conceived, as the crowning religion for a world, were derived from the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament of Christ, and modern revelation.

New revelation is the signature of Mormonism.

The themes begin with Abraham, rather than with Christ; but they go back to Adam, and to the long "eternities" ere this world was.

BEFORE ADAM, WAS MORMONISM!

There are the **generations of worlds.** The Genesis of the Gods was before the Genesis of Man.

The Genesis of the Gods is the first book of the Mormon iliad.

"Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me.

"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare if thou hast understanding.

"Who hath laid the measures thereof if thou knowest? Or who hath stretched the line upon it?

"Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? Or who laid the corner-stone thereof:

"When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?

Brother Job, where wast thou? Joseph answered the Lord when the Masonic question of the Gods was put to him:

"Father, I was with **thee**; one of the 'morning stars' then; one of the archangels of thy presence."

'Twas a divinely bold answer. But Joseph was divinely daring.

The genius of Mormonism had come down from the empyrean; it hesitated not to assert its origin among the Gods.

This is no fanciful treatment—no mere flight to the realm of ideals. The Mormons have literally answered the Lord their Father, the question which he put to their brother, Job, and have made that anwer a part of their theology.

But where was woman "when the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy?"

Where was Zion? Where the bride? Where was woman?

"Not yet created; taken afterwards from the rib of Adam; of the earth, not of heaven; created for Adam's glory, that he might rule over her."

So said not Joseph.

It was the young East who thus declared. The aged West had kept the book of remembrance.

Joseph was gifted with wonderful memories of the "eternities past." He had not forgotten woman. He knew Eve, and he remembered Zion. He restored woman to her place among the Gods, where her primeval Genesis is written.

Woman was among the morning stars, when they sang together for joy, at the laying of the foundations of the earth.

When the sons of God thrice gave their Masonic shouts of hosanna, the daughters of God lifted up their voices with their brothers; and the hallelujahs to the Lord God Omnipotent, were rendered sweeter and diviner by woman leading the theme.

In the temples, both of the heavens and the earth, woman is found. She is there in her character of Eve, and in her character of Zion. The one is the type of earth, the other the type of heaven; the one the mystical name of the mortal, the other of the celestial woman.

The Mormon prophet rectified the divine drama. Man is nowhere where woman is not. Mormonism has restored woman to her pinnacle.

Presently woman herself shall sing of her divine origin. A high priestess of the faith shall interpret the themes of herself and of her Father-and-Mother God!

At the very moment when the learned divines of Christendom were glorying that this little earth was the "be-all and the end-all" of creation, the prophet of Mormondom was teaching the sisters in the temple of Kirtland that there has been an eternal chain of creations coming down from the generations of the Gods-worlds and systems and universes. At the time these lights of the Gentiles were pointing to the star-fretted vault of immensity as so many illuminations—lamps hung out by the Creator, six thousand years ago, to light this little earth through her probation — the prophet of Israel was teaching his people that the starry hosts were worlds and suns and universes, some of which had being millions of ages before this earth had physical form.

Moreover, so vast is the divine scheme, and stupendous the works of creation, that the prophet introduced the expressive word **eternities**. The eternities are the times of creations.

This earth is but an atom in the immensities of creations. Innumerable worlds have been peopled with "living souls" of the order of mankind; innumerable worlds have passed through their probations; innumerable worlds have been redeemed, resurrected and celestialized.

Hell-loving apostles of the sects were sending ninety-nine hundredths of this poor, young, forlorn earth to the bottomless pit. The Mormon prophet was finding out grand old universes, in exaltation with scarcely the necessity of losing a soul.

The spirit of Mormonism is universal salvation.

Those who are not saved in one glory may be saved in another.

There are the "glory of the sun", and the "glory of the moon", and the "glory of the stars".

The children of Israel belong to the glory of the sun. They kept their first estate. They are nobly trying to keep their second estate on probation. Let the devotion, the faith, the divine heroism of the Mormon sisters, witness this.

Adam is our father and God. He is the God "of the earth".

Adam is the great archangel of this creation. He is Michael. He is the Ancient of Days. **He is the father of our elder brother, Jesus Christ—the father of him who shall also come as Messiah to reign. He is the father of the spirits as well as the tabernacles of the sons and daughters of man. ADAM!**

Michael is one of the grand mystical names in the works of creations, redemptions and resurrections. Jehovah is the second and the higher name. Eloheim—signifying the Gods—is the first name of the celestial trinity.

Michael was a celestial resurrected being, of another world. * * *

When this earth had become the abode for mankind, with its Garden of Eden, then it was that the morning stars sang together, and the sons and daughters of God sang for joy. They were coming down to earth.

The children of the sun, at least, knew what the grand scheme of the everlasting Fathers and the everlasting Mothers meant, and they, both sons and daughters, shouted for joy. The temple of the eternities shook with their hosannas, and trembled with divine emotions.

The father and mother were at length in their Garden of Eden. They came on purpose to fall. They fell "that man might be; and man is that he might have joy." They ate of the tree of mortal life, partook of the elements of this earth that they might again become mortal for their children's sake. They fell that another world might have a probation, redemption and resurrection. * * *.—The Women of Mormondom, pp. 175-180.

THE ANCIENT OF DAYS

BY ORSON PRATT

Who is the Ancient of Days? This is a question frequently asked by the biblical student, especially those who have studied the prophecies of Daniel with any degree of attention. The most careless reader will have observed that the Ancient of Days is one of the most prominent personages introduced before Daniel, while he was wrapped in his prophetic vision.

Daniel had previously become extensively acquainted with the future history of the world. He had seen the rise, progress, and downfall of nations and kingdoms. Four great and powerful monarchies, which should bear rule over all the earth, and hold universal empire, had successively passed before him.

In a former vision he had seen the last of these monarchies divided and subdivided into smaller kingdoms; and

finally, after having viewed earthly governments in their various forms from his own day down for many generations, and having seen their corruptions and great wickedness, his mind was carried onward to a time when another or fifth kingdom should be established, bearing rule in righteousness over all the earth.

He saw that this last kingdom, instead of originating from those which had formerly held dominion, through the vain aspiring ambition of man, was established by the God of heaven, before which all other kingdoms wasted away till no place was found for them.

These grand events of future time which opened to his astonished vision, were calculated, no doubt, to excite an intense desire to become more extensivly informed in relation to futurity, especially concerning the organization and establishment of the kingdom of God, which he saw was eventually to sway a universal scepter over all the earth. The great God who is ever willing to satisfy the desires of those who honestly serve him, was pleased to unfold to him more of the particulars concerning the introduction of that glorious era when the saints were to bear rule.

The prophet was again enwrapt in a vision of the Almighty, and saw the same things which he had formerly seen, and being more prepared by experience, and more enlightend by the spirit of truth, his views were greatly enlarged.

In this wonderful vision he saw the ANCIENT OF DAYS SIT, clothed in great power and majesty. He was attended by unnumbered millions from the heavenly worlds—a grand council was organized upon the earth, over which he presided. The books were opened, and among the most important business which came before them, was the condemnation and judgment of some of the corrupt powers of the earth, and also the confirming of more power upon the saints, that they might be prepared for the reception of their Great King—the SON OF MAN, who was to come and take the kingdom, and reign in the greatness of his splendor, in the midst of his people forever.

The Great King, having sent forth the Ancient of Days, with the Grand Council of heaven, as messengers to set all things in their most perfect order, at length, appears in the clouds of heaven. He comes in royal splendor, and in the greatness of his strength, to the Ancient of Days who delivers up the kingdom into his hands, and henceforth all people, nations and languages, serve and obey him. O glorious period! O happy time!! How these glorious visions must have cheered the heart of Daniel in his long captivity! And how blessed, and how inexpressibly happy will that people be who inherit the earth in that day!

But who is this Ancient of Days that is to act this glorious and conspicuous part in the Grand Councils of the last days, and finally deliver up the kingdom organized and prepared, into the hands of the Great King?

It cannot be the Son of God, for he afterwards comes to the Ancient of Days. It cannot be the Father, for if the saints were prepared to meet the Father and set in council with him, they would also be prepared to meet the Son, for the glory of the Father is equal to that of the Son. Who then can it be? Let us reflect for a moment. The Ancient of Days! It must be some very ancient personage, and probably the most ancient personage that ever lived in days, and hence is called by that name, in distinction from all others that lived after.

But thanks be given to the most High God, for he has not left his saints in uncertainty about this matter, but has raised up a prophet, through whom he has revealed this mystery. Thus the saints will not be left in the dark in regard to the great purposes and events of the last days.

The Ancient of Days then is ADAM —the great progenitor of the human race. He has a mission to perform for the benefit of his children, in the last times. As he performed the FIRST MISSION on the earth in the beginning of the FIRST DISPENSATION, so he will perform a mission in the ending of the LAST DISPENSATION. In the FIRST he presided over a few; in the LAST he will preside over unnumbered millions.—Times & Seasons, 4: 204. (May 15, 1843).

ANCIENT RECORDS

Circumstances are daily transpiring which give additional testimony to the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. A few years ago, although supported by indubitable, unimpeachable testimony, it was looked upon in the same light by the world in general, and by the religious world in particular, as the expedition of Columbus to this continent was by the different courts that he visited, and laid his project before. The literati looked upon his expedition as wild and visionary, they suspected very much the integrity of his pretensions, and looked upon him—to say the least—as a fool, for entertaining such wild and visionary views.

The Royal courts, aided by geographers, thought it was impossible that another continent should, or could exist; and they were assisted in their views by the learned clergy, who, to put the matter beyond all doubt, stated that it was contrary to scripture; that the Apostles preached to all the world, and that as they did not come to America, it was impossible that there should be any such place.

Thus at variance with the opinions of the great, in opposition to science and religion, he set sail, and actually came to America. It was no dream, no fiction, but a solid reality; and however unphilosophical, and infidel the notion might be, men had to believe it; and it was soon found out, that it would agree both with religion and philosophy.

So when the Book of Mormon first made its appearance among men, it was looked upon by many as a wild speculation, and that it was dangerous to the interest and happiness of the religious world. But when it was found to teach virtue, honesty, integrity, and pure religion, this objection was laid aside, as being untenable.

We were then told that the inhabitants of this continent were, and always had been, a rude, barbarous race, uncouth, unlettered, and without civilization. But when they were told of the various relics that have been found indicative of civilization, intelligence and learning; when they were told of the wealth, architecture and splendor of ancient Mexico; when recent developments proved beyond a doubt, that there was ancient ruins in Central America, which, in point of magnificence, beauty, strength and architectural design, would vie with any of the most splendid ruins on the Asiatic continent; when they could trace the fine delineations of the sculptor's chisel, on the beautiful statue, the mysterious hieroglyphic, and the unknown character, they begun to believe that a wise, powerful, intelligent and scientific race had inhabited this continent. But still it was improbable, nay, almost impossible—notwithstanding the testimony of history to the contrary, that anything like plates could have been used anciently, particularly among this people.

The following letter and certificate, will, perhaps have a tendency to convince the skeptical, that such things have been used, and that even the obnoxious Book of Mormon, may be true. And as the people in Columbus' day were obliged to believe that there was such a place as America, so will the people in this day be obliged to believe, however reductantly, that there may have been such plates as those from which the Book of Mormon was translated.

Mr. Smith has had those plates. What his opinion concerning them is, we have not yet ascertained. The gentleman that owns them has taken them away, or we should have given a facsimile of the plates and characters in this number. We are informed, however, that he purposes returning with them for translation; if so, we may be able yet to furnish our readers with it.

It will be seen by the annexed statement of the Quincy Whig, that there are more dreamers and money diggers, than Joseph Smith, in the world, and the worthy editor is obliged to acknowledge that this circumstance will go a good way to prove the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. He further states that, "if Joseph Smith can decipher the hieroglyphics on the plates, he will do more towards throwing light on the early history of this continent than any man living." We think that he has done that already, in translating and publishing the Book of Mormon, and would advise the gentleman and all interested, to read for themselves, and understand. We have no doubt, however, but Mr. Smith will be able to translate them.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES AND SEASONS:

On the 16th of April last a respectable merchant by the name of Robert Wiley commenced digging in a large mound near this place: He excavated to the depth of 10 feet and came to rock. About that time the rain began to fall, and he abandoned the work. On the 23rd he and quite a number of the citizens with myself, repaired to the mound, and after making ample opening, we found plenty of rock, the most of which appeared as though it had been strongly burned; and after removing fully two feet of said rock, we found plenty of charcoal and ashes, also human bones that appeared as though they had been burned. Near the eciphalon a bundle was found that consisted of six plates of brass, of a bell shape, each having a hole near the small end, and a ring through them all, and clasped with two clasps. The ring and clasps appeared to be of iron very much oxidated. The plates first appeared to be copper, and had the appearance of being covered with characters.

It was agreed by the company that I should cleanse the plates. Accordingly I took them to my house, washed them with soap and water, and a woolen cloth. But finding them not yet cleansed I treated them with diluted sulphuric acid, which made them perfectly clean, on which it appeared that they were completely covered with hieroglyphics that none as yet have been able to read.

Wishing that the world might know the hidden things as fast as they come to light, I was induced to state the facts, hoping that you would give it an insertion in your excellent paper, for we all feel anxious to know the true meaning of the plates, and publishing, the facts might lead to the true translation. They were found, I judge, more than twelve feet below the surface of the top of the mound.

I am most respectfully a citizen of Kinderhook.

W. P. HARRIS, M. D.

The following certificate was forwarded for publication, at the same time.

We the citizens of Kinderhook, whose names are annexed do certify and declare that on the 23rd April, 1843, while excavating a large mound, in this vicinity, Mr. R. Wiley took from said mound, six brass plates of a bell shape, covered with ancient characters. Said plates were very much oxidated—the bands and rings on said plates mouldered into dust on a slight pressure. The above described plates we have handed to Mr. Sharp for the purpose of taking them to Nauvoo.

Rob't Wiley, G. W. F. Ward, Fayette Grubb, Geo. Deckenson, J. R. Sharp,.... W. P. Harris, W. Longnecker, Ira S. Curtis, W. Fugate.

—Times and Seasons, Vol. 4, pp. 185-6. May 1, 1843.

ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS

One of the oldest sacred records that has outlived the ravages of time is the Bible. Ancient manuscripts containing parts of the New Testament are still found in various places. A part of the Book of Mormon gives the history of families that emigrated to this continent from the Tower of Bable, viz: Jared, his brother, and their friends.

