

path and make it plain, and we will emerge from the difficulty stronger than we were before, and be full of additional thanksgiving unto God our heavenly Father for His goodness and kindness to us. This will be the result in the future just as it has been in the past, and it will continue to be the result. For I tell you there is a great future before this people. We have all the elements which are necessary to make us a great people, and we cannot be deprived of them. We are a united people to begin with. And then we are a temperate people, we are a frugal people, we are a loving people, we are a virtuous people, we are a brave people. Yes, we are a brave people; for it takes courage to be a Latter-day Saint. A man that is a coward cannot be a Latter-day Saint. A woman who is not a heroine cannot be a Latter-day Saint. It requires just that kind of courage which is so rare in the world to be a Latter-day Saint—the courage to maintain one's convictions. This famous young lady—Belle Harris—has given us an exhibition of it. She preferred to go to the Penitentiary rather than answer the questions propounded to her. Such an exhibition of courage must have a wonderful influence. There is something about it, even if the cause were a bad one, that is admirable. Men admire that quality wherever they see it. There is nothing so admirable as courage of that description. It impresses even our enemies. "Why," they say, "if this girl can do such a thing, what shall we do with a people of that kind?"

Well, courage is a quality that this people have always manifested. They have submitted to wrongs, it is true; but their having done so is not an indication of a want of courage. On the contrary, it is sometimes an evidence of the highest and the purest and the best courage, to be willing to suffer wrong rather than take a course that could not be approved of to resist it, and these qualities in the struggle that lies before us will tell. You find a people who are frugal, who are temperate, who are industrious, who are united, who are loving, and who increase as we do, and they will make their mark on the earth. Such qualities always did tell in the struggle for existence among men from the earliest days. The nations that have possessed the qualities which our people possess have always been the honored nations. They have been the nations that have won their way to power and have compelled admiration even from their enemies. These qualities we possess, and we mean to cultivate them. We mean to train our children in these virtues. We mean to make them a virtuous people above everything else. That is the most desirable quality in this age of sin and corruption, when women, in many instances, are unsafe in the society of men. I want to see it in our country that our young ladies in the company of our young men, in any place and under any circumstances, in the darkest hours and in the most unprotected situations, will feel as safe as if they were in their mothers' bed chambers so far as anything wrong from the opposite sex is concerned. I would rather see men punished with death—which we believe is a law that should be put in force against any man who ruins woman—than that there ever should be a time in our country when corruption and wrongs of this character should run riot and be unchecked. Virtue lies at the foundation of individual and national greatness. No man can amount to much who is not a virtuous man, who is not strong in his virtue, I do not care who he is. He may be as talented as Lucifer; but if he is not a virtuous man his greatness will not amount to much. Virtue lies at the foundation of greatness. We mean to promote it and encourage it in the rising generation. In order that the rising generation should have it, the mothers must have it, and feel its importance, and the fathers also. And then we must teach all those other virtues that belong to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Our religion is admirably adapted to every circumstance of life. We can carry it with us every day. It is not like our Sunday clothes—to be worn on the Sunday and laid away on Monday. It is an eminently practical religion, and is adapted to every day alike and not for special occasions alone. I like it on that account. I am very much pleased with it, always have been, and with those virtues that it instills, the every day virtues of life.

If I am a Latter-day Saint, as I

should be, I am an honest man. If I were to trade I would trade honestly, or else I am not worthy of the name of Latter-day Saint. If I had a wagon to sell I would tell what sort of a wagon it was and not cheat the party to whom I was selling, or say that he must judge of the article by his own eyes, that his own eyes must tell him if there is anything wrong. I do not consider that good Latter-day Saint doctrine. If I have a horse to sell to my neighbor and he asks me if the animal has any defect, I ought to be willing to tell what it is. And so with everything else. We must be an honest people; for I tell you those who are not honest cannot retain the Spirit of God. God wants an honest people, a truthful people, a people whose word can be relied upon, a people whose word is as good as their bond. I do not know whether you all do or not, but if not, you ought to cultivate this quality of honesty. It is always profitable for a man to be honest. Let him get a credit of that kind and it will bring him profit; but if he deceives then confidence is gone and people will shun him. I never trade with a man that tricks me more than once. I do not say much. I suppose everybody has the same kind of feeling. I never quarrel nor find fault, but then I think a great deal, and I suppose most of the people have a good memory for these sort of things.

