

Censorship and Mormonism

I. Censorship of Church History

1. Misrepresentation of Facts. When the RLDS Church insisted that Joseph Smith had not practiced polygamy, then-Assistant Church Historian Joseph Fielding Smith misrepresented a document to prove them wrong. In 1905 he wrote: “I have copied the following from the Prophet's manuscript record of Oct. 5, 1843, and know it is genuine” and then quoted Joseph Smith's diary that he alleged concluded, “. . . and I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time unless the Lord directs otherwise.” The hand-written Nauvoo diary of Joseph Smith for 5 October 1843 actually ends: “No man shall have but one wife.” (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Spring 1985, p. 22.)

2. Joseph Smith Acquitted of Conspiring to Murder Grandison Newell. “In another incident about which [Joseph] Smith's personal diary and official history are completely silent, he was acquitted in June 1837 of conspiring to murder anti-Mormon Grandison Newell. The silence may be due to the fact that two of Joseph's supporting witnesses in the case, both apostles, acknowledged that the Prophet discussed with them the possibility of killing Newell. Apostle Orson Hyde testified that ‘Smith seemed much excited and declared that Newell should be put out of the way, or where the crows could not find him; he said that destroying Newell would be justifiable in the sight of God, that it was the will of God, &c.’ Hyde tried to be helpful by adding that he had ‘never heard Smith use similar language before,’ insisting further: ‘I have known him for some time and think him to be possessed of much kindness and humanity towards his fellow beings.’ Likewise, apostle Luke S. Johnson acknowledged to the court that Joseph had said ‘if Newell or any other man should head a mob against him, they ought to be put out of the way, and it would be our duty to do so.’ However, Johnson also affirmed: ‘I believe Smith to be a tender-hearted, humane man.’ Whether or not the court agreed with that assessment, the judge acquitted Joseph because there was insufficient evidence to support the charge of conspiracy to commit murder.” (D. Michael Quinn, “The Culture of Violence in Joseph Smith's Mormonism,” *Sunstone*, October 2011, pp. 20-1.)

3. Early Talks Censored. In 1857, while speaking in the Bowery, Brigham Young said: “Brother Heber says that the music is taken out of his sermons when brother Carrington clips out words here and there; and I have taken out the music from mine . . . Our sermons are read by tens of thousands outside of Utah. Members of the British Parliament have those *Journals of Discourses*, published by brother Watt; they have them locked up, they secrete them, and go to their rooms to study them, and they know all about us. They may, perhaps, keep them from the Queen, for fear that she would believe and be converted. I know that I have seen the day when, let men use language like brother Heber has today, and many would apostatize from the true faith. In printing my remarks, I often omit the sharp words, though they are perfectly understood and applicable here; for I do not wish to spoil the good I desire to do. Let my remarks go to the world in a way the prejudices of the people can bear, that they may read them, and ponder them, and ask God whether they are true.” (Brigham Young, *Journal of Discourses*, 5:99-100.)

4. Council of Fifty Records. Klaus Hansen, referring to the “openness” while Leonard Arrington was Church Historian, noted: “Even at the time there were some limits to 'openness.' I vividly recall being denied access to records of the Council of Fifty that colleagues had been allowed to peruse earlier. Meanwhile, these papers had been removed to the vault of the First Presidency, which was not governed by the same rules of access then prevailing in the Historical Department.” (*Sunstone*, August 1989, p. 42.)

1. J. Reuben Clark's Concerns. In 1957, President J. Reuben Clark “learned that BYU professor James R. Clark was planning to publish an article about the defunct and little-understood Council of Fifty in LDS history. Reuben tried to dissuade his nephew by saying that the fact of their family relationship would make it appear to members of the church that the article had President Clark's approval. He told Professor Clark, ‘You are telling a lot of things you don't know anything about’ and that ‘I don't think any good Churchman should do it,’ that ‘I think it is unwise.’ Yet when his nephew asked if he was specifically telling him to discontinue the project, Reuben replied, ‘I think you should not touch it, but you can if you want. I am not going to tell you not to do it, but I think you will make a mistake if you do it.’ In 1958 Professor Clark published the first-ever article about the

theocratic Council of Fifty. This did not harm his church status nor his reputation at headquarters [nor did it harm the Church!] With permission of the LDS president, he subsequently edited a multi-volume publication of First Presidency messages and official statements.” (D. Michael Quinn, *Elder Statesman: A Biography of J. Reuben Clark*, 2002, p. 221.)

E. Books Altered. “In the year 1855, Mormon Apostle Parley P. Pratt published a book entitled, *Key to the Science of Theology*. In 1965, the Mormon-owned Deseret Book Company printed the 'Ninth Edition' of this book. We compared the 1965 reprint with the original 1855 edition and found that many important changes had been made. Hundreds of words concerning the doctrine of polygamy were deleted without any indication, and many of Apostle Pratt's statements concerning the Godhead were changed or deleted without any indication.” (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Major Problems of Mormonism*, 1989, p. 50.)

2. What the Tanners noted with Parley P. Pratt's book, I have seen in many other books. Many books reprinted by Deseret Book or Bookcraft have alterations made in later editions, with no hint that substantive changes have been made. They often do not even say “revised edition.” Later editions of James E. Talmage's *The House of the Lord* leave out the pictures of the Holy of Holies in the Salt Lake Temple that appeared in the 1912 edition. When Orson F. Whitney's *The Life of Heber C. Kimball* was reprinted, the story of Joseph asking Heber for his wife Vilate was deleted, along with much other sensitive material, with no indication given. *The Articles of Faith, Jesus the Christ, Essentials in Church History, A Marvelous Work and a Wonder* and similar books have been edited without any notice being given to the reader.

3. O. C. Tanner's outstanding lesson manual, *Christ's Ideals for Living*, is still in use in the Church; the problem of what to do when Tanner became more or less a “lapsed” Mormon was solved by simply leaving his name off the subsequent editions. Apparently to solve any such problems in the future, authors' names are now left off all of the Church's manuals. The name of the author was left off John T. Wahlquist's reprinted teacher-training manual, *Teaching as the Direction of Activities*, without the author being told, much to his annoyance.

E. William Clayton's Journals. William Clayton (who is perhaps best known for having written “Come, Come Ye Saints”) was chosen as one of Joseph Smith's scribes in Nauvoo. In that assignment he was privy to the activities of most of the Church leadership in Nauvoo, particularly concerning the introduction of polygamy. Aside from his work for Joseph, he kept his own journals, filling three volumes in the Nauvoo period alone. These journals have been under the tightest of security, and have been kept in the First Presidency's vault for most of this century. Then, for a brief time, trusted Mormon historian James B. Allen was allowed to peruse the journals in conjunction with a biography of Clayton he was writing. Apparently he and Dean Jessee made an unauthorized 300 page typescript of the journals. Someone made a copy of the most dramatic entries from the typescript, and very quickly there were dozens (and perhaps hundreds) of copies circulating. Andrew Ehat, who had made some annotations of the material, reportedly told BYU faculty members that the material was so sensitive it would “destroy the Church” if it were not returned. The Church moved quickly to recapture the documents, reportedly even threatening excommunication to those not cooperating, and many copies were retrieved. At least one copy remained in circulation, however, and fell into the hands of Jerald and Sandra Tanner. The Church initiated a lawsuit to try and prevent the material from being printed. Parts were printed, however, by the Tanners. The excerpts they printed do not make Joseph Smith or Brigham Young look very good, particularly concerning polygamy. These excerpts indicate that considerable deception occurred, and that many first wives (including Emma Smith) were not told about their husband's additional wives. (See Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *The Tanners on Trial*, 1984 [142 pages]; *Seventh East Press*, Jan. 18, 1982, p. 1, 10-11; and the Tanners, *Clayton's Secret Writings Uncovered*, 1982.)

4. *The Journal of Discourses*. “The *Journal of Discourses* was a sixteen-page semimonthly subscription publication privately printed in Liverpool, England, in 1854-1886. It served as the printed word of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, particularly for members who had no access to the Salt Lake City *Deseret News*. . . . The origin of the *Journal of Discourses* is tied to George D. Watt, an English convert baptized in 1837 by Heber C. Kimball. Before immigrating to the United States in 1842, Watt learned Pitman shorthand. He used this new skill in his adopted land to record the proceedings of conferences of the Church. . . . After 1852 Watt transcribed Church conference addresses for the *Deseret News*. But because the *News* was not generally available outside central Utah, and because Watt received little pay for his work, he proposed to publish privately and sell sixteen-page semiweekly issues of the *Journal of Discourses* containing selected sermons of the General Authorities. . . . He was supported in this proposal by Brigham Young, who authorized him to print his sermons.” (*Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, Macmillan Publishing Co., 1992, p. 769.)

1. One of the Standard Works. The preface to Vol. 8 of the *Journal of Discourses* states: “The *Journal of Discourses* ranks as one of the standard works of the Church, and every right-minded Saint will certainly welcome with joy every Number as it comes forth from the press as an additional reflector of ‘the light that shines from Zion’s hill.’”

2. Apparently Suppressed. LeRoy Johnson, polygamous leader of the Short Creek, Arizona settlement “often told his followers that the orthodox Church ‘sent agents out around the country gathering up the *Journal of Discourses* and the *Millennial Star*.’ . . . Presumably this was to suppress previous teachings promoting plural marriage. Apparently at some point there was an effort by the Church to take the *Journal of Discourses* out of circulation. Johnson recalled this happening ‘in about 1924-25.’” (Ken Driggs, *Dialogue*, Summer 1990, pp. 52-3.)

3. Historians Denied Access. LaMar Peterson wrote, “In 1954, upon learning that the Deseret Book Company had a microfilm of the 26-volume *Journal of Discourses*, I asked for the privilege of reading from some of the volumes on their viewer. After checking ‘across the street’ [i.e., with the LDS Church Administration Offices] the management announced that the privilege of reading from the *Journals* could not be granted.” (*Salt Lake City Messenger*, Utah Lighthouse Ministry, October 2007, p. 5.)

4. Published by the Fundamentalists. LeRoy Johnson and his polygamous followers in Short Creek “believe with considerable pride that because of them the *Journal of Discourses* . . . is available to twentieth-century Latter-day Saints. . . . Johnson recalled that in 1954 the Fundamentalists republished the set at a cost of \$55,000,” and the initial press run of 500 sets was “scattered among the people and libraries.” Following that success, the Fundamentalists “sold them through Deseret Book.” Johnson claimed that “this incited the envy of the leaders of the Church. Why? Because the *Journal of Discourses* were being distributed among the people of the Church, and it wasn’t by the consent of the Church.” (Ken Driggs, *Dialogue*, Summer 1990, pp. 52-3.)

a. A Personal Note. I have always assumed the 1954 edition was published by the Church, though I wondered why they would do so, given the very many entries that are now embarrassing to the Church, particularly those dealing with the Adam-God doctrine, polygamy, priesthood authority, and not always flattering portrayals of Church leaders. Checking the title page recently, I noticed that no publisher is listed. It consists entirely of the original title page from the 1854 edition in Liverpool. On the back of the title page is this state-ment: “Exact Photo Reprint of Original Edition.” Below that it states: “Lithographed in the United States of America.” I next checked the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, under “JOURNAL OF DISCOURSES.” The author of that article, Ronald G. Watt (a descendant of George D. Watt?), stated only this about the publisher: “The semimonthly issues have been bound into twenty-six annual volumes and are currently available in a lithograph reprinting ‘of the original edition.’” LeRoy Johnson’s claim, above, may be exactly right: Once the original 500 sets were sold, around 1954, the Church could hardly *not* support distribution, without raising difficult questions. Better to have Deseret Book as an outlet than to have anti-LDS establishments as the only source. [RW]

5. Censoring Brigham Young's Talks. Efforts to censor the writings of early Church leaders began quite early. An apostle made this notation on December 7, 1893: "I read copies of some dispatches from a letter book of Pres. Brigham Young, which were written in the time of the Buchanan war [1857]. They are very strong in some places. Harry Timmons came to me today, and said an Outsider in this city had got possession of the book, and the Liberals desired to use it against Statehood this winter. He wanted to know if the Church would not buy it. The brethren desired me to see upon what terms it could be had." (*Candid Insights of a Mormon Apostle: The Diaries of Abraham H. Cannon, 1889-1895*, edited by Edward Leo Lyman, 2010, 443-4.)

1. Church Paid \$400 to Keep BY Letter-Book Out of Circulation. "Dec. 12, 1893. In the morning Bro. John R. Winder and myself met Harry Timmons in the [Deseret] News Office and bargained with him for the [Brigham Young] Letter book concerning which I gave the brethren a report last Thursday. We secured it by the payment of \$200 cash, and a verbal promise of an additional \$200 after we become a State, providing none of the contents of this book are brought to the attention of the public in the meantime. This is to guard against the use of any copies which may have been taken." (*Ibid.*, 444, and 444 f40.) A \$400 purchase in 1893 would be the same value as \$10,256 in 2013.

2. Brethren Worried About Another Batch of BY Letters. Jan. 30, 1894. "I attended my quorum meeting. . . . Thereafter we listened to some few letters which were written about 30 years ago by Pres. Brigham Young to Wm. H. Hooper, when the latter was in Congress. Some fellow in town desired to sell them to the Presidency, but it was decided that they contain nothing which would do us any injury if published, and they will therefore not be purchased unless offered at a very low figure." (*Ibid.*, 469.)

H. Biography of B. H. Roberts. In 1965, BYU professor Truman Madsen began a biography of his grand-father, B. H. Roberts, a colorful and controversial general authority. BYU officials advised against completing the work; although the school trustees (the Quorum of the Twelve) subsequently relented "with the understanding that it would be cleared with the publications committee of the church before actually being published," Madsen's biography remained unpublished for fifteen years. (Gary James Bergera and Ronald Priddis, *BYU: A House of Faith*, 1985, p. 73.)

I. Danger of Mormon History. "For his dissertation at Chicago, Russel Swensen had considered an analysis of Mormon origins but was dissuaded following a lengthy interview with B. H. Roberts, a member of the First Council of the Seventy and leading church intellectual. 'Half the people in the church would apostatize if they knew the true history of the church,' Swensen remembered Roberts saying. 'My best work will never be published. I do not have complete freedom to do the writing I would like to do.'" (Gary James Bergera and Ronald Priddis, *BYU: A House of Faith*, 1985, p. 395.)

J. Danites. In 1982 Jerald and Sandra Tanner published *Joseph Smith's 1838-39 Diaries*, also known in Church history as "The Scriptorium Book of Joseph Smith." The entry for July 27, 1838 had earlier been scratched out and almost obliterated by someone, presumably a church historian, before an illegal copy had been made. The Tanners published a picture of the defaced entry on page 14 of their book. It clearly mentions Danites twice, but much of the entry is lost. At the time of this entry, Mormon leaders have insisted, the Church leadership knew nothing about the Danites—but obviously they did for it to be mentioned in Joseph Smith's diary. Interestingly, Joseph Smith's *History of the Church* relies on the "Scriptory Book" for the entries of July 26 and 28, 1838, but the entry for July 27—i.e., the portion concerning the Danites—has been omitted.

3. In 1987, Signature Books published all of Joseph Smith's known diaries under the title, *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*, edited by Scot H. Faulring. On page 198, which covers the July 27, 1838 entry, Faulring adds this footnote: "This transcription has been reconstructed from a microfilm copy of the original manuscript at the archives of the Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. My request for access to the original manuscript for verification was denied by historical department administrators. The paragraph is cancelled out in the original."

K. Mormon Americana. For several years the Special Collections Division of the BYU Library published a semi-monthly LDS bibliography titled *Mormon Americana*. It was widely used in historical circles because of its comprehensiveness. When BYU opened in the fall of 1982, *Mormon Americana* was discontinued by school administrators “because some of the Twelve believe it promoted anti-Mormon works.” (*BYU: A House of Faith*, p. 90.)

L. Tabernacle Choir. In a 1951 letter to Fawn M. Brodie, Dale Morgan wrote: “Sam Taylor is in town publicising his new book. He thought he had cleared it with the Church, but after it was printed, someone objected to his story of John W. Taylor's Conference reference to the reported unchastity of Tabernacle Choir members. So the Deseret Book will not display it and Auerbach's cancelled their 400 copy order and their autograph party. Sam is rather indignant about it all. Serves the guy right. Anybody who sets out to please the Church is going to find himself in these straits sooner or later.” (*Dale Morgan on Early Mormonism: Correspondence and a New History*, 1987, p. 187.)

M. Apostles' Journals. On Oct. 5, 1904, apostle Rudger Clawson recorded this in his diary: “Pres. [Joseph F.] Smith said that he wanted to refer to a matter that had given him much concern— namely, the private journals of the brethren of the Council. Many things were written in them which if they were to fall into the hands of an enemy might bring trouble upon the church. After the death of the brethren, you cannot tell what may become of their journals, and even now the brethren felt an anxiety in relation to Pres. Geo. Q. Cannon's Journal, who made a pretty full account of everything that transpired in the Councils of the brethren; the same with Abram Cannon and others. . . . Pres. Winder said that it was very unsafe and risky for the brethren to write down that which occurred in these meetings. This duty belonged to the clerk of the council and nobody else. Pres. Winder moved that it be the sense and feeling of the council that the brethren should not write in their journals that which took place in the council meetings. Carried by unanimous vote.” (*A Ministry of Meetings: The Apostolic Diaries of Rudger Clawson*, edited by Stan Larson, 1993, p. 777.)

N. Hugh Nibley. In 1946, Dr. Hugh Nibley was asked to write a rebuttal to Fawn McKay Brodie's recently published book, *No Man Knows My History*, a biography of Joseph Smith. His response was cleverly titled *No Ma'am, That's Not History*. Some of Brodie's most controversial findings were not even challenged by Nibley. Instead, he based much of his case on the unchanging nature of Mormonism: “Yet of all churches in the world only this one has not found it necessary to readjust any part of its doctrine in the last hundred years. . . . The gospel as the Mormons know it sprang full-grown from the words of Joseph Smith. It has never been worked over or touched up in any way, and is free of revisions and alterations.” This easily refuted statement has been insisted on by several general authorities in their writings on the Church. (Hugh Nibley, *No Ma'am, That's Not History*, 1946, pp. 46, 61-62.)

O. BYU Studies. Maureen Ursenbach Beecher, in her presidential address for the Mormon History Association in May 1985, mentioned that *BYU Studies* began publishing in 1959, and then adds in a footnote: “[Leonard] Arrington, however, relates the near doom of that publication when one piece in the mode of the current scholarship caused offense and the journal was suspended for a year.” Richard S. Marshall adds these de-tails: The article was “An Economic Interpretation of the Word of Wisdom,” written by Arrington himself. The periodical obviously succumbed to pressure from above and did not publish anything for a year. Then it reappear- ed in 1961 with an entirely new board of editors. (*Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 12, 1985, p. 45, and Richard S. Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, a Senior Honors Project Summary, University of Utah, 1977, p. 26.)

4. Opposed by Elder Mark E. Petersen. Arrington noted, “Although the first editors of *BYU Studies* were anxious to print sound historical essays, we were startled when an interpretive article I wrote for the first issue, as I learned from BYU president Ernest L. Wilkinson, created such opposition from Elder Mark Petersen of the Twelve that the journal was suspended for a year.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, p. 58.)

P. Damage Control. “But the myths and the mythmaking persist. Striking evidence for this is found in the fact that currently one of the most successful anti-Mormon proselyting techniques is merely to bring to light obscure or suppressed historical documents. Reading these historical documents arouses a considerable amount of incredulity, concern, and disenchantment among Mormons under the spell of this mythological view of history. That individuals find these bits and pieces of history so shocking and faith-shattering is at once the meat of the fundamentalistic heresies and an indictment of the quasi-suppression of historical reality which propagates the one-sided view of Mormon history.” (Frances Lee Menlove, “The Challenge of Honesty,” *Dialogue*, Spring, 1966 pp. 49-50.)

1. “Leonard Arrington was asked the question, 'is it really possible to humanize all phases of Mormon history without destroying Church doctrines regarding historical events?' The opinion of this writer is that the answer to that question is no, at this point in time. However, if there were a Churchwide emphasis on openness in its history and the dispelling of myths, then indeed the New History would become less dangerous. The danger at present lies in the fact that it has the ability to shatter previously held notions about former events and leaders. It is the shock that accompanies that shattering which can induce a lack of faith. Dr. James L. Clayton, of the History Department [now a Vice-President] at the University of Utah asks, 'is the shock rooted in the *materials* or in the *deception* of Church leaders who distorted them?’” (Richard S. Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, p. 34.)

Q. Nauvoo Restoration. “Unfortunately, we Mormons have been fed on literary mythology that often has scant relationship to the truth. For example, the Church Information Service made a film on Nauvoo, and a scholar whom I rate the world's greatest expert on Nauvoo told me it contained 87 errors of fact. When you can be wrong 87 times in a half hour, you're really dedicated to mythology.” (Samuel W. Taylor, *Dialogue*, Vol. VIII, No 3/4, [1973], p. 11.)

R. Mother Smith's History. “Prest. Young said He wanted all the Saints to burn up every Copy they have of the History of Joseph Smith by his mother Lucy Smith for it is Not True. Much of it is fals.” (*Wilford Woodruff Journal*, May 8, 1865.)

5. Members Told to Destroy Book. On August 23, 1865, the following notice, signed by Brigham Young and his two counselors in the First Presidency, was published in the *Deseret News*: “Happening lately, while on a preaching trip to Cache Valley, to pick up a book which was lying on a table in the house where we were stopping, we were surprised to find that it was the book bearing the title, on the outside, of ‘Joseph Smith the Prophet,’ and on the title page, ‘Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith, the Prophet, and his progenitors for many generations, by Lucy Smith, mother of the Prophet; published for Orson Pratt by S. W. Richards, Liverpool,’ &c. Our surprise at finding a copy of this work may be accounted for, by the fact of our having advertized some time ago that the book was incorrect, and that it should be gathered up and destroyed, so that no copies should be left; and, from this, we had supposed that not a single copy could be found in any of the houses of the Saints.” (*Messages of the First Presidency*, compiled by James R. Clark, 1965, Vol. 2, p. 229.)

2. Book Basically Correct. The attempts of Brigham Young to suppress Lucy Mack Smith's *History* are widely known among historians. (Jan Shippo took 19 pages to discuss the incident in a recent book.) Brigham Young sent general authorities to each settlement to have the *History* destroyed. Yet most historians today believe the book to be important and basically correct. It was originally published in 1854 by Orson Pratt, under the title, *Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith, the Prophet, and His Progenitors for Many Generations: By Lucy Smith, Mother of the Prophet*. After it had been suppressed for many years, a carefully censored edition was published in 1905, with revisions by George A. Smith. In 1958, it was printed again, under the title, *History of Joseph Smith by His Mother, Lucy Mack Smith*, with Notes and Commentary by Preston Nibley. In both the second and third editions, changes and deletions are made with no indication given of the manner in which the text has been altered. The third edition is the one still used in the Church today.

3. Reasons It Was Condemned. “[Former Church Historian Leonard] Arrington disagreed with [Brigham] Young's negative assessments of Mother Smith's history. He described it instead as 'informative, basically accurate, and extremely revealing of Joseph Smith's early life and his family background,' and explained that 'it now seems clear' that the work was condemned 'primarily because of the favorable references and space devoted to William Smith [who broke with Brigham Young at the time of the exodus] therein. In reality, he said, this work 'perhaps tells more about Mormon origins than any other single source.'” (Jan Shipps, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition*, 1985, pp. 91, 181.) Shipps concludes that Brigham Young “was probably right in deciding . . . that for the protection of the Great Basin kingdom, Mother Smith's *History of the Prophet Joseph* had to be condemned and recalled. For buried in its pages could be found an implicit challenge to Brigham Young's legitimate right to lead the Mormon Church.” (*Ibid.*, p. 106.)

6. “Lucy Smith’s memories of the early years of the rise of Mormonism have a demonstrable degree of accuracy.” (Richard L. Anderson, “Circumstantial Confirmation of the First Vision through Reminiscences,” *BYU Studies*, Vol. 9 [Spring 1969], p. 391.)

S. Parkin vs. Brodie. LDS Institute instructor Max Parkin is one of the best known professors of Mormon history in the Church. He initially intended to do his master's thesis on Fawn Brodie's work, *No Man Knows My History*, “in an attempt to show that she had misinterpreted and misquoted her sources. It soon became evident to him, however, that she was correct in her use of original sources. Parkin abandoned his thesis because 'I didn't want my name attached to a thesis which vindicated Fawn Brodie.’” (Cited in Richard S. Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, p. 25.) Brodie was excommunicated as a result the book.

T. Mountain Meadows Massacre. In a private journal kept by Wilford Woodruff for the Historian's Office, he recorded on March 10, 1859 that Judge Cradlebaugh in Provo was investigating the Mountain Meadows Massacre, and that things were getting difficult. Then on page 12 he writes: “24: In consequence of the course of the Court in Provo who are establishing a Military Despotism, & taking men where ever they can find them we packed up in one box our Journals and records to secure them against the mob in case any search should be made of our Papers.” (*Historian's Private Journal*, March 10 and 24, 1859.)

1. Brigham Young Told. John D. Lee's confession states: “When I arrived in the city, I went to Pres. Young's house, and gave him a full detailed statement of the whole affair from first to last. I gave him the names of every man that was present at the massacre. He said to me, 'When you get home I want you to sit down and write a long letter, and give me an account of the affair, charging it to the Indians. You sign the letter as “farmer to the Indians,” and direct it to me as Indian agent. I can make use of such a letter to keep off dangerous and troublesome inquiries.’” (*The Confession of John D. Lee*, 1882, pp. 252-3.)

2. Papers “Lost.” The following is from an affidavit taken and signed by Brigham Young on July 30, 1875: “Did you, about the 10th of Sept. 1857, receive a communication from Isaac C. Haight, or any other person of Cedar City, concerning a company of emigrants called the Arkansas company?” Answer: “I did receive a communication from Isaac C. Haight or John D. Lee, who was then a farmer for the Indians.” Question: “Have you that communication?” Answer: “I have not. I have made diligent search for it, but cannot find it.” (R. N. Baskin, *Reminiscences of Early Utah*, 1914, pp. 116-117.)

3. Statements Gathered. In the 1890s, Andrew Jenson, Church Historian's Office, was given the assignment to visit southern Utah and gather all the information available concerning the Mountain Meadows Massacre. He wrote in his journal, “The information that I received made me suffer mentally and deprived me of my sleep at night; and I felt tired and fatigued, both mentally and physically when I returned home.” (Davis Bitton and Leonard Arrington, *Mormons and Their Historians*, 1988, pp. 47-48. NOTE: A footnote on page 176 adds: “Jenson's Journal E, 412. These notes cannot be located in the Church Archives. One supposes that they were placed in the vault of the First Presidency of the Church and still remain there.”)

4. Downplayed. There has been a great “conspiracy of silence” among Mormon writers about the

Massacre. Joseph Fielding Smith, who most certainly had access to the facts, quoted H. H. Bancroft approvingly, that the massacre “was the crime of an individual, the crime of a fanatic of the worst stamp . . .” In his own *Essentials in Church History*, Smith insisted “ It was the deed of enraged Indians aided by a number of white men . . .” He tells of the execution of Lee, and adds: “Others who were implicated fled from the territory and died fugitives. While they thus evaded the justice which earthly tribunals might inflict, they still await the trial for their crimes before a Higher Court where justice never fails.” He never mentions that a stake presidency, a complete stake high council, and the Church leadership for much of southern Utah planned and executed the attack, and then formed a temple prayer circle to take a vow of silence. (See Joseph Fielding Smith, *Essentials in Church History*, 1946, pp. 419-422.)

7. Klingensmith's Trial Testimony. “Philip Klingensmith's testimony given at the first John D. Lee trial was found in the Beaver Court House, Beaver Utah; and all but sixty-six pages of Philip's testimony were found in the History Archives of the [LDS Church]. The sixty-six missing pages from the LDS Archives contain the most unfavorable testimony in regard to the Church. . . . Workers at the LDS Archives, in the spring of 1991, claimed the trial testimonies no longer exist in their archives.” (Anna Jean Backus, *Mountain Meadows Witness: The Life and Times of Bishop Philip Klingensmith*, 1995, p. 32.)

6. Access Denied. Juanita Brooks related her difficulties in getting access to material about the Massacre: “Sometime before his death, the late Judge David H. Morris, of St. George, Utah, told the writer of affidavits which he had taken at the order of the First Presidency of the Church from the participants in the massacre who still lived in southern Utah. He suggested that 'sometime when it is convenient' he would show these to her. After his death, the writer asked his daughter, Mrs. Paul Hafen, about them and learned that in compliance with the advice of her attorney, Orval Hafen, she had taken the affidavits to SLC and given them to David O. McKay of the First Presidency of the Latter-day Saints Church.

“After two unsuccessful attempts to get an interview with President McKay, the writer made an appointment by long distance telephone. After traveling more than 300 miles to keep that appointment, she was refused audience as soon as the office girl learned 'specifically, what is it you wish to speak to him about?' The writer then asked for another appointment, offering to stay in the city indefinitely, if necessary. This was refused. She was however permitted to talk to Mr. Joseph Anderson, private secretary to the First Presidency, who listened to her request and promised to do what he could for her. He asked her to return the next morning.

“At that time, Mr. Anderson said that he and President J. Reuben Clark had read the affidavits and President Clark had decided that they should not be made available. The large, worn envelope which contained them and the telegram authorizing them lay on the table during this conversation. The most difficult thing to understand about all this is not so much the refusal to show the affidavits as the consistent and repeated refusal to discuss the question.” (Juanita Brooks, *The Mountain Meadows Massacre*, 1962, pp. 217-218.)

7. Cover-Up. “By no means the least disconcerting thing about the de-mythologizing of this tragic affair is the demonstration that initially there was a cover-up. At first no one knew anything. Then as bits and pieces began to be discovered by Judge Cradlebaugh and others who were trying to attach blame to Brigham Young, from an institutional point of view it became a matter of damage control. It is virtually impossible to see what happened to John D. Lee in other terms than that 'it is better that one man should perish . . .’ No one but Lee was ever tried. Once he had paid the price, the matter was just dropped.” (Richard Poll, *History and Faith: Reflections of a Mormon Historian*, 1989, p. 96.) Most of the details are now publicly known, but the Church continues to be less than candid in its seminary and institute lesson materials, and in its official literature.

8. Lee Reinstated. Juanita Brooks learned that John D. Lee had had his temple blessings restored posthumously, and wanted to include that information in her book's second edition. “Threatening to rescind the action should there be any publicity about it, President David O. McKay assigned Apostle Delbert Stapley the task of dissuading Juanita. In early summer Stapley summoned Juanita to a private interview in his Salt Lake office. 'The apostle declared categorically that God would be displeased with her publication of the reinstatement.

Juanita described her response in something close to the following terms: 'I didn't talk to him as a humble member speaks to an apostle; I talked to him like one ordinary person to another. I looked him in the eye and I said, 'Brother, in this matter I know the will of the Lord as well as you do.' "By reinstating Lee, the Church had tacitly admitted that her interpretation was correct." (Levi S. Peterson, *Dialogue*, Spring 1989, pp. 17, 22.)

9. Suppression. "Ultimately, an agonized Juanita decided to include the reinstatement, knowing that her decision put her into the greatest jeopardy of excommunication of her entire life. She did so not from mere stubbornness but from a sense that, in the case of a prominent public figure like John D. Lee, the suppression of an important fact was a violation of the integrity of all who knew of that suppression. Time has proven Juanita's instinct sound on this matter. Happily she was not excommunicated, nor was the reinstatement rescinded, and readers of her biography, Mormon and non-Mormon alike, have universally congratulated, rather than condemn-ed, the Church for the reinstatement." (Levi Peterson, *Sunstone*, October 1989, pp. 6-8.)

8. Statement of "Regret." On Sept. 11, 2007, the 150th anniversary of the Massacre, the First Presidency issued a formal "Statement of Regret" concerning the Massacre. It was prepared by Elder Marlin K. Jensen of the Seventy (currently the Church Historian), approved by the First Presidency, and read by apostle Henry B. Eyring at a memorial service held at the site where the Massacre occurred. While not including the word "apology," the statement was the closest the Church has come to accepting responsibility for the events at Mountain Meadows. The statement reached two conclusions: "That the message conveying the will and intent of Brigham Young not to interfere with the immigrants arrived too late, and that the responsibility for the massacre lies with local leaders of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the regions near Mountain Meadows who also held civic and military positions and with members of the Church acting under their direction." (*Church News*, Sept. 15, 2007, p. 4.)

a. Terrible and Inexcusable. The statement added: "What was done here long ago by members of our Church represents a terrible and inexcusable departure from Christian teaching and conduct. We cannot change what happened, but we can remember and honor those who were killed here. We express profound regret for the massacre carried out in this valley 150 years ago today and for the undue and untold suffering experienced by the victims then and by their relatives to the present time. A separate expression of regret is owed to the Paiute people who have unjustly borne for too long the principal blame for what occurred during the massacre. Although the extent of their involvement is disputed, it is believed they would not have participated without the direction and stimulus provided by local Church leaders and members." (*Ibid.*)

b. Divine Justice and Mercy. About the perpetrators of the massacre, the statement said: "No doubt Divine Justice will impose appropriate punishment upon those responsible for the massacre. Nevertheless, our continued prayer for their relatives is that knowledge of a God who is both just and merciful will bring a measure of peace to their souls. . . . we conclude by expressing our love and desire for reconciliation to all who have in any way been affected by what occurred at Mountain Meadows 150 years ago today. May the God of Heaven, whose sons and daughters we all are, bless us to honor those who died here by extending to one another the pure love and spirit of forgiveness which His Only Begotten Son personified." (*Ibid.*)

U. Statehood Attempt. In 1849, Church leaders worked to make Utah an organized territory, and sent delegates East to help bring it about. Then they learned from Thomas L. Kane and others that statehood should have been sought instead. There wasn't time to go through the steps of electing, drafting, ratifying, electing again and then petitioning Congress. They also knew that if they asked for statehood without going through this process they couldn't succeed. So they created a record. They wrote a constitution, borrowing mostly from a copy of Iowa's. They then created minutes of daily actions, election documents, named members to a legislature, and sent the papers back to Kanesville, Iowa where apostle Orson Hyde printed them. The "Constitution of the State of Deseret, with the journal of the convention which formed it, and the proceedings of the legislature consequent thereon" was published as a 16 page document. Actually, no such convention was held, and some of the people who are described in this pamphlet as having attended this convention were not even in the valley at the time. The pamphlet is now a rare and valuable document. "You can make a credible rationalization for it . . . but this

document is as fraudulent in its content as the Donation of Constantine and the 'salamander letter.' It is still precious, but it does raise questions. Especially if you have difficulty coping with the fact than an LDS First Presidency published it.” (Richard Poll, *Sunstone*, May 1988, p. 18.)

V. Harvard's Mormon Books. When Frederick Jackson Turner was appointed a professor at Harvard, an alumnus suggested the possibility to Turner of giving an annual gift of \$1,000 to help build up a western history library at Harvard. Turner was aware that the Shepard Book Co. of Salt Lake City had advertised the sale of a collection of 1,400 volumes on Mormonism at a cost of \$4,500. When snags developed in obtaining the funds, Turner approached Charles W. Elliot, former Harvard president, who noted, “The collection could be preserved against a day when an impartial historian would tell the true story of a church remarkable for its extraordinary merits as a colonizer.” The funds were raised. When word of the pending purchase leaked out, the *Salt Lake Herald* reported that the Church strongly disapproved of the sale and had agreed to purchase 500 of the most outspoken anti-Mormon works, presumably to keep them out of circulation. After considerable negotiations, “Turner and friends dispatched Mr. Heald on the train west with instructions to close the deal and see the shipment across state lines and out of the threat of interference from either Church officials or others opposed to the purchase.” More than 2 ½ tons of books were turned over to the Harvard library. The *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* reported the good news, boasting of “57 volumes of collected pamphlets, the sizeable newspaper and magazine files, the numerous first editions of the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants, the publications of such dissenting factions as the Strang group, and the hundreds of books by Utah authors.” (Ray Allen Billington, “The Origins of Harvard's Mormon Collection,” *Arizona and the West*, 1968, pp. 211-24; cited in *Regional Studies of Latter-day Saint History: New England*, 1988, pp. 125-8.)

