

A PRIESTLY ROLE FOR A PROPHETIC CHURCH: THE RLDS CHURCH AND BLACK AMERICANS

WILLIAM D. RUSSELL

IN RECENT YEARS many RLDS Church members have been proud of the fact that the church has been ordaining blacks into the priesthood since early in its history. Sometimes they have made unfavorable comparisons between RLDS policy and that of their cousins in Utah who denied holy orders to black men and women until last year when half of the restriction was lifted.

I suspect some of these RLDS members were disappointed when the General Authorities in Utah announced the change in racial policy, for no longer will the RLDS be able to cite racial exclusion as one of the "differences that persist" between the two churches. But that did not mean the RLDS would be prevented from getting in one last lick. In response to a UPI story that ran in the Independence (Mo.) *Examiner* on June 10, 1978, the Acting Director of the Public Information Office wrote a letter published in the *Examiner* ten days later in which he took issue with a UPI statement that the Mormons' racially discriminatory policy was based on the teachings of Joseph Smith. He pointed out that Elijah Abel had been ordained and had served the church during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. He went on to assert, inaccurately, that the RLDS Church "has never discriminated against black members."

The Public Information officer would have had only to consult recent scholarship on the subject to find evidence of racist as well as nonracist attitudes in the first Mormon prophet.¹

THE CANONICAL WRITINGS OF JOSEPH SMITH, JR.

Potentially serious impediments to an egalitarian policy on race were evident in

WILLIAM D. RUSSELL, former editor of the RLDS journal, *Courage*, is chairperson of the Division of Social Science at Graceland College. This article was presented as a paper at the 1979 Annual Meeting of the Mormon History Association held in Lamon, Iowa, May 25-27, 1979.

Smith's writings canonized by both the LDS and RLDS churches. While the RLDS had the good fortune not to have elevated the *Book of Abraham* to canonical status, both the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith's "New Translation" contain apparent racist elements.

The Book of Mormon, published by Joseph Smith in 1830, included the notion that because of their iniquities God caused a "skin of blackness" to come upon the Lamanites so that they would be "loathsome."² People were warned against intermarriage: "And cursed shall be the seed of him that mixeth with their seed: for they shall be cursed even with the same cursing."³ In the Book of Jacob, the Nephites were told that if they did not repent of their sins the Lamanites' skins "will be whiter than yours, when ye shall be brought with them before the throne of God."⁴ In Mormon 2:44 (LDS 5:15) the Nephites are specifically warned that they

shall become a dark, a filthy, and a loathsome people, beyond the description of that which ever hath been amongst us; yea, even that which hath been among the Lamanites; and this because of their unbelief and idolatry.

Those who defend the Book of Mormon against the charge of racism usually quote II Nephi 11:113–115 (LDS 26:33): "He inviteth them all to come unto him . . . black and white, bond and free, male and female, . . . all are alike unto God." But the Book of Mormon also seemingly invited black people to come unto God with the result that this would produce a white skin!⁶

In Joseph Smith's "New Translation" of the Bible, the only change this author is aware of that has racial connotations is in Chapter 9 of Genesis. The King James Version reads:

And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his youngest son had done unto him, and he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.⁶

At this point Joseph Smith added the words: "And a veil of darkness shall cover him, that he shall be known among all men." While it can be argued, as some have done for the Book of Mormon, that the "veil of darkness" may not refer to skin color, the passage certainly leaves that impression.⁷

Whatever seeds may have been planted in these and other writings during Joseph Smith's lifetime, it is nonetheless true that an important facet of racial discrimination—priesthood denial—was not officially implemented until several years after the Prophet's death.

THE EARLY REORGANIZATION

That the Reorganization did not follow the lead of the Mormons under Brigham Young in this decision is attributable directly to the Prophet's son, Joseph III. He assumed the leadership of the RLDS Church in 1860. It is my thesis that the RLDS Church has generally followed the trend of secular society on racial matters by adopting the "respectable" attitudes of white society. In short, the church has normally adopted a "priestly" or "pastoral" rather than a "prophetic" model.⁸ This can be shown in the relevant documents from 1860 to the present.