The brother of Jared talked with the Lord at the time of the confusion of languages, and some years after in the wilderness, and was commanded by Jesus Christ to write a record of it, but it was sealed up with the stones or interpreters, also by commandment, till after Christ was crucified.

Ether, a descendant of Jared, many generations after, wrote the record from which Moroni took his account; so Ether must have copied from the writings of Jared to have given an account of the latter speaking with Jesus Christ; that part of the original writing must therefore have been written soon after leaving the tower; but whether they and Ether's record were kept with the records containing the Book of Mormon, and were seen by Joseph Smith, is, I suppose, unknown.

The Book of Mormon, though not ancient in itself, is valuable as containing the only account and abridgement of those records, as well as a history of the Nephites, and of the Lamanites, taken from the records of Nephi, which were commenced nearly two-thousand four hundred years ago, and were hid up, 420 A. D. It differs from the Bible in this respect, that it was written and then hid in the earth, and after laying there undisturbed for centuries, was correctly translated by Joseph Smith, through the aid of the Urim and Thummim; while the Bible has been circulated among men ever since it was written, many manuscripts destroyed, and those that remain, in some instances at least, not correctly translated.

Among other sacred manusripts that have been found is one containing a description of Jesus Christ sent by Lentullus, President of Judea, to the Senate of Rome; also the death warrant of Jesus Christ; it was engraved on a copper plate, and found in an antique vase of white marble in the city of Abuilla in the kingdom of Naples, in the year 1826.

Recently a manuscript of Clemen Romanus, and of other early ecclesiastical writers, have been found in Constantinople, and last March two German scholars traveling in Southern Italy, in the place of the Archbishop of Rosano, found a very valuable manuscript of the whole of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and that of St. Mark down to the middle of the fourteenth verse of the sixteenth chapter; it consists of one hundred and eighty-eight leaves; the leaves are made of purple parchment; it is written with silver, except the first three lines of each Gospel which are golden.

It is supposed to have been written in the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century, and contains a number of painted miniatures illustrating the life of Christ, as the last supper, etc., and of the heads of forty prophets and one or two other subjects. Last year there died at Jerusalem, an old man one hundred and nine years of age. Among other things, after his decease, was found a manuscript on papyrus supposed to have been written by St. Peter; a commission from the Bible Society of London pronounced in favor of its authenticity.

We are all acquainted with the Book of Abraham, a translation of some ancient records found in the catacombs of Egypt, and now forming a part of the Pearl of Great Price.

As a people, we expect that before long other records will be revealed,

when the proper time has arrived. Some time we are to have the record of the lost Ten Tribes, and we very often read of the engravings on stone found in Mexico, which, no doubt, will be extremely interesting when deciphered. Is not the Doctrine and Covenants given in our own day as worthy of a place among sacred Scriptures as the reprints of those for which are paid fabulous prices, and which are prized so highly by lovers of religion and of the curious?

It is wonderful how the manuscripts have been preserved so long, and from their instruction and age are deserving of all the value attached to them, but as regards instruction it is strange how highly the reprints are prized, while the Book of Mormon, equal in worth, is passed coolly by, and in the estimation of the majority, does not even enjoy a reputation as high as a common novel. In future years may not the manuscript of the Book of Mormon, now in the possession of Mr. Whitmer, occupy the place to which it is entitled, side by side with sacred manuscripts, and rank with them in the estimation of the people as the most important translation into the English language, in correctness, if not extreme old age?—Mill. Star, 43: 212-3.

EXCERPTS FROM EPISTLE FROM THE FIRST PRESIDENCY OCTOBER 6, 1885

Well-meaning friends of ours have said that our refusal to renounce the principle of celestial marriage invites destruction. They warn us and implore us to yield. They appeal to every human interest, and adjure us to bow to a law which is admitted on all hands to have been framed expressly for the destruction of the principle which we are called upon to reject. They say it is madness to resist the will of so overwhelming a majority. They say they see the gathering clouds, that they hear the premonitory mutterings of the resistless tempest which is about to break in destructive fury upon our heads, and they call upon us to avert its wrath by timely submission. But they perceive not the hand of that Being who controls all storms, whose voice the tempest obeys, at whose fiat thrones and empires are thrown down—the Almighty God, Lord of heaven and earth, who has made promises to us, and who has never failed to fulfill all His words.

We did not reveal celestial marriage. We cannot withdraw or renounce it. God revealed it, and He has promised to maintain it, and to bless those who obey it. Whatever fate, then, may threaten us, there is but one course for men of God to take, that is to keep inviolate the holy covenants they have made in the presence of God and angels. For the remainder, whether it be life or death, freedom or imprisonment, prosperity or adversity, we must trust in God. We may say, however, if any man or woman expects to enter into the celestial kingdom of our God without making sacrifices and without being tested to the very uttermost, they have not understood the Gospel. If there is a weak spot in our nature, or if there is a fibre that can be made to quiver or to shrink, we may rest assured that it will be tested. Our own weaknesses will be brought fully to light, and in seeking for help, the strength of our God will also be made manifest to us.

* * * * *

We are expressly commanded, and it becomes our duty, to uphold and sustain every law of the land which is constitutional; we have always had a strong desire to obey such laws, and to place ourselves in harmony with all the institutions of the country.

It must be contended, however, that, as stated elsewhere, connected with this disposition to have our conduct passed upon as provided by law administered in the genius of justice, there never can be any hope of our

yielding up, under any circumstances, a principle of conscientious or religious conviction. Were we to make such a surrender, our conduct in that respect would not be in harmony with the guarantees of the Constitution, which we are in duty bound to uphold.

* * * * *

Upwards of forty years ago the Lord revealed to His Church the principle of celestial marriage. The idea of marrying more wives than one was as naturally abhorrent to the leading men and women of the Church at that day as it could be to any people. They shrank with dread from the bare thought of entering into such relationships. But the command of God was before them in language which no faithful soul dare disobey.

"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 my glory. * * * And as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fullness of my glory; and he that receiveth a fullness thereof, must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God." * * *

It never entered into their minds to suppose for a moment that man had a right, after God had given a law to His Church for its salvation and exaltation, to enact a counter law forbidding, under severe penalties, man's obedience to God's law. Who could suppose that any man, in this land of religious liberty, would presume to say to his fellow-man that he had no right to take such steps as he thought necessary to escape damnation! or that Congress would enact a law which would present the alternative to religious believers of being consigned to a penitentiary if they should attempt to obey a law of God which would deliver them from damnation! Or that, under a plea of maintaining a certain form of civilization God's authority to direct His people how to escape from the abominable corruptions and evils which are eating out the vitals of man's much vaunted civilization, should be disputed and utterly rejected!

* * * * *

We never have believed or taught that the doctrine of celestial marriage was designed for universal practice. The Lord has made this clear, and recent events among us have also made it clear. "Straight is the gate", says Jesus, "and narrow the way that leadeth unto the exaltation and continuation of the lives, and few there be that find it."

(Signed) John Taylor
Geo. Q. Cannon

Apostle F. M. Lyman said: "With regard to compromising a single principle of the Gospel, the speaker said, if we as a people were to be guilty of such an act of moral cowardice, we would prove ourselves unworthy of the name we bore, and we could not escape the very opposition we would fain avoid."

Elder S. B. Young endorsed the language and sentiments of the Epistle of the first Presidency, and those of the previous speaker. The sentiments of some men respecting our condition and the course we should pursue in order to place ourselves in harmony with the law affecting our marital relations, reminded him of some remarks made on a certain occasion by A. W. Babbitt with regard to the Prophet Daniel's course when he found himself in conflict with the law made especially for him. Babbitt said if he had been in that position he would have considered it politic and justifiable to close the doors and draw the blinds when approaching the throne of grace. After he sat down President Young arose and sharply rebuked him for advancing such a doctrine, and said that, **had Daniel done otherwise than he did, under the circumstances, he never could**

have been favored of the Lord, neither could he have been delivered from the hands of his enemies. The position occupied by Daniel was parallel to that in which we were placed, and there remained but the one course for us to pursue, namely, to be true to our God, maintaining the honor of His name at the risk of even life itself.

The Kingdom spoken of by Daniel must be established, and it would be built on the principles of truth and righteousness by a people who would recognize and acknowledge Him in all things. In this respect that people would differ widely from our own nation especially if a certain anecdote he had heard reflected correctly its religious status. It ran thus: A certain minister, it was said, applied at the bar of the House of Representatives to be admitted. He was asked what court he represented. The minister replied, the Court of High Heaven. He was politely informed that he could not be admitted, as our government had ceased all relationship with that foreign power.

GOVERNING CHILDREN

The following instructions on governing children were given by President Brigham Young in the Salt Lake Tabernacle. He said, if followed, these rules would raise the children of the saints up in righteousness so God could use them. He said they were given in answer to his seeking these revelations.

"Sow in the morn thy seed. At eve hold not thy hand."

1. Threaten seldom and be careful how you threaten. Never lie. Some parents tell lies No wonder their children become liars.

2. Never scold your children nor tell them to do a thing (no, not the least trifle) unless you intend them to do it now.

3. Never give them anything for their crying. Some parents (very unwisely) endeavor to pacify their little ones by promising of sweetmeats or sometimes telling them of witches, ghosts, lions or about bears or the black man will catch them! Abominable!! Such impressions are often ruinous, lasting as eternity. Some children have actually been frightened to death.

4. Never allow your children to be wasteful. This evil will follow them to the grave. Bread, pie, cake, and other fragments of food partially eaten are often thrown away! Shameful! Thousands are now perishing for the crumbs that fall from your table. Christ said, when he fed the multiude, "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost."

5. Never allow your children to cry for mere trifles. Some acquire this habit very young and will cry, fret, whine or sniffle continuously until their little faces actually become wrinkled from crying. Stop this thing. Stop it now. Stop it forever. Your own happiness and those around you demand it!

6. Govern the appetites of your children. Let their meals be regular, their diets plain and simple, always keeping in rein their age, circumstances, exercise. As self denial is the first and most important thing, the very essence of well being. Lay your hands here firmly, let self denial be first and last always.

7. Never permit your children to be tempters to others. We know one family of children perfect tormenters to all around them. Impudent! Most intolerable!

8. Do you punish sometimes for willful disobedience, chastize corporally? Very well, this is correct.

9. Never let it be said or thought by a child, "I can do such and such; mama or papa isn't here."

10. Never let a child know his parents disagree on any matter of his behavior.

FIRST AID TO THE INJURED

Lightning—Dash cold water over person struck.

Sunstroke—Remove patient into shade, loosen clothing; apply ice cold water to head and keep head in elevated position.

Fainting—Place patient flat on back; allow fresh air and sprinkle with water. Have head lower than rest of body.

Stings of Insects—Apply solution of weak ammonia, oil, salt water or iodine.

Burns and Scalds—Apply either vaseline, linseed, olive, or castor-oil, white lead paint, whitewash or molasses.

Sprained Ankle or Wrist—Apply cracked ice in handkerchief, or cold water. When swelling has decreased, rub with alcohol or salt water.

Mad Dog or Snake Bite—Tie cord above wound; suck the wound and cauterize with caustic or white hot iron at once. Give stimulants such as whiskey and brandy.

Gunshot Wounds—Bandage tightly above wound to stop bleeding; remove foreign matter about wound, and splints should be applied to hold limb rigid.

Nosebleed—This may usually be arrested by putting a plug of lint into each nostril and cold applications to head and nape of the neck.

Scalp Wounds—Bleeding may be easily stopped by tightly bandaging the injured part.

Bruises—Apply arnica and wormwood or witch-hazel; keep well covered and warm.

Bleeding from Wound—If from an artery, stop the current of blood to the wound by binding a compress or cloth pad over the artery, which can generally be located by the throbbing sensation. Fasten it firmly by a handkerchief or bandage which may be tightened by twisting in a stick as a binder If from a vein, apply pressure directly over the wound, or make application of cold water. Keep the part elevated.

IT WORKED

A parson, walking down the street of an English village, was attracted by some very strong and colorful language close by. Turning, he observed a man having difficulty in slipping the rim of his spare tire on the wheel.

"My good man, that kind of language won't help you", he said. "When you are in trouble you should ask the Lord to help you."

"Well", replied the angry driver. "I've tried everything else, I might as well try that."

So saying, be bowed his head for a moment, then raised up, took the rim and slid it smoothly onto the wheel. The parson looked, scratched his head, and "Well, I'll be ———", he said.

Life is not what we make it—
Life is how we take it.

NEVER CAN TELL

A private in an army chapel was seen to bow slightly whenever the name of Satan was mentioned. One day the minister met him and asked him to explain.

"Well", replied the private, "politeness costs nothing—and you never know."

"Jimmy, I wish you'd learn better table manners; you're a regular little pig at the table."

Deep silence on Jimmy's part. So father, in order to impress him more, added, "I say, Jim, do you know what a pig is?"

"Yes, Dad", replied Jimmy meekly, "it's a hog's little boy."

TYPING SYSTEM

"Can you type?"
"Yes, I use the Columbus system."
"What's that?"
"I discover a key, then land on it."

He: "Well, I suppose you're angry because I came home with this black eye last night."

She (sweetly): "Not at all, dear. You may not remember it, but when you came home you didn't have that black eye."

TSK! TSK!

Girl Customer: "Does this lipstick come off easily?"

Cosmetic Clerk: "Not if you put up a fight!"

IT LOOKS LIKE A RACKIE

A young man whose name isn't Sappie,
Thought that he could be quite happy
By spying and snooping
And otherwise stooping
And make others take the wrappie.

This bird whose name rhymes with crappie
Evolved a scheme that's distastie;
Got in touch, so they
With a name like McHay,
Got rich, but he's still a sappie.

Sappie and Letzer and Kurtis
Tried their darndest to hurt us.
Now Old Satan would say:
"All you three are O. K."
But our Lord will not desert us.

LITTLE ORPHANT ANNIE

Little Orphant Annie's come to our house to stay,
An' wash the cups and saucers up, an' brush the crumbs away,
An' shoo the chickens off the perch, an' dust the hearth, an' sweep,
An' make the fire, an' bake the bread, an' earn her board-an'-keep;
An' all us other children, when the supper things is done,
We set around the kitchen fire an' has the mostest fun
A-list'nin' to the witch-tales 'at Annie tells about,
An' the Gobble-uns 'at gits you
Ef you
Don't
Watch
Out!

