

house of Eli, and that regarding plurality of wives, which came to the people of Lehi. Both were given because of the abuse of God's law. But in the latter case there is the remarkable provision:

For if I will, saith the Lord of Hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken to these things.

Do you, Mr. Smith, mean to tell the world that God would use polygamy as a means to raise up a seed unto Him if it were the abomination you represent? Yet this passage can mean nothing else than that for good and sufficient reasons, for the time being, monogamy was to be the law unto the Nephites, but when God's people were sufficiently advanced in the laws of life and the principles of heaven then the other command would be given for the express purpose of raising up a holy seed unto Him. Until that higher law was given, the Nephites were to observe the monogamic law. If this is not so, what is the value of the expression, "otherwise they shall hearken to these things?" Furthermore, I am of the opinion that I can draw stronger indirect proof from the Book of Mormon that the law of plural marriage was revealed to and practiced by the Nephites in later years than you can to the contrary.

You claim I have done the very thing forshadowed by Jacob, when I refer to what is written in the Scriptures concerning David. You mistake. The Latter-day Saints do not ground their faith in the divinity of the law of celestial marriage on anything said to or done by David. We base it on the word of the Lord to your martyred father. But if we wished to appeal to God's holy word regarding those men, we should be doing nothing inconsistent or unlawful, or be in any wise acting as did the Nephites of Jacob's day. They sought "to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon his son." We have no excuses to make for whoredoms. We well know that "the Lord God delighteth in the chastity of women," and no people in the world prize this virtue so highly as we do or are as severe upon the adulterer and whore-monger. Nor can we find in the scriptures handed down to us any excuses for this grievous sin. Therefore the remarks of Jacob cannot have reference to any people who act as we do. We simply appeal to God's word for support for obeying God's law.

It appears to me that your expression "fortunes of war," on which your argument hinges regarding the wives of Saul that were given to David, is a very inapt and unfortunate one. David did not succeed Saul as king of Israel by war or conquest, but by the holy anointing put upon him by Samuel, the prophet of God. He was no alien conqueror who drove the Israelitish ruler from his throne, but a youth of one of Israel's foremost tribes, who succeeded to the kingly state by divine right, and he then accepted nothing but what God bestowed upon him—kingdom, power, wives, people were all given him of Heaven. God says, He gave David these wives; you argue to the contrary. It is you and the Lord for it; I prefer to believe Him whose "word is truth." And again, let me ask, what means the Lord's statements to David, after telling him that he had given him his master's house, wives, etc? "If that had been too little, I would moreover have given unto thee such and such things." According to your construction it would be necessary to have raised up another king unto Israel, and then have David conquer him and take his wives, or have permitted him by the "fortunes of war" to rob the monarchs of other lands of their families. Such a construction is preposterous, but the only escape, I perceive, out of the difficulty created by your unwillingness to accept the word of God as it is written. Let me also ask you what you are going to do about the "Lord's portion" of the captive women which were given by His command to certain persons mentioned in the thirty-first chapter of Numbers? If polygamy be an abomination, this is a very strange proceeding on His part. Further you contend that David did not receive his wives by the same methods as the Elders of Israel do to-day. This is another of your mistakes. David received his wives through and other servants of God "unto this power," the Elders of Israel have received Joseph your father, this ministry.

There is not a shadow of difference between the two examples. David received his wives as we receive ours, or as Josiah, the righteous young king of Israel received his from the hands of Jehoiada, God's High Priest. That is the way; if you are wise, walk ye in it. And remember when you speak of plural marriage as a crime, a sin against God, an abomination, and much else that is evil, you become a perverter of the scriptures, and are reviling that which, when observed according to God's law, has always had His approval, and never, from Genesis to Revelation, from Nephi to Moroni, is there a word of condemnation of its practice, only of its abuse, when degraded and prostituted, as monogamy also frequently is, to gratify the passions of men, not to raise seed to the Lord. Are we to receive Jehovah's word or yours? Are we to believe his plain and direct statement that He gave David the wives of Saul? Or are we to give credence to your feeble sophistries regarding the fortunes of a war that never took place? Saul was fighting the Philistines, not David, when he was killed. If anyone was entitled to his wives, according to the practice which you assert prevailed, it was the king of that people, not the man whom God had anointed as Saul's successor.