The policy of not excluding racial minorities from the priesthood in the RLDS Church stems from an 1865 revelation purported to have been received by President Joseph Smith III, Section 116 of the RLDS *Doctrine and Covenants*. The Civil War was drawing to a close. According to the memoirs of W. W. Blair, an apostle in the RLDS hierarchy, the question as to whether to ordain blacks was being discussed by the saints, and in a prayer meeting on April 2, 1865, President Smith prophesied that "prejudice of race, color, and caste would soon be done away among the Saints."⁹ One month later, on the evening of May 3, 1865, twenty-four days after Appomattox, the RLDS Council of Twelve discussed the ordination question. According to W. W. Blair the question was debated "pro and con, with great warmth and persistency." When a vote was asked, "none would vote for it nor against it," so Zenos H. Gurley, Sr. suggested that they ask President Smith to seek inspiration. The minutes of the meeting record the following:

After much discussion, it was, Resolved that we refer the question respecting the ordination of Men of Colour to the Lord and that we come together fasting and praying that God may reveal His will on this matter unto us through His servant Joseph.

Adjourned until Thursday morning at 8 o'clock.¹⁰

At the 8 o'clock meeting the next morning, Smith presented a revelation, now Section 116, in which the Lord reportedly indicated that "it is expedient in me that you ordain priests unto me, of every race who receive the teachings of my law . . ." The revelation closes with the following admonition:

Be not hasty in ordaining men of the Negro race to offices in my church, for verily I say unto you,

All are not acceptable unto me as servants, nevertheless I will that all may be saved, but every man in his own order, and there are some who are chosen instruments to be ministers to their own race. Be ye content, I the Lord have spoken it.¹¹

Although the revelation is permissive on the ordination of blacks, it has been criticized by RLDS liberals for its apparent suggestion of a segregated ministry and for its note of caution, warning against haste in ordaining Negro men. Such caution is appropriate for all priesthood calls, they argue, and thus it is inappropriate to single out Negroes for such caution. Other RLDS members defend the note of caution by asserting that it was probably wise in its historical context.

A difference of opinion apparently arose among early RLDS leaders as to whether the term "priest" in the revelation referred to priesthood offices generally, or to the office of priest only. Joseph Smith III recalled in his memoirs:

I was of the opinion at the time that the term "priests" occurring in the opening portion of the revelation covered the authority as ordinarily represented by anyone properly ordained according to the New Testament plan. This opinion, however, did not prevail with a majority of the members of the Council, who believed that . . . such ordinations should be restricted to the office of priest, only. I did not contend for my own understanding very strongly, as at the time there was no apparent necessity for making any such serious discrimination; since the office of priest would permit the preaching

of the Word, I felt that time would either soften asperities or the Lord would make the matter still plainer by further direction.¹²

The following year, on April 3, 1866, the Council of Twelve discussed "whether Coloured Members should be organized by themselves into Branches or in connection with the White Brethren." After discussion the Twelve passed the following: "Resolved that as the Author of Life and Salvation does not discriminate among His rational creatures on account of Colour neither does the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints."¹³

At the April 1868 General Conference, the Quorum of Twelve presented a motion, "Resolved that this conference would encourage the carrying out the provisions made for preaching the gospel to the negro race in the revelation of May 4, 1865."¹⁴

Seven years later, in the February 15, 1875 *True L.D.S. Herald*, President Smith wrote an editorial strongly condemning elders who were making racial distinctions:

We are pained to learn that some few Elders are making an unnecessary distinction between the white and colored races in regard to gospel ordinances and fellowship. . . .

It is unjust to the Church for one, two or more Elders to teach, preach, or advise a distinction and exclusion from church fellowship and communion upon the ground of race or color; while the "articles and covenants of the Church" nowhere warrant such exclusion, and the practice of the Church has never sanctioned it. . . .

We think it derogatory to the teaching of Jesus, as found in the New Testament, Book of Mormon, and Doctrine and Covenants to insist upon a separation of the races.¹⁵

Perhaps Smith's editorial led to the General Conference Resolution adopted two months later. General Conference Resolution 171 stated that the gospel is for

all mankind, irrespective of color, nationality, sex or condition of life; and that elders in Christ are not justified in making, or insisting on being made, any separation in church privileges, worship, or sacrament, other than is made in the church articles and revelations in regard to ministerial ordinations and labor; and that we advise all officers of the church to be governed by the spirit and tenor of this teaching and this resolution.¹⁶

Thus, during the decade immediately after the Civil War, President Smith, The Council of Twelve and the General Conference seemed to have formulated a somewhat liberal racial policy, opening the door for black priesthood and rejecting racial segregation or discrimination in the church. During that same period, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were added to the United States Constitution in an attempt to legally establish racial equality. But, as has been well documented historically, the United States government backed off from the equalitarianism expressed during the Reconstruction period. So did the RLDS Church.