Onc't they was a little boy wouldn't say his prayers,—
So when he went to bed at night, away up stairs,
His Mammy heerd him holler, an' his Daddy heerd him bawl,
An' when they turn't the kivvers down, he wasn't there at all!
An' they seeked him in the rafter-room, an' cubby-hole, an' press,
An' seeked him up the chimbly-flue, an' ever'-wheres, I guess;
But all they ever found was thist his pants an' roundabout!
An' the Gobble-uns'll git you
Ef you
Don't
Watch
Out!

An' one time a little girl 'ud allus laugh an' grin,
An' make fun of ever' one, an' all her blood an' kin;
An' onc't when they was "company", an' ole folks was there,
She mocked 'em an' shocked 'em, an' said she didn't care!
An' thist as she kicked her heels, an' turn't to run an' hide,
They was two great big Black Things a-standin' by her side,
An' they snatched her through the ceilin' 'fore she knowed what she's about!
An' the Gobble-uns'll git you
Ef you
Don't
Watch
Out!

An' Little Orphant Annie says, when the blaze is blue,
An' the lampwick sputters, an' the wind goes woo-oo!
An' you hear the crickets quit, an' the moon is gray,
An' the lightning'-bugs in dew is all squenched away,—
You better mind yer parents, and yer teachers fond and dear,
An' churish them 'at loves you, an' dry the orphant's tear,
An' he'p the pore an' needy ones 'at clusters all about,
Er the Gobble-uns'll git you
Ef you
Don't
Watch
Out!
—James Whitcomb Riley.

HOW DOTH THE LITTLE BUSY BEE

How doth the little busy bee
Improve each shining hour,
And gather honey all the day
From every opening flower.

How skilfully she builds her cell;
How neat she spreads her wax,
And labors hard to store it well
With the sweet food she makes.

In works of labor or of skill,
I would be busy too;
For Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do.

In books, or work, or healthful play,
Let my first years be passed;
That I may give for every day
Some good account at last.
—Isaac Watts.

DOES IT MAKE SENSE?

For serious consideration I offer this bit of vital news:

October, 1944: Jury finds Utah women guilty of conceiving and raising American children unlawfully.

January, 1945: Army sends out urgent plea for more American man-power.

Does it make sense?

—Edward Midgard.

However dull a woman may be, she will understand all there is in love; however, intelligent a man may be, he will never know but half of it.—Madame Fee.

When love and skill work together expect a masterpiece.—John Ruskin.

TRUTH

TRUTH IS KNOWLEDGE OF THINGS AS THEY ARE, AND AS THEY WERE, AND AS THEY ARE TO COME.

VOL. 10. MAY, 1945. NO. 12.

An Epistle

FROM THE FIRST PRESIDENCY OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS (October 6, 1885)

Prepared by the Brethren While in Hiding from United States Officers, to Avoid Arrest and Further Persecution for Living a Divine Law.

★

The Edmunds Law Special Legislation—Guilt of Saints Presumed on Arrest—The Famous Segregation Outrage — Persecution to Be Thankful For—Only the Pure in Heart to See God—The Value of Chastity.

★

(Deseret Evening News, October 7, 1885; Mill. Star 47:705 et seq.; The Reed Smoot Investigation, Vol. 2: pp. 460-475.)

★

TO THE OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS.

Brethren and Sisters:

As the time for holding our semi-annual conference has again come around, and we are still prevented from addressing the saints in public, we deem it proper to take this method of communicating with you, that you may know the counsel we have to give and that we are not neglectful of the duties which devolve upon us as the first presidency of the church.

As all the saints doubtless understand, there has been no cessation since last we wrote in the work of persecution. It rages, if anything, more fiercely than ever. Under cover of what is called the Edmunds law, the most outrageous acts of oppression are being perpetrated against the Latter-day Saints. The avowal has been openly made that this law was expressly designed for the destruction of a principle of our religion, and in this spirit all the persecutions have been conducted. Thus far no criminal, however guilty, who has not been a "Mormon" has been punished under it. **Acts of the most sickening depravity have been committed by non-Mormons within easy reach of its arm, but have scarcely had a pass-**

ing notice. While it is also worthy of note that up to the present writing, out of all who have been accused and brought before the district court, only one Mormon has been acquitted. The man acquitted, we understand, was charged with being the husband of a woman, on the ground that he had camped in his wagon in a 10-acre lot in which her residence stood and had carried some crickens for her to market.

One of the most remarkable features connected with the administration of this law is the extraordinary rulings which are made in its enforcement. The judge who presided in the second judicial district in the recent trial of a case of unlawful cohabitation gave instructions to the jury at the request of the defense. Several accused persons would have been cleared in the third judicial district had the juries which rendered verdicts in their cases been similarly instructed. They are as follows:

1. Prior to the act of March 22, 1882, cohabitation with more than one woman was not unlawful.

2. If you find from the evidence that the defendant, since the passage of the Edmunds Act, March 22, 1882, and within the dates named in the indictment, has not held out to the world, introduced, or announced more than one of the women named in the indictment as his wife, you should acquit the defendant.

3. It is not necessary that the parties to a polygamous marriage, or who have lived in the practice of cohabitating with two or more women, should divorce themselves in order to entitle them to the presumption of innocence of cohabitation after the passage of the law.

4. As all children of polygamous marriages begotten before March 22, 1882, are legitimated and no cohabitation before that date was unlawful, no criminating inference can be drawn by the jury from the defendant's later acknowledgment of his paternity of such children by the women mentioned in the indictment, nor from later recognition of such women as their mothers, and as women whom he had before said date taken into the polygamous relation with him.

* * *

6. The law presumes innocence, and therefore that all persons who were cohabiting when the Edmunds Act took effect contrary to the provisions of that act then ceased to do so.

* * *

8. The law presumes that all persons charged with a criminal offense to be innocent until the presumption is overcome by proof; therefore it presumes that all persons who were living with more than one woman as wives prior to March 22, 1882, have since that date ceased to live and cohabit.

9. If you find from the evidence that defendant had children by the women named in the indictment prior to March 22, 1882, then the defendant had a right to visit his children and support them and make arrangements as to their welfare. He had a right also to assist their mothers in their support, and for such a purpose could visit the house where they and their mothers live. He could furnish them a home, he could visit the mother, the same as if they had been divorced, or as if no such previous relations had existed between them, but he should not associate with her as a husband associates with his wife.

Do we say too much if we state that there are those now undergoing punishment in the penitentiary, in the society of thieves and murderers, who would be as free as the prosecuting officers themselves had the law been construed by the legal canons applied to other laws, and according to the instructions given above?

The practice in these attacks upon us has not been to presume the accused innocent until proved guilty, but to

view him as undoubtedly guilty because accused; and the rulings of the court in several instances have been made to secure conviction where the evidence was open to question. The extraordinary ruling concerning "holding out" is one in point; notwithstanding the Edmunds law specifies that the penalty for unlawful cohabitation shall not be more than six months' imprisonment and $300 fine, the notorious ruling from the same bench concerning the number of indictments which can be found against a person accused of unlawful cohabitation, states that he not only can be indicted once for the whole period since the passage of the law, but an indictment can be found for every week of that time; so that, if found guilty in this manner, a man's punishment would aggregate an imprisonment of ninety-two years and fines to the amount of $55,200.

Still more extraordinary is the ruling of another judge, who, not to be outdone in his zeal, says that an indictment can be found for this charge against a man for every day, or other distinct interval of time since the enactment of the law. **As about 1,292 days have passed since then, a man found guilty can be incarcerated in prison for 646 years and made to pay fines to the amount of $387,600. Comment upon this absurdity is unnecessary.**

Before the Edmunds bill became law, and while on its passage, it was claimed that its provisions were of general application and in the interests of morality, and not, as we asserted, a measure directly aimed at religious liberty and for purposes of persecution. But time has fully revealed its true character. Stripped of all disguise it stands out now in all its hideousness. The most shocking immorality flourishes in its presence and thrives under the very eyes of its administrators. All forms of vice, if not directly encouraged by those who are charged with the duty of administering the Edmunds law, are at least viewed by them with indifference. They appear to have no care as to the most flagrant sexual crimes if they are only committed by non-Mormons, or outside of the pale of matrimony. Mormons, also, under the present administration of the law, may do what they please with women, be guilty of the foulest injustice to them and their offspring, if they will only disown them as wives. **The war is openly and undisguisedly made upon our religion.** To induce men to repudiate that, to violate its precepts and to break its solemn covenants, every encouragement is given. The man who agrees to discard his wife or wives and to trample upon the most sacred obligations which human beings can enter into, escapes imprisonment and is applauded; while the man who will not make this compact of dishonor, who will not admit that his past life has been a fraud and a lie, who will not say to the world, **"I intended to deceive my God, my brethren, and my wives by making covenants I did not expect to keep", is, besides being punished to the full extent of the law, compelled to endure the reproaches, taunts, and insults of a brutal judge.**

Nothwithstanding all these cruelties are practiced against us, we do not feel that, as Latter-day Saints, we should mourn because of them. We should mourn because of our weaknesses, follies, and sins, and repent of them. But to be persecuted, to be discriminated against, to be separated from the rest of the world, to be imprisoned and abused are not causes of sorrow to true saints; they are causes of rejoicing. If, in the great hereafter, we expect to be admitted to the society of the Son of God, our Redeemer, to the society of prophets and apostles, and holy men and women, ought we not to be willing to endure the tribulations which they received so joyfully? Where is the prophet or apostle who did not endure persecution, whose liberty and life were not in almost constant jeopardy? They did not have an Edmunds law, perhaps, enforced against them; but they had laws which emanated from the same

source. With few exceptions they were all punished, deprived of liberty and of life, in the sacred name of law. Even the holiest being that ever trod the earth, the great Redeemer of mankind himself, was crucified between two thieves to satisfy Jewish law

There has probably never been a time in the history of mankind when those whom we now revere as martyrs and whose sacrifices adorn and glorify our humanity and lift it nearer to God could not, by being recreant to the truth intrusted to them, have escaped the fate which made them so admirable to the generations which followed them. The Savior himself had it in his power to compromise with his enemies and escape the cruel and ignominious death inflicted upon him. Abraham might have bowed to the gods of his idolatrous father and needed no angel to rescue him from his impending doom. Daniel and his three brethren, also, might have submitted to the decree and law of the ruling powers under which they lived and escaped the fiery furnace and the den of lions. Their refusal to obey the decree and law doubtless appeared to those who had not the knowledge of God which they possessed as acts of wicked obstinacy that should be summarily punished. But had they, to escape the threatened penalty, obeyed these edicts posterity would have lost the benefit of their example and the great God would not have been glorified before their contemporaries as He was by their acts. Instead of their names being, as now, radiant with light and resplendent with heroism they would, had they reached us, been covered with odium and been mentioned in the same category with the Jews concerning whom the prophet Jeremiah said: **"They bend their tongues like their bow for lies; but they are not valiant for the truth upon the earth, for they proceed from evil to evil, and they know not me, saith the Lord."**

Well-meaning friends of ours have said that our refusal to renounce the principle of celestial marriage invites destruction. They warn us and implore us to yield. They appeal to every human interest and adjure us to bow to a law which is admitted on all hands to have been framed expressly for the destruction of the principle which we are called upon to reject. They say it is madness to resist the will of so overwhelming a majority. They say they see the gathering clouds, that they hear the premonitory mutterings of the resistless tempest which is about to break in destructive fury upon our heads, and they call upon us to avert its wrath by timely submission. But they perceive not the hand of that Being who controls all storms, whose voice the tempest obeys, at whose fiat thrones and empires are thrown down—the Almighty God, Lord of heaven and earth, who has made promises to us and who has never failed to fulfill all His words.

We did not reveal celestial marriage. We cannot withdraw or renounce it. God revealed it, and He has promised to maintain it and to bless those who obey it. Whatever fate, then, may threaten us, there is but one course for men of God to take, that is, to keep inviolate the holy covenants they have made in the presence of God and angels. For the remainder, whether it be life or death, freedom or imprisonment, prosperity or adversity, we must trust in God. We may say, however, if any man or woman expects to enter into the celestial kingdom of our God without making sacrifices and without being tested to the very utmost, they have not understood the gospel. If there is a weak spot in our natures, or if there is a fiber that can be made to quiver or to shrink, we may rest assured that it will be tested. Our own weaknesses will be brought fully to light, and in seeking for help the strength of our God will also be made manifest to us. The Latter-day Saints have been taught this from the beginning. Such scenes as we now witness in these mountains and hear about in lands where the elders are preaching the gospel ought not

to be a surprise to us. The prophets and apostles and elders of this dispensation would be false prophets and apostles and elders if these events did not take place; for they have predicted them and warned the people unceasingly concerning them.

Speaking concerning the law, the Lord, in a revelation given through the Prophet Joseph Smith, August 6, 1833, says:

> **4. And now, verily I say unto you concerning the law of the land, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them;**
>
> **5. And that law of the land WHICH IS CONSTITUTIONAL, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind, and is justifiable before me;**
>
> **6. Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the CONSTITUTIONAL LAW OF THE LAND;**
>
> **7. And as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever is more or less than these cometh of evil.**
>
> **8. I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore ye are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free.**
>
> **9. Nevertheless, when the wicked rule the people mourn.**
>
> **10. Wherefore, honest men and wise men should be sought for diligently, and good men and wise men ye should observe to uphold; otherwise whatsoever is less than these cometh of evil.**
>
> **11. And I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good; that ye shall live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God:**
>
> **12. For He will give unto the faithful line upon line, precept upon precept, and I will try you and prove you herewith;**
>
> **13. And whoso layeth down his life in my cause, for my name's sake, shall find it again, even life eternal:**
>
> **14. Therefore be not afraid of your enemies, for I have decreed in my heart, saith the Lord, that I will prove you in all things, whether you will abide in my covenant even unto death, that you may be found worthy;**
>
> **15. For if ye will not abide in my covenant, ye are not worthy of me."**

Fifty-two years have passed since this was given to the church, and we are now witnessing its fulfillment. The saints are required to do whatsoever the Lord commands them, to live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God. They are also instructed to **befriend every constitutional law of the land, for such laws support the principle of freedom—they maintain rights and privileges. This, as a people, we have striven to do from the beginning of our organization. We have ever been a law-abiding people.** Times without number we have suffered the most grievous wrongs without resenting them. We have ever thought it better to suffer wrong than to do wrong.