The law of celestial marriage is not for the world, but for God's people. All others are governed by the usages of the civilization in which they dwell, be it monogamic or polygamic. But [polygamy without] Jehovah's sanction is not celestial marriage. The world is constantly confounding the two systems. The essence and virtue of celestial marriage is that it extends beyond the veil into the eternal world; other marriage, single or plural, is of no force or binding power in the great hereafter; it is not recognized there because not performed by Heaven's authority. Herein is the difference, and all polygamy (such as that denied by your father), illicit intercourse, unlawful connections or associations, are as repugnant to the gospel now, and worthy of our condemnation to-day as when stigmatized by Joseph and Hyrum Smith and denied by President John Taylor. Let me also remind you that the article on marriage that formerly appeared in the appendix to the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and which you misuse so largely in your argument, is not a revelation from God; it does not come with "thus saith the Lord," and has none of its binding force; at any rate I presume you will not argue that the Lord was bound by it; neither was His church (even if your construction be correct) after a revelation had been given which modified its declarations. If there be a hidden meaning in it, then it is simply on a par with the policy which caused Abraham to say of Sarah, on certain perilous occasions, "She is my sister."

You take strong ground with regard to submitting the revelations of God to the various quorums of the priesthood for acceptance. There were many revelations given to your father of which you know nothing. Nor were they ever submitted to any but those whom they concerned. They were no less the word and will of the Lord for all that. But in the case of the revelation on celestial marriage it was submitted by your father to the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, and was accepted by the members of that Quorum. Of that we have abundant testimony. It was also submitted to the High Council at Nauvoo and accepted by that body, though three of its members individually rejected it. On this point we have the testimony and affidavits of members of the Council who were present on the occasion, one of whom, Elder Thomas Grover, still lives in Utah, and he can be cross-examined if you wish to do so. The names of the members of the High Council of Nauvoo, who were present on that occasion, who make this affidavit, are David Fullmer, Thos. Grover, Aaron Johnson and James Alfred, all men well known in Israel. The following is David Fullmer's statement:

TERRITORY OF UTAH,
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE, } ss

Be it remembered that on this fifteenth day of June, A.D. 1869, personally appeared before me, James Jack, a Notary Public in and for said County, David Fullmer, who was by me sworn in due form of law, and upon his oath saith, that on or about the twelfth day of Aug. A.D. 1843, while in meeting with the High Council, (he being a member thereof,) in Hyrum Smith's brick office, in the City of Nauvoo, county of Hancock, State of Illinois, Dunbar Wilson made enquiry in relation to the subject of a plurality of wives, as there were rumors about, respecting it, and he was satisfied there was something in those remarks, and he wanted to know what it was, upon which Hyrum Smith stepped across the

road to his residence, and soon returned bringing with him a copy of the revelation on celestial marriage, given to Joseph Smith, July 12, A.D. 1843, and read the same to the High Council, and bore testimony to its truth. The said David Fullmer further saith that, to the best of his memory and belief the following named persons were present: William Marks, Austin A. Cowles, Samuel Bent, George W. Harris, Dunbar Wilson, William Huntington, Levi Jackson, Aaron Johnson, Thomas Grover, David Fullmer, Phineas Richards, James Alfred and Leonard Sobr. And the said David Fullmer further saith that Wm. Marks, Austin A. Cowles and Leonard Sobr were the only persons present who did not receive the testimony of Hyrum Smith, and that all the others did receive it from the teaching and testimony of the said Hyrum Smith. And further, that the copy of said revelation on Celestial Marriage, published in the Deseret News extra of Sept. 14th, A. D., 1862, is a true copy of the same.

DAVID FULLMER.

Subscribed and sworn to by the said David Fullmer the day and year first above written.

JAMES JACK, Notary Public.

You mention the fact that in early days God censured the people of His church for not observing His commandments contained in the Book of Mormon, etc. Quite true; but how you can make this have any bearing on polygamy is the difficulty that presents itself to my mind; for polygamy was not practiced by the people at that time, and therefore they could not be under condemnation on that point, either one way or the other.

I think it would be rather a hard task for you, or any other man to disprove by cross-examination the fact that certain women were the wives of your father, as they have testified under oath. Surely they know, beyond peradventure, that the sealing ceremony was performed in their cases, and that they lived with him as his wives. You might as well try to argue a woman out of her existence or identity as that she makes a mistake in matters of such vital importance to her as these. No, sir; the chain of evidence is complete, and no cross examination will change the main facts; they were and are known to hundreds; and to tell us that they were not, is as wise in our eyes as if you were to tell us we dwelt on Mercury, or Mars, or were not men but birds, or fishes. All your arguments are as lost as that of the blind man who endeavored to persuade his neighbors blessed with good eyesight that the sun did not shine. They knew better and so do we.