W. Attempted Castration. In a story well-known to Mormons, an angry mob pulled Joseph Smith from his bed in the Hiram, Ohio home of Father John Johnson, on the night of March 24, 1832. He was stripped of his clothing, horribly scratched and tormented, and then tarred and feathered. That is the extent of the story known to most Mormons. Additional details are available, however, and are significant. The attack was precipitated by the four grown sons of Father Johnson. They apparently resented the attention paid by Joseph Smith to their sister Nancy Marinda, also living at the home. A respected physician, Dr. Dennison, was induced to participate, for the purpose of castrating Joseph; but when face to face with the Prophet, he could not carry out the act. “When the Johnson boys joined the mob that entered their own home, they clearly suspected an improper association between Joseph and their sixteen-year-old sister Nancy Marinda.” Nancy later married apostle Orson Hyde in Nauvoo. While he was on a mission to Palestine, Joseph apparently took her as a polygamous wife. When Orson returned and heard the rumors, he became mentally unstable for a time, and possibly tried to commit suicide. Records at the Genealogical Library show that Orson Hyde took Nancy Marinda to the Endowment House on July 31, 1857, and had her sealed for eternity to Joseph Smith. (Many writers discuss this controversial material. See Linda King Newell and Valeen Tippetts Avery, *Mormon Enigma: Emma Hale Smith*, 1984, pp. 41-43; Brodie dates the marriage of Joseph and Nancy Marinda from at least December 1841, and possibly as early as April 1839 in *No Man Knows My History*, 1945, 1983, pp. 119, 462-3. See also Donna Hill, *Joseph Smith: The First Mormon*, 1977, p. 146.) Hill also quotes this interesting detail: “Another of Johnson's sons, Lyman, told Orson Pratt, his missionary companion, that Joseph had made known to him as early as 1831, while he was living on the Johnson farm, that God had revealed to him that plural marriage was a correct principle but that the time had not yet come to teach and practice it in the church.” (*Ibid.*, p. 146.)

9. Elder George A. Smith gave a discreet account of this incident in an address in the Ogden Tabernacle in 1864: “He was daubed with tar, feathered and choked, and aquafortis [nitric acid] poured into his mouth. Dr. Dennison had been employed to perform a surgical operation, but he declined when the time came to operate.” (*Journal of Discourses*, [Nov. 15, 1864]; 11:5.)

X. Masonic Influence on Temple Ceremony. On April 20, 1974, Dr. Reed Durham, Director of the LDS Institute of Religion at the University of Utah, delivered the presidential address at the Mormon History Association's annual convention in Nauvoo, Illinois. In it he stated, “There is absolutely no question in my mind that the Mormon ceremony which came to be known as the Endowment, introduced by Joseph Smith to Mormon

Masons initially, just a little over one month after he became a Mason, had an immediate inspiration from Masonry. This is not to suggest that no other source of inspiration could have been involved, but the similarities between the two ceremonies are so apparent and overwhelming that some dependent relationship cannot be denied. They are so familiar, in fact that one writer was led to refer to the Endowment as 'Celestial Masonry.'"

Shortly after he gave his paper on Masonry Dr. Durham was called in to see President Spencer W. Kimball. Immediately thereafter he wrote a letter and circulated it reaffirming his faith in the Church, its temple ceremony and the present leaders. The letter began, "To Whom It May Concern," and included a formal apology for his remarks in Nauvoo. Among several items is this statement: "Of course, I assume the full responsibility for creating those questions, concerns, and misunderstandings. It was because I was not skillful enough, erudite enough, nor perhaps prayerful enough to make my personal position and feelings clearly known. Therefore, regardless of what I said, or what interpretations were placed upon what I said, let it be known at this time, that: . . . I know further that Temple Work, with all its ramifications including Eternal Marriage and the Endowment ceremony is divinely inspired. . . . I am deeply sorry that [I was misunderstood]. Sincerely, Reed C. Durham, Jr." He was then given a year's sabbatical leave from the Institute to write a book, and returned not as Director, as he had been, but as a teacher. (Reed C. Durham, Jr., "Is There No Help for the Widow's Son," 1974, mimeographed copy in my possession; and Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, pp. 51-54. In a later interview, Durham said, "I had to write that. They wanted me to bear my testimony. I hadn't done that in my talk. They had me do that so people would know where I stood." (*Ibid.*, p. 54.)

Y. Teachers Warned. In 1976, Elder Ezra Taft Benson told a gathering of seminary and institute teachers: "It has come to our attention that some of our teachers, particularly in our university programs, are purchasing writings from known apostates, or other liberal sources, in an effort to become informed about certain points of view, or to glean from their research. You must realize that when you purchase their writings, or subscribe to their periodicals, you help sustain their cause. We would hope that their writings not be on your Seminary and Institute or personal bookshelves. We are entrusting you to represent the Lord and the First Presidency to your students, not the views of the Church's detractors." (Ezra Taft Benson, Address delivered Sept. 17, 1976. Typescript in Western Americana Dept., Marriott Library, University of Utah.)

6. Transfiguration of Brigham Young. One of the best-known stories in Mormon history is that of the transfiguration of Brigham Young into the likeness and voice of Joseph Smith at a church meeting on August 8, 1844 in Nauvoo. In recent years, several Mormon historians have questioned the reality of the event. Those trying to prove or disprove it have very little first-hand information to go on. "The original minutes of this 8 August 1844 meeting, presently controlled by the Quorum of the Twelve, are 'not available for public scrutiny' (F. Michael Watson, secretary to the First Presidency, to Richard Van Wagoner, 14 June 1993). The account of the meeting in William Clayton's diary (in possession of the First Presidency) is also unavailable." The available journals of those who were present, and wrote about it at the time, do not mention the incident. (Richard Van Wagoner, "The Making of a Mormon Myth," *Dialogue*, Winter 1995, p. 7.)

I. There were two meetings on Aug. 8, 1844. Minutes of the afternoon session are available; they do not mention a transfiguration. Minutes of the morning meeting are restricted. The original minutes, taken by Thomas Bullock, are not just "unavailable for public scrutiny." They have "never been transcribed," even though they could quickly settle the issue of whether or not a transfiguration took place. (*Ibid.*)

7. Dale L. Morgan's History. On Nov. 21, 1949, Pres. J. Reuben Clark informed a representative of Kennecott Copper in SLC that the Guggenheim family's investments in Utah would suffer if the Guggenheim Foundation continued to sponsor Dale L. Morgan's proposed multi-volume history of Mormonism. The Guggenheim Foundation agreed to stop funding Morgan, who never finished even one volume of his history. Morgan was a good friend of Fawn McKay Brodie, and the Church presumably feared his Mormon history would be controversial. (D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 1997, p. 836.)

8. Boyd K. Packer's Position. Elder Boyd K. Packer noted in a letter to the First Presidency: "On several occasions I have expressed in our council meetings my concern for some projects being undertaken by the Church Historian's Office and some of those who have been engaged to work on the projects. . . . I think our brethren in the Historical Department are wonderful men. . . . It is the principle that concerns me. It is a matter of orientation toward scholarly work—historians' work in particular—that sponsors my concern. I have come to believe that it is the tendency for most members of the Church who spend a great deal of time in academic research to begin to judge the Church, its doctrine, organization, and history, by the principles of their own profession. . . . However, it is an easy thing for a man with extensive academic training to consider the Church with the principles he has been taught in his professional training as his measuring standard. In my mind it ought to be the other way around. A member of the Church ought always, particularly if he is pursuing extended academic studies, to judge the professions of men against the revealed word of the Lord. I do feel, however, and feel very deeply, that some tempering of the purely historical approach needs to be effected. Otherwise these publications will be of interest to other historians and perhaps serve them well, but at once may have a negative effect upon many. *Particularly can they affect our youngsters*, who will not view the publications with the same academic detachment that a trained historian is taught to develop." (Lucile C. Tate, *Boyd K. Packer: Watchman on the Tower*, 1995, p. 245.)

I. "These principles are deeply rooted in Elder Packer and his brethren, and so they continued to watch the trend of research being done in the archives of the Church. They also watched the openness with which materials were being made available to certain individuals other than those authorized. The motives of many of these individuals were later proven not to be worthy. For some, such concerns seemed to inhibit honest research and foster censorship; but what they did not understand was that the Brethren, knowing where alternate trends could lead, were watching over the Church, defending the Lord's anointed, and protecting a sacred stewardship." (*Ibid.*, p. 247.)

9. Study of Mormon History "Discouraged." "In 1981, the head of the BY history department, Eugene Campbell, told a session of the American Historical Association that authorities had warned him to discourage faculty scholarship relating to polygamy or blacks and the priesthood." (Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, 2nd edition, 2007, p. 255.)

II. Problems with Joseph Smith's "History of the Church"

A. Background. Perhaps the most quoted and best known source on Mormon history is the seven-volume *History of the Church*, attributed to Joseph Smith, but written by many scribes over many decades. It was originally printed serially in various Church periodicals and newspapers. It first appeared in book form in 1902; it was reprinted in 1930 for the centennial of the Church. It is based on fragments of Joseph's writings, considerably added upon by scribes and others over the years. There are many problems with the *History*:

1. Over 24 ghost writers wrote the history between 1829 and 1844. Nine of them later left the Church.
2. Almost all of it was originally written in the third person, and not in complete sentences. It was changed over to the first person, presumably quoting Joseph Smith, even though he wrote almost none of it.
3. In terms of pages in the original manuscript history, only 35% had been written up to the time of Joseph's death, and none of this was in Joseph's own handwriting.
4. When Brigham Young called scribes to complete the history after the trek West, he instructed them to continue to reconstruct the story from any sources available (journals, letters, newspaper accounts, etc.) and to continue the story in the first person.

5. B. H. Roberts, in editing the manuscript for the Centennial history in 1930, “not only perpetuated the myth that the entire narrative was the Prophet's own writing or words, but he also made additions and deletions right in the text, without any annotation, as if they were products of the Prophet's own mind. He corrupted the text as he tried to correct it.” (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Winter, 1981, pp. 102-122.)

6. For many years, the Church insisted on the integrity of the *History of the Church*, as basically a product of Joseph Smith's own writing, with some minor changes and additions by his scribes. As historians began working with original documents on Mormonism, however, it became obvious that the published volumes varied considerably from the original source material, and that substantial tampering had occurred. In 1971 Dean Jessee's careful examination of the HC was published at BYU, confirming that the *History* contained many flaws. Prior to 1971, however, the official position of the Church was that the *History* was basically without flaw. The following are appropriate statements about the *History*:

(1). The title page of the first six volumes states: “History of Joseph Smith, the Prophet, By Himself.”

(2). The Preface states: “The *History of Joseph Smith* is now before the world, and we are satisfied that a history more correct in its details than this was never published. . . . We, therefore, hereby bear our testimony to all the world, unto whom these words shall come, that the *History of Joseph Smith* is true, and is one of the most authentic histories ever written.” (*Preface*, Vol. I, pp. v-vi.)

(3). John A. Widtsoe wrote: “The History of Joseph Smith, published by the Church, as to events and dates, may be accepted as an unusually accurate historical document. It will increase in importance with the years and become more and more a proof of the honest sincerity of the founders of the Church in this dispensation. The history is trustworthy. No flaws have been found in it.” (John A. Widtsoe, *Joseph Smith—Seeker After Truth*, 1951, p. 250.)

(4). Elder LeGrand Richards wrote in answer to a question: “Has Joseph Smith's History been changed from the original history? No. No changes have been made in meaning in any way.” (Letter dated May 12, 1966; cited in Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *The Falsification of Joseph Smith's History*, 1971, p. 1.)

(5). Dr Hugh Nibley responded to the same question: “There have been no changes in Joseph Smith's history.” (*Ibid.*, p. 1.)

(6). Joseph Fielding Smith, longtime Church Historian, wrote: “The most important history in the world is the history of our Church, and it is the most accurate history in all the world. It must be so.” (*Doctrines of Salvation*, Vol. 2, p. 199.)

(7). Once it was discovered that much of the *History* was taken from newspaper accounts or minutes of meetings at the time, the Tanners and others began checking copies of those newspapers against the printed *History*, to see what changes had been made. In just a short time it became obvious that thousands of changes had been made, and that many of them tended to put the Church or its leaders in a better light than the original accounts had done.

B. Fading Memory. “In comparing the original sources with the published *History of the Church*, one finds that by the 1850s the memory of Carthage witnesses had faded beyond recall, that sequences were jumbled, and that those who worked to correct these deficiencies succeeded only in part.” (Dean Jessee, *Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 8 [1981], pp. 18-19.)

C. Much Added. “There is a published 128-word reconstruction of one of Joseph Smith's sermons in the *History of the Church* based on an original notation of only five words recorded twelve years earlier.” (D. Michael Quinn, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View*, 1987, p. 43.)

D. Extra Baby. Under the date of Dec. 26, 1842, the following is recorded in Joseph Smith's diary: "At Home. Sister Emma sick, had another chill." (*An American Prophet's Record*, p. 258.) In a speech delivered at BYU on Aug. 6, 1987, Dean Jessee, who is an expert on Joseph's history, said that the "compiler of the history misread the word 'chill' for the word 'child,' and thereby created an event that did not occur." In the *History of the Church*, 5:209, the statement concerning Emma's illness was expanded from seven words to 22, and the child was transformed into a "son:" "On my return home, I found my wife Emma sick. She was delivered of a son, which did not survive its birth." "The Mormon officials who worked on Joseph Smith's history after his death were obviously aware that there was no child living at that time who could have been born on Dec. 26, 1842. They, therefore, made Joseph Smith say that the child 'did not survive its birth.' How they were able to determine that this nonexistent child was a 'son' rather than a daughter is somewhat of a mystery." (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *The Salt Lake City Messenger*, November 1987, p. 15.)

E. Stephen A. Douglas Prophecy. The William Clayton diary for May 18, 1843 includes this statement: "Dined at Backenstos's with Judge Douglas who is presiding at Court. After dinner the Prest. & Judge had conversation concerning sundry matters. The Prest. said 'I prophecy in the name of the Lord God that in a few years this government will be utterly overthrown and wasted so that there will not be a potsherd left' for their wickedness in conniving at the Missouri mobocracy. The Judge appears very friendly & acknowledged the propriety of the priests' remarks." When this incident was printed in the *History of the Church*, Vol. 5, p. 394, The following was added just before the last sentence above: "Judge, you will aspire to the presidency of the United States; and if ever you turn your hand against me or the Latter-day Saints, you will live to see and know that I have testified the truth to you; for the conversation of this day will stick to you through life." It appears that the famous Douglas prophecy was added sometime later, and is definitely not a part of Clayton's diary which is cited as the source. (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *The Salt Lake City Messenger*, November 1987, p. 16.)

F. No Errors? "On another occasion Joseph Smith remarked to the Saints, 'There is no error in the revelations which I have taught.' The records indicate, however, that such warnings did not preclude necessary revisions by proper authority, nor were they pronouncements that everything the Prophet would write would be unalterable." (Dean Jessee, "The Reliability of Joseph Smith's History, *The Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 3 [1976], p. 28.)

G. Robert's Changes. "Unfortunately, he [B. H. Roberts, in preparing the 1930 edition], simply perpetuated many of the original publication errors. . . . Even worse, he made additional unacknowledged changes, hundreds of them—deletions, additions, or simple changes of wording." (Davis Bitton and Leonard J. Arrington, *Mormons and Their Historians*, 1988, pp. 75-76.)

H. Revivals in 1820? "The Reverend Mr. Walters' article on the first vision raised quite a stir among Mormon scholars when an early version circulated about a year and a half ago. . . . He candidly presents his argument and bluntly tells Mormons to reevaluate the foundations of their church. That kind of frankness is far more disarming than the more pretentious variety. . . . Instead of hauling out the tiresome affidavits and reviving the moneydigger stories, for the most part he passed over these and concentrated on a brand-new question: Were there revivals in 1819-20 in the vicinity of Palmyra as Joseph said? Everyone up until now had assumed that of course there were. Walters said no, and the sources of his answer were impressive. They stood apart from the biased materials on which most anti-Mormon work is based. They were contemporaneous with the event, and they were right to the point. . . .

"While Mr. Walters has put us on the spot for the moment, in the long run Mormon scholarship will benefit from his attack. Not only was there an immediate effort to answer the question of an 1819 revival, but Mormon historians asked themselves how many other questions about our early history remain unasked as well as unanswered." (Richard Bushman, "The Question of the Palmyra Revival," *Dialogue*, Spring 1969, pp. 82-3.)

I. Bainbridge Trial. The Reverend Mr. Walters "published information in 1974 with regard to the so-called Bainbridge Trial of Joseph Smith in 1826. Supposedly Joseph Smith was brought to court on the charges of being

'a disorderly person and an imposter,' and a money digger. Walters had discovered the bill of costs for the trial in which Joseph Smith was listed as a 'glass-looker.' That was a very incriminating discovery. Hugh Nibley remarked in *The Myth Makers* that if 'the court record (published in *Frazer's Magazine* in 1873 and in the *Schaaf-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, in 1883) is authentic it is the most damning evidence in existence against Joseph Smith.' The discovery of the bill of costs for the trial is at least partial evidence that there was a trial and that the incriminating court records might be accurate." (Hugh Nibley, *The Myth Makers*, 1962, p. 142, and Richard Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, pp. 49-50.)

J. Orson Pratt's Seniority. In June 1875, President Brigham Young (just two years before his death) changed the order of succession among the apostles, so that seniority was determined by the longest *continuous* membership in the Quorum of the Twelve. The seniority of anyone who had been temporarily dropped from the Quorum was measured by the date of his reinstatement, rather than his initial ordination. This had the effect of making John Taylor, rather than Orson Pratt (who had frequently clashed with Brigham Young), next in line to be Church President, since Pratt's membership had been in question in Nauvoo. The new policy required some changes in the *History of the Church*, because that record did not appear to uphold Brigham Young's position. Originally, the *Millennial Star*, 20:423 was printed as follows: (1). "I told the Council that as there was not a quorum present when Orson Pratt's case came up before them, that he was still a member—that he had not been cut off legally, and I would find some other place for Amasa Lyman, to which the council agreed." "In the *HC* 5:255, that paragraph has been shortened to just the following: "I told the Quorum; you may receive Orson back into the Quorum of the Twelve and I can take Amasa into the First Presidency." (2). The next sentence, "... ordaining Orson Pratt to his former office *and standing* in the quorum of the Twelve Apostles ..." was changed to "ordaining Orson Pratt to his former office in the quorum of the Twelve." (3). The next paragraph was changed also: "I had restored Orson to his *former standing* in the quorum of the Twelve Apostles" became "I had restored Orson Pratt to the quorum of the Twelve Apostles." [Emphasis added.]

K. Sidney Rigdon. "At the bottom of page 120 of Vol. 1 of the *HC*, there is nothing to indicate that a deletion has been made, but approximately 3,400 words which were printed in the *Times and Seasons* have been deleted. These words were very complimentary to Sidney Rigdon. Since Rigdon was excommunicated after Joseph Smith's death, it was apparently felt best to remove Joseph Smith's praise concerning him. An examination of the original handwritten manuscript reveals that these words have been crossed out, which proves that this was a deliberate change. If Rigdon had remained faithful to the Church, the Mormon Historians would probably have left these 3,400 words concerning him in the *HC*." (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Falsification of Joseph Smith's History*, 1971, p. 14.)

1. "In the process of remaking Mormon history, a monumental disservice was done to Sidney Rigdon and others who challenged the Quorum of the Twelve's 1844 ascent to power. . . . Although I have been troubled by Mormon revisionism for years, newly discovered incidents in my Rigdon research fueled profound dismay. . . . My careful study of the record shows that Rigdon was innocent of the charges. . . . The original version of Sidney's 7-8 October hearing, as recited in the *Times and Seasons*, was recast when reported in the *Deseret News* in 1858, and later published in the *History of the Church*. This falsification conveyed an erroneous image of Rigdon that prevails in Mormon tradition to this day. . . . According to the official account, which seems to be an example of putting words into Smith's mouth, the Prophet then allegedly arose, shook himself, and said: 'I have thrown him off my shoulders, and you have again put him on me. You may carry him, but I will not.' [Emphasis in original]. . . . The contemporary transcript from the 15 Oct. 1843 *Times and Seasons* presents a more moderate outcome, one more sympathetic to Rigdon, one lacking the purported final dramatic flourish on Smith's part:

President Joseph Smith arose and satisfactorily explained to the congregation the supposed treacherous correspondence with Ex-Governor Carlin, which wholly removed suspicion from elder Sidney Rigdon, and from every other person. He expressed entire willingness to have elder Sidney Rigdon retain his station, provided he would magnify his office, and walk and conduct himself in all honesty, righteousness, and integrity; but signified his lack

of confidence in his integrity and steadfastness, judging from their past intercourse.

“Hyrum Smith then reminded his brother and fellow Saints of God's mercy, and the importance of their showing compassion to Rigdon. . . . Thus the 8 October 1843 scenario was rewritten to portray Rigdon and Smith as irrevocably estranged.” (Richard S. Van Wagoner, “Sidney Rigdon and Me,” *Journal of Mormon History*, Fall 1996, pp. 152-6.)

L. Carthage. When B. H. Roberts revised the *History of the Church* for the 1930 Centennial Edition, he deleted three paragraphs of events immediately following Joseph Smith's leap from the window at Carthage Jail, including this paragraph he considered to be “a whole fabric of myth”: “The ruffian who set him against the well curb now gathered a bowie-knife for the purpose of severing his head from his body. He raised the knife, and was in the attitude of striking, when a light, so sudden and powerful, burst from the heavens upon the bloody scene (passing its vivid chain between Joseph and his murderers), that they were struck with terror. This light, in its appearance and potency, baffles all powers of description. The arm of the ruffian that held the knife fell powerless, the muskets of the four who fired fell to the ground, and they all stood like marble statues, not having the power to move a single limb of their bodies.” (*Millennial Star* 24:487 and *HC* 6: 618-19.)

M. Nephi or Moroni? “He called me by name, and said . . . that his name was Nephi.” (*Times and Seasons*, 3:753 [1842]. “ . . . we read the history of our beloved brother, Joseph Smith, and of the glorious ministry and message of the angel Nephi . . .” (*Millennial Star*, August 1842.) “ . . . his name was Nephi . . .” (1851 edition of the Pearl of Great Price.) “ . . . his name was Nephi . . .” (Lucy Mack Smith, *Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith the Prophet, and His Progenitors for Many Generations*, London: 1853, p. 79 [now called “Joseph Smith's History by His Mother”].) “I have heard my grandmother [Mary Whitmer, wife of Peter Whitmer, Sr.] say on several occasions that she was shown the plates of the Book of Mormon by an holy angel, whom she always called Brother Nephi.” (*The Historical Record*, edited by Andrew Jensen, SLC, 1887, Vol. 7, p. 621.) The *History of the Church of Jesus Christ (Reorganized)*, 1902, refers to Nephi rather than Moroni.

N. Sample Alterations. In general, the numerous alterations from the original sources eliminated embarrassing material, or changed events to conform more with current Mormon doctrine. Some typical changes are as follows:

1. Polygamy. Joseph Smith diary for Oct. 5, 1843 states: “. . . gave instruction to try those who were preaching teaching or practicing the doctrine of plurality of wives on this law. Joseph forbids it, and the practice thereof.—No man shall have but one wife.” In 1855, it was rewritten: “Gave instructions to try those persons who were preaching, teaching, or practicing the doctrine of plurality of wives; for, according to the law, I hold the keys of this power in the last days; for there is never but one on earth at a time on whom the power and its keys are conferred; and I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time, unless the Lord directs otherwise.” (HC 6:46.)

2. Relief Society Keys. Joseph Smith's remarks at the organization of the Relief Society are recorded in the minutes of Eliza R. Snow as follows: “He spoke of delivering the keys to this society and to the Church—that according to his prayers God had appointed him elsewhere.” This was changed in HC 4:604, as follows: “He spoke of delivering the keys of the Priesthood to the Church and said that the faithful members of the Relief Society should receive them in connection with their husbands, that the Saints whose integrity has been tried and proved faithful, might know how to ask the Lord and receive an answer; for according to his prayers, God had appointed him elsewhere.” Snow's minutes also state: “I now turn the key to you . . .” That has been changed to “I now turn the key in your behalf . . .” (*The Words of Joseph Smith*, Compiled and Edited by Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook, 1980, pp. 141-2.)

3. Women as Priests. Eliza R. Snow's minutes state that at the organization of the Relief Society Joseph said that “the society should move according to the ancient priesthood, . . . Said he was going to make of this society a kingdom of priests as in Enoch's day—as in Paul's day—that it is the privilege of each member to live long and enjoy health.” That was changed in the HC from “society” to “Church.” (*The Words of Joseph Smith*, p. 137.)

4. Rough Stone. Willard Richards recorded that Joseph Smith said in a Sunday address at the Temple Stand, “. . . rough stone rolling down hill.” That incomplete sentence in his minutes is expanded in the *History of the Church* as follows: “I am like a hugh stone rolling down from a high mountain; and the only polishing I get is when some corner gets rubbed off by coming in contact with something else, striking with accelerated force against religious bigotry, priest-craft, lawyer-craft, doctor-craft, lying editors, suborned judges and jurors, and the authority of perjured executives, backed by mobs, blasphemers, licentious and corrupt men and women—all hell knocking off a corner here and a corner there. Thus I will become a smooth and polished shaft in the quiver of the Almighty, who will give me dominion over all the every one of them, when their refuge of lies shall fail, and their hiding place shall be destroyed, while these smooth-polished stones with which I come in contact become marred.” (HC 5:401, and *The Words of Joseph Smith*, p. 282.)

5. First Vision. “I saw two personages, and they did in reality speak unto me, *or one of them did.*” Roberts deleted that final phrase. (Davis Bitton and Leonard J. Arrington, *Mormons and Their Historians*, 1988, p. 75.)

6. Joseph's Own Story. “I frequently fell into many foolish errors and displayed the weakness of youth and the *corruption* (changed to “foibles”) of human nature, which I am sorry to say led me into divers tempta-tions, *to the gratification of many appetites* (phrase omitted) offensive in the sight of God.” (*Ibid.*, p. 76.)

(1). The following entire paragraph was inserted immediately after the above sentence: “In making this confession, no one need suppose me guilty of any great or malignant sins. A disposition to commit such was never in my nature. But I was guilty of levity, and sometimes associated with jovial company, etc., not consistent with that character which ought to be maintained by one who was called of God as I had been. But this will not seem very strange to any one who recollects my youth, and is acquainted with my native cheery temperament.”

(Compare HC 1:9-10 with *Times and Seasons*, 3:749. The 1851 edition of the Pearl of Great Price contains the version quoted from T&S, indicating that the addition was made after that date.)

(2) Neal Chandler noted in 2000: “This same relationship obtains between the Church and its history. For instance, the popular profile of our founding prophet has, in my lifetime and in numerous videos produced at BYU grown ever more ideal, ever more antiseptic: BYU’s most preferred man in a nineteenth-century collar and a conservative hair cut. There is little or nothing left of the flesh and blood founder of Mormonism.” (Neal Chandler, *Sunstone*, February 2000, p. 36.)

7. Curse. “Preached on the hill near the Temple, concerning the building of the Temple, and pronounced a curse on (changed to “reproved”) the merchants and the rich . . .” (*Ibid.*, p. 76.)

8. Rocky Mountain Prophecy. The HC, Vol. 5, p. 85, records the famous prophecy of Joseph Smith: “I prophesied that the Saints would continue to suffer much affliction and would be driven to the Rocky Moun-tains, many would apostatize, others would be put to death by our persecutors or lose their lives in consequence of exposure or disease, and some of you will live to go and assist in making settlements and build cities and see the Saints become a mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains.” A footnote on that page indicates that the date is questionable, and that there are other difficulties. The Tanners point out that the prophecy has been inserted in the margin of “Joseph Smith's Manuscript History,” and that it could have been added many years after the Saints were in Utah. Furthermore, they add, “At any rate, Dean C. Jessee's study proves that this prophecy could not have been written in “Joseph Smith's Manuscript History” until at least a year after Joseph Smith's death. He shows that page 1362 of the Manuscript History—the page containing the prophecy—was not even written until July 4, 1845” and the insertion could have been made long after that date. (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *The Falsification of Joseph Smith's History*, 1971, p. 23.)

9. Negroes. Joseph Smith's letter to John C. Calhoun was changed from “rebellious niggers in the slave States, . . .” to “rebellious Negroes in the slave States.” (MS 22:602 and HC 6:158.)

10. Prophets Before Adam. Hyrum Smith went from saying “There were Prophets before Adam, and Joseph has the spirit and power of all the Prophets,” to “There were Prophets before, but Joseph has the spirit,” etc. (MS 23:406 and HC 6:346.)

11. Mob at Hiram. “. . . the fellow that I kicked came to me and thrust his hand into my face, all covered with blood, (for I hit him on the nose) . . .” (*Times and Seasons* 5:611. HC 1:262 leaves out “for I hit him on the nose.”)

12. Curse. In the *Millennial Star*, 19:360, Joseph Smith was quoted as saying: “Preached on the hill near the Temple, concerning the building of the Temple, and pronounced a curse on the merchants and the rich, who would not assist in building it.” (In HC 4:601, “pronounced a curse” is changed to “reproved.”)

13. Cholera Cure. HC 5:212 deletes this statement of Joseph Smith, which was printed in the *Millennial Star* 20:263, the account used in HC for the material just before and after it: “Salt, vinegar, and pepper, given internally, and plunging into the river when the paroxysms begin, will cure the cholera.”

14. Contradictions. Much of the criticism of the HC comes because of the “numerous textual alterations and changes that are clearly the effort of a later generation to cope with textual problems of the History. . . . The omission of Joseph Smith's phrase at the beginning of the history, speaking of the churches of his day ('for at that time it had never entered into my heart that all were wrong,') which contradicts an earlier statement of the Prophet, ('who of all these parties were right? or, are they all wrong together;') and the substitution of the name 'Moroni' for 'Nephi' as the angel who addressed Joseph Smith about the golden plates, are typical of this type of editorial revision.” (Dean Jessee, *Journal of Mormon History*, 1976, pp. 41-42.)

15. Word of Wisdom. At Carthage Jail, Joseph asked Brother Markham to “go and get a pipe and some tobacco” for apostle Willard Richards. (*Millennial Star* 24:471). The *History of the Church* 6:614 now reads “‘get the doctor something that he needs to settle his stomach,’ and Markham went out for medicine.”

(1). An original observation that Joseph Smith gave some of the brethren a “couple of dollars, with directions to replenish” their supply of “whisky” (*Millennial Star*, 21:283) was deleted entirely when the surrounding incidents were printed in HC 5:450.)

(2). “Drank a glass of beer at Moessers” (*Millennial Star* 23:720) was completely deleted in HC 6:424.)

16. Great Salt Lake Valley. On Sept. 9, 1845, the Council of Fifty “voted to send ‘a company of Saints to the West next spring’ and to appoint a committee of five to begin preparations. The published *History of the Church* claims that this meeting specified the ‘Great Salt Lake valley’ as the destination, but that is a retro-active addition. The Clerk of the Kingdom indicated the location as simply ‘the West.’ Apostle John Taylor wrote that this meeting of the Fifty discussed ‘California,’ and four days later Young referred to settling ‘on the California coast.’” (D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 1997, p. 233.)

1. Character of Dr. Robert D. Foster. Dr. Robert D. Foster was surgeon-general and brevet-brigadier-general of the Nauvoo Legion. Joseph Smith’s diary, from 2 March 1843 to 21 January 1844 (as printed in Scott Faulring, *An American Prophet’s Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*, 1987) lists at least 15 positive or neutral comments about Foster, including this one for October 29, 1843: “Dr [Willard] Richards called for a collection to get \$8.00 for a new Book for the history and obtained \$3.00. Dr. R[obert] D. Foster voluntarily came forward and gave \$4.50. [He] Has given .50 in the subscription making \$5.00 which is to be recorded on the book purchased.” Later, Foster was one of the dissenters who threatened to expose Joseph’s polygamous marriages in Nauvoo in March 1844. When Joseph’s diary was published in the *History of the Church*, the October 29, 1843 entry was deleted. See HC 6:61. (D. Michael Quinn, “National Culture, Personality, and Theocracy in the Early Mormon Culture of Violence,” *The John Whitmer Historical Association 2002 Nauvoo Conference Special Edition*, 2002, p. 183.)

2. Fingers in Eyes. As originally written, the *HC* reported that Joseph Smith said, “Can a branch of the Church make by-laws on the principle of expediency which are not specified in any revelation? Answer, Yes, if they wish they may make laws to stick their fingers in their eyes.” While revising the record for the 1930 *History of the Church*, B. H. Roberts wrote to President Joseph F. Smith, “It is thought that the illustration following shall at least be omitted, and perhaps the whole question and answer. The illustration to the answer is certainly undignified for Apostles and ought not to be reproduced in the history.” (*Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 3 [1976], p. 43.)

3. “First Visitation of Angels.” Once the saints were established in the Salt Lake Valley, the *Deseret News* began publishing Joseph Smith’s history, using his journals as the source. On May 29, 1852, they printed this statement from Joseph Smith’s diary for Nov. 14, 1835: “I gave him [Erastus Holmes] a brief relation of my experience while in my juvenile years, say from six years old up to the time I received the *first visitation of angels*, which was when was about fourteen years old.” When the *History of the Church* was published in 1932, this statement had been changed as follows: “I gave him a brief relation of my experience while in my juvenile years, say from six years old up to the time I received the *first vision*, . . .” (Italics added.)

O. Roberts' Changes. “In re-editing the HC for publication, beginning in 1902, B. H. Roberts deleted other items that were regarded by the standards of his time as insignificant, outdated, in poor taste, or undignified, such as a reference to Joseph hitting a mobber in the nose, a rebuke of President Martin Van Buren, phrenology charts of Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball, Joseph's argument in support of repeal of a Nauvoo City hog ordinance, and his giving money to replenish a whiskey supply of his rescuers in 1843.” (Dean Jessee, *Journal of Mormon History*, 1976, p. 43.)

P. Mormon = “More Good.” In a letter to President Joseph F. Smith, B. H. Roberts noted: “The definition is most likely worked out by W. W. Phelps and accepted by the Prophet, perhaps in a good humored way, being influenced to accept it from the idea of Mormonism being 'more good' than a corrupted Christianity. It is pedantic, offensively so, and starts from inaccurate premises. 'Bible' does not mean 'good,' either in its widest sense or any other sense. It is derived from 'biblie'—'the books,' and by no manner of torture can be twisted to mean 'good.' This is the false premise from which the definer starts, and he reaches unwarranted conclusions. The treatise leaves the Prophet open to ridicule which need not be perpetuated. It should be left out.” (*Journal of Mormon History*, 1976, p. 43.)

Q. Joseph or William Clayton? “Comparing the entries in Clayton's journal with the *History of the Church* provides an interesting insight into the way the *History* was compiled. It is obvious that Clayton was the source for this part. But in the HC Clayton is not mentioned at all—on either date—and Joseph Smith is portrayed as the one selling the property and receiving the money. Clayton, of course, was always acting as Joseph's agent, and it appears as if whoever compiled this portion of the HC was simply trying to give the prophet credit for doing as much as possible. This is also an example of the way Clayton was frequently subordinated—his activities overshadowed or ignored. But the fact he was one of those who worked on compiling the HC may be evidence that he willingly took subordination without complaint.” (James B. Allen, *Trials of Discipleship: The Story of William Clayton, a Mormon*, 1987, p. 106.)