Such was the case when we suffered expatriation from the State of Missouri. We were robbed and pillaged, despoiled and persecuted, yet we had no idea of retaliating, on account of these wrongs, upon the Government and its institutions, which to us are sacred. The same loyal spirit animated us when we were beset by bloodthirsty mobs in Illinois, one of which murdered Joseph Smith, our prophet, and Hyrum Smith, the patriarch, while they were under the pledged protection of the State, given through the governor. On the same occasion one of the signers of this address was also brought to the gate of death by being shot by the same band of assasins. When driven from the homes we had established in Illinois, we had no disposition to hold the nation at large nor the Government of our beloved country responsible for those inhuman deeds, nor to allow the spirit of vengeance to rankle in our hearts. We took the first opportunity to exhibit the spirit of true patriotism. While undergoing great hardship on account of being subjected to a compulsory exodus, when called upon by the Government to furnish a body of men to take part in the war with Mexico 500 of the flower of our camp responded with alacrity and

in accordance with the call of our country, traversed the great American desert, penetrated to Mexico, and completed an arduous and hazardous campaign, and journeyed to California.

You have no doubt read, through the papers, an account of the terrible affair which recently occurred at Rock Springs, in Wyoming Territory. We could not help feeling a little anxiety lest some of our people should have been connected with that bloody riot, and immediately requested Brother Cluff, president of Summit stake, to inquire into the matter. So far as we have obtained information to the present, however, we find that not more than one has been in any way mixed up with that matter, and he a person of doubtful standing. We are pleased to learn of this, because we cannot associate with any deeds so revolting and inhuman, and we take this opportunity to express our opinion on this subject to the saints. A great number of secret societies are formed with which we cannot affiliate. Such organizations are generally inimical to law, to good order, and in many instances subversive of the rights of man. We cannot amalgamate with them. They are very distinctly spoken against in the Book of Mormon as among the calamities which should afflict the people.

We are expressly commanded, and it becomes our duty, to uphold and sustain every law of the land which is constitutional. We have always had a strong desire to obey such laws and to place ourselves in harmony with all the institutions of the country.

We repeat that we desire that all men should be aware of the fact that we have been the upholders of the Constitution and laws enacted in pursuance of that sacred instrument.

We still entertain the same patriotic disposition and propose to continue acting in conformity with it to the last. Neither have we any desire to come in active conflict even with statutes that we deem opposed to the Constitution both in letter and spirit. Whatever opposition has been offered in that line has been only of such a character as is justified by the usages and customs of this and all other civilized countries and such as the laws and institutions of this nation provide. Nor have we the least desire to shun the consequences of our acts in their relationship to the laws to which we refer, providing there were any assurance that our cases would be submitted to a fair and just adjudication. Events of the past few months give no ground for hope that such treatment would be accorded. It must be contended, however, that, as stated elsewhere, connected with this disposition to have our conduct passed upon, as provided by law administered in the genius of justice, **there never can be any hope of our yielding up, under any circumstances, a principle of conscientious or religious conviction. Were we to make such a surrender our conduct in that respect would not be in harmony with the guaranties of the Constitution, which we are in duty bound to uphold.**

In order to place our people at a disadvantage and to crush out their religious system, the Constitution has been violated in a number of ways. It does not require any depth of legal learning to understand what is meant by a religious test, which is forbidden by the "supreme law of the land". Yet laws have been passed applicable to a wide section of this Northwestern country, disfranchising and inflicting total political disabilty upon our people without regard to their acts. The offense for which this restriction has been prescribed is simply religious belief and the means of application is a religious test. It is consequently unconstitutional upon its face. This and other laws—notably the Edmunds Act—inflict disabilities upon those of our people who are not in any way associated, by their acts, with polygamy. Thus probably about nine-tenths of our community are punished for alleged offenses for which they are in no way responsible and in which

they have taken no part. Surely no person who is unbiased, that gives this subject even the most casual attention, can characterize such treatment as other than flagrantly unjust.

It has been estimated that out of a community of about 200,000 people, more or less, from 10,000 to 12,000 are identified with polygamy. When the Edmunds Act was passed this small minority who were deprived by it of the right to vote or hold office, voluntarily, without the application of coercion, withdrew from those privileges, notwithstanding the high estimate they placed upon them. It may well be asked wherein is the justice of placing the bulk of the people at a disadvantage as well, seeing they have done nothing to furnish an excuse for such treatment. Granting that the small minority connected with polygamy are criminals before the law, what justification is there on that account for punishing, as the Edmunds and other acts do, the overwhelming majority? If such doings were perpetrated in any other connection, they would be unsparingly denounced as oppressive and tyrannical in the most extreme degree. If one portion of a community were designated as criminal, to hold the other and much the greater portion responsible for such condition is not only unjust, but decidedly absurd.

Statements upon this subject have been made to the Chief Executive of the nation in the form of a protest and petition for redress of grievances. Knowing that misrepresentations have taken the place of impartial scrutiny of the question with which the Latter-day Saints are associated, the consequences being a general misapprehension of the community and their affairs, we presumed that Mr. Cleveland was not acquainted with the real situation. An opportunity was thus sought to acquaint him with the facts. The very reasonable desire was expressed in this connection that a commission of inquiry be appointed that the truth might appear and be given to the nation. Was it too much to expect that this action, supported by a representation of 200,000 people, would meet with some favorable response, which thus far has not, however, been made? Yet it would be unfair to attribute the delay of the President either to indifference or a disposition to refuse to accord justice to a people whose liberties are being trampled upon to an extent that is almost past human endurance. It is still hoped that he will take some consistent and humane action in the premises. In alluding to the delay in granting a response to the representations made to the President, we must not forget the extensive and arduous character of the duties devolving upon him as the head of the administration of a great Government. We mention this that you may not be disposed to be too censorious in regard to the actions of men in high places who have the power to redress our grievances. And even when we feel that we are wronged it is proper for us to follow the example of our Lord and master, and say, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

Referring once more to the situation in a more local sense, we are not oblivious to the anomalous position in which the Federal judicial officers are placed in dealing with a subject which appears to occupy a large share of popular attention. While it is impossible for them to escape pronounced exceptions being taken to their official course on account of its harshness, undue rigor, and unjust discrimination in administering the laws, they are entitled to some consideration, justified by well-understood circumstances. The Latter-day Saints are the objects of popular obloquy. Their institutions appear to be greatly disliked. The officers are doubtless influenced by the general clamor for the application of heroic treatment to the saints. They themselves have doubtless been influenced to some degree by personal prejudices, and their official conduct, by these conditions, is thrown out of balance. While their course cannot be

sustained in the light of fair play, some allowance should be made on account of the liability of the human mind to be warped by influence in conflict with the principles which should universally obtain in courts of law and presumed justice. Neither would it be justifiable on the part of the saints to entertain toward them, on account of their departures from their proper line of duty, any rancorous or vengeful feeling. A spirit of that character is not in unity with the genious of the gospel of peace. All men are in the hands of a just God, whose mighty, penetrating power is capable of analyzing all the motives which prompt human action, and He can and will deal with us and them and all men according to the principles of eternal justice.

Upward of forty years ago the Lord revealed to His church the principles of celestial marriage. The idea of marrying more wives than one was as naturally abhorrent to the leading men and women of the church at that day as it could be to any people. They shrank with dread from the bare thought of entering into such relationships. But the command of God was before them in language which no faithful soul dare disobey.

"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. * * * And as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory, and he that receiveth a fulness thereof must and shall abide the law or he shall be damned saith the Lord God."

Damnation was the awful penalty affixed to a refusal to obey this law. It became an acknowledged doctrine of the church; it was indissolubly interwoven in the minds of its members with their hopes of eternal salvation and exaltation in the presence of God. For nearly twenty years this continued to be our faith and practice. Then a law was enacted against it. Another twenty years elapsed and the Edmunds law was passed. Nearly forty years had thus elapsed from the first revelation of this doctrine, during which period thousands had lived and died firmly believing and solemnly testifying that it was divine. At great sacrifice they had obeyed it, and based their hopes of eternal felicity upon the promises which the revelation contained. **They never dreamed that they had not a constitutional right to obey God, especially when in obeying Him they did not interfere with nor encroach upon the rights of any human being, either man or woman. It never entered into their minds to suppose for a moment that man had a right, after God had given a law to His church for its salvation and exaltation, to enact a counter law forbidding, under severe penalties, man's obedience to God's law.**

Who could suppose that any man in this land of religious liberty would presume to say to his fellow-man that he had no right to take such steps as he thought necessary to escape damnation? Or that Congress would enact a law which would present the alternative to religious believers of being consigned to a penitentiary if they should attempt to obey a law of God which would deliver them from damnation? Or that, under a plea of maintaining a certain form of civilization, God's authority to direct his people how to escape from the abominable corruptions and evils which are eating out the vitals of man's much vaunted civilization should be disputed and utterly rejected? What is this "Mormon" problem, so-called, and why should it disturb the people? It is an unpopular religion. But so was that of the ancient prophets. Jesus told the Jews that they garnished the tombs of the dead prophets, but killed the living ones. They crucified Jesus, and were almost as unanimous in their cry to crucify Him as the people and rulers of the United States are today to destroy the "Mormons". They killed all

of his apostles except one, and he was banished to work as a slave on the isle of Patmos. It is said they cast him into a caldron of boiling oil, but he was not killed; and if the Scriptures are true he still lives, for he was to tarry till the coming of the Savior.

We receive as the word of God, and so do millions of the human family, the writings and testimony of the prophets who were killed. It is published by the millions of copies and sent to the various nations of the earth by the very people who would now seek to destroy us. Jesus, who was crucified between two thieves, is now worshiped by millions in Christendom as the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world. The twelve apostles, his disciples, who suffered such ignominious contumely and death are now designated by the millions of Christendom as "The Apostles of the Lamb of God", and churches and cathedrals are called after them, as St. Peter, St. John, St. Mark, St. Luke, etc. **It was then the "Christian problem"; it is now "the Mormon problem—the same problem though called by a different name. Was Jesus the enemy of the people in His day? Only as He told them the truth. "What evil hath he done?" asked Pilate, the Gentile judge. "No matter what evil or what good", vociferated the Jews. "Crucify him! Crucify him!" "What evil have the Mormons done?" is asked; and the cry comes back, "No matter, no matter; let them be destroyed."**

By the circulation of endless slanders and falsehoods concerning us and our marriages, wrath and indignation have been aroused against us in our nation. The ignorance of the people concerning us and our doctrines and system have been taken advantage of. Constant attempts have been and still are being made to induce the world to believe that our motive in espousing patriarchal marriage has been the gratification of gross sensualty—that our belief in and practice of the doctrine had its origin in licentiousness, and that the sanction of religion is merely invoked to furnish greater license for the indulgence of base passions and devouring lust. This, as you know, is the exact antipodes of the truth. But the world generally do not know it. Those of them who know how utterly false are these charges are either so cowed down by a fierce public opinion that they dare not speak, or if they have the courage to speak are almost unheard amid the noisy clamor against us. Thousands upon thousands of honest people in this and other nations, whose voices, did they know the truth, would be raised in our favor, are deceived by these lies and are arrayed against us. This persecution, if it serve no other purpose, will do good in this direction. It brings home to the hearts of the people, as no protestations or arguments of ours ever could do, that there is something more in this doctrine and practice than they have been led to believe. Reflecting people will see that there must be a great principle involved in this, or men and women would not be willing to suffer fines, bonds, and imprisonment as they do.

Is there any necessity for lustful men and women in this age and nation to suffer martydom to gratify their passions? Who ever heard of a people preferring imprisonment and all manner of cruel treatment for the indulgence of appetites which they could gratify to the fullest extent in popular ways, especially when the judges upon the bench, the prosecution attorneys at the bar, the juries who bring in verdicts, point out the way in which marriage obligations can be discarded and sensuality be gratified without risk or without punishment? The press and sectarian pulpits also echo the advice. The universal voice is: "Put away your wives, cease to support them and their children; BE AS WE ARE, and you need not be put under bonds, be fined, or be incarcerated in prison."

Foul desire opens wide her arms and invites all to her lecherous embrace by easier paths than honorable marriage

and the begetting of numerous children to be carefully trained and educated and made respectable and useful citizens.

Will the world see this? Every man who goes to prison for his religion, every woman who, for love of truth and the husband to whom she is bound for time and eternity, submits to bonds and imprisonment, bears a powerful testimony to the world concerning the falsity of the views they entertain respecting us and our religion. If such noble and heroic sacrifices as men and women are now called upon to make for their religion by Federal courts do not teach the world the truth concerning us, **then woe to the world, for nothing but the wrath of Almighty God will reach it.**

We join with all saints in invoking blessings upon the noble men and women who have exhibited their integrity to God and His cause, and their devotion to principle by submitting to bonds and imprisonment rather than deny their faith or break their covenants. If anything were needed to show to the world that our marriages cannot be reduced to the level of the vile practices to which our defamers would drag them down, their heroic conduct has furnished it. Thank God that so far in this persecution at least as large a proportion have stood the test without flinching or cowering as Jesus in His parable of the ten virgins intimated would be ready to meet the bridegroom at his coming. Their names will be held in everlasting honor in time and eternity, not only as martyrs for religious truth, but as patriots who suffered in defense of the principle of religious liberty.

Truths such as God has revealed in these days are not established without suffering and sacrifice on the part of those who espouse and advocate them. It was for these truths that we were driven time and again from our homes, and were finally compelled to seek refuge in this mountain country, then known as the "American desert". And now, again, we are menaced with ruin; and for what? Whom have we injured? Upon whose rights have we trespassed? It can be truthfully said we have not injured or trespassed upon any. **Have we not, under the blessing of the Lord, changed these barren valleys into fruitful fields and gardens? Have we not established and maintained good and cheap government in every place which we have settled? Has not every man who came into our borders and behaved himself been safe in his property, person, and religion? Have not peace and good order been the fruits of our presence? To all these we can answer in the affirmative. Have we endeavored to force our doctrines or practices upon anyone? Have we in any manner threatened the peace of our neighbors or of the nation? We certainly have not.**

Respecting the doctrine of celestial marriage, we could not, however much we might be disposed to do so, teach it to or enforce it upon others not of our faith without violating a command of God. We do not stand in the attitude of propagandists of polygamy. We never have believed or taught that the doctrine of celestial marriage was designed for universal practice. The Lord has made this clear, and recent events among us have also made it clear. "Strait is the gate", says Jesus, "and narrow the way that leadeth unto the exaltation and continuation of the lives, and few there be that find IT."