As Latter-day Saints, we should be honest, truthful, frugal and economical, and do everything we can to improve our condition. Every man that has a poor house should seek to get a better. When I started out in life I attached little importance to the matter of a house. For many years I was in the missionary field. Fifteen years of my early experience in life was spent in the missionary field. I was only some nine months at home during that period, and I attached little importance to a house. But I soon found out that my folks did not take the same view that I did about it. I have learned this, that a woman looks upon a house as a matter of much more importance than a man does. It is her home. And when I see wives in houses of a poor class when their husbands might build better, I think their husbands do not understand woman's nature as they should do. Women with families should have good houses, and husbands should labor to get them, and then leave them to adorn them and make them comfortable and desirable. Children like to have a nice house, because they can invite their companions to it. Men should strive to make their families comfortable in this way. It is their duty to do so. I was very much delighted with some remarks President Taylor made on this subject. He told the husbands to court their wives over again, to cultivate the feeling they had when they started out in life, when they were everything to each other, and when they could not do enough for each other. That is a feeling that should be cultivated. Men should never treat their wives with disrespect. They should manifest a feeling of love for them, and more especially when they become advanced in years. There is nothing that will excite love in a man's heart so much as to see a wife as willing, even in her advanced years, to sacrifice her own comfort for his sake as she was when they were first married; and I am sure it must have the same effect upon a woman—to have the husband, when her charms are fading and she is growing old, and perhaps not so attractive as she was—to have the husband tender and kind and loving, not forgetting her good qualities, nor what she has done. When a woman sees a husband manifest that feeling towards her, she in return will manifest her kindness and love for his thoughtful attentions.

These are little things, but how much they contribute to our happiness and to our peace! We should therefore cultivate these qualities ourselves and teach them to our children. Our children should be made to feel that we love them and that we are disposed to treat them with proper respect. When we ask a child to do a favor, we should ask it as though he were a gentleman, or if a girl, as though she were a lady. A man should never talk to his children as though he were a tyrant. He should address them in kindness, and as though they were gentlemen and ladies, and they will grow up with that feeling and treat others with the same respect. Why, I would not ask my children to do me a favor without thanking them any

more than I would ask any grown person. Neither would I ask a favor of a hired hand without doing the same thing. I have been in such positions myself and know the feelings that such people have. I know that their feelings are tender and that in their position they appreciate kindness. And people who are young are more sensitive than older persons of more experience in life, and we cannot be too careful about their feelings. We should treat one another with the utmost respect and the utmost kindness. Women should talk to their children in kindness; not harshly, and not in a spirit of scolding. It is a dreadful habit this habit of scolding. A man or a woman who is always scolding, loses her influence with her children and with everybody else.

I pray God to bless you and all you with the Holy Ghost, in the name of Jesus, Amen.

LETTER FROM JOSEPH SMITH, OF LAMONI, IOWA.

Editor Deseret News:

In your issue for August 7th, is an editorial upon "Joseph Smith and Celestial Marriage," which I propose to examine, and as you have chosen to supplement Mr. L. O. Littlefield's reply, which you deemed to be ample to crush me and my view, you ought in the name of justice and truth which you pretend to love, to permit me to place my statement before your readers.

It is not well known to your Church that Joseph Smith taught and practiced plural marriage. It cannot be, and for the simplest of reasons, it was "taught secretly" and practiced "secretly." It was known, if at all, to but few. Brigham Young so stated, August 29th, 1852, and so states Mr. Littlefield. Either they mistake, or you do. If Mr. Littlefield was put, or put himself forward as the one to call out the leader of the Josephite movement, Mr. Littlefield's testimony is better than yours; for whatever he may know on the subject, your testimony is only hearsay, as personally you know nothing about it.