Despite the 1865 revelation and the other pronouncements, very few blacks were ordained to the priesthood. It was not until 1889 that a black man was ordained to the Melchisedec priesthood, and he was a Canadian, Emanuel Eaton.¹⁷ As late as the 1960's, it could rightfully be said that very few blacks had been

ordained to the RLDS priesthood, although the situation has improved somewhat in the last decade or so.

Joseph Smith III's views changed as American society backed off from commitment to civil and political rights for the former slaves. He may have felt—as indicated in his memoirs—that time was on the side of the interests of Negro citizens. But history suggests that this was not the case. The drift of American society in the last third of the 19th century was away from the ideal of racial equality. Similarly, Smith's own attitude seems to have backed away from his liberality of the 1860s and 1870s. We find him writing in an editorial in the *Saints' Herald* in 1893 that even though the gospel is for everyone ("There are none so low but that Jesus would weep and pray for them."), it would be wise not to offend social sensibilities, or violate laws such as those prohibiting miscegenation. Smith suggested separating the races in church and establishing separate branches where practicable so that black priesthood could minister to their own race. He stated that the various races "are now unequal in the scale of civilization, and are not equal, socially or morally." The prophet was willing to give way to social custom: "Custom and the natural barriers in the way must have their weight."¹⁸

Smith concluded the editorial as follows:

Church privileges and equal access to God's mercy do not necessarily destroy the social distinctions which wisdom and peculiarities of condition impose and make distinctive. Any attempt to urge the unrestrained intercourse of all classes, races, and conditions will stir up strife and contention far more dangerous to the welfare and unity of the church, than the principle contended for will justify.¹⁹

The previous year the *Herald* had contained an editorial about Priest C.D.G. Taylor, "the colored brother received into the church at Lamoni, not long ago," complaining that he wasn't making a special evangelistic effort with his own race.²⁰ "Dr. Taylor," as he is called in the editorial, was briefly under general church appointment, but his appointment was not renewed, apparently due to dissatisfaction with his lack of effort on behalf of his own race.

George H. Graves, another black man, was under appointment for ten years, from 1898 to 1908. His initial assignment was "among the colored people."²¹ He was soon working Chicago with an associate, W. H. Fuller, apparently white. Graves reported that Brother Fuller "baited his hook to catch white fish" while he "baited his hook to catch black bass."²² By 1903 Graves, laboring in Kentucky, wrote to the *Herald* saying he hoped to be able to "get started the first branch in the world known as a colored branch of the Latter Day Saints."²³ F. Henry Edwards notes that Graves ran into difficulties with the church administration when he showed his preference for ministry to white congregations.²⁴ In 1908 the First Presidency suggested he be appointed to some large city to "labor exclusively among the people of his race" and "that he also be prevented from making any petitions to the Saints at large for financial aid. . . ." But after further consultation with the Twelve, his appointment was simply not renewed.²⁵

Edwards, writing about the racial situation in the United States and in the church around 1900, indicates that church people tended toward a modified reflection of their environment: they were not against Negro members or priesthood, but they showed little objection to the segregation policies of their times.²⁶

C. Vann Woodward, in his *Strange Career of Jim Crow* and in *Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction*, has suggested that after the Civil War it required nearly a generation for the South to develop the rigid Jim Crow racial structure that was in place by the end of the century. Woodward points out that after the Civil War, southern whites exhibited attitudes toward blacks that were more humane than the Jim Crow attitudes which became dominant about the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896.

A key turning point came during the disputed Presidential election of 1876 which was settled by allowing the apparent loser, Republican Rutherford Hayes, to assume the Presidency. Part of the deal was a Republican promise to withdraw the federal presence in the South and allow the Southern states to handle the race problem as they saw fit. This decision indicated that the North was not going to insist on civil and political equality for blacks. From the end of Reconstruction to the turn of the century, the South gradually degraded the social and political status of blacks, culminating in Jim Crow and voter disfranchisement laws enacted in various states around the turn of the century.²⁷

During this period the churches, which had been somewhat integrated in the 1870s, moved toward complete segregation. In a recent article in *Church History*, Kenneth K. Bailey documented this in the southern churches. He noted that near the turn of the century, a respected Southern Methodist, the Rev. William Martin, reminisced about bygone days when blacks "enjoyed the same preaching with the white people; they communed at the same altars, they were served by the same hands, and drank in remembrance of the crucified One from the same cup."²⁸

Although the RLDS Church was primarily a midwestern church, it appears that the RLDS attitude toward black-white mixing underwent the same general transition between the end of the Civil War and the turn of the century that Woodward and Bailey describe in the South.