There appears to be a fallacious idea abroad regarding this doctrine. It has been asserted that there was a design to propagate it outside of our community, and thus introduce into the United States an element opposed to the Christian views of this and other nations. On the contrary, our elders have been instructed not to introduce the practice of that principle anywhere outside of the gathering place of the saints; and they do not preach it abroad to any extent even in theory, except on occasions when it is called for or when

they are assailed on account of it. At such times they respond by defending it as a doctrine of the Bible and not inconsistent with the laws of nature. It should also be understood that the practice is not generally admissible even among the Latter-day Saints. It is strictly guarded, the intention being to allow only those who are above reproach to enter into the relationship. The practice of the doctrine is not for extension beyond the church, and is even limited within its pale. The idea, therefore, that plural marriage is a menace to the general monogamous system is without foundation. This fallacy is further exhibited by the fact of the popular antipathy with which it is regarded, people outside of our church exhibiting a disposition the reverse of favorable to its establishment in other communities, making the extension of its practice abroad impossible. Furthermore, being strict believers in free will, you Latter-day Saints know that no man or woman has ever been coerced into obligations of that kind, much less would we desire to enforce it upon any other class of people.

But in all these events which are now taking place we recognize and acknowledge the hand of God. There is a wise purpose in it all which He will yet more fully make plain to us. One thing is clear, the saints are being tried in a manner never before known among us. The faithful rejoice and are steadfast; the unfaithful fear and tremble. Those who have oil in their lamps and have kept them trimmed and burning now have a light for their feet, and they do not stumble or fall; those who have neither light nor oil are in perplexity and doubt; they know not what to do. Is not this the fulfillment of the word of God and the teachings of His servants? Have not the Latter-day Saints been taught all the day long that if they would remain faithful and endure to the end they must live their religion by keeping every commandment of God? Have they not been continually warned of the fate which awaited them if they committed sin? Can adulterers, fornicators, liars, thieves, drunkards, Sabbath breakers, blasphemers, or sinners of any kind endure the trials which saints must pass through and expect to stand? If there are any who entertain such a hope they deceive themselves. Upon these sins God has pronounced judgment. No man or woman who is guilty of any of these transgressions of God's law can stand and retain His spirit. They must repent of them and put them far from them or they will be left in darkness, and misery will be their doom. The Lord will not be mocked. He will not bear with hypocrites; but they will be spewed out.

If all who call themselves Latter-day Saints were true and faithful to their God, to His holy covenants and laws, and were living as saints should, persecution would roll off from us without disturbing us in the least. But it is painful to know that this is not their condition. There are secret abominations practiced by those who are called saints, which the trials we are now passing through will reveal in a manner terrible to them. Open sins are also winked at and condoned by presidents, bishops, teachers, and parents in a manner offensive to God and grievous to man. Proper care and vigilance are not exercised to keep wards and stakes cleansed from iniquity and to have transgressors dealt with. The innocent are thus made to suffer with the guilty; for the Lord has commanded that the inhabitants of Zion must purge themselves from iniquity, folly, covetousness, and vanity, and listen to and obey His laws, or they cannot have His protection. He has also said that if His people will obey His laws and keep His commandments, to do them, not in name only, but in reality, He will be their shield and protector and strong power, and no man will be able to hurt them, for He will be their defense. These trials of our faith and constancy which we are now passing through will be overruled for our good and future

prosperity. In days to come we shall be able to look back and perceive with clearness how visibly God's providence is in all that we now witness. Let us do all in our power to so live before the Lord that if we are persecuted it shall not be for wrongdoing, but for righteousness.

At the present time we may very pertinently inquire: Why are the people of these mountains treated as we now are? Where in this broad land is the virtue of women so amply guarded or so jealously protected as here? No cry of hungry, naked, or outraged humanity has ever ascended to heaven from our borders against the men whom the courts are now so busy in sending to prison and treating as criminals. There was a time in these mountains when adultery, fornication, whoredom, and illegitimacy were almost unknown. A woman was as safe from insult in traversing over our streets and highways as if she were under her husband's or father's roof. Marriage was encouraged; vice was repressed. Women were free to form connections with the opposite sex to suit themselves, so long as these connections were sanctified by marriage. But what a change we now behold! A tide of evil surges around us. it threatens to overwhelm us and to reduce us to ruin. The floodgates of vice are opened upon us, and not content with the rush of this filfthy stream in our cities and settlements, those who hate us would do more. They would invade our dwellings; they would destroy our families; they would loosen every bond which has held society together; they would array wife against husband, child against parent, friend against friend; they would make every man, woman, and child a spy, an informer, and a betrayer; they would sap the foundation of faith, confidence, and honor, and make every one distrust his fellow.

Satan never wrought greater ruin in Eden than these enemies of ours would work in our midst if we would listen to their blandishments or be frightened by their threats. And is all this havoc to be wrought because of our wickedness? No; ten thousand times, no. Let those who are so loud in denouncing us, so active in persecuting us, look around them. Are there no people but the Mormons to regenerate and purge from sin? Read the daily record of black crime which fills the journals of the land. If the correction of evil, the improvement of morals, the uprooting of vice, the repression of violence and crime were the objects which animate those who seek to destroy society in these mountains, then we could say in the language of the Savior: "Thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye. Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

We speak to you, a people who have traveled and mingled much in society all over the world. You are not ignorant of the world, its ways, or its corruptions. You know, therefore, how great is the beam that is in the eyes of those who reprove us for the mote they imagine they perceive in our eye. We know that from the household of every faithful Latter-day Saint daily and fervent thanksgiving ascends to the God of heaven for having shown them how to escape from the frightful evils under which society groans in so-called civilized lands. Nevertheless, we will not indulge in recrimination. We sincerely mourn over the existence of the dreadful sins which are permitted to flourish and to spread with unblushing front through the land. As a people we have lifted our voices in warning against the sins and against those who practice them. We shall continue to do so. If in return for all this we are treated with violence and reproach, it is no more than our Lord and Master was before us. We may rest assured that the predictions concerning the calamities and judgments which are about to fall upon the wicked, the unbeliev-

ing, and the unrepentent will all be fulfilled, as will every word and promise which the Lord has spoken to us. But while we warn others let us not forget ourselves or our families. Let us look well to our own lives and the cnduct and lives of those who belong to our households. If we keep ourselves unspotted from sin, rest assured the Lord will never forget or forsake us.

Upon presidents of stakes, bishops, and other leading officers great responsibility rests. They are placed as shepherd over the flock of Christ. If through any neglect of theirs the flock is injured or destroyed, the blood of those souls will be found upon their garments. The Melchisedek and Aaronic priesthoods confer great power and authority upon man. They lift man nearer to God and make him His representative. But woe to the men who use their priesthood for base purposes and fail to use it for God's glory and the salvation of His children. Far better for them if they had never received it.

We have been commanded of the Lord to set our households in order. Apostles, presidents of stakes, and bishops, have you done this with your own households? Have you also seen that the saints have done the same? Have you impressed upon the people under your charge the absolute necessity of purity if they desire the blessing and protection of the Most High? Wolves never watched with greater cunning and more ravenous hunger a flock of sheep and lambs than the people of your wards and stakes are now being watched by those who are ready to devour them. Are you awake to this danger, and do you take every precaution against it?

Parents, are you full of fidelity yourselves to every principle of godliness, and do you surround your sons and daughters with every safeguard to shield them from the arts of the vile? Do you teach them that chastity in both man and woman should be more highly esteemed than life itself? Or do you leave them in their ignorance and inexperience to mix with any society they may choose, at any hour that may be convenient to them, and to be exposed to the wiles of the seducer and the corrupt? These are questions you will have to answer either to your shame and the condemnation or to your joy and eternal happiness. Know this—that God, in giving us the precious blessings we possess, demands from us a suitable return. By receiving them we are placed under obligations. If these are not discharged, condemnation inevitably follows.

We hear favorable accounts of the action of primary associations, Sunday schools, young men's and young women's mutual improvement associations, and relief societies. These organizations have unlimited opportunities of doing good. If those who have them in charge are faithful in attending to their duties, great will be their reward. If we desire the prosperity of Zion we will carefully guard and train our young . They come to us pure from the Lord. By proper training we can make them mighty instruments for good. But, superintendents and teachers of primary associations and Sunday schools, and presidents of young men and young women's associations and relief societies, remember this—that God will never bless an unvirtuous people, and while a flood tide of corruption, destructive of all true morality and virtue, is sweeping over the land we must erect barriers to stop its contaminating influence. **You have the young in your charge. Teach and impress upon them by every means in your power how dreadful a sin is unchastity. They are taught to shrink in horror from murder, but they should be taught to shrink with abhorrence from the next great sin to shedding blood, and that is unchastity.**

From the elders who are abroad in our own and in other lands we hear generally favorable reports. They have much to contend with. The world is

waxing worse and worse. Iniquity abounds. Men's hearts are hardened against truth and the nations are fast being prepared for the judgments which the Lord has said He will pour out in the last days. The elders are required to carry the message which God has sent to mankind to every nation and to warn them, not in anger or in scorn, but in meekness and humility, that they may flee from the wrath to come. To them we say: Be pure in all your thoughts, words, and acts. Keep yourselves unspotted from every evil. Avoid all vulgarity of act and expression. Put away all your light speeches, and be sober men of God, filled with the Holy Ghost and the power of your priesthood.

To the twelve apostles and their counselors we say: Remember the weight of your high calling in Christ Jesus. You are called to be His special witnesses in all the world, to bear testimony that He lives and reigns on high, to see that the Gospel is preached to all the inhabitants of the earth and that the earth is prepared by suitable warning for the coming of the Son of Man. How great and all-important is your calling. It may be said that the souls of a world are intrusted to you. Through your labors and testimony, either in person or through other chosen messengers whose labors you direct, the inhabitants of the earth will be judged. Is there any law of God, then, which you should neglect? Is there any degree of purity which you should not reach? Is there any sacrifice which you should not be willing to make? Can men with such a calling as yours be other than holy and yet please our God? Who among you can neglect the duties of your high calling to devote time and care to the world and its pursuits? We say to you in all truth and solemnity that no one of you can do this without displeasing your God and endangering your salvation.

To the saints we say that President Woodruff, at our last accounts, was in good health and spirits, notwithstanding his advanced age, and as full of zeal and faith as ever.

President Joseph F. Smith, our fellow laborer in the first presidency, though not with us is actively employed in the ministry and rejoicing greatly in the work of God. He is as ardent, as devoted, and as persevering as ever. Were he here his name without doubt would appear with ours to this epistle.

Notwithstanding all that we are now passing through, our hearts are filled with joy and peace. We can truly say, **"Hosannah to God in the Highest"**. We know that Zion will not be overthrown or be made desolate. Every promise made concerning Zion by the Almighty God will be fulfilled. The only thing which ever disturbs our serenity is the report of wrongdoing by those who are called Latter-day Saints.

Praying that God will bless and preserve you and lead you in the path of righteousness, and that you may all operate together any accomplishment of the purposes of God and the purification of His church and the establishment of His kingdom, we remain, with much love,

Your friends and fellow laborers in the new and everlasting covenant,

JOHN TAYLOR,
GEORGE Q. CANNON,
Of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Salt Lake City, October 6, 1885.

THE RING FINGER

The wedding ring is always worn on the third finger of the left hand because of an old belief that a delicate vein connects that finger, and no other finger, with the heart.

MARRIAGES IN THE UNITED STATES

are celebrated at the rate of more than 1,000,000 every year, according to available statistics.

EDITORIAL

"I would rather be chopped to pieces and resurrected in the morning, each day throughout a period of three score years and ten, than to be deprived of speaking freely, or to be afraid of doing so."—Brigham Young.

*"He that gave us life gave us liberty. * * * I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."*

—Jefferson.

TRUTH

Devoted to Questions — Political, Social, Economic, and Religious

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

By Truth Publishing Company
1153 Third Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
Phone 3-7368

TERMS: $2.00 per year, in advance; $1.00 six months; 20 cents a copy

Vol. 10. MAY, 1945. No. 12.

EDITORIAL THOUGHT

THE sacrfiice required of Abraham in the offering up of Isaac, shows that if a man would attain to the keys of the kingdom of an endless life, he must sacrifice all things. When God offers a blessing or knowledge to a man, and he refuses to receive it, he will be damned. The Israelites prayed that God would speak to Moses and not to them; in consequences of which he cursed them with a carnal law. — Joseph Smith.

THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

In announcing the present day application of a very old law, General Dwight D. Eisenhower has made personal responsibility clear to our fighting enemies. We quote a news item from the Salt Lake Tribune (March 25, 1945):

Declaring that the allies had knowledge of an order issued from Adolf Hitler's headquarters on Oct. 18, 1942, and its supplement issued in October, 1944, calling for the execution of allied air borne and parachute troops, Eisenhower said in his message to the German army:

"The development of the battle on German soil may bring you into contact with allied air borne or parachute troops in large or small units. Such units may be landed or dropped deep behind your lines.

"You are solemnly reminded that such troops landed or dropped in uniform behind your lines are not terrorists, but soldiers carrying out legitimate military tasks.

"The execution of air borne or parachute troops operating in uniform is entirely contrary to the accepted rules and practices of war.

"All persons—officers, other ranks or civilians—implicated in the issuing or carrying out of the fuehrer headquarters order * * * or any other similar orders subsequently issued or to be issued will be held to strictest account and will be punished according to their deserts. THE EXCUSE OF HAVING CARRIED OUT ORDERS RECEIVED FROM ABOVE WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED VALID."

It is generally taken for granted that when soldiers or civilians execute an order from a superior officer he is absolved from responsibility, the entire blame resting on the officer giving the order. Thus, both soldier and civilian would, under the German order, be free from all censure in executing such an order.

But the fact must be borne in mind that wars are supposed to be controlled by laws as are peace-time operations. There are international war laws to which the Nazis and the Allies have subscribed, and their conduct of the

war must conform to such laws if severe penalties and reprisals are to be avoided. The "Geneva Convention" (1919), signed by thirty-five nations, including Germany, England and the United States, governs the treatment of prisoners of war. Prisoners are required to be fed as well as soldiers and officers of equal rank in the captor army.

A spy, captured by the enemy and proved guilty, may be executed, while captured soldiers in army uniform, engaged in open conflict, must be cared for as prisoners of war and accorded their rights. They cannot be legally executed by the enemy. Soldiers or civilians breaking the laws of nations, though following orders from their superiors, must stand individually responsible. They are presumed to know the law and must carry out its edicts at any cost.

We agree with the General's interpretation and application of this international law and apply the same to ecclesiastical affairs. God's laws must, as we have explained on numerous occasions, be assumed to be eternal and unchangeable. They must be obeyed in every detail if the rewards based on such compliance are to be expected.