It was not necessary that L. O. Littlefield should put out a letter for the purpose of getting me upon record on the point in question; for I have been on record for twenty years, and he will be a fortunate man in this controversy who can name a time or place that I have said or done that which would contradict the record.

The charging of Joseph Smith, the martyr, with "deceit, hypocrisy and cowardice" is not my work; and Elder L. O. Littlefield and you, Mr. Editor, know that I have denied his being the human author of the doctrine of plurality of wives, and the revelation which is claimed for its sanction upon the ground that he was not a deceiver, was not a hypocrite and was not a coward. And for the reason that God was not a deceiver, was not a hypocrite, was not a changeable being, I have and do deny that he was the divine author of the revelation and the doctrine.

The tenor of your editorial is to defend against a charge of changeability on God's part said to have been made by me. Before you can truthfully say that I have in any sense charged God with having changed you must first show that the revelation on which you predicate celestial marriage is from God; this you cannot do. Should it be proved that Joseph Smith taught and practiced plural wifery, it does not prove that the doctrine is of God, but simply proves what Joseph Smith did. And if he thus taught and practiced before the revelation was promulgated, he did so without warrant and contrary to the law then prevalent. You make him to be the sinner when you thus charge him.

I deny the charge, thus maintaining his integrity. Besides this, if you prove that Joseph Smith did so teach and practice before the revelation was to be known to the people, you throw strong suspicion upon the character of the evidence that he gave touching the divinity of the revelation; because it takes on the nature of an *ex post facto* law, and therefore to be received with great caution.

If you are so anxious that the truth should be told, why are you so willing to set me before your readers falsely. Is not the fact that I seem to oppose what my father taught, and condemn what it is asserted he practiced, enough in itself, without that position being falsified by you?

I have quoted the language of the books the Mormons say they believe in regard to the character of God for changeability, and cited the argument the Elders were wont to use.

The stand I have taken is against the men, who, by the claim they make for him, his acts and teaching, make my father a man of duplicity and cowardice; and it is because I am not willing to admit that he was this, I have given as a reason for my stand against those men.

Has bias, or prejudice, nothing to do with you or your fellows, Mr. Editor, when you present and defend plurality of wives?

Before you charge me with quibbling you will do well to get rid of the evasions resorted to destroy the force of the statement made by Jacob: "Truly David and Solomon had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord." There is not a line in Jacob's charge that shows that it was for taking wives without God's command, but was for having them at all.

Where in the revelation on plural marriage is any commandment that it should be kept secret? Why did Joseph and Hyrum publicly declare that the marriage law published in the Doctrine and Covenants of 1834 was the only one in the church? Why did John Taylor do the same thing in 1850? Where is the word of the Lord telling Brigham Young that the time, August 29th, 1851, was the time when the revelation should be declared to the world? What change took place in the conditions under which the church existed from 1831 to 1843, that warranted a change in the laws of marriage in that church? It is not shown that at that time there was any intention on the part of Joseph and Hyrum to remove beyond the jurisdiction of the monogamic laws of the States. There has been no change in those laws, hence no change in the conditions created by them, under which the church existed. There was no material change in the conditions in regard to such laws, until the people were removed into a territory where there was no State organization. If then the revelation was dependent upon conditions of that character, it would have been more consistent to have waited until such removal had taken place, before the revelation was given. The fact that the revelation was given before such removal, if given at all, is evidence against any claim that the conditions resulting from such removal make the revelation valid.

There is no evidence on record that Joseph Smith ever advocated, in public speech, article or published letter, the doctrine of plural marriage, celestial marriage, or polygamy. If there is, and the *News* can produce it, it will go farther towards convicting me of "opposing doctrines advocated by him," than any amount of calling me bad names, and telling what an "unworthy son" I am.

And pray tell us, Mr. Editor, upon what does any man, the editor of the *News* for instance, predicate his opposition to men or doctrines, if not upon "antipathies and convictions alone." I have given and can give good reasons for my antipathy against the doctrine of "plural wives," and also for my convictions, which are as strong as Holy Writ. The friends of the doctrine have given me no reasons why I should change my convictions, nor has the accepted history of its workings made it lovely in my eyes that I might have sympathy for it.