FROM PLESSY TO BROWN

The period between the Supreme Court's *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896 and its *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954 was a bleak one for black people in the United States. Segregation—*de jure* in the South and *de facto* in the North—made it easy for Americans to turn their backs upon the aspirations of black people. It was also a period in which the RLDS Church paid little attention to black people and their problems despite the organization of the NAACP, the Urban League and CORE during this period. There were very few blacks in the church—north or south—and in the South they were segregated.²⁹

Joseph Smith III died on December 10, 1914 and was succeeded by his son, Frederick Madison Smith, who was President of the church until his death on March 20, 1946. In his recent Ph.D. dissertation on Fred M. Smith, Larry Hunt concluded that Smith took a middle-of-the-road position on race—he accepted segregation because of his primary concern for "social safety," but he disliked racial discrimination and violence.³⁰

In light of the tendency of the RLDS to expound on the differences between themselves and the LDS Church, it is significant that RLDS polemical literature during this period remained silent on the subject of race. The church published two large tracts during this period which discussed the basic differences between the two churches. In 1930 Herald House issued a 60-page tract by Calvin H. Rich,

Some Differences in Faith Between the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, with Headquarters at Independence, Missouri, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints with Headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah. In 1943 Presiding Patriarch Elbert A. Smith produced a 62-page tract, *Differences That Persist Between the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and the Utah Mormon Church*, which subsequently went through more than a dozen printings before it was discontinued about 1965.³¹ In both tracts a great deal of ink was spilt on the perennial questions of polygamy, the plurality of gods, succession in the Presidency and temple rituals. But the policy difference between the two churches on ordaining blacks was not mentioned in either tract, which suggests a lack of interest in the issue by the RLDS Church during that period.

More recently—as interest in civil rights has become more respectable—the RLDS people have been far more inclined to note the difference. Two full length books on the “differences that persist” have been published by Herald House since the civil rights movement was renewed in the 1950s. One, by Russell F. Ralston, included a brief four-page discussion of “The Negro Question” at the end, after 230 pages of the usual issues. The other, by Aleah Koury, ignored the race question.³² The authors, both Seventies who had served the church in Salt Lake City, were promoted to the Twelve not long after their books were published. Various other statements and actions by RLDS leaders on race have clearly shown a motivation to distinguish between the churches in Independence and in Salt Lake City.³³

THE CHURCH DURING THE “SECOND RECONSTRUCTION”

After World War II the United States gradually began to address the problem of racial injustice as it had not done since Reconstruction. As Philip C. Dolce has written, “The Cold War was forcing the United States to prove that its democratic heritage extended to black Americans.”³⁴ Harry Truman became the first twentieth-century President to advocate a full-scale civil rights program.³⁵ But the *Brown* decision of May, 1954 appears to have been the real catalyst in re-awakening the nation to the oppression of its black citizens, thereby ushering in the so-called “the second Reconstruction” in the United States. Soon after *Brown*, the Montgomery bus boycott propelled Martin Luther King, Jr. into national leadership with his non-violent direct action strategies.

The RLDS Church also rediscovered the race issue during this period. Though comment on the race issue became more frequent in church periodicals,³⁶ the impetus came from a few rank-and-file saints, rather than from the top.

Since Reconstruction the first effort to enact a general church policy statement came in 1948 in a resolution submitted to the General Conference by the Chicago District delegation.³⁷ Citing scripture, the resolution both endorsed racial equality and acknowledged discrimination by saints. Israel A. Smith, who was President of the Church from 1946 until 1958, opposed the resolution: “There is nothing in the law of the church which creates or tends to create racial inequality or racial discrimination.”³⁸ He continued: “To legislate with respect to a specific race raises, by implication, the presumption that that race heretofore had been unjustly dealt with in our church law and discipline, which we cannot and do not admit.”³⁹ Smith also asserted that the church “places no ban or bar against ordaining those

of colored races, as witnessed by the fact that many have been ordained and some have been appointed to labor as missionaries."⁴⁰ Israel Smith showed his determination to avoid the racial controversy, indicating in a 1957 *Herald* editorial that race relations "are political in their nature" and that as churchmen we "feel a natural hesitation to subject ourselves to criticism for getting into politics."⁴¹