The Church structure set up by direct revelation from the Lord is so well fortified by checks and balances that men are amply protected in their ecclesiastical rights if the Lord's instructions are followed. The three government branches—Legislative, Judicial and Executive—are reflected in the Church organization as well as in the Kingdom, and when functioning properly full protection is afforded.

The "Eisenhower doctrine", applied to the Church, would prevent many miscarriages of justice now prevailing in church jurisprudence. Under that doctrine a Bishop would not say to a member, **"We have nothing against you and can see no wrong in your belief or actions, but we have orders from 'higher up' to excommunicate you, and must do so."** Such an order that went to the authorities of Rexburg Stake and which, because no one in the stake could be found who would sign a complaint against Joseph T. Jones, caused them to adopt a silly and farcical procedure to "cut him off", could not obtain. In this case the weaklings in the stake Presidency addressed a letter to themselves as follows:

Rexburg, Idaho, Dec. 18, 1939.

To the Presidency of the Rexburg Stake of Zion.

Dear Brethren:

We, the Stake Presidency, hereby make to you a charge of apostasy against Joseph T. Jones: and in support thereof allege as follows: That said Joseph T. Jones, having been given an opportunity to sign a statement of his support and loyalty to the General Authorities of the Church, refused to sign the same.

We, respectfully suggest that the above named accused be called to answer this complaint, BEFORE YOURSELVES and the High Council of this the Rexburg Stake of Zion as a court thereof.

PETER J. RICKS
ARTHUR PORTER
OSWALD CHRISTENSEN

Signed in the presence of
F. L. Davis, Witness.

Here the judiciary corruptly became the complaining witness, the judge, jury and the executive—three in one! The farcical procedure stands to condemn the church judicial system as now administered, for all time.

Under the "Eisenhower doctrine" the President of the Quorum of Twelve could not make a demand on a stake president to "cut off" a member without a trial, as in the reported case of Francis M. Lyman sending a formal demand to the President of the Beaver Stake to cut Dr. McGregor off the Church for alleged polygamous living. In that case the stake president, sensing his duty under the "Eisenhower doctrine", very properly replied to the formal request, "If you wish to file

charges of unchristian-like conduct against the Doctor we will hear the evidence, but our High Council is not in the habit of cutting people off without legal cause." This stake president knew, by the revelations of the Lord, his rights and his duty under them and was loyal enough to the right to take a positive stand.

Under the "Eisenhower doctrine" a presidency of a stake, as in the case of Judge McConkie (TRUTH 5:248) could not say, and get away with it, **"It makes no difference whether the Manifesto is a revelation from God or from the Devil, it is now binding upon the Church."** (If actually binding upon the Church it is because the Church has accepted it, but such action of the Church could not bind the Priesthood which stands above and independent of the Church.)

Under the "Eisenhower doctrine" a president of a stake, as in the case of Hugh B. Brown in the trial of J. Leslie Broadbent, could not say or permit to be said in his court, **"Forget the Doctrine and Covenants (the law book of the Church) we have with us Heber J. Grant to tell us what to do."**

How often we hear men and women say, "I know that is the law but President Grant tells us to do differently. We will do as he says and let him assume the responsibility." Such is an insecure alibi. The law book of God to the Church is open to all members. **Wilful ignorance is no excuse.** To know that the leaders are wrong in their orders and yet follow such orders will surely bring condemnation alike to the guilty leaders and the followers. The Lord has made it very clear, speaking of the Celestial glory,—

> **That bodies who are of the celestial kingdom may possess it forever and ever; for, this intent was it made and created, and for this intent are they sanctified.**
>
> **And they who are not sanctifieed THROUGH THE LAW which I have given unto you, even the law of Christ, MUST inherit another kingdom, or that of a terrestrial kingdom or that of a telestial kingdom.**
>
> **For he who is not able to abide the law of a celestial kingdom cannot abide a celestial glory, etc. (D. & C., 88:20-22).**

Men who have lived the law only in part, will not be able to rise in the resurrection and claim the full reward. We know people who frankly declare they cannot live the higher laws, hence will be satisfied with a lesser glory. There is consistency in this attitude, and they will be rewarded accordingly; but let them not feel that by some system of legerdemain they can attain the celestial glory by abiding a terrestrial law.

The "Eisenhower doctrine" of individual responsibility is sound, and in announcing it to the German people over the radio and through the press the General has performed a useful service alike to the Church and to the warring nations. Let no man hope for a reward for which he is unwilling to work. We frequently hear the plaint: "I know the law of celestial marriage is right but my wife will not receive it. I love her and don't want to break her heart and drive the children from me." A very nice speech. But how much does he love his wife and children? Does he love them dearly enough to exalt them? He cannot lead them into the highest glory unless he is willing, at all earthly costs, to live the laws of that kingdom. We hear a woman say, "I don't care if this is the law of God, I will not let my husband live it—I will share his time with no other woman." Foolish woman. You would deprive your husband of the power to lead you with yur children into the presence of God! What are you gaining by such a near-sighted policy? You become a millstone about his neck. On this subject President Wilford Woodruff said:

> **We have many bishops and elders who have but one wife. They are abundantly qualified to enter the higher law and take more, but their wives will not let them. ANY MAN WHO WILL PERMIT A WOMAN TO LEAD HIM AND BIND HIM DOWN IS BUT LITTLE ACCOUNT IN THE CHURCH AND KINGDOM OF GOD. The**

law of Patriarchal marriage and plurality of wives is a revelation and commandment of God to us, and we should obey it; but one says, "If you do, Judge McKean will be after you." What has given us a future in these Valleys of the Mountains? It is because we have obeyed this part of the Celestial Law of God.—Life of Wilford Woodruff, p. 490.

Let men who have embraced the holy Priesthood stand up like men and live the laws of the Priesthood (D. & C., 132:28, 58, 61, 64), and don't hide behind a smoke screen of social popularity or commercial standing, or their alleged love for their wives and children as an excuse for refusing to live the fulness of gospel requirements. God said, **"Obey my laws and I will fight your battles for you."**

How many men and women left their wives and husbands in the old world to embrace the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and how many children left their stubborn parents to join with the Latter-way Saints and gather with the Saints in Zion? These people did not stop to count the cost. They heard the truth, were convinced by it and they embraced it, leaving the consequences with the Lord. Jesus Christ said:

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.—Matt. 10:34-38.

Suppose these early converts to "Mormonism" had tried to hide behind the alibi, "I know the gospel as you teach it is true, but I cannot embrace it, otherwise it will break up my family", what would have become of these thousands of pioneer Mormons that took such a noble part in building up our commonwealth?

When J. Reuben Clark, Jr., came into the Presidency of the Church we cherished the hope that he was bringing to the new position the wisdom of a diplomat, the bearing and skill of a great lawyer and the simple faith in the Gospel of Jesus Christ of a well seasoned Latter-day Saint. He came with shining armor, with the shield and buckler of a servant of the Lord, and his words were received by the Saints as inspired and authoritative; he was regarded in circles both in and out of the Church as a safe and stalwart leader. It is he who began to give to the Church its proper bearings with relation to the Priesthood—that the Church is subsidiary to the Priesthood and subject to it. Said he 'mid the angry commotion of the leading brethren to establish the Church as the all in all in ecclesiastical organization, **"I conceive the Church to be the organized Priesthood of God, drawn up in battle formation to carry on unceasing war against error wherever error is to be found. * * * The Priesthood is essential to the Church, but the Church is not essential to the Priesthood. * * * The Priesthood can exist without the Church but the Church cannot exist without the Priesthood."**

These were facts that started the Church back on its proper pathway. It cannot exist as the Church of Christ without the Priesthood, but the Priesthood can exist without the Church; it organized the Church, gave to it its Presidency, its Quorum of Twelve, its Seventies, with its other helps and governments.

This bold stroke of President Clark's began to bear fruits of an ecclesiastical reformation. Followed to a logical conclusion it would have given to the Church a re-birth and rendered it a power in the earth. We entertained strong hopes in the new leadership.

"We stand for the Constitution of the United States with its three departments of government therein set forth, each one fully independent in its field", was the voice of the new leader. The Church had gone far afield, as we have

shown, in its judicial system, combining the functions of the complaining witnesses, judge, jury and executor (sheriff) in one office. Cases rightfully belonging to the jurisdiction of the Bishopric or High Council were being disposed of direct by decree of the President of the Church or by the Quorum of Twelve, without a proper hearing and without any jurisdictional authority whatever. Bishoprics and High Councils were acting, not on complaints and evidence, but on ill advised instructions, from the leaders to "cut off" certain persons on rumor and gossip. The rules of evidence as revealed by the Lord were wholly ignored. A dictatorship was being set up in the Church under whose regime the rights of members were being ignored.

Being advanced into the Quorum of Twelve were men of legal minds and professions. Surely such talent these men possessed associated with the strong legal acumen of President Clark, the Church was bound to return to an ecclesiastical power with checks and balances commensurate with its claims. **But what have we today?** An ecclesiastical dictatorship—unmistakable and definite. We have succumbed, as the early church did, to the wiles of Satan. As the Prophet Isaiah predicted, **"We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement"; and "We have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves."** (Sec. 29).

The Prophet says further in his indictment against the church today: **"As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err and destroy the way of thy paths."** (Ib. 3:12). **"For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed."** (Ib. 9:16).

The Prophet Jeremiah said of us in this day: **"For among my people are found wicked men: they lay in wait, as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men. (This no doubt refers to the sneaks selected by the Presidency of the Church to snoop into the homes of the Saints to get evidence for the court prosecutors.) "Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation (church) as this? A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land: the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?"** (Jer. 5:26, 29, 30, 31) What will these false leaders do when the Lord demands an accounting?

The Saints, those following in the footsteps of the Prophet Joseph Smith who stands at the head of this dispensation, are disappointed in their leaders. They have **"asked for bread and received a stone; for a fish and are given a serpent."**

The leaders talk glibly of being prophets, seers and revelators, yet in the most calamitous period of the world's history (as well as the history of the Church) when needed most, their prophetic gifts are silenced. They see not, neither can they reveal. As was aptly stated by the late President B. H. Roberts: **"We have prophets but they have ceased to prophesy; seers that cannot see, and revelators that do not reveal."** Their lives and ministery continue the fulfillment of the Prophet Micah's biting charge:

> **Then shall they cry unto the Lord, but he will not hear them; he will even hide his face from them at that time, as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings.**
>
> **Thus saith the Lord concerning the Prophets that make my people err, that bite with their teeth, and cry, Peace; and he that put teth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him.**
>
> **Therefore night shall be unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and THE SUN SHALL GO DOWN OVER THE PROPHETS, AND THE DAY SHALL BE DARK OVER THEM.**

Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded: yea, they shall all cover their lips; FOR THERE IS NO ANSWER OF GOD.—Micah 3:4-7.

Isaiah puts the facts in these words, (59:1-2):

Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot hear; but iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, THAT HE WILL NOT HEAR.

From recent happenings we must conclude: The Church has full dominion of the machinery of both the church and the state. In the prosecutions of the so-called "Funamentalists" for polygamously living in accordance with the commandments of God it is demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Church is at the bottom of the unholy crusade. The Church is wholly and solely responsible for the present wholesale prosecution that has for its purpose the sending of nearly fifty of its adherents to the prisons of the country—men and women, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers — upon whom there is not a criminal blotch,—for daring to uphold the sacred traditions of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as established and taught in the law book to the church, the Doctrine and Covenants.

A band of former traditional lawbreakers, as pertaining to the corrupt laws of man, talk loudly, virtuously and boastfully of sustaining the unconstitutional laws of man. It lies within their power to reinstate the laws of God in the commonwealth. This they have not only refused to do but in their vicious, craven surrender to world friendships, they have had new laws passed increasing a simple misdemeanor with a prison term of sx months to that of a felony bearing a prison term of from one to five years. They wink at the unlawful sexual congress being practiced on every hand and refuse to return to Gods system of Celestial marriage. Like King Rehoboam, when appealed to for lighter burdens for his subjects, the present leaders have turned a deaf ear using the king's reply, in effect, "My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke: my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." In their official organ, the "Deseret News", they contend for constitutional rights, while lending themselves to the breaking of the most precious right known to man—Religious liberty. While during the present Easter season they are denouncing the cruel trial, conviction and crucifixion of the Son of God, they cause to be published in the Improvement Era this note the final paragraph of an article on the "Trial of Jesus" which completely belies their actions:

While there are many lessons that can be derived from the trial of Jesus, there is one that has particular present-day application. Some of our well-intentioned but false liberal thinkers would like to take this nation down an alien road of concentration of power, like unto the great Sanhedrin, with the executive branch exercising a constantly increasing amount of both legislative and judicial powers. If they were acquainted with the history of the past, they would know there is nothing liberal in this doctrine; that it is the most reactionary of all political theories and that its ultimate application would spell the end of our liberties. Like unto the case of Jesus, the executive branch of the government could shape the laws to accomplish its own purposes and there would be no courts by or in which one could be assured of a fair trial. If a situation akin to a concentration of these powers, such as existed in the great Sanhedrin, ever becomes a reality, we will have largely lost our political free agency as men.

We are now brought to the unalterable conclusion: That since these church dignitaries, with J. Reuben Clark, Jr., at their lead, have failed in their duty to have expunged from the statutes of the State the vicious anti-polygamy laws under which the Saints have been persecuted for the past three-quarters of a century; and since they have initiated and are backing the present cruel and uncalled for crusade, subjecting men, women and children to violent persecutions, they must now be regarded as out and out apostates from the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ;

their brows carrying the mark of infamy of hypocrisy and dishonor before the hosts of Israel. The facts convict them with committing the evils spoken of by the Prophet Jeremiah: "They have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and have hewn them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

These men now leading the Church have forgotten though they frequently repeat **"That the rights of the priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven, and that the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only upon the principles of righteousness"**: that to gratify their pride, their ambition, and to exercise control, dominion and compulsion upon the souls of the children of men, they have acted in total unrighteousness; **and it is "Amen to their Priesthood and authority."** (D. & C., Sec. 121:36-7).

The Church must return to the "Eisenhower doctrine" of each person assuming responsibility for his own actions in accordance with the laws of the Gospel, as revealed by God to Joseph Smith and all the Prophets; until which time all the noise of the authorities protesting their own righteousness in the cause of Christ will be as the passing wind, today felt and tomorrow forgotten.

ELDER LEE TALKS LOOSE

In his recent radio address, Sunday, March 25, (See Mag. Sec. Deseret News, March 31st), Elder Harold B. Lee of the Quorum of Twelve, fell into some of the old ruts from which we have extricated other members of the Quorum in times past.

