

and therefore should have a public trial is astonishingly absurd. He was not accused in the sense of a trial or investigation. The fact of his lack of harmony with the authorities was explained and shown to be of much earlier date than his refusal to sign the Declaration and his engaging in active politics. To place himself in harmony with the Twelve, or refuse to do so, required no "trial" either public or private. He did neither. Yet the assurances given him which he misconstrues were observed and his "case" was not called up until he was able to appear.

It was but a few days after the Conference, even if it had entirely closed, before he appeared and spoke at public meetings as though he still held the authority in which he had not been sustained at Conference. This necessitated the announcement from the First Presidency through the DESERET NEWS that he had no right to officiate in the Priesthood while in his suspended condition.

Notwithstanding that announcement, when he chose to present himself to the authorities he presumed to attempt entrance to the Temple for that purpose, and at a time when the First Presidency as well as the Twelve met for the consideration of other Church matters and for holding their prayer circle. No one could attend but those of their own body, nor even enter the House unless in good standing.

No member of the Church without the proper recommendation obtain admittance to the Temple, no matter how much he may have contributed to its erection. That would cut no figure at all in the right of entrance. It is amazing that Moses Thatcher should attempt to intrude the boast of his contributions into the question of entering the Temple of God when not in good standing and full fellowship.

His exclusion from the Temple he construes into being "denied the privilege of meeting with the Quorum." No one knew better than he that there was no such denial. The assurance given him by Elder F. D. Richards and others of the Quorum was proof of their willingness to meet him and their joy at his manifestation of even a desire to meet them. That there were other places and occasions when he could properly have an interview with his brethren he fully understood, and he subsequently applied for it as he should have done long before.

In passing I will notice his technical quibble about the closing of the Temple against him on October 15th for his disregard of my letter of October 23rd, which he says is hard for him to understand. A careful reading of my letter will show that the difficulty is of his own manufacture. What I said conveys no such meaning as he asserts. I said, "This being the condition of affairs you were not admitted to the Temple on the forenoon of Thursday." "The condition of affairs" which caused that exclusion is set forth in the first paragraph of my letter, and relates to occurrences before the 15th. It is true that my letter of the 23rd in reply to his of the 16th is incidentally mentioned, but only as something growing out of what happened on the 15th, and of course was not intended to apply as a

condition existing before that date. This perversion of plain language shows what small evasions will be resorted to when one gets into the dark.

Reference to the Conference discourses published in the DESERET NEWS was made that Brother Thatcher might know exactly what his brethren said, that he might see the necessity there was for the people to understand where he stood, and that he might see the need of putting himself in harmony with the Church authorities.

It is necessary to notice his complaint that he had not been invited to attend the meeting at which final action was taken in his case. In his letter dated November 4th, he says:

I returned to this city Thursday—a week ago tomorrow—and have daily expected to hear respecting a time when I could see the brethren once more together. No word having reached me respecting that matter, I adopt this means of respectfully asking you when such meeting can be arranged. As early a reply as convenient will greatly oblige,
Your brother in the Gospel,
MOSES THATCHER.

To this I replied, as he has published, under date of November 6:

In accordance with your wishes for a meeting, I take pleasure in appointing 2 o'clock on Thursday next at the Historian's Office, upon which occasion the quorum will be pleased to meet with you. With kindest regards, your brother and fellow servant,
LORENZO SNOW.

On the day thus appointed the Apostles met, at the time and place thus designated, when they received his lengthy communication dated Nov. 11, in which he said:

I shall not trouble my brethren therefore to convene in a special meeting named for Thursday at 2 p. m. at the Historian's Office.

Thereupon the Council of the Apostles gave him one week more, and notified him that his case would be called up for action at a meeting to be held in the Historian's office at 10 a. m. on Thursday, the 19th inst., as appears in my letter, published by him with the other correspondence.

When that day arrived we received his last letter in which he said:

As there is to be no trial of any case and as I am not requested to be present, I take it to be the purpose of considering my case, etc.

Why should there have been any further tampering with the case? Moses Thatcher was entirely out of harmony with his brethren the Apostles. He was simply required to put himself in accord with them as is required by the Gospel and the order of the councils of the Priesthood. That he declined to do. After asking for a time and place to be appointed when he could meet with them, and in response to that request a time and place were set, and the Apostles came from distant points for the purpose of meeting with him, instead of appearing he coolly notified them by letter that he would "not trouble them to convene." Then when they gave him another week in which to appear, and notified him that his case would be called up for consideration and action, he still treated the Council with contempt and asserted: "I am not requested to be present."

That the Council of the Apostles took the only consistent action that was left open must be evident to every Latter-day Saint who has eyes to see and a heart to understand. Why Moses Thatcher did not meet with his brethren, after they had assembled at his own request, is best known to himself. Notwithstanding his past course they were ready to receive him with open arms if he had come in the proper spirit and put himself in accord with them. As he would not, they expelled him from the Priesthood as they were in duty bound to do.

It should be known that the disaffection of Moses Thatcher dates back to a time long before political difficulties could enter into the matter. President Woodruff has stated publicly that Moses Thatcher had not been in full harmony with his quorum since the death of President John Taylor. Trouble was had with him before that time.

In 1886 he proclaimed in public discourses ideas and predictions not endorsed by his brethren. At Lewiston, Cache county, notes were taken of these utterances and published on a fly-leaf. He was subsequently written to by President Taylor, and his answer is on file. While he claimed that he had not been accurately reported, he gave his own language, under his own hand, to the effect of predictions of events to occur within five years, which have failed of fulfillment and which were founded on erroneous interpretations of Scripture. He wrote for publication a sort of retraction which really took nothing back but merely charged partial errors in the report of his extravagant remarks.

He was out of harmony with his brethren in relation to a standing appellate High Council, which he claimed should be appointed and which notion he has never acknowledged was incorrect.

He disputed with President Taylor as to the appointment of President of the Logan Temple and contended for a man of his own selection, even after the President announced the appointment by revelation.

His bearing with his brethren of the Twelve was such that he could not brook dissent and resented their non-acceptance of his personal views.

When Wilford Woodruff's accession to the Presidency was under consideration, as the proper successor, he expressed opinions which showed that he regarded human smartness and business ability as above that simplicity of character and susceptibility to divine impressions which are notable in that faithful servant of God, and objected that such a man could not grasp the situation of affairs or cope with the difficulties arising. He was overruled but persisted in his views.

When President George Q. Cannon, after the decease of President Taylor, was in prison for infraction of the anti-polygamy laws, Moses claimed that Brother Cannon had defrauded him, and he threatened in the presence of President Woodruff and others of the Twelve to sue him at law, and thus bring many private affairs before the public through the courts. Only on being emphatically warned by President Woodruff and others that such a course, particularly in Bro