RLDS General Conferences are held every two years. In 1954 a resolution was brought to the conference, co-sponsored by Muirl Robinson of Battle Creek, Michigan, and James Everett of Salt Lake City. The resolution asked

That a special committee be appointed, composed of General Church appointees and lay ministers of professional competence in the field of social relations, to study and make recommendations on the problems involved, and to prepare recommended outlines of methods and procedures for activating an effective program for carrying the gospel message to colored peoples, and with particular emphasis to the immediate problems in the United States and Canada where most of our present members reside.⁴²

The resolution also called upon the membership at large to support the 1948 United Nations "Declaration of Human Rights" asking the U.S. members to support "The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights."⁴³ Rather than pass the resolution, the conference referred the matter to the First Presidency, Council of Twelve and the Quorum of Seventy, instructing them to report back to the 1956 General Conference.⁴⁴

One month later, in May 1954, the Supreme Court handed down the *Brown* decision. When the delegates gathered for the next General Conference in April 1956, the three quorums presented their resolution on race relations. The document, General Conference Resolution 995, that emerged after three amendments were offered from the floor by J.C. Stuart, reads as follows:

The gospel is for all mankind. It knows no distinction of race or color.

The possibility of sharing the gospel has always been influenced by racial, social, economic, educational, and political factors. This is still true.

The social patterns are changing in the direction of closer integration by the various groups comprising the total population. It is difficult to imagine segregated churches in a society which teaches the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Wherever groups, missions, branches, and congregations are organized they should be formed as a matter of administration and not as a matter of racial discrimination.

There are areas where the church must first build up the will to welcome all races. In such situations discretion is important, but only as an essential factor in breaking down barriers.

The church welcomes all who respond to the call of the Lord from among all races.

Persons of any race who are ordained to the priesthood should function freely according to their gifts and callings. Some may well receive church appointment. Such appointees should be assigned with reasonable consideration for the opportunities for ministry to their own race, but such assignments should not be to that race only.

The appointing authorities should carry the needs of all men in their hearts with ministry being directed according to the spirit of wisdom and revelation

in the general, local, and missionary presiding officers concerned. It should be shared in by the Saints in the spirit of fraternity, which is the spirit of Zion.⁴⁵

Seven years later an editorial by the First Presidency appeared in the August 1, 1963, *Saints' Herald*. Entitled, "Our Position on Race and Color," this editorial was written after the Birmingham demonstrations and just before the March on Washington. Public opinion favorable to civil rights was building, and President Kennedy, after more than two years of caution, had decided to push for new civil rights legislation. The First Presidency's editorial specifically reaffirmed the principles of the 1956 General Conference Resolution, i.e., the gospel knows no racial distinctions, the church welcomes all persons who respond to the gospel, and priesthood holders of any race should function freely according to their gifts and callings. However, the editorial contained little hint that the RLDS Church or its members have been anything but egalitarian or have in any way contributed to discrimination in the past century or more since the church has existed. There was no mention of the segregation of RLDS congregations in the South and only a vague hint that internal problems have existed in congregations that were integrated. A member of the Presiding Bishopric stated privately at the time that the editorial failed to take into account the racial difficulties experienced in virtually every congregation where there were Negro members. The following quotation from the editorial will illustrate:

The internal racial problems in our church have been very minor. Integration has been such a natural process that there would be no need to discuss it in these columns were it not for the national attention that has resulted from the tense integration question.

We have Negroes in our branches, in our priesthood, and in our church college. Our integration preceded any social pressures or Supreme Court decisions.

It would be difficult to say how many of our Negroes now hold priesthood. No systematic records have been kept based on race or color. We have felt no reason for such accounting.

These optimistic words were sounded despite the fact that the church had very few black members; black priesthood holders were so rare that systematic records were not required to keep track of them. Nor had very many black students attended Graceland, the only RLDS college. While the number of blacks at Graceland has increased since 1963, those blacks have had their share of problems. Few have been church members; many were non-members recruited by the coaching staff.

It appears that the Presidency's editorial reflected the church's new awareness of the racial issue, but the content and tone suggest a rewriting of its history to prove to itself that its new attitude was the one it had always held.

Critics also noted that the editorial implied that civil rights organizations are strictly for Negroes. While the principle of having black leadership in the civil rights movement was probably sound, even black militants generally believed that whites were needed to assist, if only as Stokely Carmichael once said, to civilize fellow whites. The editorial further suggested that civil rights organizations were

for Negroes' physical well-being, implying a dualism between the spiritual and physical and apparently ignoring the fact that the movement provided spiritual renewal for many as well.