R. Prudential Changes. “Years later Elder Charles W. Penrose, a member of the First Presidency, admitted that after Joseph Smith's death some changes were made in the official record 'for prudential reasons.’” (Charles W. Penrose diary, 10 Jan. 1897, Utah Historical Society; cited by Richard Van Wagoner, *Dialogue*, 28:3, Winter 1995, p. 3.)

S. Changes Regarding Seventies. In 1930, President Heber J. Grant told B. H. Roberts, senior member of the Council of Seventies, and assistant church historian, that he was to remove from the forthcoming volume of the *History of the Church*, the statements of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young that Seventies are ordained apostles. A very upset B.H. Roberts wrote to President Grant on Aug. 30, 1930: “I desire, however, to take this occasion of disclaiming any responsibility for the mutilating of that very important part of President Young's Manuscript, and also to say, that while you had the physical power of eliminating that passage from the History, I do not believe you had any moral right to do so.” (D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 1997, pp. 822, and 147.)

T. History is Dishonest. Mormon historian Richard Van Wagoner made this assessment in 1996: “Perhaps the saddest of these silent revisions, at least for me, occurred to our official *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, first issued in the *Deseret News* in the 1850s under Brigham Young's supervision, then eventually published in book form under the direction of the First Presidency in 1902. The introductory assurance that 'no historical or doctrinal statement has been changed' is more than demonstrably wrong; it is dishonest. Overshadowed by editorial censorship and hundreds of deletions, additions, and alterations, these seven volumes are essentially not reliable. This official history is a partisan chronology, a flawed legacy for rank-and-file believers. Not only does this history place polygamy and Brigham Young's ecclesiastical significance in the rosy glow of political acceptability, it smooths out Joseph Smith's roughhewn edges, tidies up his more disreputable adventures, and deletes unfulfilled prophecies. Even conceding the different standards of what constituted historical accuracy between the nineteenth century and our own, I find it lamentable that this manipulative history has been perpetuated right up to the present. I feel especially strongly about this double

dealing because, in my opinion, the history of Mormonism requires no such anxious sanitation. It is even more powerful, compelling, and yes, inspirational in its workaday shirt sleeves than it is in its Sunday broadcloth and cuff-links.” (Richard S. Van Wagoner, *Journal of Mormon History*, Fall 1996, p. 152.)

U. Summary. All told, there are many thousands of changes in the *History of the Church*. To this day, none of the changes has been indicated in the text, and most readers are likely unaware that they exist. As former assistant Church Historian Davis Bitton cautions, “for researchers in early Mormon history Rule Number One is 'Do not rely on the DHC [*History of the Church*]; never use a quotation from it without comparing the earlier versions.’”

V. History of Brigham Young. “After the history was complete through August 8, 1844, the clerks in the office of the president of the church continued it as the ‘History of Brigham Young.’ As in the case of the Joseph Smith history, this was an ‘annals’ approach to church history, and documents from a wide variety of sources were used to tell not only the history of Brigham Young but also the history of the church over which he presided. To this date [1998], the only portion of this history, which consists of 48 volumes of about 1,000 pages each, that has been published is that from 1844 to 1847, issued under the editorship of B. H. Roberts in 1932 as volume 7 of *History of the Church*. Historians hope that additional volumes of the massive Brigham Young history will eventually be edited for publication.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, p. 67.)

III. Censoring Polygamy

By its very nature, the Mormon practice of polygamy was shrouded in secrecy. In Nauvoo, Joseph Smith and some of the Twelve vehemently denied the rumors of polygamy even while they were taking additional wives and quietly teaching others to do the same. In Utah, polygamy was more open for a while; but even after it was officially abandoned, Church leaders continued to take plural wives. Today, very little is said officially about the practice, and much of what is said is wrong. The typical Church member today would likely be surprised at how much deception still continues on the subject.

W. Scripture Falsified. The 1835 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants added Section 101. Verse 4 states, “Inasmuch as this church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy: we declare that we believe, that one man should have but one wife; and one woman, but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.” At the time that was printed, Joseph Smith had already dictated a revelation authorizing polygamy, had secretly explained that polygamy would one day become a practice of the Church, and had himself already married his first plural wife.” (D. Michael Quinn, Dialogue, “LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904.” Spring 1985, pp. 19-20.)

X. Nauvoo Affidavits. In 1840, 12 men and 19 women signed affidavits that stated in part: “we know of no other rule or system of marriage than the one published in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants [quoted above].” The signers included apostles John Taylor and Wilford Woodruff (who had already been taught the doctrine by Joseph Smith); Bishop Newell K. Whitney (who had performed a plural marriage ceremony the previous July for his own daughter and Joseph Smith); his wife Elizabeth Ann Whitney (who witnessed the plural ceremony); Sarah M. Cleveland (who had already become Joseph Smith's plural wife early in 1842; and Eliza R. Snow (who married Joseph Smith on 29 June 1842.) (Ibid., p. 20.)

Y. William Clayton. In 1843 Joseph Smith told William Clayton regarding his plural wife who was now pregnant, to “just keep her at home and brook it and if they raise trouble about it and bring you before me I will give you an awful scourging and probably cut you off from the church and then I will baptise you and set you ahead as good as ever.” (Ibid., p. 21.)

Z. Officially Denied. The following notice appeared in the Nauvoo Times and Seasons Feb. 1, 1844: “NOTICE: As we have lately been credibly informed, that an Elder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day

Saints, by the name of Hiram Brown, has been preaching polygamy, and other false and corrupt doctrines, in the county of Lapeer, state of Michigan. This is to notify him and the Church in general, that he has been cut off from the church, for his iniquity; and he is further notified to appear at the Special Conference, on the 6th of April next, to make answer to these charges. [Signed] JOSEPH SMITH and HYRUM SMITH, Presidents of said Church.” (Times and Seasons, Vol. 5, p. 423. The notice is clearly a subterfuge. Furthermore, no one named Hiram Brown is listed in the History of the Church, and he is not mentioned again in the T&S; it is possible that even the name is fictitious.)

AA. Joseph's Denial. Although Joseph Smith had married more than 30 plural wives by May 1844, he told a Nauvoo congregation that he was accused of “having 7 wives, when I can only find one.” (*Ibid.*, p. 21.)

BB. Public Deceived. At the British general conference in 1846, apostle Parley P. Pratt said: “Such a doctrine is not held, known, or practiced as a principle of the Latter-day Saints. It is but another name for whoredom; and is as foreign from the real principles of the Church, as the devil is from God.” (*Millennial Star* 6:22.) At that time he had seven wives.

CC. John Taylor's Denial. Apostle John Taylor, while on his mission to France in 1850, published a pamphlet which stated: “We are accused here of polygamy and actions the most indelicate, obscene and disgusting, such as none but a corrupt heart could have conceived. These things are too outrageous to be believed; therefore I shall content myself with reading our views of chastity and marriage. . . .” At that time, Taylor already had fifteen wives. (John Hyde, *Mormonism: Its Leaders and Designs*, 1857, p. 15.)

DD. Divorces. In spite of public pronouncements to the contrary, a great many polygamous marriages failed and ended in divorce. There were over 2,000 divorces granted prior to the 1890 Manifesto. Brigham Young himself granted 1,645. Of the 72 general authorities who were polygamists, there were 54 divorces, 26 separations and 1 annulment. (“Divorce among Mormon Polygamists: Extent and Explanations.” *Utah Historical Quarterly*, Winter 1978, p. 4.)

EE. Always Illegal. A persistent myth among Mormons maintains that polygamy was not illegal when it began, and when the anti-polygamy laws were passed the Church went to court to get a constitutional ruling; as soon as the Supreme Court upheld the ban, the Church quit the practice. In actuality, except for the years 1847-1862 in Utah Territory, polygamy has been illegal everywhere the Church practiced it, including Illinois, Mexico, Canada, and Utah after 1862. (“LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904.” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 18, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 15-17.)

FF. How Many Involved? For many years the Church has indicated that relatively few Mormons were polygamists, perhaps as few as 5%. Those who have studied polygamy carefully place the figure much higher. The Frank Esshom study estimated that 25-30% of Utah Mormons were polygamists; Larry Logue, in a more recent study, found that some 33% of Mormon households were polygamist. Lowell Bennion, Jr. estimates that 20% to 40% of Mormon families were polygamist. Logue concludes: “Polygamy was therefore far from the marginal practice that previous studies have described.” (*The Mormon People: Their Character and Traditions*, 1980, Charles Redd Monograph, BYU, pp. 59-60; Larry Logue, “Polygamy in a Utah Town,” *The Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 11 (1984, p. 9; Richard Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy*, 1986, p. 91.)

1. LeGrand Richards' Book. In 1950, Elder LeGrand Richards first published his best-selling book, *A Marvelous Work and a Wonder*. In it he claimed, “only a few of the members of the Church ever lived the principle of plural marriage—never over three percent.” (P. 401.) “Although subsequent research has proven this a gross underestimation, this book has remained continuously in print for more than fifty years and is required reading for many LDS missionaries.” It has not been corrected. (Stephen C. Taysom, *Dialogue*, Fall 2002, p. 137.)

GG. Women Could Veto? It is claimed that women controlled polygamy by being able to withhold

assent for their husbands to take additional wives. In theory, the earlier wife or wives were to place the hand of the new wife in the hand of their husband. Yet there are many documents which show that earlier wives often never did learn of additional wives being taken by their husband.

HH. Joseph's Wives. While many people are not even aware that Joseph Smith was a polygamist, he married as many as 35 wives. At least thirteen of them were already married to other men. In three cases, the original husband stood proxy for Joseph or were witnesses in the temple while their wives were sealed to the deceased Prophet. (Danel Bachman, "A Study of the Mormon Practice of Plural Marriage Before the Death of Joseph Smith," Purdue University M.A. Thesis, 1975, 124, 135.)"

II. Hiding Joseph's Polyandrous Marriages. During the dispute with the RLDS Church over whether or not Joseph Smith practiced polygamy, Church leaders signed affidavits to prove that various women were polygamous wives. Todd Compton noted, however: "I should mention that neither Joseph F. nor Joseph Fielding Smith published an affidavit of a polyandrous marriage [of which there were 11 by Joseph Smith], to the best of my knowledge, so that was an aspect of Joseph Smith, Jr.'s polygamy that they clearly did not feel comfortable with." They published many affidavits of wives that were *not* involved in polyandrous marriages." (Todd Compton, *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal*, Vol. 19 [1999], p. 68.)

N. Manifesto: Largely Untrue. The Utah Commission report claimed that 40 Utah male *residents* had married plural wives since June 1889. Records show that at least 30 did so in Utah alone. In addition, many Utah residents were polygamously married in Mexico, which the Manifesto ignored. Another dozen marriages were performed in the Endowment House which the Utah Commission did not know about.

1. President Woodruff was asked if there had been a marriage performed in the Endowment House (the Hans Jespersen case, referred to in the Manifesto). On Oct. 20, 1889 he told the *Tribune*: "It seems incredible if it is true. It is against all of my instructions. I do not understand it at all. We are looking into it and shall not rest until we get all the facts. There is no intention on our part to do anything but to obey the law." (*Salt Lake Tribune*, 20 Oct. 1889. He should not have had any trouble finding out. Apostle Franklin D. Richards performed the ceremony, which was recorded in the Endowment House sealing record. The recommend was likely signed by Wilford Woodruff himself. (D. Michael Quinn, *Dialogue*, Spring 1985, p. 38.)

2. The Manifesto says the Endowment House was torn down because of a plural marriage. It was actually torn down as a make-work project to justify moving hundreds of good Mormons into SLC to register and vote in the anti-Mormon election coming up shortly. By working on the Endowment House they were "SLC residents." (*Dialogue*, Spring 1985, pp. 38, 46.)

3. The vote accepting the Manifesto is listed as "unanimous." In reality, it appears many—perhaps a majority—of those present abstained from voting at all, and some of those present, by their own accounts, audibly voted no.

4. At his trial before the Twelve on May 10, 1911, Elder Matthias F. Cowley said, "Bro. Penrose told me once in the city of Mexico, that he had written the Manifesto, and it was gotten up so that it did not mean anything and President [Joseph F.] Smith had told me the same." *The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley*, Collier Publishing Co., Jan. 1987, p. 28.)

JJ. Children After Manifesto. Despite numerous denials by high officials, many General Authorities continued polygamous cohabitation long after the Manifesto. At least 61% of the General Authorities of 1890 fathered children after the Manifesto, including Joseph F. Smith, Heber J. Grant and at least nine other apostles. (*Utah Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 46 #1 [Winter, 1978], pp. 24-36.)

1. President Joseph F. Smith's wives bore him 13 children after the Manifesto, even though he publicly testified he was not "cohabiting" with them. (*Dialogue*, Spring 1985, p. 83.)

2. “Though the 1891 petition for amnesty did not specifically pledge conformity to the law, the grants of amnesty from Presidents Harrison and Cleveland clearly assumed such. Still, 11 General Authorities, including Heber J. Grant, fathered 76 children by 27 plural wives during the years 1890-1905.” (Richard S. Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy*, 1986, p. 160.)

3. Michael Quinn, in his exhaustive study of “authorized” polygamy after the Manifesto says that at least 3,300 children were born to men who married polygamously *with Church authority* from 1890 through 1904. “These 3,300 children, many of whom are still alive, have produced 50,000 or more living [1985] descend-ants. Some of these post Manifesto polygamists have sixth generation descendants at present.” (*Dialogue*, Spring 1985, pp. 3-104.)

KK. Marriages After Manifesto. While most people believe polygamy ended with the Manifesto, Church leaders continued the practice. The following apostles are all known to have taken additional wives after the 1890 Manifesto: Abraham H. Cannon, George Teasdale, Abraham O. Woodruff, Brigham Young, Jr., and Marriner W. Merrill. President Anthony W. Ivins of the First Presidency recorded more than 40 polygamous marriages performed by him alone between 1897 and 1904 (*Utah Historical Quarterly*, Winter, 1980, pp. 9, 19.)

LL. How Many? Until recently, the Church position has been that very few authorized polygamous marriages occurred after the Manifesto. A statement of the First Presidency in 1907 said “a few.” Arrington and Bitton in 1979 said “perhaps a few score.” Kenneth Cannon's 1983 study reported on at least 150 documented cases. In 1984, Francis Gibbons, former secretary to the First Presidency wrote that “a comparatively large number of polygamous marriages had been performed after the Manifesto. Quinn places the figure at “more than 250” which were “authorized by the First Presidency, and by action or assent of all but one or two members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles.” (*Dialogue*, Spring 1985, pp. 3-103, and Thomas Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition*, 1986, p. 328.)

MM. Madame Mountford. Although sharply denied by the Church, there is substantial evidence that President Wilford Woodruff himself, in whose name the Manifesto was issued, took a plural wife seven years after he issued the Manifesto. In the last sixteen months of his life, President Woodruff referred to a “Madame Mountford” (or sometimes, “M.M.” at least 111 times in his journal. (See *Dialogue*, Spring 1985, p. 65, and the *Wilford Woodruff Journals* for 1896-7. At his trial before the Twelve on May 10 1911, Elder Matthias F. Cowley said, “I believed President Woodruff married a wife the year before he died, of course I don't know. I can't prove it.” (*The Trials of Apostles John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley*, Collier Publishing Co., January 1987, p. 32.)

NN. Heretical Lies? Despite several hundred “authorized” post-Manifesto polygamous marriages which have been documented, the Church continues to teach otherwise. *The Doctrine and Covenants Student Manual*, in use since 1981 at BYU and in Institute courses throughout the Church, states: “Others who refused to follow the commandment of the Lord claimed that the Manifesto was issued only for good public relations and that in secret the Church leaders still performed marriages and supported the practice. To put down such heretical lies, President Joseph F. Smith issued the Second Manifesto in 1904.” (Cited in *Dialogue*, Summer 1985, p. 4.)

OO. Non-Polygamists Single Forever. In 1873, President Brigham Young declared: “Now, where a man in this church says, 'I don't want but one wife, I will live my religion with one,' he will perhaps be saved in the Celestial kingdom; but when he gets there he will not find himself in possession of any wife at all. He has had a talent that he has hid up. He will come forward and say, 'Here is that which thou gavest me, I have not wasted it, and here is the one talent,' and he will not enjoy it but it will be taken and given to those who have improved the talents they received, and he will find himself without any wife, and he will remain single forever and ever.” (*Deseret News*, Sept. 17, 1873.)

PP. Not to be Discussed. “On one occasion Leonard [Arrington] and I were advised to leave a chapter on polygamy out of our book. . . . Polygamy is a large and important part of our history. . . . Thinking that we

could render service by producing a concise, low-key treatment of the subject, we proposed such a work to our superi-ors. They declined. . . . polygamy is such a sensitive subject that some General Authorities preferred to avoid mentioning it at all. Church magazines were not supposed to mention the practice. Books published by Deseret Book studiously avoided it.” (Davis Bitton, *Dialogue*, Fall 1983, p. 13.)

1. Not in Any Manuals. To my knowledge, there is not a manual in the Church which discusses polygamy, even though it was a major doctrine for about half the elapsed time since the Restoration. Presumably, the Brethren prefer the approach taken by Preston Nibley, who wrote a 540 page biography of Brigham Young without ever once mentioning polygamy.

2. Carmon Hardy’s Experience. Mormon historian B. Carmon Hardy has written: “Not only are records, diaries, reports, notes, and statistics bearing on polygamy withheld from researchers, not only do official Church accounts carefully ignore post-Manifesto polygamy and engage in distortions concerning it, but efforts are made to direct scholars away from the subject. As a young professor at Brigham Young University in the mid-1960s, after sending question- naires to numbers of individuals I believed to have been involved with approved plural marriages after the 1890 Manifesto, I was called into the office of a high administrative officer at the university and angrily grilled as to the reasons for my interest. I was further told I should have secured permission from Church superiors before investigating so sensitive a topic. I then dutifully applied to the First Presidency of the Church for approval to continue my research. After months of waiting, I was told by my dean at BYU [Antone K. Romney, brother of President Marion G. Romney] that he had received a written communication from a member of the First Presidency [President Hugh B. Brown] that not only denied my request but indicated I should discontinue research on polygamy altogether. When I asked for a copy of the letter containing this directive, I was refused. . . . [E]very scholar with whom I am acquainted agrees that there is yet official Church reticence when it comes to using certain records, diaries, and other materials in the church’s archives and in the First Presidency’s possession relating to polygamy.” (Carmon Hardy, *Case Reports of the Mormon Alliance*, Vol. 3, 1997, edited by Anderson and Allred, 1998, p. 279.)

a. In an article in *Dialogue* in 2008, Hardy filled in more details. The BYU “high administrative officer” was Anthony Bentley, who was born in the Mexican colonies but lived in Provo. “[He] had somehow learned of my questionnaires and insisted that I explain the reason for them. Angrily, he interrogated me both about my purpose in sending such inquiries and my intentions regarding the use of any information obtained from them. With a raised voice, he repeatedly demanded to know where I would publish my findings. . . . He told me that, before resuming work on the colonies I should clear future research with him.” The letter Hardy received from President Hugh B. Brown instructed Antone K. Romney “to tell me that it was best not to examine subjects that had brought ‘trouble’ to the Church in the past. “I was disturbed by the message, not only because of the curb it placed on my work but by the view that things possibly embarrassing to the Church were not appropriate for scholarly investigation. It seemed entirely at odds with what I thought a university should be about.” (B. Carmon Hardy, “Polygamy, Mormonism, and Me,” *Dialogue*, 41:2 [Summer 2008], pp. 88-9.)

b. Senator Smoot’s Disillusioned Secretary. Hardy speaks of “young Carlos A. Badger, secretary to Senator Reed Smoot at the time of the Senate hearings on allegations of continued Mormon polygamy in 1904. When President Joseph F. Smith was first subpoenaed, Badger was exuberant, describing his church president as a warrior for the faith. But after hearing Smith dissemble and prevaricate, declaring things that Badger knew were not true, he was deeply shaken, sorrowful, and bitter. It left him, he said, morally confused.” (Carmon Hardy, *Case Reports of the Mormon Alliance*, Vol. 3, 1997, edited by Anderson and Allred, 1998, pp. 280-81.)

c. Notes Confiscated. Hardy remembered his experience in the 1960s: “I continued my research on the colonies in Mexico with a view to eventually publishing my findings. This research involved regular visits to the Church Archives in Salt Lake City, where I learned, first, that there were numerous documents I could not see and second, that whatever notes I took on documents I *was* permitted view must be examined by

A. William Lund, then assistant Church historian. It was always a harrowing half hour or so at the end of each research day, when Lund read the 3x5 cards on which I wrote my notes—especially when, finding some of which he disapproved, he would crumple them and throw them into the waste can in his office.” (B. Carmon Hardy, “Polygamy, Mormonism, and Me,” *Dialogue*, 41:2 [Summer 2008], p. 87.)

QQ. Polygamy Required for Celestial Kingdom? Yes! Brigham Young preached in 1866: “The only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy. Others attain unto a glory and may even be permitted to come into the presence of the Father and the Son; but they cannot reign as kings in glory, because they had blessings offered unto them, and they refused to accept them.” (*Journal of Discourses*, 11:269.)

1. Joseph F. Smith announced in the Tabernacle on July 7, 1878: “Some people have supposed that the doctrine of plural marriage was a sort of superfluity, or non-essential, to the salvation or exaltation 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 want here to enter my solemn protest against this idea, for I know it is false. . . . it is useless to tell me that there is no blessing attached to obedience to the law, or that a man with only one wife can obtain as great a reward, glory or kingdom as he can with more than one, being equally faithful. . . . I understand the law of celestial marriage to mean that every man in this Church, who has the ability to obey and practice it in righteousness and will not, shall be damned, I say I understand it to mean this and nothing less, and I testify in the name of Jesus that it does mean that.” (*Journal of Discourses*, 20:28-29, 31.)

RR. Polygamy Required for Celestial Kingdom? No! In October 1901, Elder James E. Talmage wrote in an official LDS publication that in celestial marriage “plurality of wives was an incident—never an essential.” (James E. Talmage, *Improvement Era*, October 1901, p. 12.)

1. Not Mentioned in Brigham Young Biography. In 1926, Apostle John A. Widtsoe edited a volume of the *Discourses of Brigham Young* which did not even mention plural marriage. (Stephen C. Taysom, *Dialogue*, Fall 2002, p. 133.)

1. At the general priesthood meeting on Oct. 8, 1927, “President [Anthony W.] Ivins replied to the unsigned pamphlet Celestial Marriage. He gave every one present positive instructions that plural marriage was not celestial marriage as spoken of in the Doctrine and Covenants and no one was authorized to perform a plural marriage and any one entering into that kind of marriage would be excommunicated from the church. Pres. Grant also spoke upon same subject.” (*In the World: The Diaries of Reed Smoot*, edited by Harvard S. Heath, 1997, p. 665.)

2. In 1933, President Heber J. Grant and his two counselors issued an official statement: “Celestial marriage—that is, marriage for time and eternity—and polygamous marriage are not synonymous terms. . . . Monogamous marriages solemnized in our temples are celestial marriages.” (“Official Statement from the First Presidency,” *Deseret News*, Church Section, June 17, 1933.)

3. When Larry King asked President Gordon B. Hinckley about polygamy during a television interview in September 1998, he responded: “I condemn it, yes, as a practice, it is not doctrinal.” (*City Weekly*, Jan. 28, 1999, p. 13.)

a. As the interview progressed, Larry King asked about percentages:
KING: You could have a certain amount of . . .”

HINCKLEY: The figures I have are from—between two percent and five percent of our people were involved in it [polygamy]. It was a very limited practice . . .”

b. Actually, historians figure some 30-40 percent of the membership was living in

polygamous families. President Hinckley certainly knew that the figures he quoted were far short of the reality.

SS. Censorship Counter-Productive. “So-called ‘faith-promoting’ church history which conceals controversies and difficulties of the Mormon past may actually undermine the faith of Latter-day Saints who eventually learn about the problems from other sources. One of the most obvious demonstrations of that fact is the continued spread of unauthorized polygamy among Latter-day Saints during the last 75 years, despite efforts of church leaders to stop it. Essential to this church campaign is the official historical argument that there were no plural marriages authorized by the church or First Presidency after the 1890 Manifesto. . . .

“As a lifelong opponent of post-1890 polygamy, J. Reuben Clark knew otherwise. He spearheaded the administrative suppression of polygamist Fundamentalists from the time he entered the First Presidency in 1933, but he ruefully noted in 1945 ‘that one of the reasons why the so-called “Fundamentalists” had made such inroads among our young people was because we had failed to teach them the truth.’ The truth was that more than 250 plural marriages occurred from 1890 to 1904 in Mexico, Canada, and the United States by authorization of the First Presidency and by action or assent of all but one or two members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. The official denial of that fact in LDS church statements and histories has actually given credibility to Fundamentalists in their promotion of new plural marriages after 1904 in defiance of First Presidency authority.” (D. Michael Quinn, *Faithful History: Essays on Writing Mormon History*, 1992, p. 87.)

TT. Quinn’s Awakening to the Issue. Mike Quinn, who as a history professor at BYU first raised the issue of pervasive disregard of the Manifesto by Church leaders [and who ultimately was excommunicated for his stand following intervention by Elder Boyd K. Packer] wrote of his first realization that there had been a cover-up of post-Manifesto polygamy: “During my first semester back at Brigham Young University, a faithful Mormon student also shook my confidence in traditional Mormon history. One afternoon Stephen E. Robinson (a religiously devoted freshman) confronted me in the BYU dorm with the accusation that his religion professor had wilfully lied to the class that morning by claiming that anyone who married in polygamy after the Manifesto was an adulterer. ‘My grandfather [Joseph E. Robinson] was a mission president who married two plural wives in Salt Lake City ten years after the Manifesto,’ he said and added that his family had a recommend (signed by LDS President Joseph F. Smith) for one of the marriages. I was deeply disturbed by what Steve Robinson told me about his grandfather’s post-Manifesto polygamous marriages. This did not fit the explanation that Apostle Richards had given me as a teenager, and it contradicted traditional histories by B. H. Roberts and Joseph Fielding Smith. At first I couldn’t believe it, and asked for his grandfather’s name to check out the story. The next weekend I took the bus to the LDS Genealogical Society, where I found that the man married two plural wives in 1901, and remained mission president for almost twenty years, during which time he fathered children by all his wives. This BYU student sent me on a quest to understand post-Manifesto polygamy and every other historical claim about the LDS church made by anti-Mormons. In the process, I found that traditional Mormon historians were denying the existence of things (or remaining silent about events) that anti-Mormons could demonstrate from Mormon sources.” (D. Michael Quinn, “Pillars of My Faith: The Rest is History.” *Sunstone* 18, no. 3, December 1995, 53.)

UU. Reversal of Positions. “For a century, the RLDS church denied that Joseph Smith practiced plural marriage, while the LDS church affirmed that he did. Now, however, the RLDS church’s Herald House bookstore sells Todd Compton’s recent Mormon History Association award-winning *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith*, but the LDS church’s Deseret Book store refuses to carry it.” (“Sun Spots: Changed Partners.” *Sunstone*, Dec. 1998, p. 79.)

VV. Encyclopedia of Mormonism. “Quinn states that more than 250 polygamous marriages took place between 1890 [the Manifesto] and 1904 with authorization from the First Presidency. . . . Faced with research by Quinn and other historians in recent years, the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* of 1992 mentions in passing that unofficially there were some post-Manifesto marriages, but it avoids mentioning that any post-Manifesto marriages were authorized by members of the First Presidency.” (Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, 1999, p. 73.)

WW. 1997-1998 Church Almanac. The *Deseret News 1997-1998 Church Almanac* includes biographies on each President of the Church. However, information on wives and number of children is given only for those presidents from David O. McKay to the present. Six of the seven presidents before McKay were all polygamists; President McKay was the second (after George Albert Smith) who was a monogamist.

XX. "Heretical Lies?" Despite several hundred "authorized" post-Manifesto polygamous marriages which have been documented, the Church has continued to teach otherwise. *The Doctrine and Covenants Student Manual*, in use since 1981 at BYU and in Institute courses throughout the Church, states: "Others who refused to follow the commandment of the Lord claimed that the Manifesto was issued only for good public relations and that in secret the Church leaders still performed marriages and supported the practice. To put down such heretical lies, President Joseph F. Smith issued the Second Manifesto in 1904." (*Doctrine and Covenants Student Manual*, Religion Course 324-325, 1981, 363; "Editor's Note: *Dialogue*, Summer 1985, 4.)

YY. Photo of Imprisoned Polygamists Removed from Manual. "One instance of purposeful removal of the subject of polygamy from official literature was the deletion of a group picture of proud jailed pioneer polygam-ists from the second edition of *My Kingdom Shall Roll Forth*. In contrast to the fiery defense of pioneer times, this quiet movement away from the topic of polygamy has resulted in almost complete neglect." (Martha S. Bradley, "Changed Faces: the Official LDS Position on Polygamy, 1890-1990," *Sunstone* 14, no. 1, February 1990, 32.)

ZZ. 1999 Lesson Manual. For 1999, the Church issued a new manual for use in priesthood and Relief Society meetings, *The Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Brigham Young*. The biographical material on Brigham Young (p. vii) never mentions polygamy, and the only wife acknowledged was his first one, Mary Ann Angel. The only children mentioned (p. 4) are the six mothered by Mary Ann Angel. The manual gives no hint of his other 54 wives, or the other 50 children, or that polygamy was ever a doctrine and practice in the Church.

AAA. Nauvoo Temple. "On June 27, 2002—the anniversary of the murder of Joseph Smith—the LDS church dedicated a temple in Nauvoo, Illinois. . . . The original temple in Nauvoo was burned by a mob in 1846. The new temple is a replica of the old one, and the church and its members celebrated their return to Joseph Smith's 'city beautiful.' It was also a celebration of the triumph of historical consciousness; in all of the festivities, no one mentioned plural marriage or the close relationship nineteenth-century Mormons saw between polygamy and temple rituals." (Stephen C. Taysom, "Joseph Smith's Legacy, Polygamy, and Public Memory, 1852-2002," *Dialogue*, 38:3, Fall 2002, p. 144.)

BBB. Dramatic Change with Publication of Joseph Smith Papers. A review of *Journals, Volume 2: December 1841-April 1843* of the Joseph Smith Papers, reviewed by Brian C. Hales, discusses the inclusion of a 32-page introductory essay to Volume 2: "Significantly, seven pages (xxiv-xxx) in the essay discuss Joseph Smith's plural marriages. In eight paragraphs and 37 footnotes, editors Andrew H. Hedges, Alex D. Smith, and Richard Lloyd Anderson, provide the most detailed look at Joseph Smith's personal polygamy ever published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints or one of its organizations." (Brian C. Hales, Book review of *Journals, Vol. 2*, of the Joseph Smith Papers Project, reviewed in *Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 38, No. 3, (Summer 2012), 237-253.)

1. Hales' Search for Citations to Polygamy. "For example, the Institute manual *My Kingdom Shall Roll Forth: Readings in Church History*, (1979), mentions polygamy but primarily in the context of the persecution it incited in the 1880s. Published two years later, the *D&C Student Manual*, designed for Institute students, includes instructions regarding eternal marriage when it discusses Section 132 but does not address how the revelation affected Joseph Smith. The 1989 one-volume *Church History in the Fullness of Times*, published for the Church Educational System, acknowledges 'The law of celestial marriage, as outlined in this revelation, also included the principle of plurality of wives. . . . Joseph Smith and the Church were to accept the principle of plural marriage as part of the restoration of all things.' However, very few details are mentioned. The 1992 *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* was not published by the Church but its articles were authored by BYU faculty and

other LDS scholars. Its article on ‘Polygamy’ by Daniel W. Bachman and Ronald K. Esplin provides an overview without specifically addressing the Prophet’s personal involvement. Four years later, the Church supplement to Sunday School classes, *Our Heritage: A Brief History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, briefly discussed plural marriage without mentioning that Joseph Smith was a participant. The 2007 *Teachings of the Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith* acknowledges that he established the principle and practice without identifying him as a pluralist.” (244.)

2. No Improvement Era or Ensign Citations “In addition, during the past century, no *Improvement Era* or *Ensign* articles or general conference sermons have directly addressed Joseph Smith plural marriages. A search of lds.org reveals 146 hits for plural marriage’ and 98 for ‘polygamy,’ but they are all brief references, and the Prophet is seldom mentioned as participating. None of these sources detail how he introduced and personally practiced the principle.” (244-5.)

3. Importance of Joseph Smith Papers Project. “. . . The Joseph Smith Papers Project will assist in transcribing and printing quality reproductions of historical manuscripts, some of which discuss celestial and plural marriage as taught by the Prophet. The publication of this introductory essay (accompanied by a few scattered entries in *Volume 2*) constitute the first efforts in over a hundred years to officially address this meaty topic. It represents a new and important chapter in the history of plural marriage and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.” (245.)

4. Very Controversial Topics Included. “In addition, controversial topics are mentioned, such as purported plural proposals to Nancy Rigdon (xxix) and Sarah Bates Pratt (xxx). . . . In addition, the introductory essay courageously references Joseph Smith’s sealings to legally married women, a form of ‘polyandry’ (meaning that a woman has more than one husband (xxvi-xxvii). Joseph Smith was sealed to legally married women and thus participated in what I call ‘ceremonial polyandry’ where the woman experienced two marriage ceremonies (one legal and the other religious). While many authors have portrayed Joseph as also practicing sexual polyandry, no solid evidence has been found.” (246-7.)

5. Richard Bushman: Joseph's Polyandry: Single Most Puzzling Part of His Life. "As the author of *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling*, Richard L. Bushman may be the most accomplished of all of Joseph Smith's biographers, so his views on 'polyandry' are helpful. However, a year after the biography's publication, he was asked regarding Joseph Smith's 'polyandrous' marriages and responded: 'This is the single most puzzling part of Joseph Smith's life for Mormons. It's probably for non-Mormons too.' He also added: 'There is just seemingly no answer. . . . How to explain it I think is very difficult. And probably you shouldn't even try. If you try to make up explanations you get in more trouble.'" (248.)

6. Marriage to Orson Hyde's Wife. "The introductory essay also discusses one of Joseph Smith's more controversial polyandrous marriages: his sealing to Marinda Nancy Johnson Hyde. According to available documents, the priesthood sealing with Joseph occurred while her husband, Apostle Orson Hyde, was on his mission to Palestine. Details are frustratingly skimpy; but just months after his return, Orson asked Joseph to perform his own plural marriage to Martha Browitt. A number of authors have accused the Prophet of sending men on missions so he could marry their wives. However, of the 11 'polyandrous' husbands identified by Todd Compton, nine were not on missions at the time Joseph was sealed to their legal wives. Of the two possible exceptions, only Orson Hyde is documented as serving as a missionary at the time. The second possible case involves George Harris, who left on his 14-month mission in July 1840; however, the date of his legal wife's sealing to the Prophet is unavailable and is disputed." (249-50.)

IV. Censorship of Church Doctrine

A. D&C 81. Section 81 of the Doctrine and Covenants is the call of Frederick G. Williams to the First Presidency. The current revelation is identical to the revelation first given in March 1832, except for two words. Originally, Jesse Gause was called to the First Presidency: "Verily, verily, I say unto you my servant Jesse Gause." He left the church, however, a few months after the revelation was received. When the Doctrine and Covenants was being prepared for publication, the revelation remained in the new scriptures, with this one change: "Verily, verily, I say unto you my servant Frederick G. Williams." (Jack Raveill, *The Revelation Revisions of 1835*, 1984, p. 81.)