I feel that in one sense I have a warrant to permit my antipathy to bias my action. It is found in Revelations 2, 15 "So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate."

Not one of the quotations you make from the Doctrine and Covenants, authorized the keeping of that plural marriage business secret. Mr. Littlefield wrote that "because of the prejudices of the brethren, and the persecution he well knew he would have to meet; he delayed to make it known." It is Mr. Littlefield who charged cowardice on Joseph my father, and not I.

JOSEPH SMITH.

Lamoni, Iowa, August 24th, 1853.

A FRAUD EXPLODED.

A SHORT time ago we published the translation of an alleged copy of the decalogue, said to have been obtained from some Arabs in Syria, and consisting of fifteen strips of ancient

looking leather manuscript, the characters being in the Moabite language. The "discoverer" was a converted Jew named Shapira. It is not known whether he is a descendant of Sapphira spoken of in the New Testament, and we do not think his first name is Ananias, but like most of those renegade Hebrews who pretend to be converted to modern "Christianity," his conduct has been worthy of a literal descendant of those illustrious persons who came to a sudden death in the days of the Apostle Peter.

Shapira has figured before as a collector of curiosities. He was the "discoverer" of a number of Moabite jars and other pottery with Phoenician inscriptions, which American antiquarians rejected but which some European scholars accepted as genuine, probably because they helped to authenticate certain portions of Biblical history which are of doubtful authority to the skeptics. In like manner some of the scientific pedants received the sheepskin manuscripts with Moabite characters, similar to those on the famous Moabite stone as genuine, and the converted Jew has been trying to get from the British Museum, for his treasures, the modest little sum of five million dollars.

Investigation into this matter was placed in the hands of Dr. Genesberg and other philological experts, and the inquiry was extended to the private character and pursuits of the "pious" Shapira. The manuscripts have been pronounced a fraud, and the pretended discoverer a humbug and a scoundrel. He has been keeping a curiosity shop in Jerusalem, where "antiques" have been palmed upon the unsophisticated pilgrim and tourist, some of them perhaps taken out of ancient ruins, but many of them manufactured by one Selim, a bird of prey of the same feather as Shapira. In this instance the aid of some copyist of skill has been invoked, the characters have been taken from the Moabite Stone, the sheepskin has been scraped and rubbed and dried and smoked and made ancient by modern art, and for a while the world was set agog by the wonderful treasure which was to prove such a grand corroboration of the Mosaic revelation of the ten commandments.

The exposure of the fraud reflects credit on Dr. Genesberg and his associates, and shows that the wisdom of the learned is often foolishness, and that scientific people are not unfrequently as gullible as common folks. The satire in the *Pickwick* papers about the antique stone inscribed bilstubshismark, is a comical illustration of the owl-like profundity of some pompous professors of extraordinary erudition.

It is a fortunate thing for the Directors of the British Museum and for the great public that the attempted fraud has been exploded, and it is to be hoped that the cunning rascal who has failed to bag a large sum of money will find himself in prison for his pains.

HEARD FROM.

VERY little has been heard lately of that pompous and obese philosopher commonly called the Rev. Joe. Cook. In Boston he is a great lecturer; elsewhere he is looked upon as a great fraud. We are reminded of his existence by the following squib in the *Omaha Herald*:

Joe Cook has spoken again. This time he has decreed that, should England ever have a weak and meddlesome king, he would be the last. That settles England, and her kings. What the Rev. Mr. Cook does not know about heaven, earth, or any region above or below them, will never be known. For a versatile man, the Boston theologian has never been surpassed; at least not in this generation. From a discourse on raw beef to an opinion on the wickedness of the press, from a sermon on his own importance to a lecture on England's future, is only an easy step for him. Great man this Cook! Persons visiting Boston should not fail to call on Professor John L. Sullivan and the Rev. Joseph Cook. Both are curiosities.

Puny, weak, and sickly children are made healthy and strong by using Brown's Iron Bitters.