Finally, the First Presidency's editorial cautioned against participation in "extremist movements—any mob action—either for or against segregation." The statement was vague as to what was meant by "extremist movements" or "mob action." Church members could as easily have believed the editorial condemned non-violent demonstrations as KKK-style violence.

During the week of the 1968 conference, Martin Luther King was assassinated. In response, the conference passed two resolutions. One was a tribute to Dr. King; the other was a call to "more adequately implement the policies and resolution previously adopted by the World Conference."⁴⁶ The latter resolution also deplored extremism: recent racial changes have "uncovered extreme militant feelings." Again, interpretation among members could have varied widely.

Both resolutions and the editorial stated that the RLDS Church welcomed all persons into its fellowship. Only the 1968 resolution suggested consciously seeking to win non-whites into active participation in the church. This omission in the two earlier statements is strange for a missionary-minded church which expects its members to aggressively seek out converts. None of the statements dealt with racism in other areas—education, housing, employment and so forth. It is as if proper evangelism would solve the racial problem. The "official position" calls for no corporate action by the church.

There was considerable resistance from church members who did not like the official statements and articles advocating racial equality in the church press in the late 1950s and early 1960s. As an editor at Herald House in Independence for six years, 1960–1966, and as a private citizen in the Center Place during those years, I had an opportunity to observe individual church members and the church leadership in their responses to the problem of race. It was not uncommon for RLDS members to defend school segregation and racial exclusion in housing and public accommodations and to condemn intermarriage. A few priesthood members were also members of the Ku Klux Klan. Most top church leaders were unwilling to sign a "Good Neighbor" pledge being sponsored by all major faiths in the Kansas City-Independence area as a device to open up housing opportunities for non-whites. One pastor opposed open housing for Independence because Zion was to be reserved for "the rich, the wise, the learned and the noble," and another Independence pastor regarded civil rights activists as communists or fellow travelers. An elder in a public address to an Independence RLDS congregation defended segregation as the absolute divine will. Herald House editors were advised by church leaders to go slowly and not to offend on the race question.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the RLDS Church has followed the trend of secular society on race,⁴⁷ usually taking the currently respectable view.⁴⁸ The leadership has adopted the priestly rather than the prophetic role. Before the Civil War period, Joseph Smith, Jr., and other church leaders, generally assumed the attitudes toward race predominant in American society. After a period of liberalism during the Reconstruction period, the church, following the trend of society, turned its back on the

dream of racial equality. Some progress has been made in the second Reconstruction since the 1950s, but the church's cautious response is still being resisted by some members who would prefer that the church ignore the aspirations of black people.

NOTES

¹ Lester E. Bush, Jr., "Mormonism's Negro Doctrine: An Historical Overview," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Spring, 1973, pp. 11-68; Newell G. Bringhurst, "'A Servant of Servants . . . Cursed as Pertaining to the Priesthood': Mormon Attitudes Toward Slavery and the Black Man, 1830-80" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Davis, 1975).

² II Nephi 4:35, 36 (RLDS edition); II Nephi 5:21, 22 (LDS edition).

³ II Nephi 4:37 (RLDS); II Nephi 5:23 (LDS).

⁴ Jacob 2:59 (RLDS); Jacob 3:8 (LDS).

⁵ The following passages seem to me to be quite attractive to the racist: I Nephi 3:128-134, 151; II Nephi 4:31-33; 12:79-85; Jacob 2:42-65; Alma 1:104-119; and Mormon 2:36-54 (RLDS edition).

⁶ Genesis 9:24-26 (King James Version)

⁷ For an effective rebuttal to the typical segregationist's use of the Bible, see Everett Tilson, *Segregation and the Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1958). For a more appreciative view of the Restoration Scriptures, see the series of three articles by John Bradley in the *Saints' Herald* (Hereafter *SH*), Vol. 110, November 15, December 1, and December 15, 1963.

⁸ Recent RLDS leaders' tendency to adopt the pastoral rather than the prophetic role is well documented in an undergraduate paper by Arlyn R. Love, "RLDS Church Leaders' Policy Concerning the Black Civil Rights Movement" (Lamoni, Iowa: Unpublished Senior Seminar paper, Graceland College, April 17, 1979).