B. Adam-God Doctrine. On June 1, 1980, Apostle Bruce R. McConkie spoke at a BYU fireside on "The Seven Deadly Heresies." "HERESY SIX: There are those who believe, or say they believe, that Adam is our Father and our God; that he is the Father of our spirits, and our bodies; that he is the one we worship. The devil keeps this heresy alive as a means of obtaining converts to cultism. It is contrary to the whole plan of salvation set forth in the scriptures. Anyone who has read the book of Moses, and anyone who has received the Temple endowments, and who yet believes the Adam-God theory does not deserve to be saved." [The underlined part was changed when this was published, and now reads: "has no excuse whatever for being led astray by it."] One could hardly guess from this talk that the Adam-God doctrine was first preached extensively by Brigham Young, and was the official position of the Church until the early twentieth century.

1. Widely Preached. "The Adam-God doctrine was taught not by Brigham Young alone, but was infused into every avenue of gospel and doctrinal input. Within the temple, it was taught in both literal and symbolic form. It is found in the sermons and writings of Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff, and other church authorities. Church publications such as the *Deseret News* and *Elders' Journal* became proselyting tools for the Adam-God doctrine. It was also taught in missionary publications, and is reflected in the contemporary writings of the time. In short, the Adam-God doctrine was intended to become an expansion on the concept of God and to be an integral part of every saint's belief in God. It permeated every facet of Mormon ideology. Its permeation was so extensive that, to this day, it has not been rooted out. That Brigham Young taught the Adam-God Doctrine has been amply documented in the preceding chapters. He repeatedly taught this doctrine through-out his tenure as president of the church. He seemingly seized every opportunity to teach it. It was taught in the School of the Prophets, semiannual general conference, semiannual priesthood conference, in the temple, as well as in private." (Cully K. Christensen, *The Adam-God Maze*, 1981, p. 108.)

2. Orson Pratt's Trial. Orson Pratt *rejected* the Adam-God theory, and almost lost his standing in the Quorum of the Twelve because of it. A special council meeting was held April 5, 1860 to determine Pratt's fate. Orson Hyde asked: "Will He suffer His mouthpiece to go into error? No. He would remove him, and place another there. Bro. Brigham may err in the price of a horse, or a House and lot, but in the revelations from God, where is the man that has given thus saith the Lord when it was not so? . . . the Lord will not suffer Brigham to introduce incorrect doctrine . . ." George A. Smith added, "If Brigham Young is the President of the Church, he is an inspired man. If we have not an inspired man, then Orson Pratt is right." John Taylor said, "When bro. Brigham tells me a thing, I receive it as revelation. Some things may be apparently contradictory, but are not really contradictory." Wilford Woodruff said, "The moment we launch out into unrevealed doctrine, we are liable to get into error. Bro Pratt ought to make the thing right with Pres. Young." Erastus Snow noted, "It is given to the presiding officer to discern all things, and tell a man whether he is on the track or not. When bro. Pratt feels a reluctance to credit bro. Brigham, he takes a course opposed to truth." Charles C. Rich stated, "It is not right for a member to have doctrines opposed to his quorum, or the Presidency. Orson Pratt finally agreed not to oppose the Adam-God doctrine, but said he would not be able to preach it. That was acceptable to all present, and the meeting adjourned. ("Minutes of Council of the Twelve in Upper Room of Historian's Office," April 5, 1860. Photo copy in my possession.)

3. Joseph F. Smith. In a letter to Edward Bunker, Jr. on Feb. 27, 1902, Church President Joseph F. Smith responded to a letter Bunker had written a few weeks earlier. He wrote "as to which all is the greater [Adam or Christ], these are matters immaterial at the present time, and are best but an unprofitable speculation." (Joseph F. Smith Letter Books, 26-27, LDS Archives; cited by John Buerger, *Dialogue*, Spring 1982, p. 40.)

4. Avoiding the Problem. Apostle Franklin D. Richards wrote the following in his journal in 1897: "The Council did not deem it wise to lay out any line of procedure in which to deal with the subject, but felt that it is best to avoid bringing it up, and to do the best we can and as the Spirit may suggest when it is thrust upon us." (Quoted in *Dialogue*, Spring, 1982, pp. 36-38.)

5. Theory Discarded. President Anthon H. Lund recorded in his diary, April 8, 1912, about a special meeting held at the conclusion of April Conference: "Had a large special Priesthood meeting in which the declaration was made that the God we worship is not Adam but the God that Adam worshiped in the Garden." (*Danish Apostle: The Diaries of Anthon H. Lund, 1890-1921*. Edited by John P. Hatch, *Signature Books*, 2006, 477.)

6. Turner's BYU Thesis. In 1953, Rodney Turner studied the issue as his master's degree thesis at BYU. In it he wrote, "Brigham Young has not been misquoted in the official publications of the Church" and "A careful, detached study of his available statements, as found in the official publications of the Church, will admit no other conclusion than that the identification of Adam with God the Father by President Brigham Young is irrefutable fact." Turner's thesis is restricted at BYU, although it has been published by an "underground press." See "Censorship at BYU," (Rodney Turner, *The Position of Adam in Latter-day Saint Scripture*, unpublished master's thesis, BYU, 1953, pp. 47, 58, and Richard Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, pp. 71-73.)

7. Denied By Widtsoe. "Those who peddle the well-worn Adam-God myth, usually charge the Latter-day Saints with believing that . . . Adam was the father of Jesus Christ. A long series of absurd and false deductions are made from these propositions. Those who spread this untruth about the Latter-day Saints go back for authority to a sermon delivered by President Brigham Young . . . An honest reading of this sermon and of other reported discourses of President Brigham Young proves that the great second President of the Church held no such views as have been put into his mouth in the form of the Adam-God myth." (John A. Widtsoe, *Evidences and Reconciliations, 3 Volumes*, [Combined], 1960, p. 68.)

8. Denied By Joseph Fielding Smith. Elder Joseph Fielding Smith maintained that Brigham Young was misunderstood: "Surely we must give President Brigham Young credit for at least ordinary intelligence, and in

stating this I placed it mildly. . . . It is very clear from these expressions that President Brigham Young did not believe and did not teach, that Jesus Christ was begotten by Adam. . . . [He] was fully conversant with the revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants and accepted the teaching which they contained. . . . If there is a statement contradicting this fact we must conclude that something is lacking and that we have a faulty translation.” (Joseph Fielding Smith, *Answers to Gospel Questions*, Vol. V, pp. 121-128.)

9. Denied in 1970s. Those writing to the First Presidency about the Adam-God theory in the 1970s received a letter similar to this one, written by Francis M. Gibbons, secretary to the First Presidency: “Dear Sister Wilden: I have been asked to acknowledge your letter dated Dec. 3, 1976, to President Kimball about the so-called Adam-God theory, and to suggest that you obtain a copy of the book, *Adam—Who Is He?* by Elder Mark E. Petersen, which fully discusses the questions you raise.” Petersen's book, published in 1975, emphatically states that Brigham Young was misquoted. Yet the evidence is overwhelming that Brigham Young was not misquoted, and that he taught the theory many times. He even claimed in 1873 (*Deseret News*, June 8, 1873) that he received it as a revelation.

10. McConkie's Response. Because of his earlier talk on the “Seven Deadly Heresies,” many people, including good church members, pointed out to Bruce R. McConkie that the doctrine had been official church doctrine. McConkie did not take kindly to such information. In a scathing letter to BYU professor Eugene England, Elder Bruce R. McConkie wrote in 1982: “Yes, President Young did teach that Adam was the father of our spirits, and all the related things that the cultists ascribe to him. This, however, is not true. He expressed views that are out of harmony with the gospel. . . . I do not know all of the providences of the Lord, but I do know that he permits false doctrine to be taught in and out of the Church and that such teaching is part of the sifting process of mortality. . . . [I]t is in my province to teach to the Church what the doctrine is. It is your province to echo what I say or to remain silent. You do not have a divine commission to correct me or any of the Brethren. . . . If I lead the Church astray, that is my responsibility, but the fact still remains that I am the one appointed with all the rest involved so to do. . . . If I err, that is my problem; but in your case if you single out some of these things and make them the center of your philosophy, and end up being wrong, you will lose your soul. . . . Now I hope you will ponder and pray and come to a basic understanding of fundamental things and that unless and until you can on all points, you will remain silent on those where differences exist between you and the Brethren.” (*LDS Apostle Confesses Brigham Young Taught Adam-God Doctrine*, Modern Microfilm Co., Oct. 1982, p. 6.)

C. Blood Atonement. “In debate, George A. Smith said imprisonment was better than hanging. I [Joseph Smith] replied, I was opposed to hanging, even if a man kill another, I will shoot him, or cut off his head, spill his blood on the ground, and let the smoke thereof ascend up to God; and if ever I have the privilege of making a law on the subject, I will have it so.” (*History of the Church*, 5:296.) In 1916 the Church published in pamphlet form an address given by Elder Charles W. Penrose: “To be believers in the Bible, blood atonement should be an established principle of salvation . . . So the doctrine of salvation, you see, is absolutely based on blood atone-ment, and without blood atonement there is no salvation, for there is no remission of sins. . . . Well, is there any other sin [other than murder] that a man may commit which is worthy of death? I think there is. I will refer to one in the Book of Leviticus, 20th chapter and 10th verse: 'And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that commitest adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death.'” (Charles W. Penrose, *Blood Atonement As Taught by Leading Elders of the Church*, 1916, pp. 4, 13, 23-4.)

1. "In keeping with the doctrine of blood atonement, capital punishment is ordained of God as the just, proper, and necessary penalty to be imposed for the commission of certain grievous crimes. It is part of the gospel itself and is not something that appertains only to some lesser order of things. . . . As a mode of capital punishment, hanging or execution on a gallows does not comply with the law of blood atonement, for the blood is not shed." (Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine*, 1958 Edition, p. 314.)

2. In 1978, Elder Bruce R. McConkie responded in a letter: "We do not believe that it is necessary for men in this day to shed their own blood to receive a remission of sins. This is said with a full awareness of what I and others have written and said on this subject in times past. . . . Let me say categorically and unequivocally that this doctrine can only operate in a day when there is no separation of Church and State . . . Anything I have written or anything said by anyone else must be understood in the light of the foregoing limitation. . . . There is no such a doctrine as blood atonement in the Church today nor has there been at any time." (Letter to Mr. Thomas B. McAfee, *Utah Law Review*, University of Utah, from Elder Bruce R. McConkie, dated Oct. 18, 1978.)

D. Section 109. The introduction to Section 109 states that the dedicatory prayer for the Kirtland Temple was given to Joseph Smith "by revelation." The *History of the Church* 2:420 states "The following Prayer was given by Revelation to Joseph, the Seer . . ." Oliver Cowdery's "Sketch Book" journal for March 26, 1836 states: "I met in the president's room, pres. J. Smith, jr., S. Rigdon, my brother W. A. Cowdery, & Elder W. Parrish, and assisted in writing a prayer for the dedication of the house [temple]." Yet in a recent book, Church archivist David J. Whittaker wrote: "It is possible that a committee produced D&C 134, just as they did D&C 109: the dedication prayer for the Kirtland Temple, which Oliver Cowdery and others helped Joseph Smith write." (David J. Whittaker, *New Views of Mormon History*, edited by Davis Bitton and Maureen U. Beecher, 1987, p. 86.)

E. Section 137. The newly canonized scripture concerning Joseph Smith's vision of the Celestial Kingdom has been altered since it was first recorded in Joseph's diary. Originally it read: "The heavens were opened upon us and I beheld the celestial Kingdom of God, . . . I saw father Adam, and Abraham and Michael and my father and mother, . . ." Since the Church now teaches that Adam and Michael are the same person, the words "and Michael" were silently deleted from the revelation. (*An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*, Edited by Scott H. Faulring, 1987, p. 119 [Jan. 21, 1836, & D&C 137:5.]

F. Kinderhook Plates. "I insert fac-similies of the 6 brass plates found near Kinderhook . . . I have translated a portion of them, and find they contain the history of the person with whom they were found. He was a descendant of Ham, through the loins of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and that he received his kingdom from the Ruler of heaven and earth." (Joseph Smith, *History of the Church* 5:372.)

1. "A recent electronic and chemical analysis of a metal plate . . . brought in 1843 to the Prophet Joseph Smith . . . appears to solve a previously unanswered question in Church history, helping to further evidence that the plate is what its producers later said it was—a 19th century attempt to lure Joseph Smith into making a translation of ancient-looking characters that had been etched into the plates. . . . As a result of these tests, we concluded that the plate . . . is not of ancient origin . . ." (Stanley B. Kimball, "Kinderhook Plates Appear to Be a Forgery." *The Ensign*, August 1981, pp. 66-70.)

2. "The time has come to admit that the Kinderhook Plate incident of 1843 was a light-hearted, heavy handed, frontier-style prank, or 'joke' as the perpetrators themselves called it. That from the beginning anti-Mormons seized upon the incident to discredit Joseph Smith should not deter us from consigning the episode to the limbo of faked antiquities . . ." (Stanley B. Kimball, *The Mormon History Association Newsletter*, June 1981, p. 1.)

G. Book of Commandments. The revelations which had previously been received by the Church were collected and prepared for publication in 1833 in Jackson County, Missouri. Before the project could be completed, a mob destroyed the press. Only a few hundred copies of the *Book of Commandments* were saved. In

1835, in Kirtland, Ohio, those revelations were prepared again (along with additional revelations received since 1833), and were printed as the *Doctrine and Covenants*. A comparison of the revelations in the two books shows that several thousand changes were made in the original revelations before they were printed the second time. Some typical changes are listed below:

1. Baptized in Womb. Section 84:28 originally said, “For he was baptized while he was yet in the womb, and was ordained by the angel of God . . .” In 1835, it was changed to: “For he was baptized while he was yet in his childhood, and was ordained by the angel of God . . .”
 2. House for Joseph's Father. Section 104:45 added a phrase missing from the 1833 revelation: “For behold, I have reserved an inheritance for his father, for his support . . .”
 3. Second Coming. Section 104:59 said: “to prepare my people for the time of my coming, which is at hand.” In 1835 it was changed to read: “to prepare my people for the time when I shall dwell with them, which is nigh at hand.”
 4. Book of Mormon Copyright. This entire paragraph appeared in the 1833 edition but was deleted in 1835: “Wherefore a commandment I give unto you, that ye shall take the Book of Mormon and also the copy-right and also the copyright which shall be secured of the articles and covenants: in the which covenants all my commandments which it is my will should be printed, shall be printed as it shall be made known unto you, and also the copyright of the New Translation of the scriptures; and this I say that others may not take the blessings away from you which I have conferred upon you.”
 5. Law of Consecration. Very significant changes were made in the printed text of Section 42, completely changing the concept of the law of consecration. In 1833, it stated: “and behold, thou shalt consecrate all thy properties, that which thou hast unto me, with a covenant and a deed which can not be broken and they shall be laid before the bishop of my church . . .” In 1835 it stated: “And behold, thou wilt remember the poor, and consecrate of thy properties for their support, that which thou has to impart unto them, with a covenant and a deed which cannot be broken—and inasmuch as ye impart of your substance unto the poor, ye will do it unto me—and they shall be laid before the bishop of my church and his counsellors . . .” Then the 1835 version added this verse: “And again, if there be properties in the hands of the church, or any individuals of it, more than is necessary for their support, after this first consecration, which is a residue, to be consecrated unto the bishop, it shall be kept to administer to those who have not . . .”
 6. Objections. Many members objected when changes were made in the revelations. David Whitmer, who had been one of the Three Witnesses, wrote as follows in 1887: “Is it possible that the minds of men can be so blinded as to believe that God would give these revelations—command them to print them in His Book of Commandments—and then afterwards command them to change and add to them some words which change the meaning entirely? As if God had changed his mind entirely after giving his word? Is it possible that a man who pretends to any spirituality would believe that God would work in any such manner?” (*Saints' Herald*, Feb. 5, 1887.)
- H. “Working With the Rod.” The Book of Commandments 7:3 stated: “Now this is not all, for you have another gift, which is the gift of working with the rod. Behold, it has told you things. Behold, there is no other power save God that can cause this rod of nature to work in your hands for it is the work of God. And therefore whatsoever you shall ask me to tell you by that means, will I grant unto you, that you should know.” Apparently this referred to using a forked witch hazel rod to get answers; in folklore rods were used as a way to find water. (See D. Michael Quinn, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View*, 1987, pp. 204-211 for examples of members “using the rod.”) The 1835 *D&C* replaced both “rod” references as follows: ‘Now this is not all thy gift; for you have another gift which is the gift of Aaron. . . . behold there is no other power save the power of God that can cause this gift of Aaron to be with you.’”

1. “ Church authorities published this 'rod of nature' revelation in 1832 and again in 1833, but after E. D. Howe's 1834 *Mormonism Unveiled* ridiculed the Smiths' previous use of divining rods, the 1835 edition of the *D&C* changed these references to the euphemistic 'gift of Aaron.' Thirty years later, the church printed Heber C. Kimball's diary entry of 6 June 1844, without the reference that these revelations had come 'by the rod.'” (Richard P. Howard [RLDS Church Historian], *Restoration Scriptures: A Study of Their Textual Development*, 1969, p. 212.)

2. In 1985, the *Ensign* explained this phrase as follows: “The meaning of this revelation [on working with the rod] as recorded in the Book of Commandments and in the Doctrine and Covenants is not clear. History does not record that Oliver Cowdery or anyone else living at the time it was given had a problem understanding it, but today some of the revelation is unclear to us.” (Melvin Peterson, *Ensign*, Feb. 1985, p. 20.)

I. Key to Theology. Until the 1920s, Parley P. Pratt's *The Key to Theology* was a standard text used by missionaries. T. Edgar Lyon, who served a mission in the Netherlands from 1923-1926, gave this account of how that book fell from favor during his mission: “One of the Protestant ministers got hold of it and wrote an anti-Mormon book on the unchristian, Godless people who were worshipping a man and degrading God by making people almost vault into Godhood at the moment they died. . . . So President Hyde got word from Salt Lake to destroy all copies. All of them were destroyed, but I [kept] one. But as I remember it, they held the fire out in back of the mission home and burned them all.” (T. Edgar Lyon, Jr., *T. Edgar Lyon: A Teacher in Zion*, 2002, p. 80.)

J. Messages of the First Presidency. BYU religion professor James R. Clark was given official permission in 1960 to publish a compilation of First Presidency statements issued over the years. A total of six volumes were published between 1965 and 1975, entitled *Messages of the First Presidency*. Even though Clark omitted the most controversial statements, he was refused further access to the First Presidency's files and advised to “be careful about publishing some of the messages that were issued during controversial periods in church history since they would probably be misunderstood today.” Although the series was widely heralded, no statements beyond early 1951 were printed, and the project was never completed. (Gary James Bergera and Ron Priddis, *Brigham Young University: A House of Faith*, 1985, p. 73.)

K. Book of Mormon Geography. John L. Sorenson's reconciliation of Book of Mormon archaeology and Mesoamerican cultural geography, *An Ancient American Setting for the Book of Mormon*, was rejected for publication by BYU's Religious Studies Center because Elder Mark E. Petersen found the topic to be “too touchy.” (Administrative Council Minutes, 31 May 1978). Only after Petersen's death in 1984 was the work finally published. (*BYU: A House of Faith*, p. 86.)

L. James E. Talmage. In the 1899 first edition of *The Articles of Faith*, James E. Talmage wrote that the church fostered a plan which “without force or violence (seeks) to establish a natural equality, to take the weapons of despotism from the rich, to aid the lowly and the poor. . . . From the tyranny of wealth, as from every other form of oppression, the truth will make men free.” Later, as the emphasis on equality declined, these passages were softened to delete all except a reference to “misused wealth.” (Thomas Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890-1930*, 1986, p. 182.)

M. Civil War Prophecy. On Christmas Day, 1832, Joseph Smith recorded a revelation concerning “the wars that will shortly come to pass, beginning at the rebellion of South Carolina.” In the previous month, a special convention, called by the legislature of South Carolina, was held to nullify the federal tariff laws. It declared that any attempt by the federal government to enforce those laws would result in South Carolina's secession from the Union. It was widely assumed that civil war was imminent, and that South Carolina would lead the way. Joseph Smith's prophecy was assumed by many to refer to the then-current situation in South Carolina. That crisis passed without civil war, and little was said about the revelation. It was never published in Joseph's lifetime.

1. In 1856 Wilford Woodruff recorded: “I called upon Pres. Young. Read a peace of History on Book

E-1 page 1681-2 concerning Hyrum leading this Church & tracing the aaronic Priesthood. It was in detached sentences. Pres. Young thought it was not essential to be inserted in the History & had better be omitted. He spoke of the peace of History published in the News Vol VI No 18 Concerning Joseph's words upon South Carolina. He wished it not published.” [It was not officially published in the United States until after the Civil War.] (*Wilford Woodruff Journal*, July 11, 1856.)

2. “In the preface to the revelation in the *History of the Church*, he [Joseph Smith] explicitly established the Nullification Crisis as the background for the revelation. . . . Thus, he seems to state that the Nullification Crisis will result in world war. This becomes explicit in the next verse, which originally read thus: 'For behold, the Southern States will call upon other nations, even the nation of Great Britain, as it is called, and they shall also call upon other nations, in order to defend themselves against other nations, and thus war shall be poured out upon all nations.' Clearly a causal relationship, demonstrated by the word 'thus' is seen here . . . Note that there is no hint in the text that could conceivably suggest that slavery itself would be at issue in the rebellion in South Carolina. For Smith in 1832, the prophecy predicted the immediate onset of a series of cataclysmic events preparatory to the Parousia [Second Coming]. . . . But even granting the remarkable insight (or coincidence) that war would begin in SC, the suite of events predicted in the revelation just did not occur. Although the South made overtures to Great Britain, the English never did enter directly into the war, all the nations of the earth were not dragged into an American domestic conflict, and, of course, Jesus did not return again in glory at the end of this unfulfilled string of events.” (Anthony A. Hutchinson, *Sunstone*, July 1987, pp. 16-17.)

3. “In 1921 James E. Talmage and other members of an apostolic revision committee edited the text so that it fit more comfortably with this post-World War I interpretation. 'Thus' was changed to 'then.' Here is a case where the predictive element of the text was maintained only through textual reinterpretation and emendation.” (*Ibid.*, p. 17.)

N. Differing Positions. John Taylor said, “We are firm, conscientious believers in polygamy, and that it is part and parcel of our religious creed.” Brigham Young stated, “The only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy.” Bruce R. McConkie wrote, “Any who pretend or assume to engage in plural marriage in this day . . . are living in adultery, have already sold their souls to Satan, and . . . will be damned in Eternity.” (*Life of John Taylor*, p. 255; *Journal of Discourses* 11:269; *Mormon Doctrine*, 1958, pp. 522-3.)

O. 1886 “Revelation.” On Sept. 27, 1886, just prior to his death, President John Taylor recorded in his own hand a revelation on polygamy: “My son John: You have asked me concerning the New and Everlasting Covenant and how far it is binding upon my people. Thus saith the Lord All commandments that I give must be obeyed by those calling themselves by my name unless they are revoked by me or by my authority and how can I revoke an everlasting covenant? For I the Lord am everlasting and my everlasting covenants cannot be abroga-ted nor done away with; but they stand forever. . . . I have not revoked this law [polygamy] nor will I for it is everlasting and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof, even so Amen.” This document has engendered tremendous controversy. Was President Taylor mistaken? If it is authentic, the Manifesto was a mistake, and the Church has gone astray, as the fundamentalists insist. Rumors of the existence of this document were widespread right from the start. The Church has insisted, however, that no such document exists. But copies are readily available, including photostat copies showing Taylor's handwritten message. “During a meeting of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, on March 29, 1892, Apostle John W. Taylor stated that he found it among his father's papers after his death (*Abraham H. Cannon Diary*, March 29, 1892).

1. “A photograph of the document was taken which has since been compared with President Taylor's handwriting, and beyond any reasonable doubt the revelation is authentic. Several copies of it were made and filed in the John Taylor Papers by the late Apostle and President of the Church, Joseph Fielding Smith Jr., who was at the time working in the Historical Dept. of the Church. At the top of these copies he wrote the following: “Revelation given to John Taylor, Sept. 27, 1886, copied from the original manuscript by Joseph F. Smith Jr

August 3, 1909. (Fred C. Collier, compiler, *Unpublished Revelations of the Prophets and Presidents of the Church*, Vol. 1 1979, pp. 145, 156-173.)

2. This revelation reportedly is located in the First Presidency's vault. Most Church writers in the past have insisted it does not exist. Others insist it is authentic, and that they have seen it themselves. "Reed Durham told [Richard Marshall] that it is 'an out and out lie' to say that the 1886 revelation does not exist. He said, 'I could stand before the Bar of God and prove that revelation was given. I have minutes of the meetings of the First Presidency and of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles referring to it.' While Durham calls it an 'out and out lie' to deny the revelation was given, Max Parkin, one of his colleagues, calls it a 'lie of expediency' on the part of the Church. Whatever the status of this revelation, the Historian's Office has taken incredible measures to keep it from being authenticated. The diaries of anyone close to President Taylor during that period have been locked up. The journals of many of Taylor's associates are not available for the date in question, even though earlier and later volumes are. (Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, p. 77.)

3. "... the Church has systematically suppressed critical documents relating to the 1886 revelation. Not only the original handwritten copy, but the journals of George Q. Cannon, John Taylor and Francis M. Lyman, as well as portions of the L. John Nuttall journals have been tightly controlled by the First Presidency." (Richard Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy*, 1986, p. 194.)

4. Fred Collier writes of the "cover-up" in this incident by mentioning all the diaries the Church won't release: "the personal diary of President Taylor, as well as the personal diary of George Q. Cannon, the First Presidency's Office Journal, and the personal diary of L. John Nuttall [personal secretary to President Taylor]. . . . The Taylor diaries are presently located in the First Presidency's office vault, and are not available for research. No one is allowed to see them, not even Taylor's descendants. . . . The Cannon diaries and the First Presidency's Office Journals are in the same vault as the Taylor diaries. . . . And so it is, the four most important diaries pertaining to this period of time in church history are locked away; one cannot help but wonder what it is they contain that makes them so confidential!" (Fred Collier, *Re-Examining the Lorin Woolley Story*, Feb 1981, p. 5.)

5. J. Reuben Clark's Study. "One of [J. Reuben] Clark's initial assignments upon joining the First Presidency was to write a lengthy document outlining the church's opposition to polygamy. This position paper was approved by the other members of the First Presidency and issued as an 'Official Statement.' 'As to this pretended revelation,' the statement, as published in the 18 June 1933 *Church Section* of the *Deseret News*, read, 'the archives of the Church contain no such revelation; nor any evidence justifying a belief that any such revelation was ever given. From the personal knowledge of some of us, from the uniform and common recollection of the presiding quorums of the Church, from the absence in the Church Archives of any evidence whatsoever justifying any belief that such a revelation was given, we are justified in affirming that no such revelation exists.'" (Richard S. Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy: A History*, 1986, p. 193.)

a. "Whether unintentionally so or not, Clark's statement proved to be incorrect on virtually every point. Though church leaders did not have the original revelation, they owned the copy which John W. Taylor had given Wilford Woodruff in 1887. Furthermore, Heber J. Grant was in attendance at the 22 February 1911 Quorum of the Twelve meeting when the 1886 revelation was discussed and entered into the minutes. One month after the First Presidency issued the statement, Frank Y. Taylor [a son] donated the original handwritten 1886 revelation to the Church." (*Ibid.*)

P. Book of Abraham. BYU Professor Richard Poll commented on the discovery that the Egyptian papyri associated with the Book of Abraham are from the "Breathing Permit of Hor": "The rediscovery of some of the Egyptian papyri associated with the Pearl of Great Price certainly challenged the LDS tradition—the historical myth—that the Book of Abraham is a literal translation of an ancient document. . . . If the book did not come from the papyri, did it come from God? . . . Although translations by both LDS and other scholars made it clear that [the papyri] were not part of the Abraham text, Church scholars . . . suggested that the scrolls themselves may simply have been the catalyst that turned Joseph's mind back to ancient Egypt and opened it to revelation on the

experiences of Abraham. . . . Joseph may have received these ideas the same way he did those of the inspired translation of the Bible. . . . Why Joseph Smith thought it important to provide partial explanations of the pictures associated with the Book of Abraham is, to me, part of the larger enigma that is the Prophet. I wish that he hadn't. I also wish that the Allen-Leonard interpretation of 'translator' [in *The Story of the Latter-day Saints*] had wider currency among today's Latter-day Saints. . . . We took Joseph Smith seriously when he said that some of his own revelations might be from man or the devil, and it helped us to cherish the great insights in his teachings without worrying unduly about Zeph or the Kinderhook plates, or whether that figure in the Pearl of Great Price is Abraham on an altar." (Richard Poll, BYU professor emeritus, *Sunstone*, May 1988, p. 20.)

1. *Dialogue* asked several non-LDS Egyptologists to translate the Joseph Smith papyri. They concurred that they seemed to be from the "Breathing Permit of Hor" and not anything about Abraham. Joseph Jeppson, an editor at *Dialogue* at the time, saw the papyri episode as a defining moment in Mormonism: "When we published the scrolls articles, I think we all just sat back and held our breaths, not knowing what would happen next. Not much did, ostensibly. But I think it changed the scholars of the Church forever, and perhaps the leadership as well. From then on, the Brethren were not nearly so interested in Mormon doctrine as in bringing Mormonism on as a 'mainstream' religion." (*Dialogue*, Fall 1999, p. 57.)

Q. Egyptian Papyri. "After a silence of more than 20 years, I think I had better set the record straight. While acting as an editor of *Dialogue* in 1968, I was sitting in the Stanford office talking on the phone with Klaus Baer, a leading Egyptologist from the University of Chicago, when he let it slip that the Joseph Smith papyri were still in existence (and therefore had not burned up in the Chicago Fire as most of us thought). He would tell me no more (probably because he had promised his friend Hugh Nibley that he wouldn't). I called Wallace Turner of the *New York Times*, who had written a book on Mormons, and set him on the trail. Three days later he called me to report that he had located the papyri in the basement of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, whereupon I called Mr. Fischer, museum director of the Metropolitan, to let him know that we knew where they were. Fischer told me that because *we* knew, the whole Mormon world would know shortly, and that he was faced with a security problem. A day or two later he told me that he had decided that the scrolls could best be kept from harm if the LDS church owned them. When the sale later transpired, the Church issued a press release saying that Professor Attiya had discovered the scrolls while looking for something else in the basement of the Metropolitan. I phoned Attiya to tell him I didn't believe the story, since I knew about the scrolls before he 'discovered' them. He became quite nervous and would say only that he was fond of the Church and its people and stood ready to help in any way he could. This information should allow someone to research the *real* story of the 'discovery' if the trail is not now too cold." (Joseph Jeppson, "Letter: The Real Story?" *Dialogue*, Fall 1989, pp. 8-9.)

2. Jeppson elaborated on this incident in 1999: "I called [Dr. Henry] Fischer 'curator of the Egyptian collection at the Met], and told him we knew they were there. Fischer told me he worried about their safety, and asked me to give him three days to figure out what to do. I did. He arranged to [donate] them to the church. *Fischer sent me photocopies of them, in case the church decided to destroy them.*" (*Dialogue*, Fall 1999, p. 52. Emphasis added.)

P. Two Elijah Abels. As more and more individuals became aware that an early Mormon black, Elijah Abel, had held the Melchizedek Priesthood, was ordained a seventy, and was sent on a mission, various "damage control" efforts were made to negate the story. Assistant Church historian Andrew Jenson claimed in his *LDS Biographical Dictionary* in 1920 that "an exception" was "made in his case with regard to the general rule of the Church." "By 1955 even this qualified view of Abel's place as a Mormon priesthood holder was denounced by Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith. In response to a private inquiry, Smith rejected Jenson's account of Abel, suggesting that there were *two* Elijah Abels in the early Church—one white and the other black. Jenson had confounded the 'names and the work done by one man named Able [sic]. . . with the name of the Negro who joined the Church in an early day.'" It stretches credulity to imagine that Apostle and Church Historian Joseph Fielding Smith did not know the truth about this matter. (Joseph Fielding Smith to Mrs. Floren S. Preece, 18 Jan. 1955, S. George Ellsworth Papers, Utah State University; cited by Newell G. Bringham, *Neither White Nor Black*, 1984, p. 140.)

)

V. Censorship at Brigham Young University.

A. BYU Universe. Under President Ernest L. Wilkinson, a list was drawn up of topics deemed unsuitable for treatment in the student newspaper, the *Universe*. It included “advocacy of communism, socialism, fascism and other extremist doctrines or systems of government; . . . advocacy of birth control, illicit sex, drug abuse, illegal procedures, invasion of privacy, and other anti-social practices; debate on the validity of church doctrines; ridicule of university and church leaders; libel in any form; other issues as may be identified by the Board of Trustees.” Over the next four years, the list expanded to include: “Negro and the priesthood and other racial problems; polygamy; sex education, pornography, nudity; . . . personal stories on church leaders involving age, health, children, et cetera; confidential church and university information such as finances, appointments, council meetings, ecclesiastical tribunals, embarrassing incidents both historical and current; attacks on church and BYU policies; . . . church policies regarding the war in Vietnam; . . . university policies regarding standards, et cetera; evolution and claims of science in conflict with beliefs of church leaders; church censorship such as involving ‘Jesus Christ, Superstar,’ and acid rock, nude painting, et cetera.” (Gary James Bergera and Ronald Priddis, *Brigham Young University: A House of Faith*, 1985, p. 261.) While a similar list is not available currently, it is assumed that most of these topics are still prohibited.

B. Movies. The films that can be shown on campus have been subject to approval by the University Films Committee, composed of a handful of school administrators, faculty, and student representatives. In 1978 the committee chairman, religion professor Paul Cheesman stated, “We edit the movies so they don't teach immorality. Most profanity and nudity is censored along with all disrespectful references to deity.” Films that have been barred include *Patton*, *The Cowboys*, *The Sting* (barred because it “glorifies con-men”), *Bless the Beasts and the Children* (“It's just too real for our students. It's a propaganda film . . . that destroys confidence between youth and adults”), *A Funny Thing Happened On the Way to the Forum*, and *1776*. *The Towering Inferno* cleared the Films Committee by a margin of one vote. Movies that were allowed only after certain scenes had been deleted include *Man of LaMancha*, *Kramer vs. Kramer*, *Star Trek—The Motion Picture*, *Ordinary People*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The China Syndrome*, and *Apocalypse Now*. (*BYU: A House of Faith*, pp. 315-318.)

C. BYU Bookstore. “In early 1984, BYU bookstore officials removed from their shelves the albums of the British band Culture Club, pending an investigation of the sexual behavior of the group's lead singer, Boy George. . . . Almost immediately, some students penned such sarcastic responses as, ‘Is there any real difference between a man who dresses as a woman in order to sell records and a parochial school that masquerades as a university in order to sell a church?’” Books and publications are similarly screened. In the mid-1980s, the bookstore removed all copies of *The Journal of Mormon History*, published by the Mormon History Association, because it was too controversial. At the time it was removed, the MHA was housed on campus, and a BYU professor was president. (*BYU: A House of Faith*, p. 324, and personal knowledge.)

D. Forum Speakers. “Following the appearance of U.S. vice-president Hubert Humphrey in October 1966, Wilkinson complained that he had been pressured by Democratic General Authorities into allowing the vice-president to speak on campus (Wilkinson Journal). He was particularly annoyed that he had not had enough time to provide an articulate Republican rebuttal. Less than two years later, Wilkinson refused to cancel classes for the campus appearance of presidential candidate and U.S. senator Robert F. Kennedy (D—Massachusetts). Still, more than 15,000 students packed the George Albert Smith Fieldhouse to hear the charismatic Kennedy quip, ‘I had a very nice conversation with Dr. Wilkinson, and I promised him that all Democrats would be off the campus by sundown.’”

“Despite the new tolerance for presidential candidates of varying life styles, other speakers were rejected during the 1970s on the basis of alleged sexual immorality. Among those disapproved for allegedly advocating or engaging in illicit sexual behavior were Moshe Dayan, Ben Bradley, Jerry Brown, Betty Ford and Allen Ginsburg.