Your argument regarding the expression "they twain" seems to me without weight. It can be truly said of a man and his second or third wife that "they twain shall be one flesh," as of a husband and his first consort. And to me the words of I. Cor. 6: 17, "Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh" proves that it has no relation to the subject of monogamic marriage. And now let me tell you, Mr. Smith, that God made man polygamic. The history of this world in all its generations proves it. To-day three-quarters of the human family accept it as the natural law of marriage; the other quarter pretend not to believe in it; but it is only a pretence. Their actions prove to the contrary. They have adopted in place of honorable polygamy, a vile, a damnable and God-cursed substitute which is corrupting the life streams and eating out the vitals of the self-styled monogamic communities. No amount of sophistry can palliate their hypocrisy; their sins have reached up to heaven and swift judgment will follow their disregard of nature's methods which are the methods of man's great Creator.

You denounce celestial marriage as a crime against mankind and a sin against God. We assert that God never has so denounced it; but has approved it, sanctioned it, encouraged it, legalized it and made special laws for its direction; that the polygamist child was always recognized as legitimate, and under the law of God, entitled to the blessings of His holy house, whilst the bastard could not enter therein until the tenth generation; and further that many children born in polygamy were the special subjects of God's care, or of His most abundant or special blessings. We need only refer to Joseph, Samuel, Solomon and even Ishmael, as cases in point. The prophets, the Savior Himself, His apostles and disciples all ministered to a polygamic people; and whilst they denounced without stint the sexual crimes of those people they never uttered a sentence in reproof of their marriage institutions. And how do you account for it, if polygamy was so sinful in the sight of Heaven as you assert, that the Almighty Father in selecting a lineage for His Son, chose one that was so well known to be polygamic. I shall not now take up the question of the authority of Brigham

Young as the successor of Joseph Smith; God has testified by His Holy Spirit to scores of thousands that he was the man, and this testimony and revelation are sufficient for us.

You have signally failed in all the leading points that you have attempted to combat. In the first place you have failed, on the subject of polygamy; the fact still stands in unmistakable plainness that God did ordain it, that His prophets did give men wives, that He regulated it by His laws, and approved and blessed those who practised it.

You have as a professed Latter-day Saint, tried to pervert the word of the Lord regarding Temple building, and because you have not fulfilled this law you seek to cast odium upon those who have done it; but the word of the Lord still remains, as in letters of living fire, unchange and invulnerable.

Therefore, verily I say unto you, that your anointings and your washings, and your baptisms for the dead, and your solemn assemblies, and your memorials for your sacrifices, by the sons of Levi, and for your oracles in your most holy places, wherein you receive conversations, and your statutes and judgments, for the beginning of the revelation and foundation of Zion, and for the glory, honor and endowment of all her municipalities, are ordained by the ordinance of my holy house which my people are always commanded to build unto my holy name.

In your first letter you state: "The spirit of temple building has indeed been kept by you and your people." This is a high compliment paid to our devotion in living up to this standing commandment given by Jehovah to His people. I am truly sorry that as much cannot be truthfully said to yourself and your adherents. It seems a little strange that while you ignore this as a general commandment of the Lord and by your acts and words make nugatory, that you should be so elated with your good fortune in becoming the occupants of the old and first temple which the Saints in Utah ever erected, and from that sacred site anathematize us for our devotion, and say in effect that we should cease to build more temples until we reach the centre stake of Zion.

With regard to the prophecy of your father, quoted in my open letter, pertaining to the removal of the Saints from Nauvoo to these mountains, you seek to hide the true meaning of that prophecy by a superabundance of words, and by resorting to a mode of sophistical reasoning that seems peculiar to your style of writing. As a proof that this prophecy was to be fulfilled literally, you need only read the history of the Saints from the time of their exodus from Nauvoo until now, and then take a retrospective view of these many valleys filled with inhabitants, whose towns and cities reach from Idaho in the north, to Arizona and New Mexico in the south. And as an excuse why you and your organization have not been obedient to this prophecy and thus been helpers in developing the resources of this vast region, on allude to the revelation given on Fishing River, Missouri, June 23, 1834, to the members of Zion's Camp. Being myself a member of that camp, I am necessarily familiar with the condition of things at that time. The Saints had a short time previous, been expelled from Jackson County, and the Lord had called for the strength of His house to come to their aid by every honorable and just means. The movement of Zion's Camp excited the people of Jackson, Clay and Ray Counties in Missouri and to allay this intense excitement, and that the Saints might find temporary refuge there, the Lord gave this revelation instructing the members of Zion's Camp as to the course to be taken by them to accomplish the desired object. The members of this camp were counselled in this revelation as follows:

Talk not of judgment, neither boast of faith nor of mighty works, but carefully gather together as much in one region as can be consistently with the feelings of the people; and behold, I will give unto you favor and grace in their eyes that you may rest in peace and safety, while you are saying unto the people, execute judgment and justice for us according to law, and redress us of our wrongs.