⁹ W.W. Blair, *The Memoirs of President W.W. Blair*, compiled by Elder Frederick B. Blair (Lamoni, Iowa: Herald Publishing House, 1908), p. 113. Blair was an apostle in 1865 and later a member of the RLDS First Presidency. I am indebted to Diane Shelton's paper, "The 1865 Revelation," presented at the 1978 annual meeting of the John Whitmer Historical Association, held at Plano, Illinois. A copy of her paper is in the Graceland College Archives.

¹⁰ RLDS Council of Twelve Minutes, Book A, RLDS Archives, Independence, Missouri.

¹¹ Section 116, *RLDS Doctrine and Covenants* (Independence, Missouri: Herald House, 1970).

¹² Joseph Smith III, *Joseph Smith III and the Restoration*, edited by Mary Audentia Smith Anderson and condensed by Bertha Audentia Anderson Hulme (Independence, Missouri: Herald Publishing House, 1952), p. 607.

¹³ Council of Twelve Minutes.

¹⁴ *History of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints* (Independence, Missouri: Herald House, 1896), Vol. III, p. 495 (hereafter *History RLDS*).

¹⁵ "All One in Christ," *True L. D. Saints' Herald*, February 15, 1875, p. 112.

¹⁶ RLDS General Conference Resolution 171, adopted April 10, 1875.

¹⁷ *History RLDS* IV: 634.

¹⁸ Joseph Smith III, "Undue Strife," *SH*, Vol. 40, Number 19, May 13, 1893, pp. 289-90.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 290.

²⁰ *History RLDS* V: 180; *SH* October 15, 1892.

²¹ *History RLDS* V:441.

²² *History RLDS* V:507.

²³ *SH* November 11, 1903, p. 1069; *History RLDS* VI: 77.

²⁴ *History RLDS* VI: 17.

²⁵ *History RLDS* VI:268.

²⁶ *History RLDS* VI:17.

²⁷ C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (New York: Oxford University Press, second revised edition, 1966); *Reunion and Reaction: The Compromise of 1877 and the End of Reconstruction* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951).

²⁸ Quoted in William P. Harrison, *The Gospel Among Slaves* (Nashville: 1893), p. 261; in Kenneth K. Bailey, "The Post-Civil War Racial Separation in Southern Protestantism: Another Look," *Church History*, Vol. 46, No. 4, December 1977, p. 472.

²⁹ William T. Blue, Sr., "A Negro Pastor Looks at Brotherhood," *Stride*, Vol. 345, No. 4, April, 1961, pp. 2-4.

³⁰ Larry E. Hunt, *Frederick M. Smith: Saint as Reformer, 1874-1946* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1978), p. 435.

³¹ Paul A. Wellington, Editorial Director, Herald House, to William D. Russell, April 17, 1979.

³² Russell F. Ralston, *Fundamental Differences Between the Reorganized Church and the Church in Utah* (Independence, Missouri: Herald House, 1960); Aleah G. Koury, *The Truth and the Evidence* (Independence, Missouri: Herald Publishing House, 1965).

³³ See, for example, Roger Yarrington, "Mormon Race Views Enter Political Arena," *SH*, Vol. 109, May 15, 1962, p. 348; W. Wallace Smith, "Race and Priesthood," *SH*, Vol. 117, March 1970, p. 5.