By the late 1970s, politics again emerged as a criterion in speaker selection. For example, both morality and politics were cited in disapproving liberal Democrat George McGovern in 1978. One university official stated that he was 'not about to let [McGovern] come and sit in front of the student body with his concu-bine,' while a second admitted, 'Ezra Taft Benson would hit the ceiling if [McGovern] spoke on this campus.'" Consumer advocate Ralph Nader was rejected as a speaker the following year, because 'Most of his comment is simply carping, and we don't need to pay for that.'" (*BYU: A House of Faith*, pp. 199-202.)

E. Academic Standards. "The official reaction to most outside evaluations of BYU's academic standing was noted in a 1975 address by religion professor Hugh Nibley. 'Some years ago,' Nibley wryly observed, 'when it was pointed out that BYU graduates were the lowest in the nation in all categories of the Graduate Record Examination, this institution characteristically met the challenge by abolishing the examination. It was done on the grounds that the test did not sufficiently measure our unique 'spirituality.'" (*BYU: A House of Faith*, p. 342.)"

F. Arrington's Book *Great Basin Kingdom*. "After Leonard became church historian in 1972, he checked the card catalog to determine if the church even had a copy of *Great Basin Kingdom*. It did, but he noticed a little 'a' in the corner of the card. Asking the librarian he meaning of the letter, he was told that it meant 'anti-Mormon.' 'Why would it have been classified as anti-Mormon?' I asked. 'Well,' one person replied, 'it was a scholarly book, which meant it wasn't designed to be faith-promoting; and if it wasn't *for* the Church, then, by classification, it had to be against. Moreover, it didn't go through a Church reading committee, which meant it wasn't approved. And if it wasn't approved, then, by definition, it must be . . .,' Well, you get the story." (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 65.)

G. Academic Freedom. In 1988, Dr. D. Michael Quinn announced his resignation as professor of history at BYU because he found the atmosphere too stultifying. In comments published at the time, he wrote: "There is a danger that BYU's slogans may be more accurate in their inverted form. Instead of, 'The World Is Our Campus,' the reality may be that 'The Campus Is Our World.' Rather than 'Enter to Learn, Go Forth to Serve,' BYU's overwhelming emphasis on deference, compliance and conformity, creates the danger that students enter BYU to serve, and must go forth into a freer world to learn.' Twenty years ago, a joke making the rounds was that the autocratic president of BYU had written a book titled 'Free Agency and How to Enforce It.' To the degree that this attitude exists, the institution and its people are sliding away from the Marketplace of Ideas and House of Faith into the individual and cultural repressiveness of the Prison of Conformity. That development bothers me, and I hope those who remain at BYU will reflect upon the consequences of subordinating thought and faith to conformity." (*Sunstone*, March 1988, p. 7.)

H. Phi Beta Kappa. Issues of censorship and academic freedom at BYU have been raised by many societies and accrediting associations. As recently as 1985, "the prestigious national honor society Phi Beta Kappa rejected BYU's application for an on-campus chapter on grounds that the university was not academically mature enough." [BYU was turned down again in 1992. As of 2016, it still did not have a chapter on campus.] (*BYU: A House of Faith*, p. 342.)

I. Reynolds Forum. The Alice Louise Reynolds Forum was organized to honor an early Mormon educator and feminist. The Forum raised funds to furnish the Alice Louise Reynolds Memorial Room in the Wilkinson Center at BYU. Esther Peterson, an advocate for women and consumer rights, and a member of the Carter administration (and the Church), noted in an address at BYU on Sept. 22, 1988, the irony that the Reynolds Memorial Room "has been unavailable to the Forum for their monthly meetings for several years because the administration at BYU felt their speakers were 'too controversial' to appear on campus." ("News: Elder Packer Provokes Academics." *Sunstone* Issue 66, 12, no. 4 (July 1988): 51-52.

J. Research Material. In Reviewing a BYU publication, *The Religion and Family Connection: Social Science Perspectives*, Gordon Shepherd notes: "Several of the BYU contributors to this volume, as well as other BYU faculty, have done extensive consulting work for the Mormon Church. . . . These researchers are privy to some very good data on Mormon families and religious participation. Unfortunately, access to this data has been

severely limited for outside scholars. Mormon officials consider it their business to promote Mormonism, not scholarly research per se.” (Gordon Shepherd, Review of *The Religion and Family Connection: Social Science Perspectives*, *Sunstone*, June 1989, p. 52.)

K. Research Topics. Because of continued problems created by controversial dissertations and theses at BYU, it was agreed that “all theses dealing with doctrines or practices of the church in the field of religious instruction should be cleared with the Board [the Quorum of the Twelve] and with the executive committee.” “Because of the delicate nature of this situation as far as accreditation is concerned,” Ernest L. Wilkinson sub-sequently cautioned BYU academic vice-president Robert K. Thomas, “I have serious doubts whether [the policy] should be published but everyone involved ought to know about it.” Over the next ten years, theses and dissertations that proved “particularly troublesome to either the executive committee or the Board of Trustees included treatments of polygamy; a study of Mormon/non-Mormon conflict in Nauvoo; a survey of the religious education programs of the Seventh-Day Adventist church in Utah; a history of the church's Florida welfare farms; theses on the church's correlation department; textual changes in the Book of Mormon; military service and use of military force; and dissertations on the historical development of the revelations contained in the Doctrine and Covenants and the modern role and function of the twelve apostles.” (*Ibid*, pp. 72-3.)

“In the late 1970s, debate over the possible negative impact of graduate research in church history and theology led some General Authorities to request that school administrators limit access to two master's theses and one Ph.D. dissertation,” dealing with textual changes in the Book of Mormon, the Adam-God doctrine, and the historical development of the Doctrine and Covenants. (*Ibid*. p. 73; while these studies are not available through BYU, they—like most controversial papers—ultimately became available through a thriving local “underground press.” The policy, by calling attention to controversial material, is self-defeating.

L. BYU and Harvard. “BYU officials have said that Harvard should aspire to become the BYU of the East. That's like saying the Mayo Clinic should aspire to be Auschwitz. BYU is an Auschwitz of the mind.” (D. Michael Quinn, BYU professor of history, prior to resigning because of the censorship issue; *Faithful History: Essays on Writing Mormon History*. Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992.)

M. Freedom of Speech. “Faculty at BYU enjoy more academic freedom than professors at any other university in the world, BYU President Rex Lee said Monday. Speaking to 3,000 employees at the school's annual faculty and staff meeting, Mr. Lee attempted to dispel allegations by several BYU professors that the Mormon Church-owned school is stifling debate and research. BYU is the only university 'where the side-by-side study of restored truth and secular knowledge is not only recognized as legitimate, but positively of the 1986 student directory featured a picture from which the beard of BYU founder Karl G. Maeser had been removed. The incident, which attracted national medial attention, also led to an opportunity for humor as the *Student Review*, an off-campus student newspaper, published cut-out beards that could be fastened to the directory by those who wanted an unaltered Maeser.” (*Ibid*..)

1. Bare Tummies. “In a 13 January [2004] address, BYU President Cecil Samuelson specifically addressed the matter of bare midriiffs, alluding to complaints he had received from a former BYU student who recently attended her 50th year reunion. ‘It shocked me to see so many tummies on the campus,’ the letter said. ‘I don’t know how many tummies she actually saw on campus,’ Samuelson said, ‘but it doesn’t take all the fingers on one hand to count ‘too many.’” (*Ibid*..)

VI. More Recent Censorship.

A. Controversial Sermon Never Published. On April 9, 1932, at a general conference session, and “in a speech primarily about the church’s health code known as the Word of Wisdom, Elder Stephen L. Richards said he feared ‘fanaticism, rigidity of procedure and intolerance’ more than he feared ‘cigarettes, cards and other devices the adversary may use to nullify faith and kill religion.’ Richards’ speech reportedly was the only

conference address in history that wasn't published." (*Salt Lake Tribune*, April 4, 2010, p. A1.)

1. Apostle Threatens to Resign. President Heber J. Grant spoke frequently and passionately about the need to keep the Word of Wisdom—and that topic soon became his hallmark. On May 5, 1933, Apostle Stephen L. Richards told the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve that he would resign as an apostle rather than apologize for his general conference talk which said the church was putting too much emphasis on the Word of Wisdom. On May 26 he confessed his error to President Grant, and retained his position. (D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 1997, p. 822.)

2. What the Apostle Said. Elder Richards' main point was the following: "... I am not sure that we have not estranged many from the Church or at least contributed to their estrangement by attributing to violation of our standards of health, harmful as it may be, a moral turpitude and sinful magnitude out of proportion of the real seriousness of the offense. Maybe I am wrong. I do not claim that my analysis is correct, but I think it is worthy of your attention. I have said these things because I fear dictatorial dogmatism, rigidity of procedure and intolerance even more than I fear cigarettes, cards, and other devices the adversary may use to nullify faith and kill religion. Fanaticism and bigotry have been the deadly enemies of true religion in the long past." (*Sunstone*, February 2000, p. 15.)

3. Talk Censored. Elder Stephen L Richards' talk has never been printed by the Church, and it did not appear in the general conference report or the *Improvement Era*. (*Ibid.*)

B. Active Homosexual Ordained as Church Patriarch. In October 1942, 43-year-old Joseph F. Smith, grandson of President Joseph F. Smith, was ordained Patriarch to the Church. Unbeknownst to all the leadership, he was an active homosexual. Previously head of the speech and theater department at the University of Utah, Patriarch Smith served in his new calling for only four years. When appointed, "he already had a hidden history of homosexual relationships. He was released from his high position in 1946 when church president George Albert Smith learned of his ongoing extramarital affair with a 21-year-old man." (*Seventh East Press*, Provo, Utah; Vol. 2 No. 3; 17 November 1982, p. 15.)

2. Appointed by Direct Inspiration to Church President. At the time the new Patriarch to the Church was announced, Elder David O. McKay pointedly remarked: "Elder Smith's right to his office therefore is not only by lineage but by direct inspiration to the President who holds the keys of the high Priesthood." (*Conference Report*, October 1942, p. 17.)

3. Disquieting Rumors. As early as 1944 a Salt Lake police captain met with the First Presidency with accusations that Joseph F. was involved with homosexuality. The rumors seemed incredible, and were soon dismissed by the Brethren. (Irene M. Bates and E. Gary Smith, *Lost Legacy: The Mormon Office of Presiding Patriarch*, 1996, p. 195.)

4. Simply Disappeared. "One day in April or May 1946, Joseph did not come into the office as was usual. Later that day, one of the General Authorities came in and told his secretary that Joseph F. Smith II was not to give any more blessings. She was flabbergasted. His secretary never saw Joseph F. Smith II again." (Irene M. Bates and E. Gary Smith, *Lost Legacy: The Mormon Office of Presiding Patriarch*, 1996, p. 195.)

5. Case Studied Over Summer. On July 10, 1946, George Albert Smith, who had become president, recorded in his diary, 'Met in office with Council of Presidency & Twelve. . . . Jos Patriarch case considered. Bad situation. Am heartsick.' The next day President Smith records, 'Met in Church Council room with Presidency and Twelve. . . . Discussed condition of Patriarch Jos F.' The First Presidency then met with Patriarch Smith the next day, July 12. President Smith went to see the Patriarch on September 6 and noted in his diary, 'a pitiable case.' On Sept 16 George Albert wrote, 'Restless night. At office 8:15. Met with Presidency and Joseph F. Patriarch [and] Ruth [:] Browning and son present. A. E. Bowen also listened. Regret that the evidence is not satisfactory.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 195.)

6. Church Cover-Up. At the October, 1946 general conference, Pres. David O. McKay read a letter from Joseph F. Smith II that was certainly less than forthright: "As you know I have been very ill for many months. While I am slowly gaining strength and hope soon again to be able to do some work, I do not know when, if at all, I shall be able to stand the full drain upon my energy incident to the office of Patriarch to the Church." Following the letter, Joseph F. Smith was formally released from office. (*Deseret News*, 7 October 1946, p. 1, and *Ibid.*, pp. 195-6.)

7. Aftermath. "Soon after, the family left for the University of Hawaii, where Joseph F. resumed his career as a teacher of English and drama. No church trial was ever held, and no formal action was taken against him; however, the church authorities in Hawaii were instructed that Joseph F. was not to assume any responsibilities or callings [unless cleared by the First Presidency]. Ten years later . . . it was determined that Joseph F. had confessed to his wife and had written a full confession to the First Presidency [therefore] all restrictions were lifted. At the time of his death on August 29, 1964, he was serving as a stake high councillor." (*Ibid.*, p. 196.)

8. Eldred G. Smith's Response When He Replaced JFS. "On 6 April 1947, newly sustained Church patriarch Eldred G. Smith began his first conference address by saying: 'Brethren and sisters, I think you are all aware of the fact of the hereditary nature of the office to which I have been called. For that reason I was prepared to give a speech for this occasion fifteen years ago, but not today. Maybe it's because I don't like to get burned in the same fire twice.' Smith acknowledged rumors that Joseph Fielding Smith (not the same person as the Church president of that name) had been called to the officer instead of him because 'I was not worthy.' But he countered these rumors by describing how he had met with President Grant in 1932 the evening before Joseph Fielding Smith had been called to be Church patriarch to ask if unworthiness were the reason he was being passed over for the calling. Eldred Smith reported Grant as replying, 'Oh, no, no, on the contrary, In fact you have made quite a reputation for yourself in Church activities.' Smith went on to detail his activity, beliefs, and Church leadership positions in an obvious effort to lay his credentials before the congregation, Whatever the success of this move as far as establishing his personal worthiness was concerned, it inevitably raised the question of why, then, had he not been called to his hereditary position in 1932." (Joseph Geisner, *Sunstone*, Issue 165, December 2011, 19-20.)

a. Talk Changed Twice After Delivery. "Smith was asked to edit the talk before publication. He did so, but the revision that was finally published in the April 1947 Conference Report was a third version, titled 'A Testimony of Truth.' In it, Smith's defense has been entirely rewritten to read, 'I think that there are probably thousands of men in the Church who, if called by the proper authority, could come and fulfill any position in the Church, and the position to which I have been called is no exception.'" (*Ibid.*, 20.)

9. Church Still Unable to Confront Issue. At late as Jan. 13, 2007, the *Church News* reported on the one-hundredth birthday of the Church Patriarch who replaced Joseph F. Smith: "The man who had been serving as Patriarch to the Church, Joseph Fielding Smith (not to be confused with the Church president of the early 1970s) had been released due to ill health; Eldred Smith was being called to fill the position." (*Church News*, Jan. 13, 2007, p. 4.)

10. Why Hyrum G. Smith's Father Not Chosen. On January 5, 2007, the *Salt Lake Tribune* printed this letter: "Patriarch: The rest of the story. Peggy Fletcher Stack is usually such a fine reporter I hesitate to make even a small complaint about her Dec. 30 article 'Blessing of the Patriarch,' which was obviously meant to be a warm fuzzy directed at the current presiding patriarch, Eldred G. Smith. But the article is so full of factual inaccuracies and important omissions I think it is important to see the record straight. While it is true that LDS Church leaders offered no official reason for failing to appoint Hyrum G. Smith's father to the office of patriarch [see "Hyrum G. Smith," above], the historical reason is clear. He was passed over because he was a user of tobacco and was separated from his wife. Thus, the church found him unworthy of the office. When Hyrum G. Smith died in 1932, Stack reports that President Heber J. Grant felt that Eldred 'was not ready for the position.' Wrong. Although the Council of the Twelve unanimously wanted to appoint Eldred to the position immediately,

President Grant proposed that his son-in-law, Willard R. Smith, be appointed instead. Further, he personally advised Eldred that he would never appoint anyone in Eldred's lineage to the position, because so many in that lineage failed to live the Word of Wisdom. From Stack's article, one would have to conclude that the office of patriarch remained vacant from 1932 until 1947, when Eldred was appointed upon the succession of George Albert Smith to the presidency, but in 1942, after a decade of stalemate between the Council of the Twelve and the president of the church, a compromise was reached, and the grandson of former President Joseph F. Smith was set apart for the position. Joseph F. Smith was released from the position in 1946, when he confessed to the Brethren that he was a homosexual. Finally, it is true that the LDS Church determined by 1979 that it no longer desired to maintain the office of patriarch. Stack says this is because every stake had its own patriarch and the church leaders had 'grown uncomfortable with the notion of lineal descent.' This is true enough, but the larger reason is that it was never very clear just what the parameters of his authority could be. . . ." (Thomas N. Thompson, *Salt Lake Tribune*, Jan. 5, 2007.)

11. Eldred G. Smith. "When Hyrum Smith died, Eldred Smith was only 25, not married and without a college degree. Then-LDS President Heber J. Grant felt he was not ready for the position, so the office went vacant. It was 1932, the depths of the Depression, and Eldred Smith had his mother and seven siblings to care for. Within a year, he married Jeanne Ness and they soon began a family. Thus he was forced to take any job he could find. He carried 200-pound blocks of ice on his back for Hygeia Ice Co. to houses. He scraped, cleaned and painted the entire ceiling of the Salt Lake Tabernacle, a job for which his smaller frame and weight were more suited. He painted and hung wallpaper for Bennett Glass & Paint; he worked at, and owned, gas stations and repaired cars. During World War II, Smith worked as an engineer in Oak Ridge, Tenn., at a company that was enriching uranium for use in the atomic bomb. Finally, in 1947, he was called back to Utah to become the church's presiding patriarch. 'There is no way to prepare for it, no instructions, no counsel,' Smith said this week. 'When I was first ordained, I went into my office, closed the door and didn't come out for two weeks. Then a young man came to the door asking for a blessing and so I gave it to him.' How did he know what to do? 'You just say what comes to you,' he says. Smith was soon traveling the world giving patriarchal blessings." (Peggy Fletcher Stack, *Salt Lake Tribune*, Jan. 4, 2007.)

12. Francis Gibbons' Version of the Story. Francis M. Gibbons served as secretary to the First Presidency for sixteen years. He also served in both the First and Second Quorums of the Seventy and as area president for Brazil. He authored a number of biographies of different Presidents of the Church, generally considered well-written, ultra-non-controversial accounts. In *Joseph Fielding Smith: Gospel Scholar, Prophet of God*, he wrote this account of the selection of Joseph F. Smith, nephew to the Church President: "A critical issue facing the Brethren as the October General Conference approached was the desire of President Heber J. Grant to fill the office of Patriarch to the Church, which had stood vacant since the death of Hyrum Gibbs Smith in February 1932. In the meantime, both Nicholas G. Smith and George F. Richards had served successively as the acting Patriarch. Traditionally, the office of Patriarch to the Church had passed lineally to the eldest son descending from Joseph Smith Sr. But it was the intention of President Grant to call Joseph F. Smith, the nephew of Joseph Fielding Smith, to that office, even though he descended through the line of President Joseph F. Smith, who was not the oldest son of the martyr Hyrum Smith. Following the death of Hyrum Gibbs Smith in 1932, members of the Twelve had recommended that his eldest son, Eldred G. Smith, be called to the patriarchal office, but President Grant had declined to make the call. As the 1942 October General Conference approached, President Grant went to Joseph Fielding's office to discuss the matter privately with him. 'He said he could not feel right about accepting the recommendation of the apostles,' Joseph wrote of the interview, 'that the office be given to Eldred Smith and for ten years he had only had a "stupor of thought" in the consideration of this appointment. Now he felt clear regarding his duty and his mind was at rest that Joseph F., son of my brother Hyrum M., should receive this office. I said, so far as I am concerned, when the President of the Church says the Lord has manifested to him or inspired him to do anything, I would support him fully in that action. . . . if the president is inspired to change the order of descent the Lord has indicated, I will be with him with my support.'

"Few other instances in his life demonstrate more clearly than this one Joseph Fielding Smith's unqualified support of the one who occupies the prophetic office. Although when asked about it earlier, Joseph had expressed

a contrary view, he yielded that view immediately upon learning that the Prophet was inspired to do otherwise. And in giving that support, Elder Smith powerfully endorsed the idea that the Church is directed by revelation and that the Lord inspires and directs the living oracles according to the needs of the moment.” (Francis M. Gibbons, *Joseph Fielding Smith: Gospel Scholar, Prophet of God*, 1992, pp. 342-3.)

a. Gibbons on Why Patriarch was Released. In the same book, Gibbons related this story of the release of the new Church Patriarch: “Waiting for them at Honolulu was Elder Smith’s nephew Joseph F. Smith, the son of Hyrum M. Smith, who had served briefly during the 1940s as Patriarch to the Church. Illness had necessitated his release. Afterward, he had moved to Hawaii, where he had regained his health. At the time of his uncle’s visit in November 1958, he was on the faculty at the University of Hawaii. Following the unexpected death of his brother Hyrum in 1918, Joseph Fielding Smith had assumed a role of surrogate father to Hyrum’s children, including this son, Joseph F. For this reason, the apostle enjoyed spending the night at his nephew’s home and accompanying him to the temple at Laie on Monday.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 415-16.) It seems beyond credibility that Gibbons didn’t know the real reason for the abrupt dismissal.

C. Joseph Fielding Smith: Records Not Available for Any “Tom Dick, or Harry.” “In attempting to gain access to some materials in the Church Historian’s Office, I was required to meet with its head, ninety-two-year-old Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith. His main points in our interview were that the work on blacks and the priesthood already had been done (i.e., his own work), and that the Church didn’t want every ‘Tom, Dick, or Harry’ looking through its records. Naively—and armed with my temple recommend—I said I didn’t think I was any ‘Tom, Dick or Harry.’ He replied, with a smile, that they didn’t want any ‘Tom, Dick, or Bob’ either.” (Lester Bush, *Journal of Mormon History*, Spring 1999, p. 235.)

D. Censorship of An Earlier Church Racial Statement. “In 1965, apostle Joseph Fielding Smith refused to allow BYU religion professor James R. Clark permission to publish the controversial 1949 First Presidency statement affirming Black priesthood denial in his multi-volume compilation *Messages of the First Presidency*, fearing it would bring undue critical attention to the Church.” A footnote adds: “Smith instructed Clark not to publish any statements the First Presidency issued ‘during controversial periods in Church history since they would probably be misunderstood today.’” (Matthew L. Harris, “Mormons and Lineage: The Complicated History of Blacks and Patriarchal Blessings, 1830-2018,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 51:3, Fall 2018, 113 and f84.)

E. Church Records Restricted in 1972. On June 27, 1972, Church Historian Leonard J. Arrington recorded this statement in his personal journal: “Certain records in the Historical Department by action of the First Presidency have been designated as restricted. These include minutes of the First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve, minutes of High Councils, finance records, and records of the Board of Education. The use of these has been restricted to the Church Historian, Assistant Church Historians, and persons specifically designated by the First Presidency.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington, 1971-1997, Vol. 1: Church Historian, 1971-75*, edited by Gary James Bergera, Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2018, 173.)

F. Church President’s Reversal. In the 1970s, Lester Bush prepared an exhaustive study of the denial of priesthood blessings to blacks for publication in *Dialogue*. When Church leaders learned of the imminent publication, they arranged a meeting between Bush, Elder Boyd K. Packer, and Joseph Anderson, Assistant to the Twelve and the general authority over the newly reconstructed Historical Department. Bush wrote later: “When I pressed for some specifics as to problems with my paper, they explained that the material I had included on President Joseph F. Smith showed him reversing his opinion on a crucial point regarding Elijah Abel, an early black priesthood holder. This information, they said, could undermine faith in his role as a prophet, so was inappropriate.” (Lester Bush, “Mormonism’s Negro Doctrine,” *Journal of Mormon History*, Spring 1999, 257.)

1. Elijah Abel Account. “The priesthood status of Elijah Abel (who had been ordained both an elder and a seventy in 1836 and whose ‘certificate’ as such had been renewed in 1841 and later) was the subject of

repeated leadership discussion during the late nineteenth century, with Joseph F. Smith always refuting the claim that Joseph Smith had invalidated the ordination. Then, in 1908, Joseph F. Smith inexplicably reversed himself, claiming that in fact the ordination *had* been invalidated. I discussed this development at some length in my paper, demonstrating that Joseph F. Smith's earlier accounts were the most accurate. Part of the sensitivity probably derived from the use by later Church leaders—including then-President Harold B. Lee—of the 1908 account to dismiss the ‘problem’ of Elijah Abel.” (*Ibid.*, footnote, pp. 257-8.)

2. Access Restricted. Shortly afterward, Bush visited with the historians at the Historical Department. “They were particularly interested in my discussions with Packer, . . . including the probing into who gave me the [Adam S.] Bennion papers. They seemed genuinely taken aback that I had been persistently questioned on the point. Leonard Arrington told me that he had recently been asked, no doubt in connection with this, if the Bennion papers were at the Y. and if they were available to scholarly research, to both of which he answered affirmatively. A few months later I heard from the special collections staffer at BYU that ‘Some time after your statement that you used the Bennion papers at the University, the Library was contacted in behalf of the First Presidency stating that we should not have copies of the councils’ minutes and requested [that the library] send them up . . .’” (*Ibid.*, p. 260.)

G. Dean Jessee’s Chastisement at Church Historian’s Office. “Suspicious treatment was not restricted to outside scholars, perhaps the most dramatic example being Dean C. Jessee, employed by the Church Historian’s Office in 1964 and unquestionably the leading expert on Joseph Smith documents, was chastised for having written on the sensitive subject of Joseph Smith’s ‘First Vision’—notwithstanding the fact that the article was published the article was published in the scholarly journal of the Mormon Church’s own university [*BYU Studies*]. His supervisor wrote him a panicked and angry rebuke: ‘You have had published photographs of manuscripts which I have been instructed not to talk about. I have no record of you being signed up to do such research, thus you have gone contrary to the policies set up by Pres. Smith and the Asst. Historian’s. Who gave you clearance for such a writing? . . . What am I going to answer the First Presidency when they enquire of me as to what has been done? . . . Why was I bypassed in knowing of such a thing being done? I suspicioned that you were doing some writing as other work was being left undone, but not having evidence I could do nothing. Please put in writing your answer so I might present this to the First Presidency for their files and I might be cleared of any responsibility in this matter.’” (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 80-81.)

H. Masonic Lodge. The newly restored Masonic Lodge in Nauvoo is now euphemistically titled “Cultural Hall” by the LDS Church. (“News: Scholars Share Diverging Interpretations of Nauvoo.” *Sunstone*, 13:3, June 1989, p. 53.)

1. Some Apostles Don’t Want it Mentioned in Any of Our History Books. March 23, 1979. “[Merv Hogan] said another member of the Quorum of the Twelve who was against any mention of the Mormons in connection with Masonry was President Joseph Fielding Smith. He said that both Bro. Peterson and President Smith would prefer that no Mormon history book contained any mention that Joseph Smith was a Mason, that many of the leaders of the Church were Masons, that they had a lodge in Nauvoo, and so on. He said President Kimball does not personally object to it but had played the role of peacemaker.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington, 1971-1997, Vol. 2: Centrifugal Forces, 1975-80*, edited by Gary James Bergera, Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2018, 753.)

I. “Friends of Church History”. Shortly after becoming Church Historian in 1972, Leonard Arrington announced the formation of a group known as “Friends of Church History.” The organizational meeting was held in the newly completed North Temple Church Office Building, in the wing assigned to the Historian’s Office. Some 500 people, including myself, turned out for that first meeting. There was a sense of excitement and enthusiasm as names and addresses were collected, and all present were allowed to tour the Historian’s Office. No other meeting was ever called, and rumors circulated that Dr. Arrington and his staff were instructed to abolish the new organization, because some of the General Authorities did not want to encourage the independent study of

Mormon history. No public explanation was ever given. [RW]

1. “Although First Presidency approval was readily given to the formation of Friends of Church History, the public announcement of an organizational meeting on November 30 in our quarters in the Church Office Building caused one cautious member of the Twelve to bring it up for discussion in the weekly meeting. Most of the Twelve favored the organization as a means of encouraging responsible and accurate telling of the Mormon experience, but the one objector warned that ‘*Dialogue*-type historians’ would be permitted to report their freewheeling research on historical topics. Although 500 persons showed up at the first meeting, we were counseled to delay, delay, and delay a second meeting, and the promising organization never got off the ground. In the face of almost universal approval, the one objector halted a program previously approved by the First Presidency. We were embarrassed and humiliated and we lost public good will.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, pp. 96-7.)

H. Cover-Up in Argentina. In 1971 in Argentina, a missionary became despondent over his inability to memorize the discussions. A native of Peru, Elder Soto was too poor to pay his fare home, but he wanted desperately to leave his mission. The mission president insisted he stay. He became sullen and unstable. His companion agreed to go with him to the mission home to ask again for an early release. At the train depot, Elder Soto “freaked out” and deliberately pushed his companion in front of an oncoming train. The missionary survived, but spent years undergoing operations. The Peruvian missionary was immediately arrested, but hanged himself that night in his cell. Years later, the injured missionary wrote: “The general approach of the Church to this event seemed to be one of damage control. The other elders in the Caseros District were immediately transferred to opposite ends of the mission. [The mission president] instructed me that I was not to talk about these events in the same breath that he told me of Soto’s death. A few months later, an apostle visiting a stake conference in Minneapolis held a private audience with my family and instructed us all to remain silent. There is some evidence suggesting that Church leaders did not give members of Soto’s home branch the true story of his death. My profound reaction to this cover-up effort is a sense of having been ‘used’ by the Church. In spite of the ‘great worth of a soul,’ I have sensed that the General Authorities of the Church, as a matter of policy, were more concerned with maintaining the Church’s whitewashed image than with my personal integrity or with giving Soto’s family and friends an honest account of his death. There are still times when I cry about Guillermo. My heart hurts when I think about this innocent man who died. I sometimes feel as if I killed him. I was there. I made him work when he wanted to go home. My defense is that I was a kid and didn’t know any better. [The mission president] probably killed him as much as I did. He’s the one who told me to keep Guillermo on his mission. He’s the one who wouldn’t buy him the airline ticket.” The young injured elder has spent many years in daily pain from his injuries, but he says “it reminds me that obedience and conformity are not necessarily virtues. It reminds me that people are more important to me than programs. It reminds me that personal righteousness cannot be defined by institutions. The pain is the price I pay for wisdom. To this day I mourn Guillermo Soto as one of the great losses of my life.” (Kerry Winfield Burnham, “The Price of Wisdom.” *Case Studies of the Mormon Alliance*, Vol. 3, 1997, edited by Lavina Fielding Anderson and Janice M. Allred, 1998, pp. 243-248.)

I. Records of Blacks’ Patriarchal Blessings. 1970 and Later. “According to the Church Historian’s Office, which made a report to the Quorum of the Twelve in 1970, ten of the twelve tribes of Israel are represented in lineage pronouncements and as many as ‘fifteen other lineages had been named in blessings, including that of Cain. The Church Historian’s report is not available, nor are the blessings themselves, which accounts for the dearth of scholarship on Blacks and patriarchal blessings. . . . Some patriarchs pronounced ‘the seed of Cain’ on Black members during their blessings; others the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; while still others no lineage at all. Not until the late twentieth century did Mormon leaders begin to address the inconsistent and haphazard manner in which patriarchs declared lineage on Black Latter-day Saints. . . . In 2018, some forty years after the priesthood and temple ban ended, Black lineage remains a vexing problem in the LDS Church.” (Matthew L. Harris, “Mormons and Lineage: The Complicated History of Blacks and Patriarchal Blessings, 1830-2018,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 51:3, Fall 2018, 85-86.)

J. Ensign Cover Article Changed at Last Minute. 1973. Gregory A. Prince, in his 2016 book, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, dedicated his book as follows: “This book is dedicated to all who believe ‘that truth has got to be preserved’—even inconvenient truth.” In the prologue he elaborates: “A word about the dedication to this book. In 1973 writer Carol Lynn Pearson met with Leonard Arrington, who consoled her following an incident when her cover story for the LDS Church magazine, the *Ensign*, was pulled at the last minute because of her support of the Equal Rights Amendment.”

2. Church Historian Kept Dual Journals. Prince continued: “In her diary she wrote, ‘He said that he has been in my position before. In fact, he said he is enough of a realist that he makes two copies of his journal—one that stays in his office, and another that goes home with him. He said that no matter what happens to him, he wants his true story to be preserved. I told him that I also write down all of these details in my diary, and we were in agreement that truth has got to be preserved, whatever the cost.’” (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 2.)

K. Dean Jessee Article for Ensign Altered. Church Historian Leonard Arrington wrote in his personal journal on Dec. 1, 1973: “Some time ago, at my suggestion, Dean Jessee prepared an article for the Ensign on Brigham Young as a writer. A splendid article. The Ensign accepted it, and it now turns out that through the influence of Doyle Green, and correlation, Dean must eliminate references to the plural wives of Brigham Young and must correct the spelling mistakes in his letters and diary excerpt. But if we were publishing it, we would leave both in. . . . If we had to go through correlation and get approval from higher ecclesiastical authority for all we publish, then we might as well close up shop. If history is going to be an aspect of doctrine and missionary work, then our department should not exist.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington, 1971-1997, Vol. 1: Church Historian, 1971-75*, edited by Gary James Bergera, Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2018, 616-17.)

1. Even Spelling Errors Corrected by Correlation. In 1979 Jerald and Sandra Tanner made available for sale a reproduction of Joseph Smith’s diary for the years 1832-34. Church Historian Leonard Arrington commented: “There is nothing particularly startling in the diary except perhaps the spelling of Joseph Smith (more correctly the misspelling) which might be surprising. We have tried to prepare the Saints for the variant spellings of the Prophet by quotations in our articles we have published in the Ensign and BYU Studies, but usually Correlation required the Ensign to correct the spelling in the Ensign with the result that the ordinary member of the Church is not as well prepared as he might have been for this kind of eventuality.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington, 1971-1997, Vol. 2: Centrifugal Forces, 1975-80*, edited by Gary James Bergera, Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2018, 703.)

L. Hiding Past Activities at New Church Office Building. June 25, 1973. “I mentioned in my diary the other day that Wendell Ashton and his wife [Belva Barlow] had removed the picture of the brethren in the penitentiary from the exhibit of the Historical Department at the open house for the new Church Office Building. The next morning Wendell telephoned Earl to tell him to remove also the Sacrament set which consisted of some old goblets. These were presumably used when they had wine as well as when they had water. These were passed from person to person in the audience and each took a drink. According to Wendell these should be removed because ‘we don’t want people to think that the Saints were unsanitary in the early days.’” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Confessions of a Mormon Historian: The Diaries of Leonard J. Arrington, 1971-1997, Vol. 1: Church Historian, 1971-75*, edited by Gary James Bergera, Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2018, 533.)

M. Biography of George Albert Smith. “In 1974 [President Spencer W. Kimball] met with Merlo Pusey about Pusey’s three-generation manuscript biography of President George Albert Smith, his father, John Henry Smith, and his namesake grandfather George A. Smith. Deseret Book had referred the matter to the First Presidency for a decision about publication because of its treatment of some problematic issues, among them polygamy, the Mountain Meadows Massacre, and a serious disagreement between David O. McKay and George Albert Smith. Spencer read portions of the manuscript and advised Pusey that it would be ‘unwise’ for the Church’s wholly-owned book company to publish passages dealing with ‘controversial,’ and ‘delicate and

personal' matters, but he felt that he could not direct Pusey to abandon publication or require him to make changes. Deseret Book Company declined to publish the manuscript unless Pusey revised it; Pusey refused to make the changes. Pusey urged that 'the story of the disagreement is the heart of my book, showing that even after sharp personal disagreement, George Albert Smith could call David O. McKay as his counselor. The book was published in 1981 by BYU Press.' A footnote adds: "The 'delicate and personal matter' was probably a dispute involving George Albert Smith's daughter." [See "Emily Smith Stewart" in my "Oddities" paper for this account.] (Edward L. Kimball, *Lengthen Your Stride: The Presidency of Spencer W. Kimball*, CD working copy, 2005, Chapter 19, p. 15.)

