

THE WORD OF WISDOM: FROM PRINCIPLE TO REQUIREMENT

THOMAS G. ALEXANDER

THE STATUS OF THE WORD OF WISDOM at the turn of the century is evident from contemporary sources. At a meeting on May 5, 1898, the First Presidency and Twelve discussed the Word of Wisdom. One member read from the twelfth volume of the *Journal of Discourses* a statement by Brigham Young that seemed to support the notion that the Word of Wisdom was a commandment of God. Lorenzo Snow, then President of the Council of the Twelve agreed, saying that he believed the Word of Wisdom was a commandment and that it should be carried out to the letter. In doing so, he said, members should be taught to refrain from eating meat except in dire necessity, because Joseph Smith had taught that animals have spirits. Wilford Woodruff, then President of the Church, said he looked upon the Word of Wisdom as a commandment and that all members should observe it, but for the present, no definite action should be taken except that the members should be taught to refrain from meat. The minutes of the meeting record that "President Woodruff said he regarded the Word of Wisdom in its entirety as given of the Lord for the Latter-day Saints to observe, but he did not think that Bishops should withhold recommends from persons who did not adhere strictly to it."¹

Though it is clear that some church leaders, like Heber J. Grant and Joseph F. Smith, insisted upon complete abstinence from tea, coffee, liquor and tobacco, all General Authorities were not in agreement on all aspects of the Word of Wisdom. During a discussion in 1900 after he became President of the Church, Lorenzo Snow again emphasized the centrality of not eating meat, a point rarely emphasized by others, and in 1901, John Henry Smith and Brigham Young, Jr., of the Twelve both thought that the Church ought not interdict beer, or at least not Danish beer. Other apostles, like Anthon H. Lund and Matthias F. Cowley also enjoyed Danish beer and currant wine. Charles W. Penrose occasionally served wine. Emmeline B. Wells, then a

THOMAS G. ALEXANDER is professor of history and director of the Charles Redd Center for Western Studies at Brigham Young University. The author thanks the Historical Department of the Church for a fellowship which helped support the research for this article.

member of the presidency and later president of the Relief Society, drank an occasional cup of coffee, and George Albert Smith took brandy for medicinal reasons. Apostle George Teasdale, agreeing with President Woodruff, thought that no one ought to be kept from working in the Sunday School because he drank tea and that eating pork was a more serious breach than drinking tea or coffee.²

The evidence shows a diffuse pattern both in observing and teaching the Word of Wisdom in 1900. Some General Authorities preached quite consistently against the use of tea, coffee, liquor or tobacco and occasionally against the use of meat. None supported drunkenness. In practice, however, they and other members also occasionally drank the beverages that our current interpretation would prohibit. Observance of the Word of Wisdom was urged by way of counsel by President Snow and others. Some Apostles, like John Henry Smith, believed that the more important question was one of free agency and that those who continued to insist upon strict adherence to the Word of Wisdom were ignoring more serious principles. President Snow also opposed sanctions against alcohol and was upset when the General Board of the YMMIA asked for an end to the sale of beer at Saltair.³

Most vocal among General Authorities in his opposition to the use of tea, coffee, alcohol and tobacco was Heber J. Grant who would become one of the leaders of the state prohibition movement. He was particularly outraged at the church members who served liquor and at some of the Twelve who opposed the prohibition of liquor at Saltair. He was also concerned with the indifference some of the General Authorities demonstrated to the feelings of Protestant ministers who complained about the Saltair saloon.⁴

The death of Lorenzo Snow brought Joseph F. Smith to the presidency. Smith's views on the Word of Wisdom were close to those of Heber J. Grant and it is to his administration that the path to our current interpretation of the Word of Wisdom leads. Dropping the emphasis on abstaining from meat, he urged the need to refrain from tea, coffee, alcohol and tobacco. In 1902, he reversed President Snow's stand and closed the saloon at Saltair, a move which the Protestant clergy heartily approved. Following this lead, in June, 1902, the First Presidency and Twelve agreed not to fellowship anyone who operated or frequented saloons. In the same year, Joseph F. Smith urged stake presidents and others to refuse recommends to flagrant violators but to be somewhat liberal with old men who used tobacco and old ladies who drank tea. Habitual drunkards, however, were to be denied temple recommends.⁵

By mid-1905, members of the Twelve were actively using stake conference visits to promote adherence. In September, 1905, for instance, George Albert Smith advised the Stake Presidency, High Council and Bishops in Star Valley, Wyoming, to refuse "to longer tolerate men in presiding positions who would not keep the Word of Wisdom." George F. Richards preferred the technique of interviewing and urging compliance rather than insisting on lack of toleration. In keeping with the change in emphasis, the First Presidency and Twelve substituted water for wine in the sacrament in their temple meetings, apparently beginning July 5, 1906.⁶