One would expect these leading men to thoroughly inform themselves on Gospel standards before undertaking to teach them to the public. However, we presume it is but natural for men who are on the payroll of an institution to root for the principles of that institution.

Elder Lee's belabored effort to establish in the person of the President of the Church the office of the "One man" (D. & C., 132:7) who also must necessarily be the President of Priesthood, fell short of his aim. It is almost inconceivably strange that men in his position cannot understand the difference between the Priesthood and the Church. His file leader, President Clark, has done what he could to clarify the situation. He has taught that the organizations are separate and distinct; that Priesthood functions independent of the church, but the church cannot function independent of the Priesthood and remain in harmony with its founder, Jesus Christ. These men with dense minds—or are their minds guided by the sophistries of men rather than by the Holy Ghost?—seem not to be able to comprehend that the Priesthood organized the Church and gave to it all its prerogatives and powers. They would have us believe that the locomotive is greater than its designer and builder.

To speak of the Lord restoring to His Priesthood an eternal principle in this the last dispensation of the fulness of times, at the inestimable cost of the best blood of the generation, later to be taken away from that Priesthood by the President of the Church, himself being a child of the Priesthood, is but child's patter emanating from the kindergarten minds of a subservient clergy.

For Elder Lee's information let us say that President Wilford Woodruff had no revelation commanding him to to have plural marriages cease. No such revelation has been produced, **nor can it be.** It was not intended by Wilford Woodruff that plural marriages should cease. President Woodruff functioned in two offices. In the one, as President of the Church, he signed the Manifesto to satisfy the apostate element in the Church and, as the late Charles W. Penrose put it, "as a sop to the Gentiles". In the other, and greater office—as

President of Priesthood, he appointed men, among them Heber J. Grant and others, to exercise the sealing powers of Elijah in inducting worthy men into that principle, in their Priesthood capacity. The late Anthony W. Ivins was chosen and set apart under the hands of Wilford Woodruff to perform such marriages in Mexico. These are the facts and Elder Lee must sooner or later acknowledge them.

One question to Elder Lee:

If Wilford Woodruff was commanded to have plural marriage stopped both within church and Priesthood circles, why didn't the practice stop; how came that hundreds of leading church officials, including at least six members of the Quorum of Twelve, entered the practice and were never handled for doing so, and later died in the faith and confidence of the Saints?

Elder Lee cannot refute these facts. Will he try to answer the question?

TWISTINGS AND TURNINGS

(Contributed)

Under the heading of "Twistings and Turnings", in April issue of TRUTH, you printed the testimony of President Joseph F. Smith. This testimony was taken from the transcript of the Smoot investigation at Washington in 1904.

Some of the answers given by President Smith were, to me, rather disappointing. We refer especially to that given to the Chairman of the committee: "Do you understand it (the Manifesto) was a revelation the same as other revelations?" President Smith answered: "It was a revelation to me." We are wondering if he intentionally failed to complete the sentence which in his mind meant: "It was a revelation to me that the officials of the Church would endorse such a document."

Everyone familiar with that historic pronouncement knows that it was no revelation. It was an expedient formulated and concocted by men outside as well as inside the Church, solely and simply to gain statehood for Utah. The Church thought that with statehood status Federal domination would cease, and that with commonwealth rights laws could be framed to ease pressure against them to live peacefully and happily. If there was a man who knew the truth as to the origin and purpose of the Manifesto that man was Joseph F. Smith, for he was one of those who refused to put his signature to that document.

We quote:

Some people have supposed that the doctrine of plural marriage was a sort of superfluity or non-essential to the salvation of mankind, in other words, some of the Saints have said, and believe that a man with one wife, sealed to him by the authority of the Priesthood for time and eternity, will receive an exaltation as great and glorious, if he is faithful, as he possibly could with more than one, I wish here to enter my solemn protest against this idea, for I know it is false. There is no blessing promised except upon conditions, and no blessing can be obtained by mankind except by faithful compliance with the conditions or law, upon which the same is promised. The marriage of one woman to a man for time and eternity by the sealing power, according to the law of God is a fulfillment of the celestial law of marriage in part. * * * But this is only the beginning of the law, not the whole of it. Therefore, whoever has imagined that he could obtain the fulness of the blessings pertaining to this celestial law, by complying with only a portion of its conditions, has deceived himself. He cannot do it.

To put this matter more correctly before you, I here declare that the principle of plural marriage was not first revealed on the 12th day of July, 1843. It was written for the first time on that date, but it had been revealed to the Prophet many years before that, perhaps as early as 1832. * * *

Man cannot receive the fulness of the blessings unless he fulfills the law, any more than he can claim the gift of the Holy Ghost after he is baptized without the laying on of hands by proper authority, or the remission of sins without baptism, though he may repent in sackcloth and ashes. * * *

The law is in force upon the inhabitants of Zion and he that is qualified to obey it cannot neglect or disregard it with immunity, but it must be obeyed in righteousness. The commandment is "be ye righteous, be ye holy

as He is holy." (Extracts of sermon of Joseph F. Smith, Journal of Discourses, Vol. 20, p. 24).

Could any man possessing the integrity of Joseph F. Smith, making the above statement, answer the Chairman's question by saying, "It was a revelation to me", without mental reservations? We realize he was in a tough spot and that questions were being thrown at him from all directions by skillful lawyers. We believe he had great personal courage as to his own welfare, but that his main desire was to protect the Saints from needless persecution. However, had he had time to think his answer out, we honestly believe he would have answered "No".

It appears to us as though Senator Bailey expected a more forthright answer and was rebuking President Smith when he said:

> **I cannot understand how a man who has any Christian faith can yield his conscience to the law, though I do understand how he can conform his conduct to it. I cannot quite understand how, if the revelation comes from on high, you could, as a matter of conscience, yield it to a law that is made by ordinary, every-day lawmakers, either in Utah or at Washington, though I understand perfectly well that as a question of good citizenship you would, in temporal affairs, yield to the law of the land. I will say to you very frankly that I do not have much patience with a doctrine which does not receive a revelation until there is a statute and where the revelation happens to conform to the statute. What I have been trying to fix in my mind is whether you taught that this was a revelation or merely a submission to the law. If it were a submission to the law, then it would be a question whether the Christian would submit to the laws of the land or to the laws of God. I do not pretend to judge about that, but when a sect teaches that an inspiration comes just after a statute has been passed and a report made to Congress, I do not quite understand that anybody is required to accept it as a revelation.**

Are the commands of God to be regarded as the flighty debutante treats her hat selections—to be changed as often as style dictates?

President Smith did not say it was a revelation "from on high". His testimony refutes that. His object was to keep Reed Smoot in the United States Senate; but we think the cost was too great.—Editor.

JOSEPH F. SMITH

What shall I say of the grand and glorious work that he has done in rearing the large and splendid family that he leaves behind? What a noble work for any man! Indeed, no man without great nobility of soul could have accomplished it. Is not this bringing up a good family and large family of good citizens—good men and women—good for the Church, for the State and good for the Nation—is not this, I say, about the most Godlike piece of work that man can do in this world? The thinking mind which goes into this question deeply enough will see that here is the work, not only of a man, of a great man, but of a God in embryo.

The whole Church can take pride in the vindication of the great principle which he has so successfully wrought out. No ordinary man could accomplish that. Happy the wife who can call him husband. Happy and blessed indeed the children who call him father. Never was a man more chaste and virtuous to the fiber of his being than he. Against all forms of thoughts of licentiousness he was set and as immovable as a mountain. "Blessed are the pure in heart", and he was of the purest—he shall see God.—The Presidents of the Church, Nibley, p. 268.

President Smith Testified before the Committee on Privileges and Elections in the Reed Smoot case, 1904, he had five wives and forty-four children. Our correspondent who furnished the above item comments, "I cannot see why this eulogy cannot be applied to the members of the group that are now being mistreated by the Government and the Church officials."—Editor.

FRUITS OF PLURAL MARRIAGE

In the recent death of the very estimable lady, Elizabeth Badger Higgs, sister of the late Brig. Gen. Carl A. Badger, another evidence of the superior quality of offspring from plural marriages comes to the fore. Her four sons were listed in the service of their country in positions of honor. One, First Lt. Grant B. Higgs, simultantously with his mother's death, was reported lost over the North Atlantic, leaving the three survivors: First Officer Brentnal J. Higgs, Air Transport Command, Edmonton, Canada; Calvin B. Higgs, Aviation Machinist's Mate 2/c overseas; and Joseph R. Higgs, Seaman 2/c, San Diego.

These fine upstanding men are the product of plural marriage contracted since the Manifesto of 1890. Heber J. Grant in one of his mental aberrations once said, that "No man who had entered into plural marriage since the Manifesto was a credit to any community, and the same can be said of their children."

What thinks Brother Grant of these children? No apologies are needed for truth?

In the demise of this good woman—faithful wife and loving companion—we extend Brother Higgs our sincere condolences. May he find comfort in the assurance that all wrongs will be righted by the Great Judge whose word is final.

PRAYER

Through some remarks already made I am reminded of my boyhood. At that early period of my life I learned to approach God. Many a time I have gone into the fields and concealing myself behind some bush, would bow before the Lord and call upon Him to guide and direct me. And He heard my prayer. At times I would get other boys to accompany me. It would not hurt you, boys and girls, to call upon the Lord in your secret places, as I did. That was the spirit which I had when I was a little boy. And God has led me from one thing to another. But I did not have the privilege that you have. There was nobody to teach me, while you have access to good men at any time who can direct you in the way of life and salvation. But my spirit was drawn out after God then; and I feel the same yet.—Pres. John Taylor (October 19, 1881), J. of D., 22:314-5.

PROGRESS IN THE COURTS

The Supreme Court of the United States has accepted the appeal, for its review, of the cases of the nine defendants adjudged guilty of Mann Act and Lindbergh kidnapping charges. Arguments will be heard before that august body during the coming October term of court.

The Supreme Court has announced its refusal to review the Unlawful Cohabitation cases involving the fifteen defendants, appealed from the decision of the Supreme Court of Utah, claiming no federal question is involved. The defendants have filed a "Petition for Rehearing", and are awaiting the final action of the high court on this petition.

The appeal from the decision of the District Court finding thirty-one defendants guilty of conspiracy to void the State laws, is being prepared for review by the State Supreme Court. All the defendants are all at liberty on bonds.

CHILDHOOD—RUSSIA AND BRITAIN

"It is a sorry fact that millions of British children, on the day that the war broke out (War II), were seriously underfed, one-sixth of them disastrously so, as we were informed in a scientific study by Sir John Boyd Orr, our leading expert on food and health.

"In Russia, on the other hand, throughout a close inspection in five republics and nine cities, I never saw a hungry child."—Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, in the "Secret of Soviet Strength".

ABRAHAM LINCOLN SAID IT:

"Impoliteness denotes inferiority"

Many people overlook this point in their contacts with people. An Abe Lincoln story aptly illustrates the value of politeness.

President Lincoln, driving along a country road with a friend, met an aged Negro who lifted his hat. Lincoln promptly returned the salue, whereupon his companion asked in surprise:

"Surely, Mr. President, it isn't your custom to tip your hat to a Negro?"

"Why yes, indeed", replied the President; "you couldn't expect me to permit a Negro to outdo me in politeness!"

INDEX

A

Abraham: Character Vindicated—Thatcher....57
Adam: Our God and Father of Christ, 299; Ancient of Days—Pratt 299
Adams, John: On Religious Liberty 293
Agency: Free Agency, 46; Thatcher on 58
Agriculture: Minerals for Livestock, 49; Potatoes for Cows 139
Allred, Atheline Mills: Faith Promoting Experience 215
Americans: A Wonderful People 4
American Civil Liberties Union: Correspondence with Midgard 273
Ancient Records: 301; Manuscript..... 303
Angels: Directs Saints to Emigrate 176
Anniversary Thoughts: 10
Apostasy: Fruits of—John Taylor 204
Apostleship: Qualifications for 16
Appreciation: Many Letters Coming 251
Arizona: Statehood of 104

B

Babson, Roger: Sound Advice 54
Bailey, Senator: On Revelation and the Law 288
Ballard, M. J.: A Conspirator 143
Baptist, John: The Elias—John Taylor..... 191
Barlow: Passing of "Aunt" Mattie, 166; Israel B. Goes on 246
Barnes, Claude T.: Defense of "Fundamentalists" 33
Birth Rate: Declining 245
Blackstone: On Liberty, 43 292
Blankets: Origin of Name 290
Bondage: Not Right, 124; of Debt—John Taylor 157
Book of Mormon: Ancient Records... 301, 303
Brief: Unlawful Cohabitation Case—Appellants 85
Buchannan, President: Arranged the Steal. 121

C

Calendar: Perpetual 219
Calhoun: Washington Appears to 247
Cannon, George Q.: Is History Repeating Itself?, 51; Imprisoned, 52; Gossiping, 76; Odium of Persecutors, 133; Saints Cannot Surrender 220
Carpet-baggers: John Taylor on 206
Catholicism: Position on Freedom of Religion 292
Children: As Assets, 44; Brigham Young on Governing 306
Christ, Jesus: Reward for Apprehension, 22; Sermon on the Mount 180
Christmas: Greetings Acknowledged..... 223
Church: Restores—Smith, 106; Claims Authority, 126; When leader Incapacitated What Is Procedure, 135; A Conspirator, 142; Rule of Church, Not Law of God, 287; Leaders of Apostates, Backsliding—D. W. S. 84
Civilization: Modern Civilization Decried—John Taylor 121
Clark, J. Reuben: Conference Talk, 12; Return to Fundamentals Urged, 148; Eulogizes H. J. G. Beyond Deserts, 211; Comments on Inspiration, 244; An Apostate Leader 333
Cleaning, Spring: Mind and Body 137
Conference: Thoughts 12
Consecration: Law of 18
Conspirators. Who, the Real Conspirators, 141-148; H. J. Grant's Part 183
Constitution: Will Not Perish 265
Courage: Moral 129
Courts: Progress in "Fundamentalists" Cases Reported, 27, 54, 110, 139, 196, 278, 232; Comments on 75
Crimes: Big and Little 278
Critic: Answered 16

D

Declaration of Independence: A Mystery Man Appears 163
Deseret News: Copy of First Issue Filed With Priesthood 247
Devil: Power of—H. C. Kimball 50
Dissolution: Brigham Young on 7
Divorce: Evils of 246 250
Dreams: Atheline Mills Allred, 215; Brigham Young 221
Dutchman: A Puzzled Dutchman 48