N. Stopping LDS Play on Huebner. In 1976 BYU professor Tom Rogers was asked to "desist from further productions or publications on the subject of [Helmut] Huebener," the German anti-Nazi LDS deacon who was beheaded for resisting Hitler. When asked why, he responded: "I've never been sure why in 1976 we were asked to desist from further productions or publications on the subject. Some have speculated that it might have some-how interfered with plans to erect a temple behind the Iron Curtain in Freiberg, Germany. I've looked into the matter with those East German Saints of my acquaintance to whom authorities of the DDR (Deutsche Demokrati-sche Republik) first recommended the Church's doing so. However the timing doesn't exactly coincide. We will never really know." When asked who contacted him, Rogers responded: "BYU's president, Dallin Oaks, con-veyed the request to the three of us [Rogers, Alan Keele and Douglas Tobler]. It had come from members of the Board of Trustees responsible for Church affairs in Europe, including East Germany, which was still under Soviet occupation. We also had a number of members in Allende's Chile, which was at that point a socialistic nation. It seemed possible, if unlikely, that one or more well-intentioned members in those countries might be inclined, if it came to their attention, to emulate Huebener vis-a-vis their own regimes, with dire consequences for the Church. I an others have speculated about other possible reasons. Suffice it to say that, after the fall of the Iron Curtain, a BYU main stage revival of the play proceeded without any official complaint or censure—as have other productions of the play since then." (Todd Compton, "An Interview with Tom Rogers," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Spring 2008, pp. 76-7.)

Q. Sesquicentennial History Project. "Leonard Arrington's most important project was to oversee the production of a 16-volume sesquicentennial history of the Mormon Church. These volumes were to be authored by prominent Mormon scholars. Dr. Arrington stated: 'We have signed contracts with 16 persons, . . . We hope all 16 volumes will be ready by 1980.' (*Salt Lake Tribune*, April 26, 1975). Unfortunately, the 150th anniversary of the church—the sesquicentennial celebration of 1980—passed without a single volume being published!

"From what we have been able to learn, some of the scholars were too frank in their presentation of Mormon history, and this caused great consternation among some of the apostles. For some period of time church leaders dragged their feet in an effort to delay or even cancel publication of the volumes. Church leaders found them-selves in a difficult bind because the church's Deseret Book Company had signed an agreement with the 16 authors which would be binding in court. In order to suppress the history without the possibility of lawsuits, the General Authorities decided to pay each author who had finished his work \$20,000 (those who had not completed their volumes were to receive a smaller amount). Since there were 16 authors to be paid off and other costs involved, the church may have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to bring this endeavor to a halt. That the Church leaders would approve this massive project and then abort it after some of the church's top scholars had spent years working on it shows a total lack of inspiration as well as a disregard for truth." (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Major Problems of Mormonism*, 1989, p. 51.)

O. Complaining to a General Authority. Leonard Arrington "was particularly irritated by two kinds of breach of the scriptural mandate. One was when parents of BYU students bypassed professors and even university administrators, and complained directly to a General Authority about what a professor may have said in the classroom, often without merit and always giving the professor no opportunity to defend or correct the record. The other was when a church member complained directly to a General Authority about what a scholar had published, rather than taking the matter up with the scholar as the scripture mandates. He had been the victim of the second action, as he noted with exasperation in a diary entry in 1976: 'I write an article on the Word of Wisdom.

Someone complains to a General Authority. The General Authority writes to the president of BYU. The president of BYU calls the dean. The dean calls me in. The dean tells me it looks O.K. to him, but since the general authority complained, I must write him a letter of apology. This is way of academic freedom? This is the way of history?" (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 197.)

P. Kimball: Don't Send to Correlation. According to Leonard Arrington, he approached President Kimball one day about the possibility of publishing a seven-volume topical biography of Brigham Young, written by seven different authors. President Kimball said he had a different idea: "I am getting old and I want to see a really good one-volume biography of Brigham Young before I die.' That changed the plan. Arrington came back with the names of three possible biographers. President Kimball replied, 'I don't want to see the list. I want *you* to do it.' He had liked the Arrington biography of Edwin D. Woolley, his mother's father, and thought Arrington could do equal justice to Brigham Young. 'I want you to find a national publisher, and write the biography so that libraries will feel they need to have it on their shelves.' He gave specific instructions not to send the manuscript through Correlation. 'They don't know history the way you do.' And he also advised, 'Before you publish, submit the manuscript to three types of historians—non-Mormon readers, *Dialogue*-type Mormons, and orthodox Mormons.' He wanted the biography to be honest, objective, and many-sided. He also wanted Arrington to make good use of the new information in manuscripts the Historical Department had recently catalogued, some of them still boxed as they were for removal upon the approach of Johnston's Army in 1858. Here was an opportunity to present Brigham Young as a prophet-leader of his people and a fascinating human being." (Edward L. Kimball, *Lengthen Your Stride: The Presidency of Spencer W. Kimball*, CD working copy, 2005, Chapter 19, p. 16.)

2. President Kimball's own biography, written by two of his sons, came out in 1977. A cousin quoted him as saying, "I am grateful I was still alive when it was written. Otherwise, I don't think it would have made it through Correlation." (*Ibid.*, Chap. 19, pp. 18-19.)

Q. Race Issue in Brazil. Little information was given Brazilian members about the Church's racial position prior to 1978. When Joseph Fielding Smith's book, *The Way to Perfection*, was published in Portuguese, the two chapters dealing with Cain were left out. In fact, when the book was revised in 1978, the translators were still instructed to omit those two chapters, even though editions in Japanese, Spanish, and German left those chapters in. Information about the priesthood ban was spread by word of mouth. (Mark L. Grover, "Religious Accommodation in the Land of Racial Democracy: Mormon Priesthood and Black Brazilians," *Dialogue*, Autumn, 1984, pp. 23-34.)

R. Rector's Talk on Homosexuality in 1981 Completely Altered Before Publication. At a general conference session on Sunday, April 5, 1981, Elder Hartman Rector, Jr. of the First Quorum of Seventy said: "If children have a happy family experience, they will not want to be homosexuals, which I am sure is an acquired addiction just as drugs, alcohol, and pornography are. The promoters of homosexuality say they were born that way but I do not believe it is true. There are no female spirits trapped in male bodies and vice versa." (Cited Joseph Geisner, "Editing, Correcting, and Censoring Conference Addresses." *Sunstone*, Issue 165, December 2011, 20-1.)

a. *Totally Revised After the Fact.* "This talk was extensively covered in the *Salt Lake Tribune* and *Deseret News* on Monday, 6 April, and in the *Church News* on Saturday, 11 April, with quotations of passages that were later removed from the published talk. In May, the talk was published in the *Ensign* with the new title, 'Turning the Hearts.' All references to abortion, birth control, sterilization, vasectomy, homosexuality, and the dying elderly were removed, thereby transforming the speech from apocalyptic jeremiad to an upbeat pep talk about genealogy." (*Ibid.*, 21.)

S. Secret Files. Leonard Arrington has written about incidents while he was Church Historian: "Two events showed that we were being watched. The first was a campaign waged by an employee of our library who had misgivings about our 'taking over' historical research. We were told by his associates that he submitted to two members of the Twelve, on a regular basis, pages from articles and books we published with 'controversial'

statements underlined in yellow—statements that, out of context, might have looked questionable to an uninformed or suspicious mind. These and other accusations were circulated by these two to others of the Twelve and were placed in a special file of ‘questioning liberals’ kept by church security at headquarters. . . . Although we were not intimidated, we were watchful. We tried to get the hostile librarian reassigned (other executives of the Historical Department agreed), but perhaps through the intervention of higher authority he remained in his position.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, p. 101.)

W. Church Historian Removed. In 1983, historian Davis Bitton talked of the end of an era: “Between 1972 and 1982 I was part of the team of historians located in the Church Office Building under the direction of Leonard J. Arrington. It was a golden decade—a brief period of excitement and optimism—that someone has likened to Camelot. But it came to an end. . . . The euphoria of being part of something like the Historical Division in 1972 is hard to convey. It seemed like a heaven-sent opportunity. Our leaders were behind us, liked us, encouraged us. We had available one of the great collections of primary source material in the world. . . . But there is a downside to this story. . . . I can state objectively that the decision was made to scuttle the 16 volume history . . . to sharply circumscribe the projects that were approved, to reject any suggestions, however meritorious, for worthy long-range projects, to allow the division to shrink by attrition, and finally to reassign the remaining historians to a new entity, the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute of Church History, which would be affiliated with BYU. . . . Leonard J. Arrington was called as Church Historian in 1972. He was sustained at general conference that year and for the next couple of years. . . . Finally, in 1982, he received a letter honorably releasing him. . . . If you visit the East Wing of the Church Office Building you will find in the hallway a gallery of portraits. These are the Church Historians, from Oliver Cowdery to G. Homer Durham. But where is Leonard Arrington? Nowhere to be seen. The official explanation is that to be a Church Historian one has to be a General Authority. A brief period of our history, awkwardly embarrassing to someone, is thus erased. Orwell's Truth-speak did not have to wait for 1984.” (Davis Bitton, “Ten Years in Camelot: A Personal Memoir,” *Dialogue*, Fall 1983, pp. 18-19.)

1. “Church leaders apparently realized that Dr. Arrington was too prominent a man to publicly take issue with, and therefore they sought to gradually dissolve his influence. Consequently, no official announcement was made when Arrington was released from his position as Church Historian. Moreover, no announcement was made when G. Homer Durham succeeded him. It was in May 1982, when *Sunstone Review* asserted that 'Elder G. Homer Durham . . . was called and set apart as Church Historian on February 22.' This was certainly a very strange procedure. Dr., Arrington had been publicly 'sustained in the April 1972 General Conference,' but no announcement was ever made by the Church that he had been released. Durham, on the other hand, apparently replaced Arrington without being publicly sustained in the April 1982 conference. This seems to have been a rather underhanded way of removing Dr. Arrington from his position.” (Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Major Problems of Mormonism*, 1989, p. 53.)

X. Documents Restricted. “We acknowledge, however, that in the 1980s many documents are more highly restricted than in the 1970s, no apparent reason being given for the 'tightening up.’” (Davis Bitton and Leonard J. Arrington, *Mormons and Their Historians*, 1988, p. 165.)

Y. “Faithful History.” Keith W. Perkins, Chairman of the Church History Department, spoke at a symposium of Church history staff at BYU. He made the following comments about how history should be written: “Too often, when we write Church history, we rely only on the historical method we were taught at the university. I plead for a return to the way religious history was written during early scriptural times. . . . I believe one question that each of us should ask is this: 'Will this writing or teaching be pleasing to my Heavenly Father and to those Saints who are not of this world?' . . . My concern is that today we seem to have almost an obsession with being critical. This is true in coverage of general authorities and political leaders. . . . Writers explain their negative views by saying they have an obligation to tell the truth. Again, the scriptures tell us that it is not enough to tell the truth; what we write must not only be true but righteous. . . . I believe this means that, although some things might be true, it might not be righteous, or appropriate to write about them.” (*Regional Studies in Latter-day Saint Church History: New England*, 1988, p. 12.)

Z. Criticizing Leaders. Speaking to students at BYU on “Reading Church History,” Aug. 16, 1985, Elder Dallin Oaks said: “Criticism is particularly objectionable when it is directed toward Church authorities, general or local. Evil-speaking of the Lord’s anointed is in a class by itself. It is one thing . . . to deprecate a person who exercises corporate power or even government power. It is quite another thing to criticize or deprecate a person for the performance of an office to which he or she has been called of God. It does not matter that the criticism is true.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, Aug. 17, 1985.)

AA. Sterling McMurrin. For a brief period in the early 1980s, an off-campus independent newspaper, the *Seventh East Press*, was allowed to be placed in various locations on campus at BYU. On Jan. 11, 1983, the paper interviewed Sterling McMurrin, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, and prominent Mormon liberal. In the interview he explained why he did not accept the Book of Mormon as an ancient document. When asked about various controversies surrounding Mormon history, he responded: “When the Church refuses its own historians access to the materials in its archives, it obviously has something to hide.” Apparently as a result of that interview, the newspaper was refused all access to BYU. It was unable to function on that basis, and ceased publication shortly thereafter. (See *Seventh East Press*, Jan. 11, 1983, p. 2, for the interview.)

BB. Banned Books. The Church Curriculum department has a list of books which may not be quoted or referred to in footnotes in any Church publications. Much of the current “new Mormon history” is included because of its controversial nature. But there are some surprising books that are currently blacklisted. *The Story of the Latter-day Saints*, by James B. Allen and Glen M. Leonard, is included, even though the title page bears this notice: “Published in Collaboration with the Historical Department of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.”

2. Story of the Latter-day Saints. “[James B.] Allen is a very orthodox history professor at BYU, and [Glen] Leonard was a senior historical associate in the Church Historical Department when the book was written. (He has since been appointed to head the Museum of Church History and Art.) The book was published in a very large edition—35,000—by Deseret Book in 1976 and sold out in three years. In spite of considerable demand, Deseret Book did not reprint the book or allow it to be reprinted by any other publisher until eleven years later. Reportedly, several senior apostles objected to the book as being too “naturalistic,” presenting doctrines in the context of the times in which they were adopted. Allen reportedly told one writer that Ezra Taft Benson asked that the book be shredded “primarily because he and Leonard had treated the Word of Wisdom in a historical as well as a spiritual manner, and also because they did not call the story of the crickets and the seagulls a miracle.” (Richard S. Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, p. 38.)

a. Beginning of the End for History Division. Rave reviews for the new Mormon history appeared in virtually all publications focusing on Mormon writing. Even *Church History*, written for a non-LDS audience, welcomed the new book “into the larger church tent, and used effusive language in doing so: ‘For the first time in Mormon history, an analysis published under semi-official Mormon Church auspices, and covering the entire sweep of Latter-day Saint development, can be judged as serious history. . . The Mormon experience is placed within history, not outside it, as in all previous such accounts.’ . . . Against a backdrop of near-unanimous acclaim for the new book, Leonard Arrington was unprepared for a backlash that was swift and overwhelming. Although Boyd Packer’s reaction to Dean Jessee’s *Brigham Young’s Letters to His Sons* should have been an early warning, Leonard had read it as an aberration, and thus failed to see it as a signal of the beginning of the end of the History Division.” (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 278-79.)

b. Critique by the Twelve. The Historical Department arranged for the publication of *Story of the Latter-day Saints*, by James Allen and Glen Leonard, in 1976. Sales were brisk, and Church Public Communications arranged for 5,000 copies to be placed in U.S. libraries. Arrington and his associates were dumbfounded when they received an eight-page single-spaced critique from the Twelve, listing all the book’s shortcomings. The critique, supported strongly by Ezra Taft Benson and Mark E. Petersen, found much wrong with the new book: (1) The bibliography mentioned works by Brodie, and cited articles in *Dialogue*, particularly those by Richard Poll and Duane Jeffery. (2) The story of the crickets and seagulls did not bring God into the

picture. (3) The account of Zion's Camp implied that it was a failure. (4) The account of BYU's firing the evolutionists in 1911 was not sufficiently anti-evolution, and (5) The book was basically a secular history and did not have enough of the spiritual to be a 'true' account of LDS history. They recommended that Joseph Fielding Smith's *Essentials in Church History* should be reinstated as a 'traditional history book,' and all history publications should be routed through the Correlation Committee to ensure that they were doctrinally and historically accurate and had the right tone and impact. Furthermore, they noted that Joseph Fielding Smith's *Essentials in Church History* should continue to be used as the official Church history book. There were no voices speaking in behalf of the Church Historian and his staff. (Leonard J. Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, p. 149.)

c. Pres. Benson's Concerns. "Also of concern to President Benson were materials being published by some LDS historians, who he feared were incorrectly placing their emphasis on writing Church history from a perspective that downplayed the divine authorship and doctrines. In a BYU fireside in March 1976, he criticized historians whose emphasis was 'to underplay revelation and God's intervention in significant events, and to inordinately humanize the prophets of God so that their human frailties become more apparent than their spiritual qualities.' . . . Later in 1976, in an address to instructors in the Church Educational System he gave this caution: ". . . Avoid expressions and terminology which offend the Brethren and Church members. I refer to such expressions as 'he alleged' when a president of the Church described a revelation or manifestation; or other expressions such as 'experimental systems' and 'communal life' as they describe sacred revelations dealing with the united order. . . . A revelation of God is not an experiment. The Lord has already done his research.'" (Sheri L. Dew, *Ezra Taft Benson: A Biography*, 1987, p. 455.)

d. "The real issue was that Benson was determined to terminate the History Division, and *Story [of the Latter-day Saints]* was simply the catalyst that initiated the process. While it took another six years for him and his allies to complete their work of disassembly, it was already 'game over.'" (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 284.)

3. Building the City of God. A second book currently blacklisted is *Building the City of God: Community and Cooperation Among the Mormons*, published in 1976 by Deseret Book Co. Its authors were Leonard J. Arrington, Feramorz Y. Fox, and Dean L. May. Arrington was Church Historian at the time. Fox was president of LDS Business College and May was a senior research historian in the Church's Historical Department. (*Dialogue*, Summer 1984, p. 45, and *The Mormon Corporate Empire*, 1985, pp. 211-212.)

T. Arrington's Frustration as Church Historian. "At the end of 1975 Leonard wrote another self-assessment in his diary, and this time Boyd Packer loomed large. "Leonard's usually exuberant tone was gone. The entry began with frustration: 'Within a few weeks, I shall have been Church Historian for four years I cannot believe it has been so long. Nor can I believe I have accomplished so little in that period of time.' Then he put his finger on the chief problem that faced the History Division., 'our uncertainty as to what the Church will accept by way of publishing materials, interpretation, tone and so on.' . . . His frustration was palpable as he lamented that there was not one General Authority who was both accessible and 'who would understand my concerns, who would listen, give reactions, and withhold judgment.' Finally, he wrote rhetorically, 'Who is everybody afraid of? Once upon a time, it was Harold B. Lee. Now it seems to be Boyd Packer who is free to give advice and to make threats, and who cannot be trusted to keep confidences of this nature.'" (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 262-63.)

DD. Conference Talk and Video Altered. "Previously, in my exploration of our changing church, I quoted from the October 1984 general conference address of Elder Ronald E. Poelman, a member of the First Quorum of Seventy. The language I quoted must have impressed others as well, because it appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune* and the *Deseret News* reports of the conference. It does not appear, however, in the November 1984 *Ensign* magazine, which contains the official proceedings of the conference. What appears instead is a substantially edited version which preserves about 80% of the original address, omits about 10%, and drastically revises about 10%." (Richard Poll, *History and Faith: Reflections of a Mormon Historian*, 1989, p. 107.)

1. Not only was the written version changed, but Elder Poelman went back to an empty Tabernacle and gave the talk again, so it could be videotaped for the benefit of the video cassette conference tapes that are sent out all over the world. The talk, “originally a rare and inspiring defense of free agency, “was rewritten and refilmed” so that it became yet another cry for obedience. His text was not edited—his ideas were turned inside out.” Those watching the tape would assume it was the original “televised live” sermon. (L. Jackson Newell, “An Echo from the Foothills: To Marshal the Forces of Reason.” *Dialogue* 19:1 Spring 1986, p. 28.)

EE. Controversial Articles. Early in 1983, at least sixteen church members, including three BYU professors, were interviewed by their bishops or stake presidents about the historical and doctrinal articles they had written for independent Mormon periodicals [*Dialogue*, *Sunstone*, *Journal of Mormon History*, etc.]. Furthermore, it was announced that BYU would no longer pay the way for its church history professors to attend the Mormon History Association's annual conferences, even though the founders and most members were mainstream Latter-day Saints (Church Historian Leonard J. Arrington was the first president.) (*BYU: A House of Faith*, p. 90.)

FF. Tightening Up. In 1978, at the request of apostle Mark E. Petersen, an ecclesiastical and administrative investigation was conducted of a BYU undergraduate (David Buerger) and his teacher when the student wrote a term paper analyzing the 1890 Woodruff Manifesto. By 1980, ranking General Authorities had decided to scuttle the 16 volume sesquicentennial history, and sharply circumscribe other projects that had been approved earlier, and to again limit access to many important collections in the church archives. In August, 1981, church educators were warned by Elder Boyd K. Packer, “The Lord made it very clear that some things are to be taught selectively, and some things are to be given only to those who are worthy. One who chooses to follow the tenets of his profession, regardless of how they may injure the church or destroy the faith of those not ready for advanced history, is himself in spiritual jeopardy.” (*BYU: A House of Faith*, pp. 89-90.)

GG. Growing Censorship. L. Jackson Newell noted with alarm the growing tendency for censorship within the Church. He listed these developments:

1. The rewriting and refilming of Elder Ronald Poelman's October 1984 Conference address.
2. Carlisle Hunsaker's removal from the University of Utah's LDS Institute of Religion faculty at the end of the 1985 school year, apparently for writing prize-winning essays for *Dialogue* and *Sunstone*, without being accorded the right to defend his actions or face those who made the decision to force him out.
3. Lifelong members Valeen Avery and Linda Newell being prohibited in June 1985 from speaking within the Church about the fruits of their nine-year research project on Emma Smith, without being notified, given reasons, or provided a chance to defend their research before the decision had been implemented.
4. Stanley Larson's forced resignation from the LDS Translation Department in September 1985, without notice, as a result of a scholarly paper he wrote which examines the relationship between the Book of Mormon and various biblical translations.

Jackson concludes: “When truth is defined simply as what the leaders say it is, when membership requires the sublimation of personal moral judgment, when freedom within the fold is achieved by choosing silence rather than speech, and when facts are not valid until endorsed by those in authority—and each of these statements is perilously close to reality—then I believe the hour is late. . . . We are now being warned to guard against ‘the unrighteous use of truth’—a principle that enables us to dismiss any information we don't like and criticize others for not doing likewise.” (L. Jackson Newell, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Spring 1986, pp. 27, 32-33.)

HH. More Censorship. “We are witnessing disturbing efforts to undermine confidence in virtually all unofficial sources of understanding about our past—the work of professional historians, intellectuals in general, the

free press, the free discussion of ideas, and free access to information. For a people who have been taught that the Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, and the Constitution of the United States are inspired documents, these are astonishing developments.” (L. Jackson Newell, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Spring 1986, p. 32.)

II. Correlation Committee. “In recent decades, however, this function has been assumed by an ecclesiastical administrative committee charged with the task of examining the content of official church publications 'for doctrinal soundness and correctness of doctrinal interpretation.' Aptly designated the Church Correlation Committee, this body measures historical material submitted to it against existing authorized interpretations of Mormon history. For the most part, this body works so quietly and efficiently that the effectiveness with which the LDS Church continues to control its own history is truly surprising, given the size and energy of the scholarly body, whose members pursue the study of LDS history outside of and independent from connections with either the LDS or RLDS churches.” (Jan Shippo, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition*, 1985, p. 89.)

U. Conference Talks Reviewed. “In a process that would once have been inconceivable, non-general authorities review in advance and require changes in the world conference talks prepared by general authorities twice annually.” (D. Michael Quinn, *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Fall-Winter 2001, p. 158.)

KK. “Idolatrous History.” “Mormon apostles Ezra Taft Benson and Boyd K. Packer are advocating a kind of religious history which borders on idolatry, asserted D. Michael Quinn, associate professor of history at BYU in a recent lecture to the university's student history association. In an address entitled 'On Being a Mormon Historian,' Quinn, who holds a Ph.D. in history from Yale University, addressed recent criticisms made against Mormon historians by Elders Benson and Packer and BYU Professor of Political Science Louis Midgley. . . . Commenting on Elder Packer's statement that historians should 'demonstrate the hand of the Lord in every hour and every moment of the Church,' Quinn expressed the belief that such an approach demonstrates the 'view that the official acts and pronouncements of the prophets are always the express will of God, 'a position which Quinn sees as 'the Mormon equivalent of the Roman Catholic doctrine of papal infallibility.' . . . Quinn also accused Packer of advocating a history of the Church that denies any information which might be used against the Church by anti-Mormons.”

V. Controversial Issues and Deseret Book. “In 1974 Deseret Book asked the First Presidency to decide whether, as a Church-owned company, it should publish a manuscript that included discussion of polygamy, the Mountain Meadows massacre, and a serious disagreement between David O. McKay and George Albert Smith. Elder Kimball met with author Merlo Pusey and advised him that it would be ‘unwise’ for the Church itself to publish passages dealing with ‘controversial’ and ‘delicate and personal’ matters. But he did not direct Pusey to abandon publication or require him to make changes, and BYU Press later published the book unchanged.” (Edward W. Kimball, *Lengthen Your Stride: The Presidency of Spencer W. Kimball*, 2005, p. 187.)

W. New Era Couldn't Discuss Ear Piercing. In 1972, the editors of the *New Era*, the Church's publication for teens, had lunch with Leonard Arrington, and discussed issues they faced. “The most common question submitted to the magazine by its young readers, in dozens of letters every week, was whether it was all right to pierce their ears. The *New Era* editors noted, though, that ‘they cannot run a question and answer column on this because the brethren are divided on it. They cannot even run an article saying the brethren are divided.’” (Gregory A. Prince, *Leonard Arrington and the Writing of Mormon History*, 2016, 176-77.)

X. Biography of Ezra Taft Benson. Sheri L. Dew wrote a biography covering the life of President Ezra Taft Benson that was published in 1987. Even though a significant portion of his life was spent fighting Communism and promoting the John Birch Society, and he was directly chastised for being too vocal on those issues, Dew's biography has no entries in the index to “Communism,” “John Birch Society,” and “Robert Welch.” (Gregory A. Prince and Wm. Robert Wright, *David O. McKay and the Rise of Modern Mormonism*, 2005, p. 442, f15.)

Y. Archives Restricted. In a 1988 article, Ronald W. Walker, “senior research historian at the Joseph Fielding

Smith Institute for Church History at BYU,” wrote this footnote about his research on an article on Heber J. Grant’s mission president activities in Europe in 1903: “Because current LDS archival policy limits the access and use of materials, many footnote citations have not been verified.” Apparently that ban applies even to the senior research historians in charge of the archives. (*Journal of Mormon History*, Vol. 14, 1988, p. 31.)

1. Logan Temple Construction. In a 1996 article on the construction of the Logan Temple, the author quotes from a 1954 M.S. thesis, and then notes: “At the time of Larkin’s thesis research in 1953, he had full access to the official records of the Logan Temple and its construction. Since that time, temple records held at the Historical Department Archives of the Church . . . including the Logan Temple time books, are no longer accessible to scholars. The three time books used in this study were given to the Special Collections, Merrill Library, Utah State University by a private donor in 1991.” (Noel A. Carmack, “Labor and the Construction of the Logan Temple, 1877-1884,” *Journal of Mormon History*, Spring 1996, p. 53.)

Z. Genealogical Records. “This leads to the story of the unnecessary frustration of more than a million Latter-day Saints today who cannot verify the polygamous marriages performed for their ancestors in Utah temples from 1887-1889, even though those records exist and even though records of polygamous marriages at the Endowment House during the same period have always been available to genealogical researchers. Beginning with the St. George Temple in 1877, monogamous temple sealings were recorded in books separate from polygamous temple sealings, and only the monogamous sealings have been microfilmed by the LDS Genealogical Society. Descendants of these temple polygamous marriages have struggled in vain to find verification of these sealings in the microfilms of the Genealogical Society or elsewhere. This has even caused the Genealogical Society to adopt special rules for allowing family records to document a Church ordinance. This is a very curious situation since for decades the Church Historian’s Office [now Historical Department] has had custody of these recorded polygamous marriages from the St. George, Logan and Manti temples.

“I learned from the staff members of the Genealogical Department that the paranoia at the Church Historical Department is so intense that staff members and officials at HDC who knew otherwise actually informed the Genealogical Society in 1987 that there were no such records of temple polygamous sealings in the Historical Department, even though the Genealogical Society had a mandate from the First Presidency to obtain the data of all nineteenth solemn obligation to verify all ordinance data (including polygamous sealings for their ancestors), the Historical Department withholds that information not only from rank-and-file Mormons but also from the Genealogical Department and Temple Department.” (D. Michael Quinn, *Sunstone*, November 1988, pp. 47-8.)

AA. Speaker Fired. In 1989, Irene M. Bates reported on “the firing of an old missionary friend from his position in the Institute system after long and faithful service simply because he honored a commitment to speak at a Sunstone Symposium.” (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Summer 1989, p. 99.)

RR. Dilemma for Liberals. “The so-called ‘liberal’ among the Mormons finds himself in a dilemma. If the Mormon ‘liberal’ is liberal enough to entertain evidence and facts that are somewhat outside the approved history, he encounters cases where the Church leaders clearly were side-stepping issues, or were lying. If they would lie on one major issue why not on another?” (Asael C. Lambert, cited in Richard Marshall, *The New Mormon History*, 1977, p. 41.)

SS. Donors Wary. In a recent interview, Leonard Arrington discussed the current status of access to journals and diaries: “Because of the Church’s policy, families now hesitate to give their material to the Church because they’re afraid that even they—they who donated it—may lose access. I know of one instance where that hap-pened. Years ago Hugh Nibley gave the Historical Department his grandfather’s diary. I was [recently] present on one occasion when he came in and wanted to use it, and the staff wouldn’t let him, which was silly. He finally got permission to use it, but he had to argue long and hard.” (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Winter, 1989, p 54.)

TT. Nothing to Hide. “Question: What do you think is the biggest difficulty facing Mormon historians in the

1980s and 1990s?” Leonard Arrington: “The biggest difficulty is gaining unrestricted access to the wealth of material in the Church Archives. While I was in the Church Historian's Office (1972-82), we were able to make nearly everything available to scholars, both Mormon and non-Mormon, and that policy had a very positive influence on the image of the Church and its history. The atmosphere was one of openness and trust. That policy has been abandoned. Permitting scholars to use materials only on a selective and restrictive basis gives the impression that the Church is hiding something. As one who had access to everything for years, I can say this policy represents excessive caution. Virtually everything in the Archives is positive and faith promoting. Denying access only keeps Church members and historians from reading uplifting, faith-promoting materials.” (*Dialogue*, Winter 1989, p. 53.)

UU. Apostle Reed Smoot. “In the early sixties frustrations smothered another project. At the request of the University of Utah Press, I undertook the editing of the voluminous diaries of Senator Smoot covering most of his thirty years in the Senate. Some of the entries were mere jottings. After I had labored over the diaries for about three years, a controversy arose. A member of the family threatened to sue the Press if the diaries were published with entries which showed a conflict of interest on the part of the Senator during the Teapot Dome hearings over which he presided. I refused to permit use of my name as editor of the diaries if items of that type were eliminated. That ended the venture.” (Pulitzer Prize winner Merlo Pusey, “My Fifty Years in Journalism,” *Dialogue*, Spring 1977, p. 80.)

BB. Hofmann Forgeries. “The Church had purchased the false Joseph Smith III blessing in exchange for other historical items worth \$20,000. President Hinckley had purchased on behalf of the Church the false letter Hofmann created to counter the previous fraudulent letter purportedly written by Martin Harris to W. W. Phelps, for \$10,000. The purported Harris to Phelps letter had been purchased by a 30-year-old investment manager named Steven Christensen for \$40,000 as a representative for Gary Sheets & Associates who donated it to the LDS Church. President Hinckley had also purchased a purported letter from Joseph Smith, Jr., to a Josiah Stowell for \$15,000 ‘on behalf of the Church.’” When Hofmann offered the Church “the McLellin papers,” a rumored highly sensitive diary kept by an early LDS apostle who later defected, the Church (through Elder Hugh Pinnock) acted as a go-between with other parties to come up with the purchase price of \$185,000. The papers were then to be donated to the Church. The entire scheme unravelled, but only after Hofmann killed two people with home-made bombs. Hofmann was thoroughly discredited and given a life-sentence in the Utah penitentiary, but the Church appeared less than noble as all of the details became public. While the Church denied any wrong-doing, it appeared to most observers that they were buying up controversial documents to keep them out of circulation. Ironically, the real McLellin papers were finally located: the Church already had them, having purchased them in the early 1900s. The Church's historians, however, had never had access, and were not aware of their existence. (George M. McCune, *Gordon B. Hinckley: Shoulder for the Lord*, 1996, pp. 510-13.)

2. Church Buys Documents. “In January 1983, [Mark] Hofmann brought President Hinckley a letter purportedly from Joseph Smith to Josiah Stowell in which he gave instructions about finding treasure with a divining rod. This document showed the prophet as more involved in treasure digging than the traditional account allowed. If authentic, it would be the earliest known Mormon document. The First Presidency authorized the purchase of the letter for \$15,000 and placed it in the First Presidency vault. Hofmann soon leaked its contents and the rumor spread that the Church had such a letter. President Hinckley affirmed that fact in May 1985 when the text was released after the Church had investigated authenticity as far as it was able. Later that month President Hinckley wrote, ‘The enemies of the Church seem to be having a great time. Their efforts will fade while the work moves forward.’ His optimism contained a kernel of acknowledgment, however, that these purported glimpses of early Mormon history were proving troublesome. . . .

“In the fall of 1983, a rumor, later found to have been started by Hofmann, reported that a letter by Martin Harris described how Joseph Smith had received the Book of Mormon plates from a spirit that took the form of a white salamander. Several prospective buyers rejected it as probably an early forgery because of the close similarity to passages in the early anti-Mormon book *Mormonism Unveiled*. The Church might have bought it anyway if the price had not been unreasonable, but Steven Christensen, a young LDS businessman with a deep

interest in Church history, bought the letter in January 1984 for \$40,000. Wishing to understand the letter's context, he engaged three professional historians to mount a major study about folk magic in Joseph Smith's cultural surroundings, a subject that had been little discussed before. The strong suggestion of folk magic in the letter was not wholly inconsistent with the era in which the letter was supposedly written, but it put a strain on the faith of those who could not accept the Prophet Joseph Smith's involvement in what to them was superstition. . . .

"Finally Christensen, at President Hinckley's request, gave the 'salamander letter' to the Church in April 1985. Pressed by Hofmann-inspired rumors and resultant news stories about the letter's existence, the Church published the document's text in the *Church News* in May 1985 and explained the Church's position that the letter might not be authentic, and that in any event, it did not refute the truth claims of the Church." (Edward L. Kimball, *Lengthen Your Stride: The Presidency of Spencer W. Kimball*, CD working copy, 2005, Chapter 19, pp. 23-4.)

3. Salamander Letter. On or about January 11, 1983, President Gordon B. Hinckley secretly purchased a letter (later proven to be a forgery) from Mark Hofmann for \$15,000. It detailed Joseph Smith's supposed instructions to help a money digger find buried treasure. On April 29, 1985, a reporter for the *Salt Lake Tribune* wrote: "A letter reportedly written by Mormon Church founder Joseph Smith describing money-digging pursuits . . . seems to have disappeared from view. . . . Research historian Brent Metcalfe said he knows from 'very reliable, first-hand sources' the letter exists, and the Mormon Church has possession of it. Church spokesman Jerry Cahill denied the claim. 'The church doesn't have the letter,' said Mr. Cahill. 'It's not in the church archives or the First Presidency vault.'" Salt Lake publisher George Smith insisted otherwise: "Someone may be playing word games . . . The church clearly has possession of the letter' he said. 'If the exact question isn't asked, someone can wink and say the church doesn't have it.' 'No, said Mr. Cahill, the church does not have possession of the letter.'" Seven days later, the *Tribune* printed a letter from George Smith: "some scholars have reported seeing [the letter] at the church offices, . . . A number of scholars have photocopies of the letter, . . ." The next day the *Tribune* printed a letter from Jerry Cahill, Director of Public Affairs for the Church. He said he had not lied about the matter, but admitted that his earlier statement was incorrect: "My statement, however, was in error, . . . The pur-ported letter was indeed acquired by the church. For the present it is stored in the First Presidency's archives . . ." *Time Magazine* reported in its May 20, 1985 issue, "The church offered no explanation for withholding news of the earliest extant document written by Smith. . ." The Church had kept the letter secret for 28 months. The *Tribune* reported on Oct. 20, 1985 that even top Mormon historians, including the Church Archivist, were kept in the dark concerning the purchase of the 1825 letter: "Don Schmidt, retired LDS Church archivist said members of the First Presidency didn't tell him or church historians about the 1825 letter. Nor did they ask him or anyone in his department to authenticate the letter." It soon became apparent that the Church had purchased the fraudulent letter in order to keep it out of circulation. Before the Hofmann affair was over, the Church became involved in several deals that took "embarrassing" documents out of the public view. Hofmann was able to operate as he did because the Church was a ready buyer for many of his forgeries. (See *Time Magazine*, May 20, 1985, the *Salt Lake Tribune*, April 29, May 6, and Oct. 20, 1985, and Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Major Problems of Mormonism*, 1989, pp. 103-4.)