Now it seems strange that the Reorganized Church, yourself its leader, should take this revelation, many years ago acted upon and fulfilled by the men to whom it was given, and refer to it as among the main reasons why you shirk the responsibility and hardships of journeying west in obedience to the plain prediction of the Prophet. This revelation was a counsel given to the members of Zion's Camp in 1834, and was fulfilled during that period; consequently it has no reference to you or your organization in 1883.

You claim to have from twenty to

thirty thousand members in your organization. If so, it would be strange if some, perhaps very many of them, are not truly honest-hearted people. These, as well as yourself, the people of Utah would be most happy to be able to convince of the invalidity of their claims to that kingdom spoken of by Daniel, which is to be set up in the last days and stand forever. In your present condition you cannot be that people. Why? You place limits to the prerogatives of Jehovah, you express no faith in the doctrine of baptism for the dead. You say the dead are rejected and you denounce the building of Temples wherein a work can be performed for their redemption. In your midst the Lord has placed no mouthpiece holding the keys of "thus saith the Lord," to declare the mysteries of His will. You stop with the first principles of the gospel and hesitate to make further progress in the principles of a higher law for the advancement of the human race in the scale of time. Great principles which must exist in the bosom of the Almighty for the final redemption and elevation of intelligent beings to that society which is celestial and in which God Himself mingles and associates.

Now, sir, the position taken in my open letter that Joseph Smith, your father, was a polygamist, in belief and practice, I have sustained most amply by the introduction of testimony which you are unable to controvert. You have made unsupported allegations regarding your father's wives, which are met with affidavits, years ago published to the world, and numerous others exist which can be furnished if desired desirable. But if you shrink for more proof, you can have it. It all this fails to convince you I shall regard your obstinacy as not being characteristic of a Latter-day Saint who is truly honest at heart. And as you are a son of that great man whom God has placed at the head of this dispensation, I regret much the spiritual barrenness of your mind, and desire that the Lord enlighten you upon this great matter. With this earnest solicitation for your enlightenment, the following passage in your second letter creates some unpleasant forebodings, for I infer from its wording that no matter how much proof may be laid before you, you will still be obstinate and refuse to yield the position you have assumed. You say:

It is unnecessary to attempt to prove that Joseph Smith secretly taught and practiced celestial, or plural marriage, or polygamy. For when that is proved the issue remains unchanged. All that could be effected by it so far as I am concerned, would be to lessen my respect for him as a man, and give me one more heart pang to bear through life.

As you style yourself a Latter-day Saint and stand as a leader to your people, this seems unwarrantable ground for you to occupy. All who read these words, who desire to have respect for your love of truth, must be dismayed at their import. Though it be proved your father was a polygamist, still "the issue remains unchanged" and all that it could effect so far as you are concerned would be to lessen your respect for him as a man and give you one more heart pang! Then, Joseph Smith of Lamoni, these heart pangs will assuredly be felt and your respect for your illustrious father will be lessened. For if you are convinced by what evidence is presented the day will assuredly come when you will be convinced. This passage I regret to see incorporated in your letter because it indicates in you a settled purpose not to be a true and faithful follower of your father. No truly honest-hearted Latter-day Saint would go so far as that. Does not personal pride, the love of position and a willingness to affiliate with the powers that be in political ranks, win their applause, entice you to assume this unenviable attitude? I earnestly hope that you will reconsider this clause in your letter and form more just and becoming conclusions.

I do not court this controversy for the sake of the mastery in discussion. I have a sincere desire that you may know, as I do, that your honored father was a polygamist. Utah is filled with witnesses upon this point, and it will be a fruitless labor for you, however much it may wound your pride, to establish your assertions that he was not a polygamist.

With sentiments of personal respect, allow me to subscribe myself,

Yours truly,

L. O. LITTLEFIELD.

Logan, Utah, July 17, 1883.

—Utah Journal.