³⁴ Philip C. Dolce and George H. Skau, eds., *Power and the Presidency* (New York: Charles Scribner's, 1976), p. 127.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ See Carol Freeman Braby, "Desegregation's Challenge to You," *Stride*, Pilot Issue, 1956; Marian Blumenschein, "Racial Integration Through Friendship," *Stride*, November 1956; Dick Ankeny, "This Problem of Integration"; *University Bulletin*, Summer, 1957, pp. 13-15; Harley A. Morris, "Where the Solution Lies," *University Bulletin*, Summer 1957, pp. 16-18; Israel A. Smith, "Race Relations," *SH*, July 8, 1957, p. 8; Lucille Oliver, "The Worth of Souls," *SH*, February 17, 1958, pp. 10-11; Deam Ferris, "What is Color?" *Stride*, May 1958, pp. 3-8; Katherine Owens, "A Testimony on Race," *Stride*, May 1958, pp. 9-11; Dale F. Ward, "Brothers' First Meeting," *Stride*, May 1958, pp. 26-28; Roger Yarrington, "Negro Lessons in Christianity," *SH*, November 24, 1958, pp. 10-11; Minnie F. Armstrong, "Let Us Help Make People Free," *SH*, December 1, 1958, pp. 12-13, 17; Barbara Howard, "The Gospel's Not 'For White Only'" *Stride*, August 1959, pp. 28-31; H. Roy Vandel, "Brotherhood—A Christian Duty," *SH*, August 27, 1959, pp. 8-10; Mrs. Herman Eliason, "Prayer Helps Change Racial Prejudice," *SH*, January 11, 1960, p. 17; Ethyle D. Woodruff, "If Ye Love Me," *SH*, May 9, 1960, p. 11; Roger Yarrington, "Civil Disobedience Is Required of Saints," *SH*, August 29, 1960, p. 3; Wilford Winholtz, "Christ's Message Was for All the Races," *Stride*, December 1960, pp. 10-13; William D. Russell, "Our Number One Domestic Problem," *Stride*, October 1960; Blue, William T., Sr., "A Negro Pastor Looks at Brotherhood," *Stride*, April 1961, pp. 2-4; Louis Scott Wrigley, "Yes, We're Integrated," *Stride*, December 1961, pp. 21-23; Melvin Fowler, "An Anthropologist Looks at Race," *Stride*, February 1962, pp. 16-20; Lynn Weldon, "Probing Our Prejudice," *Stride*, March 1962, pp. 2-6; William D. Russell, "Deny Tax Exemptions to Segregationist Churches?" *SH*, September 15, 1962, p. 5; "Discrimination Common in Capital Punishment," *SH*, March 1, 1963, p. 2; "Can Intolerance Beget Freedom?" *SH*, April 1, 1963, p. 2; "Ten Years Later," *SH*, May 15, 1963, pp. 2, 21; "Martin Luther King: Satan or Saint?" *SH*, July 1, 1963, p. 2; "We Are On the Move Now," *University Bulletin*, Spring, 1965, pp. 50-55; "They Died for a Cause," *SH*, May 1, 1965; pp. 2, 13; "Taxation Without Representation," *Stride*, May 1965, pp. 4-9, 19; "Discrimination in the Administration of Justice," *Stride*, June 1965, pp. 14-19; W. Wallace Smith, "States' Rights and the Constitution," *SH*, November 15, 1962, pp. 4-5; Roy Muir, "Let's Teach our Children to Love," *SH*, June 1, 1963, p. 2; Deam Ferris, "Interracial Marriage," *Stride*, October 1963, pp. 4-8; Gladys Forbes, "Why I Marched," *Stride*, November 1963, pp. 20-21, 31-32; Paul A. Wellington, "The Restoration Attitude Towards Race," *SH*, November 15, 1963, p. 2; Roy Muir, "Blood, Sweat, and Prayers for Christian Brotherhood," *SH*, February 15, 1964, p. 2; Katherine J. Owens, "How Much Love?" *SH*, February 15, 1964, pp. 8-10; Carroll Thompson, "You Can Do Something About Prejudice," *SH*, April 15, 1964, pp. 12-13; Sara Baker, "We Bought in a White Neighborhood," *Stride*, September 1964, pp. 22-25; George W. Buckner, "Voter Registration: The Church's Business," *SH*, September 1, 1964, pp. 18-19; Reed W. Holmes, "The Right of a Dark-brown Skin," *SH*, September 15, 1964, p. 2; Paul A. Wellington, "The Test of Brotherhood," *SH*, February 15, 1965, p. 2; Joe Pearson, "Discrimination in Housing," *SH*, April 15, 1966, p. 5; Verne Sparkes, "Sinful Man and the Civil Rights Dilemma," *SH*, October 15, 1966, pp. 6-7, 17-18; Lloyd R. Young, "A Perspective on Racism," *SH*, July 15, 1968, pp. 11, 24; Bob Smith, "The Churches and White Supremacy in America," *SH*, July 15, 1968, pp. 12-17, 28.

³⁷ Arlyn R. Love, pp. 24–25.

³⁸ *The Saints' Herald Conference Daily* (1948), p. 105.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Israel A. Smith, "Race Relations," *SH*, Vol. 104, July 8, 1957, p. 8.

⁴² *The Saints' Herald Conference Daily* (1954), p. 95.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁴⁵ RLDS General Conference Resolution 995.

⁴⁶ *1968 World Conference Bulletin* (April 7, 1968) p. 288.

⁴⁷ Larry E. Hunt, p. 432.

⁴⁸ For the interpretation of the RLDS Church as seeking respectability in the eyes of the outside world, see Clare Vlahos, "Images of Orthodoxy: Self-Identity of the RLDS" (unpublished paper read at the annual meeting of the Mormon History Association, Logan, Utah, May 1978).