4. Many Forgeries Purchased. "In 1983 Hinckley paid \$15,000 for a letter from Joseph Smith to Josiah Stowell that showed Smith to be experienced at money-digging treasure hunting, raising the delicate matter of Smith's occult and folk magic activities in the 1820s. Another purchase was a Lucy Mack Smith letter, price estimated at \$30,000. The so-called salamander letter, which the church acquired indirectly through the collector Steven Christensen, later one of Hofmann's murder victims, cost \$40,000. . . . In the end the church acquired forty-eight documents from Hofmann directly, plus the salamander letter." (Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, 1999, p. 253.)

a. "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has 446 items in its archives that were acquired from Hofmann." (Jerry D. Spangler, *Deseret News*, Sept. 15, 2002, p. B2.)

5. Church Continues to Buy Forgeries. "In May 1985, a rumor spread (initiated by Hofmann) that

the Church had an Oliver Cowdery history corroborating the ‘salamander letter.’ He also displayed a purported deed bearing the names of Sydney Rigdon and Solomon Spaulding, not previously known to have been acquainted. And he told various people, including Elder Hugh Pinnock, that he needed financial help to purchase a collection of documents by early (and excommunicated) apostle William E. McLellin that might be embarrassing to the Church. In June 1985 Elder Pinnock, one of the Seventy, helped Hofmann borrow \$185,000 from a bank to purchase the collection. A businessman, in turn, agreed to buy the collection from Hofmann on condition it was authenticated under the supervision of Steven Christensen. . . . Hofmann felt pressured by insistent creditors, including the bank. He told a series of inconsistent stories about the location and contents of the McLellin collection but failed to produce it. With increased pressure on Hofmann to produce the McLellin papers, his elaborate scheme of forgery and fraud was unraveling.” (Edward L. Kimball, *Lengthen Your Stride: The Presidency of Spencer W. Kimball*, CD working copy, 2005, Chapter 19, p. 25.)

a. On Nov. 3, 1985, following the bombing deaths of Steven Christensen and Kathy Sheets, and Hofmann’s arrest, the *Church News*, announced that Elder Hugh Pinnock, out of his own resources, was repaying the bank (of which he had been president earlier) the entire \$185,000 they lost by loaning money to Hofmann. (*Ibid.*, p. 25.)

6. Hinckley’s Summary. “President Hinckley later summarized the Hofmann affair: ‘I frankly admit that Hofmann tricked us. He also tricked experts from New York to Utah, however. We bought those documents only after the assurance that they were genuine. And when we released documents to the press, we stated that we had no way of knowing for sure if they were authentic. I am not ashamed to admit that we were victimized. It is not the first time the Church has found itself in such a position. Joseph Smith was victimized again and again. The Savior was victimized. I am sorry to say that sometimes it happens.’” (Sheri L. Dew, *Go Forward With Faith: The Biography of Gordon B. Hinckley*, 1996, p. 432.)

7. Hofmann Case: Censorship After Twenty Years. On October 15, 2005, the twentieth anniversary of the Hofmann pipebombs that killed Steven Christensen and Kathy Sheets, the *Salt Lake Tribune* ran a four-page review of the entire tragic story. Peggy Fletcher Stack surveyed the changes in Mormon historiography since that event: “After Hofmann, the LDS historical archives restricted access to many manuscripts deemed ‘private, sacred and confidential,’ which typically includes most papers of LDS general authorities. Though there has been some loosening, it is not clear how open the LDS Church archives are today. Church officials don’t want to talk about it. Richard E. Turley Jr., now the managing director of the church’s Family and Church History Department and author of *Victims: The LDS Church and the Mark Hofmann Case*, declined to comment on anything related to Hofmann, the openness of the LDS archives or the importance of Mormon documents. Nor would any other LDS Church official, according to spokesman Dale Bills.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, Oct. 15, 2005, p. C4.)

8. Tragic Impact on Faith. In 2005, on the twentieth anniversary of the Hofmann bombings, the Sun-stone Symposium held a special session to discuss the case and its ramifications. One of the saddest of the reports was given by Brent Metcalfe. In a voice choked with emotion he said: “This is one of those presentations that you don’t really look forward to giving. How do you tell the tale of innocence lost? . . . A photograph adorns the cover of Rick Turley’s book, *Victims*, and in that photograph we see Mark Hofmann looking down at the Anthon transcript with Spencer W. Kimball, Boyd K. Packer, Gordon B. Hinckley, Marion G. Romney and N. Eldon Tanner all looking at the new prized possession. God can preserve tanned hides [referring to an earlier faith-promoting story], reveal actual ancient Hebrew words, but he is utterly incapable of [voice breaks] speaking to His prophets at a time when it mattered most. He could have saved two innocent lives and exposed a forgery, and nothing was said. In my view, if God doesn’t speak to us and His prophets about the things that matter most, then why should we care whether or not He speaks to us about the things that matter least.

“For me, the ultimate victim of those bombings was God. He died that day, along with Steve, along with Kathy. And I’ve seen no reason to resuscitate Him ever since. I admire those who have been able to retain faith in the light of such horrific events. To me it is utterly nonsensical. There is such a disconnect in my view of how we think about life, and what we are willing to apologize for God. That’s a Being that to me is not

worthy of our adoration. He's more worthy of our contempt. I suppose there is irony in all that, too, since October 15 happens to be the anniversary of Nietzsche's birthday, which is the day the bombings occurred. [It was Nietzsche who proclaimed that "God is dead."]

"Steve was an incredibly dear friend, and so was Mark Hofmann. I experienced enormous guilt for years [he chokes up again]. I was the person who introduced the two of them to each other [another pause for control]. An idealistic, young, brash, incredibly naive young man in his mid-twenties, thrown into the middle of all of this. There aren't words to communicate this. There aren't words to express the feelings of loss, regret [he has to stop again]. Since that time I think that life has gone well. Ahh, I went through a divorce shortly after the bombings, remarried, have a wonderful family, published a book in 1993, called *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon*, and was summarily excommunicated the following year for having edited the book. For me, that was a burden lifted, to be honest with you. They tried to excommunicate me before. I knew it would eventually happen again. I just felt like it was time to have this over with. [Another emotional pause.] But life goes on, and it continues to have its challenges. But for me, I'm at peace for where my beliefs have gone. I think I cherish life, and I value it even more than I did as a believer. These are the only moments that we have on this great ship that we call Earth. We're all unwitting passengers on this great journey that we call life. And I am thrilled for whatever time my existence may be to be a part of that." (Transcribed from a tape recording of the talks given at the Sunstone Symposium.)

WW. Calvin Grondahl Cartoons. The Deseret Bookstore quit carrying humorist Calvin Grondahl's cartoon books (including *Freeway to Perfection*, *Faith Promoting Rumors*, and *Sunday's Foyer*), in spite of their tremendous popularity with Mormons. The bookstore "has a reading committee that goes over all Mormon related titles. They approve or disapprove these titles to be carried through their retail stores. All three of Calvin Grondahl's titles were disapproved by the reading committee. Officially they gave no reason. My guess is that there are a handful of cartoons that might be offensive to their readership. Cal has a keen eye for Mormon humor. One of the things Calvin can do, since he is a convert to the Mormon church, is bring a perspective of one who is 'in' but 'out.' His cartoons threaten people because they are daring and he is willing to take a chance with his humor." (Gary Bergera, *Utah Holiday Magazine*, January 1990, pp. 27-8.)

XX. Counter-Productive. "So-called 'faith promoting' church history which conceals controversies and difficulties of the Mormon past may actually undermine the faith of Latter-day Saints who eventually learn about the problems from other sources. One of the most obvious demonstrations of that fact is the continued spread of unauthorized polygamy among Latter-day Saints during the last 75 years, despite efforts of church leaders to stop it. Essential to this church campaign is the official historical argument that there were no plural marriages authorized by the church or First Presidency after the 1890 Manifesto. . . .

"As a lifelong opponent of post-1890 polygamy, J. Reuben Clark knew otherwise. He spearheaded the administrative suppression of polygamist Fundamentalists from the time he entered the First Presidency in 1933, but he ruefully noted in 1945 'that one of the reasons why the so-called "Fundamentalists" had made such inroads among our young people was because we had failed to teach them the truth.' The truth was that more than 250 plural marriages occurred from 1890 to 1904 in Mexico, Canada, and the United States by authorization of the First Presidency and by action or assent of all but one or two members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. The official denial of that fact in LDS church statements and histories has actually given credibility to Fundamentalists in their promotion of new plural marriages after 1904 in defiance of First Presidency authority." (D. Michael Quinn, *Faithful History: Essays on Writing Mormon History*, 1992, p. 87.)

CC. Pervasive Censorship. "With great sadness, I catalogued evidences of anti-intellectualism in the church in a July diary entry: Eugene England and Lowell Bennion were not permitted to publish with Deseret Book or Bookcraft by direct intervention of two members of the Twelve. Carol Lynn Pearson was blacklisted from church publications until she was able 'through prayers and tears' to get one of the Twelve to reverse the decision. Jim Allen was viewed with suspicion because of *Story of the Latter-day Saints*. The *Church News* could not review *Building the City of God* or any other book by our History Division employees without specific clearance from the

Twelve. Claudia Bushman and Scott Kenney could not be published or mentioned because of their connection with *Exponent II* and *Sunstone*. Several Mormon intellectuals were publishing under pseudonyms. . . . As I look back on the period I see a diary entry that suggests how I envision magnifying my calling. Clearly, my expectations as church historian were not being realized.” (Leonard J. Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, p. 154.)

1. “*The Mormon Experience* [authored by Arrington and Davis Bitton], although cleared by the First Presidency, could not be mentioned or cited in the *Church News*, *The Ensign*, or church manuals, even in foot-notes, let alone reviewed or mentioned as a source. No official reasons were ever given.” (*Ibid.*, p. 192.)

2. “I summarized, ‘it is not that they disapprove of *me* as Church Historian; they would disapprove of any professional historian, any intellectual, any independent-minded writer. They want someone who (1) has written little history; (2) saturates history with scriptural allusions and references; and (3) obstinately refuses to mention controversial episodes.’” (*Ibid.*, p. 156.)

3. Spying at BYU. “In the fall of 1979 . . . I taught a new class at BYU called Mormonism in American History. . . . Recently, however, I have learned that the chairman of the Committee for Strengthening Members [one of the Twelve], always suspicious of ‘intellectuals,’ approached two registered students to spy on me and report to him weekly on what transpired in class. One of them has confessed to me that he reported twice and then gave up the assignment. The other, however, continued to make reports throughout the semester. I was not aware of this activity, of course. I presume that the reports were not disturbing enough to warrant my being called in for ‘counsel’ by the university president or a general authority, because nothing transpired. That spying of this nature was going on in 1979 suggests the determination of some people to build a strong case against any BYU instructor who tried to look upon Mormon history as professional historians would do.” (*Ibid.*, pp. 193-4.)

DD. First Presidency’s Vault. In the early 1980s, forger Mark Hofmann made available many documents he claimed were authentic, but which later proved to be clever forgeries. These presented controversial non-traditional accounts of events in early Church history. The Church Historian, Leonard Arrington, was unable to confirm or deny just what documents the First Presidency might have in its vault. “I had no reason to deny that the Martin Harris letter might be genuine, and I admitted that those in the First Presidency had never given me access to their private historical vault and [I] had no personal knowledge of what the vault contained.” It makes one wonder what could be in the vault that was so sensitive that even the Church Historian could not be trusted to view it. (Leonard Arrington, *Adventures of a Church Historian*, 1998, p. 222.)

1. Statements quoted throughout this paper mention at least the following as being in the First Presidency’s vault: (1) Minutes of the deliberations of the Council of Fifty; (2) William Clayton’s diaries; (3) statements gathered from participants in the Mountain Meadows Massacre that were collected by Andrew Jensen in the 1890s; (4) “Revelation given to John Taylor, Sept. 27, 1886, copied from the original manuscript by Joseph F. Smith Jr., August 3, 1909,” announcing that polygamy must continue every year until the Second Coming; (5) The personal diary of President Taylor, as well as the personal diary of George Q. Cannon, the First Presidency’s Office Journal, the personal diary of L. John Nuttall, personal secretary to President Taylor, and the diary of Francis M. Lyman. These presumably make reference to the 1886 revelation on the continuation of polygamy.

EE. Attempt to Silence Historians. “One disturbing story that made its way into the *Dialogue* office in April 1983 understandably sent a chill through the Mormon intellectual community. . . . Linda Newell reported that ‘a serious problem may be developing because seven people have been called in by their stake presidents based on a call from a General Authority. . . .’ The committee learned . . . that the general authority behind the investigations was Apostle Mark E. Petersen. Soon the news spread that at least fourteen scholars from around the U. S. had been called in to their local leaders, including not only writers who had published in *Dialogue*, but also those who had written for *Sunstone* and the *Seventh East Press* (an independent BYU newspaper founded in 1981, and only recently defunct.) Working with Roy W. Doxey, head of Church Correlation, Petersen identified authors whom he found troublesome and sent their names to their local church leaders. These leaders, in turn, would grill them about their worthiness, faithfulness, and their writing. While some of the writers found the interviews painless, even

pleasant, others felt ‘beaten up.’ Among those called in were Lester Bush, Armand Mauss, Gary James Bergera, Sissy Warner, David John Buerger, Peggy Fletcher, Scott Faulring, Edward Ashment, Jeffrey Keller, Richard Sherlock, and ‘three BYU professors,’ including historians Thomas G. Alexander and Marvin S. Hill. In many of these cases, local leaders told writers to ‘write faith promoting stories or their church membership will be in jeopardy.’ Gary Bergera, who had earlier written for [*Dialogue* and the *Seventh East Press*] was told by his stake president that ‘what I had written was anti-Mormon because it wasn’t uplifting.’” (Devery S. Anderson. *A History of Dialogue*, Part Three, *Dialogue*, Summer 2002, pp. 15-16.)

FF. Need to Hide the Truth. “When the authors of *Mormon Enigma* were censored and forbidden to speak in LDS ward sacrament meetings, one (Linda King Newell) met with Apostle Dallin H. Oaks about the ban. Oaks was a former Utah Supreme Court justice and past president of Brigham Young University, but his response demonstrates the support of dogma over the search for truth. He said, ‘My duty as a member of the Council of the Twelve is to protect what is most unique about the LDS church, namely the authority of priesthood, testimony regarding the restoration of the gospel, and the divine mission of the Savior. Everything else may be sacrificed in order to maintain the integrity of those essential facts. Thus, if *Mormon Enigma* reveals information that is detrimental to the reputation of Joseph Smith, then it is necessary to try to limit its influence and that of its authors.’” (Linda King Newell, “The Biography of Emma Hale Smith,” 1992 Pacific Northwest Sunstone Symposium, audiotape #J97 6; Robert D. Anderson, *Inside the Mind of Joseph Smith*, 1999, p. xliii.)

2. Actions Taken to Silence Authors. Linda King Newell wrote: “What happened in the year following publication of our book revealed an unwillingness by Church leaders to evaluate our book on the basis of its scholarship or to respect our efforts to interpret Emma Smith’s life as objectively and sensitively as we could. Instead, we confronted a pattern of secrecy, noncommunication and misrepresentation that was utterly distressing to us and to our families. . . . Sometimes during the first week of May 1985, bishoprics in Idaho, Utah, and Arizona received instructions not to invite Val or me to speak in Church meetings. We were later able to reconstruct the chain of command: the action originated with the Quorum of the Twelve in response to several letters asking questions about or criticizing various aspects of *Mormon Enigma*. One or more members of the Twelve then contacted the area presidents, who phoned regional representatives, who called stake presidents, who either instructed stake high councilors to notify bishops or called them personally. Except for parts of Arizona, and perhaps Idaho, nothing was transmitted in writing, resulting in some appalling discrepancies and exaggerations of the instructions. Val and I were not informed of the decision to silence our voices or of the instructions passed through priesthood channels to implement the decision.” (*Mormon Women’s Forum*, Vol. 5, No. 2 [July 1994], pp. 1, 3.)

GG. Secret Files. In 1990, after several members responded in print to changes in the temple ceremony, the Church “Strengthening the Members” committee began forwarding files to bishops and stake presidents for action. Even though the comments were unanimously positive, Church leaders were angry that anything at all had been said about the ceremonies, even in the most general of terms. “One Saint, F. Ross Peterson, former editor of *Dialogue*, visited by all three Seventies for his area, was questioned at length about his loyalty to church authorities and shown a thick church file of clippings collected on him since his college days. His temple recommend was removed and ‘further action was intimated’ if he spoke or wrote anything further about the temple. His recommend was restored after he wrote a protest and several members petitioned authorities on his behalf. Keith Norman, who holds a Duke University Ph.D. in religion, had presented a paper on the subject at the 1990 Sunstone Symposium in Washington, D.C. Norman’s bishop later said that he had been instructed to deny Norman a temple recommend for one year. When Norman asked his bishop what it was for which he needed to repent, the bishop reportedly responded, ‘I don’t know.’” (Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, 1999, pp. 192-3.)

HH. President Benson “Pretty Much a Vegetable” While President. “Many years ago I had a neighbor—let’s call him Mitch—who worked as a trauma nurse at LDS Hospital. He was a returned missionary, a husband and father, and an active member of our ward. One of his patients at the time was President Ezra Taft Benson, who had suffered a severe stroke. My memory of the specifics is somewhat cloudy after so many years, but a Church spokesperson had released a statement about President Benson’s condition that upset Mitch. The statement

must have at least assured the public that President Benson was responding well to treatment and conversing with his wife, because Mitch's response was: 'When you've had two massive brain hemorrhages, you're pretty much a vegetable. President Benson doesn't recognize his wife. And he's not talking with any-body.' Why, he then asked me, was the Church telling lies? I really didn't have a good answer for him at that time, but I think I could offer one today.

"This episode was probably not the only reason for Mitch's eventual decisions—he left both the Church and his family—but it certainly didn't help him any. He apparently never came to understand what I first began to comprehend only after years of Church employment. Still, Mitch's question is worth considering. Why *did* the Church release a statement that was not truthful? Somebody, I would guess, failed to grasp the concept introduced above, that the Church doesn't have to be perfect to be true. I can imagine someone reasoning, with that common combination of good intentions and faulty logic, that if the Church is true, then it *has to* be perfect, and in a perfect Church the prophet can't be mentally incapacitated. Not only that, but this person (or perhaps committee) probably assumed that if the truth about President Benson's condition were made public, the public would get the wrong impression. Members who are weak in their faith would certainly lose their testimonies if they found out the prophet was in a vegetative state, because that would mean 'continuous revelation through a living prophet' wasn't really continuous." (Roger Terry, "Why the True Church Cannot Be Perfect," *Dialogue*, Spring 2013, 95-6.)

II. Resignations at BYU. The *Arizona Republic* carried the following story October 10, 1993: "Last month, John Beck, 33, of Provo, resigned the church and quit his job as a BYU business professor. 'My problems had to do with the ethics of the university,' he said, 'which comes down to their not telling the truth. They are firing people not for the reasons they say.' His wife, Martha Nibley Beck, 30, daughter of famed pro-church scholar Hugh Nibley, said she left her job as a BYU sociology professor in July after the school removed Carol Lee Hawkins as leader of the Women's Symposium. . . . 'The church is moving toward social isolation,' Martha Beck said. . . . BYU spokeswoman Margaret Smoot said that the removal of Hawkins was routine. . . . However, Smoot's predecessor, Paul Richards, 57, who left BYU last year, ridiculed that notion. . . . 'I worked in public affairs for the church for 13 years, and I had to lie all the time.'" (*Arizona Republic*, Oct. 10, 1993; quoted in *Salt Lake City Messenger*, No. 85 (November 1993).)

JJ. LDS Participants Silenced. In the preface to her 1996 book, *Friendly Fire: The ACLU in Utah*, Linda Sillitoe thanked those who helped her gather information. Then she noted, "Missing, regrettably are the perspectives of the political emissaries of the LDS church, who interacted with ACLU leaders but were not permitted to give interviews." (Linda Sillitoe, *Friendly Fire: The ACLU in Utah*, 1996, p. viii.)

KK. Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Brigham Young. In 1997 the Church published a 370-page lesson manual to be used by the priesthood quorums and the Relief Society. It immediately drew comments because of information left out. In the entire manual, for instance, there was no mention of polygamy. Only his first wife was mentioned. Whenever Young is quoted on any subject and mentions "wives," the editors have substituted the word "[wife]." Nothing was said of his Adam-God doctrine or of blood atonement, or his clearly racist remarks about blacks and slavery. The manual was squeaky clean about any controversy during his administration.

2. In the introduction to this manual, the editors caution readers against consulting outside source materials: ". . . the sources cited will not be readily available to most members. These original sources are not necessary to have in order to effectively study or teach from this book. Members need not purchase additional references and commentaries to study or teach these chapters. The text provided in this book, accompanied by the scriptures is sufficient for instruction." A special instruction to teachers notes: "Carefully avoid controversy." (*Teachings of Presidents of the Church: Brigham Young*, 1997, p. vi.)

LL. Limits on Teaching Materials. At the October 1999 general conference, Apostle Dallin H. Oaks said: "As I have visited in quorums and Relief Societies, I have generally been pleased and impressed at how these *Teachings of Presidents of the Church* are being presented and received. However, I have sometimes observed teachers who gave the designated chapter no more than a casual mention and then presented a lesson and invited

discussion on other materials of the teacher's choice. That is not acceptable. A gospel teacher is not called to choose the subject of the lesson but to teach and discuss what has been specified." ("Gospel Teaching," *Ensign*, November 1999, p. 80. This statement was repeated in the *Ensign*, March 2000, p. 39.)

MM. Institute Text Book. The textbook that is used throughout the institute system for classes in Mormon history "devotes four pages to the Haun's Mill Massacre of 1838 in which 17 Missouri Mormons were mercilessly slaughtered, including a young boy. The story legitimately stresses the persecutions of early Mormons. By contrast, the Mountain Meadows Massacre of 1857, [is] described in two pages, [and] is not indexed in the history textbook." (Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, 1999, p. 230)

VII. Twenty-First Century Censorship

A. Arrington's Papers. "Just two weeks after Utah State University opened to researchers an extensive collection of papers, notes and documents donated by famed Mormon historian Leonard J. Arrington, the school is battling the LDS Church over ownership of some of the material. USU has agreed to 'temporarily sequester' some of the materials from the public until it resolves the dispute. The state-run university in Logan and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints released a joint statement late Wednesday that said the church 'has learned that the Arrington collection includes some private and confidential materials which the church believes are owned by the church or its affiliated entities, and not owned by Leonard Arrington or subject to his disposition.' Arrington, who died in 1999, was the church's official historian from 1972 to 1982 and had full access to its collection of historical documents, including letters, journals, diaries and correspondence of church leaders. Drawing on those primary sources, he wrote dozens of articles and books, including a biography of Brigham Young. Stan Albrecht, USU's provost, said the church is concerned about three categories of material: papers it says Arrington had access to but was never given permission to copy; material sent to Arrington in his official capacity as church historian; and material created or generated by Arrington in that capacity. Albrecht would not elaborate except to say the sensitive material includes transcripts of early church leaders' correspondence and diaries. . . . Employees from the LDS Church's Archives—seven men and one woman—showed up at the USU Library on Oct. 15 and spent the next four days poring over the collection, file by file and box by box. Two USU students observed the group at work. 'Visit Special Collections and you will see it in all its frenzied glory,' Robert Sidford and Ryan Swanson wrote in a letter published in the school's newspaper. 'You may be lucky enough to overhear the motives of these individuals rifling through several linear feet of manuscripts. Identify anything 'embarrassing to the church' so we can 'put it under wraps.' The Arrington papers, which fill 658 acid-free boxes and were last appraised at \$100,000, are the library's largest and possibly most valuable collection. In 1985, the historian willed his collection to USU, which he considered as having more open access than other institutions. He began sending materials to the school — where he taught economics for 26 years—a decade later. The papers once included transcriptions of Young's letters, journals and correspondence made by Edyth Romney, who worked for years as a secretary in the LDS historical department. The Romney transcriptions eventually were returned to the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute of Church History at Brigham Young University, which owned them. Utah State decided not to make copies of the Romney transcripts, Ann Buttars, USU's director of special collections, has said, because 'there were too many of them.' But Buttars acknowledged there might be a few copies hidden with other papers in the collection. Arrington wanted everything except his own journals, which he requested be sealed for 10 years, to be available to researchers. Albrecht said Utah State will do whatever it can to honor its legal commitment to Arrington. 'His wish was that we catalog those papers and . . . that those papers be made available for research. We really have received a deeded gift. The question is have we received something that is in fact owned by the church,' Albrecht said. Those are complex legal questions the university prefers to deliberate directly with the church, he said. But the matter could end up in court." (Peggy Fletcher Stack and Kirsten Stewart, *Salt Lake Tribune*, Oct. 25, 2001, p. B1.)

1. "At least some historians and even church members were bothered by the Church's claim on part of the collection. John Hatch, a 'lifelong believing and faithful Mormon' who was a supervisor at Church-owned Deseret Book, even went so far as to write a letter to *The Salt Lake Tribune* saying he was 'appalled' at the

Church's claim and adding 'The Church should be ashamed of itself,' he wrote. According to a later report in that newspaper, Hatch was fired by Deseret Book after the letter was printed, although the company won't say why." (Kent Larsen, *Mormon News*, Nov. 25, 2001.)

B. Curriculum Manuals. Duane Jeffery, a zoology professor at BYU, spoke about the 2001 Melchizedek Priesthood/Relief Society lesson manual featuring Joseph F. Smith: "Many here will have undoubtedly run into lesson number 37, which has to do with our being the sons and daughters of God. It builds its entire presentation around the November 1909 First Presidency statement on the origin of man, but it totally ignores everything else that happened in the Joseph F. Smith administration. I talked with a friend of mine who's a member of that writing committee and said, 'You know, you put us in a real bind. We in the sciences first of all have to try to reconcile the gospel with demonstrable realities in the sciences, but now you've put us in a position where we have to reconcile Joseph F. Smith with the present church. It makes this even more difficult to do—and to try to defend you as a writing committee—when it is obvious to our students that you have not been honest with the Joseph F. Smith materials.'" The manual presented a one-sided look at evolution without mentioning that in 1909 (and many times since) the First Presidency specifically stated that the Church has no official position for or against evolution—including the possibility of pre-Adamites. (Duane Jeffery, *Dialogue*, Winter 2002, p. 8.)

1. Jeffery continued: "[My friend] said, 'Oh my, I'm afraid we just didn't bring ourselves up to speed on Joseph F. Smith and science,' and I had to say, 'Well yes, that's a nice statement, but what will we do about it in the future?' I had heard rumors that the next manual would be excerpts from John Taylor, and I had great concerns that they might use a passage from John Taylor wherein he says that new species cannot be generated. I pointed out to my friend that we've been making species since about 1926 or 1927. In that same statement—and this never gets quoted by the anti-science writers—President Taylor said that chemical elements cannot change from one to another. So I said, 'You don't go to Hiroshima and tell people the atom can't be split and made into new kinds of atoms, because it jolly well can.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 8.)

a. The John Taylor manual came out in 2003. Chapter 1 quotes President Taylor's *Mediation and Atonement*: "[Christ] did not originate from a chaotic mass of matter, moving or inert, but came forth possessing, in an embryonic state, all the faculties and powers of a God. And when he shall be perfected, and have progressed to maturity, he will be like his Father—a God, being indeed His offspring. As the horse, the ox, the sheep, and every living creature, including man, propagates its own species and perpetuates its own kind, so does God perpetuate his." The quotation stops before including John Taylor's conclusion that species are fixed by immutable law, and the elements can not be changed. (See John Taylor, *Mediation and Atonement*, 1882, pp. 163-165.)

C. Joseph F. Smith Papers Historian Kathleen Flake noted in a 2004 book: "Access to Joseph F. Smith's papers and those of a majority of the church's apostles is highly restricted by the L.D.S. Church. Even the publication in December 2002 of nearly a half-million pages of archival material does not include Smith's journals for the years coinciding with the Smoot hearings. See SC, 1:26. Likewise, with very few exceptions, references to the hearing appear to have been removed from the published version of Smith's letterbooks. See SC, 1:27-30." (Kathleen Flake, *The Politics of American Religious Identity: The Seating of Senator Reed Smoot, Mormon Apostle*, 2004, p. 199.)

1. "[Senator Reed] Smoot's journals for the years of the hearing through 1908 have not been found." (*Ibid.*, p. 209, f23.)

D. Silencing BYU Faculty. "Current BYU professors have of necessity learned to exercise self-censorship. Darron Smith was denied contract renewal as an adjunct sociology teacher after a 2003 article saying the church should do more to eliminate racial 'folklore.' There were three other dustups in 2006. Todd Hendricks, the university staff member who advised student government, was fired after writing a letter to the student newspaper that criticized the process for choosing candidates for student office. The school did not renew part-time philosophy instructor Jeffrey Nielsen's contract after he wrote a *Salt Lake Tribune* article against the

church's call for adding a ban on gay marriage in the U. S. Constitution.” (Richard N. Ostling and Joan K. Ostling, *Mormon America: The Power and the Promise*, 2nd edition, 2007, p. 239.)

E. Why is BYU Paper So Conservative? The following exchange took place at a BYU Q&A session in November 2005: “Q. How does the *Daily Universe* control BYU standards? It seems like often papers are supposed to be wide-open news, but *The Daily Universe* usually seems to be ultra-conservative. “A. The control is in our audience, not in our publisher. People here don’t want a lot of liberal views; there’s no market for it. There have only been a handful of things we’ve ever shied away from covering. We cover the things that are happening around here; there aren’t very many liberal things that happen at BYU. The only thing we really avoid covering is vulgarity or profanity. Everything else is fair game. A copy of our paper does arrive to the First Presidency.” (*BYU NewsNet*, Nov. 11, 2005.)

F. President Kimball’s Biography. In 2005, Edward L. Kimball, son of President Spencer W. Kimball, wrote a fairly definitive biography of his father’s years as President of the Church. In the preface he noted: “I had access to correspondence files in my parent’s home office, but not to the correspondence kept at my father’s Church office.” (Edward L. Kimball, *Lengthen Your Stride: The Presidency of Spencer W. Kimball*, 2005, p. xv.)

1. Conflicts Between Author and Publisher. The book was published by Deseret Book. A “Publisher’s Preface” indicates there were many conflicts on what should appear in the book: “In this case, the publisher and the biographer do not agree on the interpretations or weight of importance given to a number of events, or the choices of characterization of some of the people. The author and the publisher have had open and energetic discussions on these issues, and there has been some give and take in the editorial process. The resulting book reflects a compromise between the two points of view.” (*Ibid.*, p. ix.)

2. Unusual Compromise. Fortunately for the reader, the compromise involved including a CD with all of the author’s notes and materials Deseret Book did not include in the printed volume. By reading the CD rather than the book, one gets both perspectives. The regular text of the book is published in blue type on the CD, while the material (and extensive notes) deleted by Deseret Book appear in black type. All of the sensitive material is in black type, and will be missed by those just reading the book. It is instructive to note that virtually all controversial or even modestly unflattering observations appear only on the CD.

G. Unhireability of Michael Quinn. “In 1993, the Mormon church excommunicated D. Michael Quinn, one of the world’s foremost authorities on the faith, whose writings had frequently contradicted the church’s traditional history. Now, he has become a pariah in some higher-education circles as well. Although Mormon studies is a fast-growing academic discipline, Mr. Quinn—a former professor at Mormon-run Brigham Young University and the author of six books on Mormon history—can’t find a job. In 2004, he was the leading candidate for openings at two state universities. Both rejected him. At least three other secular schools plan new professorships in Mor-mon studies, but he appears to be a long shot for these posts, too—not because he lacks qualifications, but because almost all the funding for the jobs is coming from Mormon donors. ‘At this point, I’m unhireable,’ says the 62-year-old scholar, who lives with his mother to save money in this town east of Los Angeles.” (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

1. Universities in Utah. U.S. universities have usually hired religious-studies professors regardless of whether they practiced or admired the faiths they researched. But some universities are bending to the views of private donors and state legislators by hiring the faithful. ‘If you want to succeed in Mormon studies you have to make compromises and you have to tread gently,’ says Colleen McDannell, a professor of American religions at the University of Utah. ‘Michael would not do that.’ W. Rolfe Kerr, commissioner of education for the LDS Church, said Mr. Quinn is ‘highly regarded in his discipline’ and the church would not ‘campaign against him’ for any academic post. However, Mr. Kerr said, ‘there may be a perception’ of Mr. Quinn in the Mormon community ‘that would cause him, in the eyes of some, to be less acceptable.’ Some professors at both state universities that rejected Mr. Quinn say fear of offending Mormons played a role. Deans at the universities deny that.” (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

2. Experience at BYU. “Mr. Quinn's battles with the church and BYU have shadowed his career. Born in Pasadena, Calif., he is a seventh-generation Mormon on his mother's side. She raised him in her faith after his Catholic father divorced her. Mr. Quinn became curious about Mormon history in high school, when a friend gave him a memoir about a Mormon leader who practiced polygamy after the church banned the practice in 1890. ‘I was jolted by the reality that there could be a public stance and private behavior that contradicted each other,’ he says. After graduating from BYU, Mr. Quinn earned his doctorate at Yale, and then joined the BYU faculty in 1976. He buried himself in the church archives, typing thousands of pages of notes that would provide raw material for his articles and books. Such research ran into head winds in the 1980s as the church restricted access to documents. . . . Mr. Quinn nonetheless published articles on sensitive subjects such as one in 1985 that suggested church leaders tolerated polygamy after officially prohibiting it. He says BYU restricted his research and denied him travel money. In 1988, he resigned from the university. BYU says it didn't force him to go. Five years later, the president of his Salt Lake City stake. . . handed Mr. Quinn a letter citing examples of his alleged apostasy. They included his public criticism of the church for limiting dissent and an article maintaining that Joseph Smith treated Mormon women more equally than the church does today. He was soon excommunicated along with four [sic] other scholars. Mr. Quinn's personal life contributed to his estrangement from the church. The father of four was divorced in 1985 and came out publicly as a homosexual in 1996 when he published a book about same-sex friendships and romances in 19th-century Mormonism. The church condemns homosexual behavior. Mr. Quinn says he still believes in the ‘fundamentals’ of Mormonism but doesn't practice the faith.” (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

3. Church Interceded at Yale. “Supporting himself on research grants and fellowships, Mr. Quinn cemented his scholarly reputation by publishing four books on Mormon history between 1994 and 1998, including a two-volume study of the church's interactions with politics and American society. In 1999, he began pursuing a full-time faculty job, to no avail. Few secular schools at the time sought a specialist in Mormonism. In 2003, when he was a visiting professor at Yale University, BYU threatened to withdraw funding for a conference it was co-sponsoring with Yale on Mormonism if Mr. Quinn was allowed to speak there, according to the conference's organizer, Kenneth West. Noel Reynolds, a longtime BYU administrator and now a Mormon mission president in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., says the university was concerned that ‘the conference not be used to promote personalities or personal complaints about the church.’ Yale officials insisted on the participation of Mr. Quinn, who ultimately resolved the dispute by agreeing to introduce the keynote speaker rather than give a scholarly paper.” (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

4. Fear at University of Utah. “The following year, Mr. Quinn was the only finalist for a tenured professorship in Utah and Mormon history at the University of Utah. At Mr. Quinn's request, Thomas Alexander, a BYU historian, wrote a recommendation for him. But while Prof. Alexander praised him as a scholar and teacher in his recommendation, he advised against hiring Mr. Quinn, warning that the Mormon-dominated state legislature might cut the public university's funding. When Mr. Quinn came to the school's Salt Lake City campus for a job interview, history professor James Clayton hosted a reception for him. Prof. Clayton had been Mr. Quinn's friend for years, and joined him in criticizing church censorship. He describes Mr. Quinn as the second-best historian of Mormonism, behind retired Columbia University professor Richard Bushman. Nevertheless, when Utah's faculty voted on whether to offer Mr. Quinn the job, Prof. Clayton opposed him. Now retired, he says: ‘There was a concern by several of us in the department that Mike was not the right person to head up any kind of Mormon history or Mormon studies program given the fact he's very publicly excommunicated. There would be quite a number of people in the Mormon community who would look unfavorably on that. That gave me pause.’ Robert Newman, dean of humanities at Utah, says the history department decided against hiring Mr. Quinn because his research presentation wasn't strong enough [!] and most of his books weren't published by university presses. Utah eventually downgraded the opening to an assistant professorship and filled it with an active Mormon church member.” (*Ibid.*)

5. Arizona State University. “Soon another school beckoned. Arizona State University's department of religious studies recommended to the university administration that Mr. Quinn be offered a one-year appointment for 2004-05. It was starting a doctoral-degree program with a focus on religion in the Americas.