E

Earl, Bishop: On Plural Marriage 272
Edge, Robert: Strange Personage..... 205
Editorials: Opposing Truth—W. W., 10; Anniversary Number, 10; Conference Thoughts, 12; Critic Answered, 16; Fruits of Persecution, 22; Husband Shortage, Mann Act, 39; Liberty, 43; Human Assets, 44; TRUTH in Public Libraries, 45;

INDEX (Continued)

Obedience and Free Agency, 46; Cannot Sink P. M.—H. C. K., 70; A Legislative Problem, 70, 103, 123; Contributions, 74; Nation to Be Broken Up—W. W., 123; Be Orthodox, 126; National Waste, 128; Who Are Real Conspirators, 141; Laws of God Unchangeable—John Taylor, 149; Anniversary of John Taylor, 150; Stamp Out Source of P. M., 151; Open Letter to Mark E. Petersen, 169; Kimball on Anniversary of Joseph Smith, 179; Duplicity, 182; Holiday Season, 186; Midgard on Motherhood, Petersen's Letter, 207; the "One Man", 209; Eulogies and Eulogies of H. J. G, 211; Excommunicants, 213; the Tribune List, 214; Negro Race, 218; John Taylor on Lack in Courage, "Cultists" and Mark E. Petersen, 241; Inspiration—From What Source—Clark, 244; a Worth While Press, Birth-rate Decline, 245; Our Position, 266; the Lord a Foreign Power, 269; Twistings andTurnings, 271; Jurisdictional and Constitutional Question, 291; Human Sacrifices, 294; "Eisenhower Doctrine", 323; Elder Lee Talks Loose 329

"Eisenhower Doctrine": As It Applies to the Church 233

Elias, The: John Taylor on 190

Enoch, City of: Report by Joseph Young, Sen. 188

Epistles: 182, 197, 304, 310

Evans, Abel John: Bill on P. M. 73

Excommunications: List Increasing 213

F

Faith: Have Faith and Keep It 250

First Aid: Directions Given 307

Flag:....Of U. S. and Kingdom of God—Brigham Young 103

Food: Destruction of 4

Franklin, Benjamin: Other People Control Us, 140; Liberty, 266; Prayer 278

Freedom: Religious Freedom Maintained—Brigham Young, 1, 2; Freedom for All Men—John Taylor 53

Fundamentals: Return to—Clark, 148; Progressive Opinion on 245

G

Gifts of the Spirit: Tongues, Gift 136

God: Unchangeable—John Taylor 138

Gospel: No Surrender of, 19; Unchangeable —Lee 251

Gossiping: George Q. Cannon 76

Government: Lord's Course in Moral Government—John Taylor 194

Grant, Heber J.: Lord Makes but Few Mistakes, 15; a Conspirator, 142; Eulogies and Eulogies 211

H

Hatfield: Angels Direct to Emigrate 176

Hollister: O. J. Discussion With John Taylor, 197; Lord a Foreign Power 269

Honesty: Among Saints Necessary—George A. Smith, 32; John Taylor on, 121 290

Hunt, Rt. Rev. Duane G.: On Liberty..... 43

Hyde, Orson: Judgments to Come..... 206

I

Immorality: Immorality Not Mormonism, 35; Unseen Sins to Be Punished 37

Inspiration: From What Source 244

Ivins, Anthony W.:....A Conspirator 142

J

Jefferson, Thomas: On Liberty, 43; Religious Liberty.—Cannon 234, 292

Jericho: Walls Fall 250

Jessop: Cases Dismissed in St. George 278

Judgments: Wilford Woodruff on, 137, 145; John Taylor on, 155; Dishonest to Partake of—J. T. (Epistle), 197; Orson Hyde on 206

K

Kennedy, Judge T. Blake: Decision in Mann Act Cases 126

Kimball, Heber C.: Murderers of Joseph Smith, 2; Anniversary, 11; Redemption of Zion by Power, 37; Power of Devil, 50; Vitality of Mormonism, 111; Useless to Oppose P. M., 145; Priesthood Order 179

Kimball, J. Golden: On Prejudice 150

Kingdom of God: Flag of Brigham Young, 103; John Taylor on 199

L

Law: Of the Land, 20; Moral Infractions Excused, 33; Laws and More Laws, 34; Injustices of, 40; L. Unconstitutional—Cannon, 51; Nicholes' Act, 73; Legislative Program, 70, 103, 123; Constitutional Law, 123; L. of God Cannot Be Resisted, 149; Epistle 1885 on, 304; Lyman on 305

Lee, Harold B.: The "One Man", 211; Gospel Unchangeable, 251; Radio Talk Discussed 329

Legislative Program: 70, 103, 123

Liberty: Bishop Hunt on, 43; Must Purify Ourselves—Thatcher, 57; We Seek Liberty, 109; Lincoln on, 178; An Inherent Right.. 297

"Life": Startup Letter to 79

Lincoln: On Liberty 178

Lord: A Foreign Power—Hollister 269

Love: God Is Love 189

Luther: On Plural Marriage 171

Lyman, Francis M.: On Observing Law 305

M

Madison: On Religious Liberty—Cannon, 134 292

Man Without Excuse: 288

Mann Act: What Constitutes 291

INDEX (Continued)

Manifesto: Purpose of, 73; Not a Revelation 330
Marriage: P. M. Punished and Whoredom Condoned, 4; Brann on, 5; Critic Answered, 19; I Am a Plural Wife, 23, 25; Comment on From Virginia, 38; Thatcher Defends P. M., 64; Midgard on, 65; Expressions of a Plural Wife, 69; Anti-polygamy Act—Nicholes, 73; a First Wife Speaks, 130; Joseph Smith and Successors on, 145, 146; Stamp Out Source of P. M., 151; Infanticide—John Taylor, 152; Marriage and Divorce, 250; Hundreds Authorized—John Taylor, 259, 264; "Our Position", 268; Bp. Earl on, 272; I, Too, Am a Man, 275; P. M. in Utah, 281; Age for Legal Marriage 12 to 14 years 290
Marsh, Thos. B.: John Taylor on 205
Mexico: Treaty With 106
Midgard, Edward: On Motherhood, 8, 9; on Celestial Marriage, 65; Right to Motherhood, 159, 207; Martyrs of Motherhood, 217; Correspondence With Baldwin, 273; Does It make Sense 308
Miller, Jacob H.: On God 288
Miracle: A Modern Miracle, 79; Angel Directs Saints to Emigrate 176
Missouri's Outrages: George A. Smith on 31
Mormonism: An Enigma—John Taylor, 49; Vitality of—Kimball, 111; Proverbs From the New York Prophet 138
Motherhood: Petition for, 7, 8, 9; Midgard on, 65, 159; Martyrs of--Midgard, 217; Our Position, 267; Right to Motherhood—Baldwin 273
Mystery Man: Appears in Independence Hall. 163

Mc

McKay, David O.: A Conspirator, 144, 184; Church on a Detour 149

N

New Year: By Jarbee 203
Negro Race: Joseph Smith and Brigham Young on 218

O

Oklahoma: On Statehood 104
"One Man", the: 209
Ordinances: Never Change, 107; Changed —Richards 127, 149
Orthodox: Deseret News Advises 126

P

Paul: Conversion of 22
Pearls Before Swine: John Taylor on 162
Penrose, Charles W.: Saints Should Investigate Revelations Before Accepting 15
Persecution: Missouri's Kind, 3; From Church, 14; Fruits of, 22, 23; Odium of Persecutors—Cannon, 133; Persecutors Themselves Immoral 196
Petersen, Mark E.: Bares Conspiracy, 146; Claims Pope's Power, 147; Open Letter to, 169, 183; His Letter, 208; "Cultists and Petersen" 241
Poetry: Scandal, 27; My Prayer, Standard of Zion, Always Something to Do, 28; Thought of Mine, 50; The Unfinished Prayer, Laus Infantium, Thy Will Be Done, The Return, 55; Two Men—Jesus and Alexander, Life, 84; Handful of Dust, 102; Gains for All Our Losses, The Questioner, Life's Scars—Wilcox, 112; Hello, It Takes So Little, Prayer, Habit Breaking, Eternal Destiny, Your Reward, 140; Charity, 166; Infant Gods, When I Grow Old, 167; A Prayer, Justice Not Charity—Wilcox; Hoozat, Build the Man, 196; Life's Tapestry, No Time, 223; To the Virgins, 224; My Recompense, Johnnie's Home, A New Year's Wish, My Prayer, 252; Earth Bound, Beginning at the End, 279; Christus Consolator, Another Christmas Has Passed, Life's Lesson, 280; Looks Like a Rackie, 307; Little Orphant Annie, Little Busy Bee 308
Politics: John Taylor on 158
Polygamy: Defended by Brann, 5, 7; Appelants' Brief, 85; A First Wife Speaks, 130; Reformers and Polygamy 171
Potatoes: Feeding Cows 139
Pratt, Orson: Rules of Family Conduct, 113; Ancient of Days, Who Is 299
Progress: Modern Progress Decried..... 224
Progressive Opinion: On "Fundamentalists" 245
Prostitution: In Utah Denounced..... 33
Proverbs: Mormon Proverbs 138
Public Libraries: New York Library Wants TRUTH 45

R

Records: Ancient 301
Reynolds, George: Suttee and Thuggism Compared With P. M. 294-6
Richards, Franklin D.: On P. M. in Utah.... 281
Richards, Stephen L. Favors Change of Ordinances 149
Ring Finger 321
Roberts, Brigham E.: Stamp Out Source of P. M. 151
Roberts, B. H.: All Leaders Not Inspired, 15; On Liberty to Act 75
Roosevelt, Franklin D.: Letter of Protest to—Gavalya,, 80; Religious Liberty Claimed 293
Roosevelt, Theodore: Nine Reasons for Going to Church 54
Rules of Family Conduct: Orson Pratt on 113

S

Saints: Cannot Surrender—Cannon 220
Secret Societies: Thatcher on, 63; Keeping Secrets, John Taylor 265

INDEX (Continued)

Seventies: Historical 160, 188
Sickness: Cured by Administration 79
Smith, David A.: A Conspirator 143
Smith, George A.: A Sermon—Persecution, Redemption of Zion, etc. 29
Smith, The Prophet Joseph: Murdered by Apostates—Kimball, 2; Anniversary of Martyrdom, 10; on P. M., 132; Don't Betray Brethren, 145, 211; His Position—Kimball; Anniversary, 179; writes From Liberty Jail, 186; Instructs Seventies, 188; Why Did Not Fight in Missouri, 190; Negro Race, 218; Teaches Brigham Young in a Dream, 221; Mission—John Taylor 222
Smith, Joseph F.: Men Must Act on Own Responsibility, 15; Qualification of Teachers, 127; False Doctrine, 211; Before Senate Committee 284
Smith, Joseph Fielding: Church Restored.. 106
Snow, Lorenzo: Revelation to, 81; P. M. Will Not Be Stopped 145
South Carolina: Resolution to Secede..... 48
Spring Cleaning: 137
Startup, George A.: A Letter to "Life" Magazine 79
Steinmetz, Charles: Spiritual Forces to the Fore 291
Strange Personage: Robert Edge 205
Supreme Court: Decision of 1879 Discussed 197
Suttee: Explained 295
Symes, Judge J. Foster: Quashed Conspiracy Indictments 148

T

Talmage, James E.: A Conspirator 143
Taylor, President John: On Liberty, 43; Mormonism an Enigma, 49; No Confidence in Courts, 52; Freedom for All, 53; Letter to John Henry Smith, 81; Modern Civilization Decried, 121; God Unchangeable, 138; Not Ashamed of P. M., 145; Laws of God Cannot Be Resisted, 149; Agency Proclaimed, Anniversary, Brigham Young on, 150; Infanticide, 152; Constitution an Inspired Document, 153; Bondage of Debt, 157; Politics, 158; Pearls Before Swine, 162; Elias, 190; Lord's Course in Moral Government, 194; Epistle—1882, 197; Fruits of Apostasy, 204; Carpet-baggers, 206; Joseph's Mission, 223; Discussion With Hollister on P. M., 197; Moral Courage Lacking, 241; in Court on Temples and Ordinances, 253; on Secrets, Eternity, 265; on Revelation, 277; Honesty and Truth 290
Temples and Ordinances: President Taylor's Testimony 253
Thatcher, Moses: Conference Sermon 57
Thuggism: 294
Tongues: A Testimony of, 136; Adamic Language 189
Tribune: List of Marriages 214
Truth: Magazine in Libraries 45
Twistings and Turnings Church Engaged in, 271; President Smith on the Stand, 284 330

U

Utah Commission: Report on Polygamy.... 105
United Order: George A. Smith on, 30; John Taylor on 201
United States: Nature of Government—Thatcher, 56; "Mystery Man" 163
Unity: Urged by Clark, 13; George A. Smith on, 29; Babson on, 54; Clark on.... 148

W

War: South Carolina Convention 48
Washington, George: Appears to Calhoun, 247; on Religious Liberty 292
Waste: National, Decried 128
Wells, Daniel H.: A Special People..... 182
Whitney, Orson F.: A Special People..... 182
Williams, Roger: On Liberty 72, 294
Women: Greatness Evolves From, 135; What a Woman Can Do—From the "Mormon", 165; How to Tell Her Age, 178; Women of Mormondom 297
Woodruff, Wilford: But Few to Reach Goal, 10; Revelation of 1880—Nation to Be Broken Up, 123; God's Judgments, 137; Opposers of P. M. Cursed, 145; Revelation of 1880 Quoted 209

Y

Young, Brigham: Plain Talk, 1; Dissolution, 7; Anniversary, 11; Saints Must Know for Selves, 15; Why Believe in P. M., 71; Kingdom of God and Flag, 103; P. M. the Heavenly Pattern, 145; on John Taylor, 150; on Joseph Smith, 179; Negro Race, 218; Instructive Dream, 221; Twistings and Turnings, 271; Governing Children 306
Young, Joseph, Sen.: On Seventies Organization 160
Young, Seymour B: On Law of God..... 305

Z

Zion:....How Z. Army Marched, 2; to Be Redeemed Through Law of Consecration, 29; Redemption by Power—H. C. K., 37; Z. a Place of Safety and Refuge—Thatcher, 57; Keys of City of Zion..... 189

TRUTH

Published by

Truth Publishing Company



ST. JOSEPH WHITE MUSSER – AGE 72

Joseph White Musser