Aware that Mr. Quinn was controversial, the faculty took pains to stress to administrators that his scholarship was first-rate, says Tracy Fessenden, a professor of American religions. A public university with 61,500 students, Arizona State has been cultivating Mormon students and donors—for example, by letting students resume receiving scholarships after returning from Mormon missionary work, says ASU president Michael Crow. Many of Arizona's Mormons, about 6 percent of the state's population, are concentrated in the Phoenix area near the university. Ira Fulton, a Mormon home builder in Prescott, Ariz., has given the school at least \$155 million since 2003. Mr. Fulton says the school has 3,700 Mormon students, and 'I'd like to have 6,000, 7,000, 8,000 or 10,000. They'll make ASU a better university.' ASU's administration vetoed Mr. Quinn's hiring. Simon Peacock, then associate dean for personnel, says Mr. Quinn lacked expertise to teach Christianity and Judaism courses left uncovered by a professor's departure. Mr. Peacock says Mr. Quinn's excommunication was discussed but had no effect on the decision. However, the chairman of the religious-studies department, Joel Gereboff, wrote in an email to faculty that Dean Peacock and another dean asked him to review the 'risks and benefits' of the hire and 'thought that it is probably not wise to undertake such risks' for a one-year appointment. Prof. Gereboff says the deans were referring to the risk of alienating the Mormon community. Several professors criticized the decision. 'What the administration is doing is as wrong as racial or sexual discrimination,' James Foard, a religious-studies professor, emailed colleagues. The administrators stood their ground. Prof. Gereboff says he could 'live with' the deans' decision. 'We exercise sensitivity. We don't exercise censorship,' he says. Mr. Fulton, the donor, says he doesn't get involved in faculty hiring. He calls Mr. Quinn a 'nothing person.'" (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

6. New Program at Claremont. "At least three other schools are contemplating chairs in Mormon studies—Claremont Graduate University, the University of Wyoming and Utah State. At Claremont, the school of religion has nearly completed raising \$5 million for a Mormon studies chair to be named after Howard W. Hunter, a late president of the church. Nearly all the money has come from Mormon businessmen in the state, the school says. Prof. Torjesen, the religion-school dean, traveled to church headquarters in Salt Lake City to build rapport with church leaders. The school's Mormon-studies advisory council includes two BYU professors among its dozen members. Claremont says it prefers that the holder of the chair have access to church archives in Salt Lake City, a privilege sometimes denied dissidents. Mr. Quinn's access, withdrawn on his excommunication, was restored in 1997 and the church has made more documents available in recent years. Asked whether Mr. Quinn might be hired, Claremont's associate dean of religion, Patrick Horn, replies: 'Probably not.'" (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

7. University of Wyoming. "At Wyoming, where Mormons comprise about 10 percent of students, a committee headed by a professor of Spanish, Kevin Larsen, is exploring a Mormon-studies professorship. Mr. Larsen, himself a Mormon bishop, says he wouldn't rule out critics of the faith for such a post. But he says he has explained to church leaders that 'it's not going to be a chair of anti-Mormon studies.' Wyoming is also sponsoring a lecture series on Mormonism. Prof. Larsen says the local Mormon stake provided several hundred dollars for the lectures through a Mormon student group." (*Ibid.*)

8. Utah State University. "Utah State has attracted more than 50 donors, most of them Mormons, for a professorship in Mormon history. History chairman Norman Jones says it's premature to discuss job candidates. He says the university will look for 'a person who can get along with everybody. We know what the minefields are, and we're trying to avoid them.' (*Ibid.*)

9. No Income. "Mr. Quinn says his only significant income since leaving Yale was a \$40,000 bequest from a Los Angeles doctor, contingent on his writing a biography of his late benefactor. So far, he has received \$15,000, with the balance to come when the book is finished. In the meantime, Mr. Quinn sleeps on a futon in his mother's condominium and says he can't afford health insurance, car repairs or Internet access. His library of books on Mormon and American social history lies boxed up in her garage and closets." (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 10, 2006.)

H. New Church Film. On December 23, 2005, Joseph Smith's 200th birthday, the Church unveiled a new film on the life of Joseph Smith the Prophet, which was to be shown indefinitely in the Joseph Smith

Memorial Building theater. The film is a dramatic and moving account of the life of Joseph, and highlights many of his trials and accomplishments. Polygamy is never mentioned in the film, though the young prophet had at least 35 wives, and was turned down by another ten or more women he asked to marry him, but who refused.

I. Church Preoccupation. In an article for *New Yorker Magazine*, “[Lawrence] Wright describes how during his interview with [President Gordon B.] Hinckley, three Church bureaucrats placed tape recorders alongside his own. Whether Wright means it to sound menacing or amusing, the anecdote suggests a Church preoccupied with controlling information.” (John-Charles Duffy, *Dialogue*, Spring 2006, p. 20.)

J. Why *Dialogue* Publishes So Few Conservative Articles. Robert A. Rees, a former *Dialogue* editor, responded to a reader who asked why there are not more conservative articles in *Dialogue*: “I know that I made a number of attempts to get conservative scholars to participate. Some did, but that was before there was an official pronouncement about ‘alternative voices’ (which, fairly or unfairly, many assumed was code for *Dialogue* and *Sunstone*) or the prohibition against CES [seminary and institute teachers] and BYU faculty publishing in *Dialogue* and *Sunstone* (the only such prohibition in American higher education, as far as I know). Cutting off a large portion of available conservative voices has made it difficult for *Dialogue* to achieve the balance it desires. I was always disappointed when conservative (or even moderate) scholars refused our invitation.” He adds, “I don’t know everyone on the current staff, board of directors, and editorial board; but a significant majority of those I do know consider themselves to be faithful members of the Church.” (*Dialogue*, Summer 2006, pp. 173-4.)

K. *Ensign* Stories Censored After the Fact. The *Ensign* ran an article by Oleg Barabash, 27, in the October 2006 issue of the magazine. The article, “I Will Never Go to Church Again,” was removed from the online version currently posted at www.lds.org when the author, a student at BYU, pleaded guilty to lewdness involving a twelve-year-old boy. “The article and the accompanying illustration were replaced without editorial comment by a testimonial by a different author entitled ‘Groceries or Tithing.’ Although it is highly unusual for the *Ensign* to censor articles after publication, Mormon cybersleuths have also noticed that an October 1972 [article] calling for environmental protection, written by feminist and activist Helen Candland Stark and entitled ‘Another Kind of Tithe,’ was never included in either the online or CD-ROM editions of the *Ensign*.” (“People: Censored—Oleg Barabash,” *Sunstone*, November 2006, p. 76.)

L. Reaction of General Authorities to *Rough Stone Rolling*. In writing his book, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling*, author Richard Bushman had to worry about what might happen to him as a result of writing not-always-positive things about Joseph Smith. In a personal diary he wrote: “I am getting enough feedback to be convinced many Mormons will be happy with the book. Dennis wanted to know if I expected criticism from the General Authorities. I have no idea. I also heard from a person planning a meeting for LDS chaplains that I had been invited to address. He reported that his advisers had turned down his nomination of me as a speaker. Was that a sign of something? I can see resistance on the grounds of my becoming too much of an authority on the Prophet. Whether or not they agree with the book, the General Authorities don’t like someone like me taking control of interpretation. They objected to FARMS on those grounds after they seemed to be monopolizing Book of Mormon interpretation. The Brethren become uneasy when someone gets too many readers. I can envision a cancellation of the big party Deseret Book is planning for October 27 in the Joseph Smith Memorial Building. That comes too close to an endorsement. [The signing was changed from an evening at the JSMB to a noon signing at the downtown Deseret Book store.] . . . Many of these brethren will not be thrilled with what I write . . . I know I will have supporters among a few General Authorities, but they may not be in a position to speak up if the book comes under attack.” (Richard L. Bushman, *On the Road with Joseph Smith: An Author’s Diary*, 2007, p. 24.)

1. “My purpose in writing the book . . . was to present all of Joseph Smith as far as I could grasp him. I worry about the young Latter-day Saints who learn only about the saintly Joseph and are shocked to discover his failings. The problem is that they may lose faith in the entire teaching system that brought them along. If their teachers covered up Joseph Smith’s flaws, what else are they hiding? My aim was to make the whole story of this man part of common knowledge in the Church.” (*Ibid.*, p. 121.)

M. One Word Change in Introduction to the Book of Mormon. "A one-word change in the introduction to a 2006 edition of the Book of Mormon has re-ignited discussion among some Latter-day Saints about the book's historicity, geography and the descendants of those chronicled within its pages. The book is considered scripture by members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and many lifelong members grew up believing that American Indians are direct descendants of ancient people in the book called Lamanites, who the book says built a civilization in the Americas between about 600 B.C. and 400 A.D. Past LDS Church leaders, particularly former church President Spencer W. Kimball, have made such statements, which have been supported by the introduction page in the Book of Mormon. Past editions of that page say all of the people chronicled in the book "were destroyed, except the Lamanites, and they are the *principal* ancestors of the American Indians." The new introduction reads much the same, but says the Lamanites "are *among* the ancestors of the American Indians." A Church spokesman said the introduction page in current LDS-produced books "was not part of the original text translated by Joseph Smith Jr.," adding it was written and published in 1981. The church declined comment on who [Elder Bruce R. McConkie] wrote that version of the page. Andrew Corbin, a senior editor at Doubleday, said the one-word change was specifically requested by the church for the second edition published in October 2006. "It's been out for quite a while, so if there are other questions about the text, the church can better answer that."

1. The change is significant for those who have questioned the book's claim to be a historical record of people who migrated to the Americas from Jerusalem, rather than a creation of LDS Church founder Joseph Smith, who said he translated it from plates given to him by an angel from God.

2. Claims in recent years by LDS anthropologist Thomas Murphy and former LDS molecular biologist Simon Southerton regarding the lack of a genetic connection to Hebrew blood in American Indians have caused spirited debate in some quarters about the book's origins. Southerton, a former bishop living in Australia, was excommunicated from the church after his writings appeared. Murphy was threatened with church discipline over his writings. Other Latter-day Saint scientists have challenged the assertions of both men, saying they draw conclusions well beyond those validated by existing data. Some observers have speculated the change was forced by the debate over DNA, but at least one LDS anthropologist said the change is welcome, although of minor consequence in the overall discussion regarding the Book of Mormon. It "eliminates a certain minor embarrassment in the use of language, that's all," said John L. Sorensen, professor emeritus of anthropology at Brigham Young University, adding it has no impact on the substance of the book itself. Sorensen's book, "An Ancient American setting for the Book of Mormon," outlines the "limited geography" theory and has become the definitive work to date on the topic among scholars. Its premise is that the book's characters lived within a fairly small region of Central America, rather than populating the entirety of North and South America, as some have speculated. He said several LDS scholars have noted for decades that the assumption about "principal ancestors" was inaccurate.

3. The late Elder Richard L. Evans, a member of the church's Quorum of the Twelve from 1953 to 1971, described the Book of Mormon as "part of a record both sacred and secular of prophets and people, who (with supplementary groups), were among the ancestors of the American Indians." The description — approved by the church's First Presidency—was printed in a book titled "Religions of America," by Leo Rosten, which was first published in London in 1957 and subsequently reprinted in 1963 and 1975, Sorensen said.

4. With questions among LDS scholars about its accuracy, why didn't the change come sooner? Sorensen said he believes it's simply "the principle of inertia." Such things are "not likely to be changed unless someone thinks there is something to be gained by making the change, or to be lost by not making the change." "I don't think it means very much for anyone," he said. "The assumptions may have been and may be in the minds of some that the previous phrasing had substance to it. As a matter of fact, it was a sheer accident of someone — probably (Elder) Bruce McConkie — regarding 'principal ancestors.' No one checked it or questioned it, so it was put in the introduction." Another change in the book's introduction may be of interest to those who question whether Latter-day Saints are Christians, but church officials declined comment about when that change was made. The second sentence of the introduction in many editions says the book is "a record of God's dealings with the

ancient inhabitants of the Americas and contains, as does the Bible, the fullness of the everlasting gospel." The 2004 edition produced by Doubleday for non-Latter-day Saints omits the phrase, "as does the Bible." A church spokesman declined comment on when the change was first made or an explanation of why. LDS leaders have long emphasized that the book is a second witness for Christ's gospel beyond what is contained in the Bible alone. (*Deseret Morning News*, Nov. 8, 2007.)

N. Vice-President Cheney's Visit to BYU. "An invitation to U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney to speak at BYU turned into a lively debate over the morality of the war in Iraq, testing the limits of free speech at BYU and prompting a group of students to organize an alternative graduation ceremony. . . . Four professors published a letter in BYU's *Daily Universe* asking the university to withdraw the invitation. 'From all indications, Cheney is responsible for the manipulation of intelligence used as a pretext for declaring war, the abuse of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and domestic wiretapping,' reads the letter signed by Kirk Dearden, Ralph Brown, Marie Cornwall, and Tim Heaton. 'There is every reason to question Cheney's ethics, including the conviction of his former chief of staff, Scooter Libby, Halliburton's financial gain for the bloodshed and many other scandals.'" Permission was finally given for a protest demonstration, very carefully controlled and limited to a small area. "As soon as the authorized time for the 4 April [2007] demonstration had elapsed, BYU security took possession of protesters' signs and ordered them out of the designated protest area. Local filmmaker Steven Greenstreet posted online video footage of the demonstrations that shows a large male BYU security employee leaning very close to the face of a female student in an intimidating manner as he orders her to move. . . . Also posted online is footage of BYU student Adam Barlow confronting BYU president Cecil L. Samuelson during a press conference. 'The Dick Cheney protest was limited to a small orange square.' Barlow complains to Samuelson. 'As soon as the clock struck 1:00, very large men in suits started intimidating students and forcibly confiscating their signs. . . . Why does the university so severely limit free speech, and what is the school so afraid of?' On camera, Samuelson dismisses the question by saying, 'The school is not afraid of anything, Adam. Thanks for your input. Next question.'" ("Cheney's BYU Visit Triggers Protests, Alternative Commencement." *Sunstone* (June 2007): 76-77.

O. Biographies of Church Presidents. The *2008 Church Almanac*, like those before it, includes brief biographies of all of the presidents of the Church. The article for Joseph Smith mentions his marriage to Emma Hale, but says nothing about the more than thirty additional wives he took. Brigham Young's biography not only leaves out all of his 56 polygamous wives, but—apparently to avoid the subject entirely—does not mention his first wife, either. The entry for John Taylor states, "He and his wife, Leonora, joined the Church in 1836," but says nothing about his 14 plural wives. The entries for Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, Joseph F. Smith and Heber J. Grant also mention no wives. The entries for George Albert Smith and all the presidents who followed him (all of whom were monogamists) carefully mention the name of the wife and the date of their wedding. In the case of Joseph Fielding Smith, who married three wives, but only one at a time, the names and dates of all three are included.

P. New Book's Odd Background. A new book taking a sociological look at Mormonism was written by a mix of LDS and non-LDS authors. The two co-editors are both faculty members at BYU. However, a day-long seminar to discuss the book was held at Utah Valley State College, and the book was published by the University of Utah Press. A review of the book, printed in the *Deseret Morning News* and written by a DN staff writer, forthrightly suggests the reason for this strange arrangement: "Sociologists' most recent take on The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was edited by faculty at church-owned Brigham Young University, but published by the University of Utah Press—a fact that, for longtime Utahns, may illustrate just how much has or hasn't changed in the past half-century for a faith that continues to draw both curiosity and scrutiny. . . . Information isn't always easy to obtain, because the church doesn't share its own research and keeps detailed membership information confidential." (New Book's Odd Background. Carrie A. Moore, *Deseret Morning News*, March 1, 2006, p. E1.)

1. BYU Official Afraid of Results. "Another challenge: 'The Mormon community isn't always excited about how social scientists study them. If the results are positive, that's great, but if the results are negative, that's not so good.' For example, [BYU professor Tim] Heaton said, "the editors approached a BYU

official about hosting a conference to discuss the book's findings, but 'he was afraid the press would show up and publish something that sounded negative, so he said he would rather not have the conference there. If you talk to Mormons and share something that's positive about Mormons, they love it. If it's negative, *you* become suspect.'" (*Ibid.*, p. E3.) Emphasis added.

Q. Missionary Department Records Closed to Researchers. In an article printed in the Fall 2009 *Journal of Mormon History*, Jessie L. Embry, the associate director of the Charles Redd Center for Western Studies and a research associate professor at BYU, in an article titled "Preaching Through Playing: Sports and Recreation in Missionary Work, 1911-64, noted: "The records of the Missionary Department of the Church are not available to researchers . . ." (Jessie L. Embry and John H. Branbaugh, *Journal of Mormon History*, Fall 2009, p. 57.)

R. Additional Records Gradually Surface. In their efforts to answer charges raised by various critics of different events in Church history, Church historians sometimes cause additional historical material to be released. An example of this came to light in 2009: "Through the recent efforts of historians researching the Mountain Meadows Massacre, a large collection of previously uncataloged documents at the LDS Church History Library was made available for investigation. As a result, Don Bradley obtained access to a folder containing Andrew Jenson's research notes, which he used to write 'Plural Marriage,' *Historical Record*, 6 (July 1887): 6:219-40. Don has concluded that, as part of Jenson's own research, he first approached Malissa Lott and obtained information on thirteen of Joseph Smith's plural wives, writing their names on Document 1. He met with Eliza R. Snow who apparently took the paper into her own hands and penned thirteen additional names. Eliza's handwriting has many distinctive features and historian Jill Mulvay Derr, an expert on Eliza R. Snow, reviewed the document and concluded that the thirteen names have 'every indication' of being penned personally by Eliza. Clearly they are not in Andrew Jenson's handwriting." (Brian C. Hales, "Fanny Alger and Joseph Smith's Pre-Nauvoo Reputation," *Journal of Mormon History*, Fall 2009, p. 143.)

S. Paintings of Joseph Smith. In a 2009 book review of Brian and Petrea Kelly's *Illustrated History of the Church*, reviewer Zachary R. Jones notes: "[M]ost all visual portrayals of Joseph Smith in the volume are modern paintings (post-1970) often used in LDS Sunday School lessons, which functions to uphold the laudatory personality-cult perception of a handsome, charismatic, and gentle prophet of the Lord." (Zachary R. Jones, *Journal of Mormon History*, Fall 2009, p. 266.)

T. Conference Talks Censored. There is growing confirmation that a number of general conference talks have been changed after they were initially delivered. Here is evidence of several:

1. Addresses of Brigham Young. I have spent quite a bit of time in my life reading the conference talks and sermons contained in the *Journal of Discourses*. Many of them are startling and even shocking, and I have been surprised that they ever made it into print. In a 2009 article, Philip L. Barlow surprised me with his notation that, as powerful as some of Brigham's sermons are, at least a few were abbreviated and toned down before being printed in the *Journal of Discourses*. He mentions specifically two talks, JD 2:311, and 2:322. (Philip L. Barlow, "Roundtable on Mountain Meadows Massacre," *Dialogue*, Vol. 42 No. 1 [Spring 2009], p. 127 f5.)

2. Pres. Packer's Talk on Homosexual Feelings Altered. "Senior Mormon apostle Boyd K. Packer has modified his General Conference speech for the LDS Church's online publication to more closely reflect the faith's view that the cause of same-sex attraction is unknown and that the only sin is acting on those desires. Packer's speech about gay marriage, same-sex attraction, pornography and addiction ignited a firestorm of critiques, conversations and protests, particularly the suggestion that gays could "overcome" their attractions with enough faith. Perhaps the most controversial paragraph in Packer's text that he read Sunday said, "Some suppose that they were pre-set and cannot overcome what they feel are inborn tendencies toward the impure and unnatural. Not so! Why would our Heavenly Father do that to anyone? Remember he is our father." Now the word "temp-tations" has replaced "tendencies" and the question about God's motives has been removed entirely. Packer, next in line for the LDS Church presidency, changed his wording as part of a routine practice after every General

Conference, according to spokesman Scott Trotter, when speakers are given the opportunity to make “any edits necessary.” “President Packer has simply clarified his intent,” Trotter said Friday in a statement. While minor edits may be common, such substantive changes are rare. For instance, a general authority had to revise and retape a General Conference sermon he gave in 1984 that some saw as out of step with church teachings. In recent years, officials in the Utah-based Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have distinguished between same-sex attraction and gay relationships. “It’s no sin to have inclinations that if yielded to would produce behavior that would be a transgression,” apostle Dallin H. Oaks said in an interview posted on the church’s website, lds.org. “The sin is in yielding to temptation. Temptation is not unique. Even the Savior was tempted.” On the question of inborn tendencies, Oaks said “the church does not have a position on the causes of any of these susceptibilities or inclinations, including those related to same-gender attraction.” Packer’s original speech seemed to combine attractions and actions so his changes were “more in line with where the church has been moving,” said John Lynch, chairman of the board of FAIR, a group of Mormon apologists. “My interpretation is that he’s removing the question of [same-sex attraction] from the realm of nature-versus-nurture,” said Lynch, a California Mormon whose older brother was among the first to die in the AIDS epidemic. “He’s saying, regardless of cause, people still have to contend with their desires.” Lynch applauded Packer’s statements about overcoming challenges. “One would hope that God would not put you in a position where you had no opportunity to align with his standards,” he said. “President Packer was extending a hand of hope, [saying] it’s not hopeless.”

“Others were not so positive. Gary Watts, a former member of the LDS Church who has followed church statements about same-sex attraction, doesn’t see the edits as an improvement. “It leaves it out there like this is a temptation, like this is something one can choose,” said Watts, a Provo father of six grown children, including a gay son and a lesbian daughter. “They’re trying to edit it and soften it and make it better, but it’s not going to work. [The speech has] gone viral. Everyone knows what he said.” Packer and the church should have gone further in their subsequent statements, Watts argued. “It would be nice to have the church apologize and say they’re editing it because they’ve recognized that it’s caused a tremendous amount of hurt and discomfort,” he said. “I know many leaders of our church know that homosexuality is experienced honestly and involuntarily and is not amenable to significant change. I’m disappointed they don’t speak out.” Joe Solmonese, president of the Human Rights Campaign, was even more forceful. “People across this country still need to hear from Elder Packer that he was wrong and that his statements were dangerous,” Solmonese said in a statement. “Trying to rewrite history is simply not good enough. Elder Packer and the church must immediately and fully correct the factual record. Sexual orientation and gender identity is an immutable characteristic of being human and, no matter how hard you pray, that won’t change.” Packer’s revised speech does eliminate the rhetorical question about why God would give people a condition beyond their capacity to cope — one the apostle says a loving Heavenly Father never would do. That is a question that has engaged Christian thinkers for millennia. Rabbis even asked Jesus who caused a man to be blind, his parents or himself. Jesus answered, neither. The way Packer phrased the question was a “flash point among the membership, not only those paying close attention to issues of homosexuality and gay marriage,” said Rory Swensen, a Utah businessman and former board member of Sunstone, an issue-oriented Mormon magazine. “It rippled out in a way we haven’t seen before.” Swensen blogged about the question at timesandseasons.org. That was followed by a second thread about the question on the same site, soliciting dozens of responses. “It strikes at the heart of our belief about a personal God who is involved in our daily lives,” Swensen said. “There are really profound questions that remain to be answered.”

“One final change, besides some tightening, in the freshly edited speech is worth noting. In his original talk, Packer said the church’s 1995 statement, “The Family: A Proclamation to the World,” “qualifies according to scriptural definition as a revelation.” That descriptive phrase has now been omitted, leaving the proclamation simply described as “a guide that members of the church would do well to read and to follow.” That proclamation declared that “marriage between a man and a woman is ordained of God” and that “gender is an essential characteristic of individual premortal, mortal and eternal identity and purpose.” (Peggy Fletcher Stack, *Salt Lake Tribune*, October 9, 2010.)

3. Two Talks from October 1898. “Two addressed delivered in the October 1898 General Conference did not appear in the corresponding *Conference Report*: ‘Morality and Chastity,’ given by 40-year-old

apostle John W. Taylor, a son of President John Taylor, and ‘Response to Elder Taylor,’ by President George Q. Cannon, first counselor to President Lorenzo Snow. Both discourses were delivered 7 October 1898, and both were deleted from the official records of the conference and are not found in the *Conference Report* for that year. They do appear, though, in the fifth volume of Brian Stuy’s *Collected Discourses*.”

a. Pregnant Brides in Kamas. “Taylor began his talk benignly enough but then startled the audience by reporting conversations with unnamed men who accused members of the Kamas, Utah Ward of having a conspicuous number of already-pregnant brides . . . Of the Kamas Ward, Taylor told conference attendees: ‘I was informed that eight out of every ten of the marriages there have been of such character that the wives have had children before they were married. Now, I *can not* believe that in Rhode’s Valley the Latter-day Saints are so rotten, as this man stated. I *can not* believe that they have so thoroughly rotted in the valley.’” (Joseph Geisner, *Sunstone*, Issue 165, December 2011, 14-15.)

b. Tabernacle Choir Immorality. “Then, of the Tabernacle Choir: ‘While conversing with this gentleman another man came up, whose word I could not doubt, and he said: ‘I was informed by a lady in Salt Lake who keeps a morning house, that after the close of practices by the Tabernacle Choir, several members come to her rooming house for immoral purposes.’ After Taylor was finished, George Q. Morris immediately stepped to the podium, chastised Taylor for his remarks, and tried to soothe the feelings of the accused. ‘We have regretted—I speak here for the First Presidency—that there should be any mention of any particular place as being worse in this respect than others; for we have no reason to believe that this is the case.’ Cannon said that if there were a problem it should be handled in private, not public, setting. Brigham Young, Jr., recorded in his diary that during the session, . . . Bro Jno Taylor . . . made some very unwise remarks. Pres. Cannon said Bro. T[aylor] was wrong, had no right to speak on hearsay accusing innocent persons of immoral practices, laid some of it to his zeal. Pres. Geo. Q. C[annon] was very kind to Jno. and allayed feeling which was aroused against Jno. W. T[aylor].’” (*Ibid.*, 15.)

(1). Some Voted Against Taylor During Sustainings. “During the sustaining of the general authorities, held the Sunday after Taylor’s talk, ‘all were unanimous but in the case of John W. Taylor. Some few voted against him for remarks made on Friday about Kamas Ward and the Salt Lake Tabernacle Choir.’ Following the Sunday solemn assembly, Elder Taylor ‘met with the choir and arranged his troubled with them.’” (*Ibid.*, 15.)

4. Packer’s Talk on Proclamation on the Family was Changed. “During the October 2011 general conference, Elder Boyd K. Packer referred to the ‘Proclamation on the Family,’ as a ‘revelation; but this designation was later redacted in the official published version of the talk to ‘an inspired document.’ However, despite the weight of its authority as the position of the joint council of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve, it has not been canonized as scripture and, hence, is not (yet) binding as official Church doctrine.” (Duane E. Jennings, *Stumbling Blocks and Stepping Stones*, Vol. 1, 84, 2016.)

U. Francis M. Lyman Journal. In a book published in 2010, the author cites: “Francis M. Lyman Journal, August 3, 1893, LDS First Presidency office (access restricted).” (*Candid Insights of a Mormon Apostle: The Diaries of Abraham H. Cannon, 1889-1895*, edited by Edward Leo Lyman, 2010, p. 396 f10.)

V. Material Still Unavailable in 2012. “The problem [David John] Buerger faced when he set out to write the history of temple ritual [*The Mysteries of Godliness: A History of Mormon Temple Worship*, 1994] was not a lack of surviving records from which to construct that history. The records exist; the challenge is getting the gatekeepers at the LDS Church archives to release them. Berger was fortunate to be working during the ‘Arrington spring’ of the 1970s and early 1980s, when researchers could gain access to archival materials that had formerly been, and are now once again, more tightly restricted. (Materials currently restricted at the archives include temple-related records, General Authority minutes, General Authority diaries, and records of Church discipline.)” (John-Charles Duffy, in a book review, *Journal of Mormon History*, 38:3, Summer 2012, 254.)

W. More Candid Church History Seminary Manual. In 2014 the Church introduced a new manual to

be used for classes in Church history at the seminary level. In a lengthy online review, one blogger noted some new changes:

1. The new manual discusses the four accounts of the First Vision written by Joseph Smith, and five others written by others retelling his experience.
2. There is an entire chapter on the Mountain Meadows Massacre and the Utah War. It includes a statement by Pres. Henry B. Eyring at the 150 year anniversary of the massacre: “What was done long ago by members of our Church represents a terrible and inexcusable departure from Christian teaching and conduct.”
3. There is considerably more information about the papyrus fragments involved with the Pearl of Great Price, and a discussion that the manuscripts were far too recent to have been written by Abraham himself, adding: “It is common to refer to an author’s works as ‘his’ writings, whether he penned them himself, dictated them to others, or others copied his writing later.”
4. The new manual has an entire chapter on Joseph Smith’s plural marriages (Lesson 140) and mentions Post-Manifesto plural marriages and the efforts to make the Manifesto actual practice by 1904.
5. Material on the JS Translation of the Bible states: “Thus, the translation was more of an inspired revision than a traditional translation.
6. Lesson 157 discusses the historical circumstances surrounding the priesthood ban and President Kimball’s 1978 revelation. It includes the Official Declaration 2 background material printed in the 2013 edition of the scripture.
7. The manual straightforwardly says, “The 7,000 years (D&C 77:6-7) refers to the time since the Fall of Adam and Eve. It is not referring to the actual age of the earth including the periods of creation.” (I condensed this material from an online blog, but failed to record the name of the blogger or the address.)

X. Censorship Situation in 2018. In an article published in 2018, Robert Greenwall reported the following: “The papers of Marion G. Romney are currently closed to the public, and the author wishes to thank the Restricted Access Committee at the Church History Library for providing a copy of the correspondence for this study.” He then quotes from Romney’s correspondence in 1944. (Robert Greenwall, “One Devout Mormon’s Family’s Struggle with Racism,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, 51:3, Fall 2018, 166 f24.)

Y. Church No Longer Able to Control Its History. In an introductory essay on the gospel topics essays recently posted on *lds.org*, an unnamed author noted: “During its early years, Mormonism was the ‘new knowledge,’ shaking up the Christian myth. But when the Saints immigrated to Utah, Mormonism had the time and solitude to coalesce into its own myth, eventually reaching it apex during Correlation when the myth was codified. And the result worked rather well, keeping Mormon cohesion strong and giving Latter-day Saints a common vision. . . . But then the Internet happened. It was as if Pandora had opened another box, but instead of evils, information flew out, covering the earth. The Church could no longer shield its members from this teeming information environment simply by warning them away from particular publications or gatherings—the chaos was a part of the pool that everyone with an Internet connection was swimming in. Faithful early-morning seminary or Gospel Doctrine teachers—and even run-of-the-mill members—were now stumbling across information that the myth didn’t account for—and from credible sources. So, naturally, the myth started to lose its relevance, and people began leaving the Church in disconcerting numbers, not over offenses or commandment breaking or even boredom, but over mythology lag.” (Anonymous, “Exploring the Gospel Topics Essays.” *Sunstone*, Issue 178 (Summer 2015): 7.

1. Essay on the First Vision. “The First Vision essay, unlike some of the other Gospel Topics essays, is overly defensive in its rhetorical posture, and not without reason. Critics of the LDS Church have often delighted in pointing out that multiple accounts of the vision exist and that those accounts differ, most notably in that only one heavenly being is spoken of in the first account while in later accounts there are two. . . . The essay makes several points in its attempt to defend the historical reality of the First Vision. First, it takes the position that the existence of multiple accounts of the First Vision is something that is—or at least should be—well known to Latter-day Saints. This is in response to a long-standing criticism that the Church actively hides, or at least obfuscates, parts of its history so that it may present a more coherent and seamless narrative. . . . Most Latter-day Saints are exposed to Church teachings through three venues: the LDS scriptures, Gospel Doctrine and priest

hood/Relief Society manuals, and general conference addresses. The essay does not cite a single instance in which the multiple accounts of the First Vision are mentioned in these sources. In fact, the publication you would think most likely to offer such a reference, the Church's official *Teachings of the Presidents of the Church: Joseph Smith*, cites only the canonical 1838 version. A footnote indicates that although the quotations used in that chapter came from 'the official scriptural account [. . .] on several occasions Joseph Smith wrote or dictated detailed accounts of the First Vision.' However, it does not indicate that any differences exist among the versions. A typical reader or class participant, even one assiduous enough to read the footnotes, would not learn from this source anything other than that there is an official version and that 'detailed' accounts were given at other times. So while the LDS Church may not have actively attempted to hide the fact that multiple accounts of the First Vision exist, its curricular and scriptural architecture gave its members no reason to suspect that contradictory versions exist.'" (Stephen C. Taysom, "From North Star to Constellation: 'First Vision Accounts.'" *Sunstone*, Issue 178 (Summer 2015): 8-9.)

a. Entire Account is Manipulated. "Then the essay takes one more step: 'the 1832 account does not say that only one being appeared.' That is true; it is possible that two beings were present. It is equally possible that ten beings were present. Or a million. Or one. Setting aside the fact that reading the 1832 account in such a tortuous manner is historically unorthodox and bizarre, it is obvious that the reading is driven by the *a priori* assumption that two beings had to be present, because if this wasn't the case, a contradiction exists. As a piece of historical analysis, the Gospel Topics essay fails. But it is not intended to function as historical analysis; it is intended to function as a form of religious apologetics, and in this way, and by those rules, it succeeds. It manages to create a rhetorical space in which fundamental inconsistencies in one of Mormonism's most important origin stories are claimed never to have been denied, hidden, ignored, or deemphasized. It also manages to assert (though not actually argue) that the entire corpus of First Vision narratives is characterized by consistency, redefining evident inconsistencies as incidental details. The essays will change few minds. But it can possibly shift how the First Vision is thought of among Mormons: away from a single event with one story toward a single event with a constellation of mutually supportive tellings." (*Ibid.*, 9.)

Reed Wahlquist

Compiled By

© April 2019