After 1906, a strong prohibition movement developed in the United States, centered in Evangelical Protestant groups. In 1906, only Iowa, Kansas and Maine had statewide prohibition, but by 1919 twenty-six states, principally in the midwest, far west, south and upper New England had adopted the reform. Although increasing scientific evidence on the adverse effects of alcohol helped the movement, moral rather than scientific considerations seem to have sustained it. The period between 1911 and 1916 represented the post-Civil War apogee of alcoholic consumption in the United States and fear of moral decay, broken homes and wasted fortunes fueled the prohibition movement.⁷

As indicated above, the Latter-day Saints were already working internally before 1906 to oppose the consumption of alcoholic beverages and to interdict tea, coffee and tobacco among members. The interpretations given by nineteenth-century leaders to the Word of Wisdom and the then accepted view that Brigham Young had declared it a commandment provided part of the basis for this emphasis in the Church.

Another important motive for those on all sides of the question seems also to have been the desire for acceptance. The strongest opposition to the seating of B. H. Roberts and Reed Smoot in Congress had come from Evangelical Protestant groups, and some leaders, such as Elder Grant, were particularly sensitive to their feelings. In addition, the strongest support for state—and later nationwide—Prohibition among church members was found among Democrats and Progressive Republicans. Mormons of these parties were searching for acceptance by other church members who were increasingly pressured to vote Republican in support of Reed Smoot and his Federal Bunch and for national approval by Protestants who had so long opposed the Church. Among Federal Bunch Republicans, however, the situation was much different. Generally in control of the legislature, the governorship and the congressional and senatorial seats until 1916, Smoot supporters were reluctant to upset their majority position by alienating members of the business community sympathetic to the liquor traffic or by creating a climate congenial to anti-Mormon political parties.⁸

The organization of the statewide prohibition movement in Utah began in December 1907 when the Reverend Dr. George W. Young of Louisville, Kentucky, assistant general superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of America, came to Utah. Throughout early 1908, the League organized its three departments—agitation, legislation, and law enforcement—in Utah, and Heber J. Grant, who took an early interest in the movement, became a trustee for Utah and an officer of the Utah organization. In the late fall and early winter of 1908, the Reverend Dr. Louis S. Fuller, superintendent of the League for Utah and Idaho, met at various times with members of the First Presidency and Twelve and with Elder Grant. They agreed to support a local option bill in the 1909 legislature.⁹

Initially, Prohibition was widely supported in the Church. Edward H. Anderson expressed surprise in a January 1908 *Improvement Era* editorial that Utah was still one of the completely “wet” states. He thought that the “Latter-day Saints will unitedly and enthusiastically join in bringing about

. . . [the liquor traffic's] complete extermination." A number of the Twelve, meeting with members of an organization called the Salt Lake City Betterment Committee, agreed to implement an October 1907 General Conference resolution, to do all in their power to stop the liquor traffic. As Anthon H. Lund, second counselor in the First Presidency, said, "this means 'prohibition.'" At the temple fast meeting on January 5, 1908, Richard W. Young, president of the Ensign Stake, and Joseph F. Smith both endorsed Prohibition.¹⁰

A number of factors, however, supported the notion that Church leaders should *not* endorse prohibition but should support local option or even oppose public action on the liquor question. William Spry, John Henry Smith and a number of Republican leaders were concerned that not only would Prohibition fail to actually prohibit, but that the law would subject property to confiscation. Some, like Francis M. Lyman, urged individual regeneration rather than Prohibition, though he later changed his mind in favor of Prohibition.¹¹

Perhaps the most important pressure against Prohibition came from genteel Republicans, particularly businessmen whose interests included liquor manufacture or sales. Fred J. Keisel, for instance, said it would be a political blunder to support statewide Prohibition. After June, 1908, the *Intermountain Republican*, the Church-owned organ of Reed Smoot's Federal Bunch, stopped publishing articles favorable to Prohibition, and the Republican Party dumped Governor John C. Cutler, partly because of his support of statewide Prohibition, in favor of William Spry who nominally supported local option.¹²

By the time the legislature met in January, 1909, the church leadership was moving in two directions. Francis M. Lyman, by now converted to Prohibition, called Bishop John M. Whittaker to work with the legislature and with Elder Grant, Presiding Bishop Charles W. Nibley and others who favored Prohibition. The *Deseret News* published articles and interviews favoring Prohibition. President Joseph F. Smith, Reed Smoot and others more sensitive to the political problems, however, became equivocal in their support. Reed Smoot said he believed the prohibition movement would hurt the Church by bringing further charges of church influence in politics. John Henry Smith opposed Prohibition but considered Smoot's objections somewhat hypocritical because the Apostle-Senator "had no objection to Priesthood influence when he wanted to be elected. Then he said all . . . [the Gentiles] honored was power." Eventually, the legislature sidetracked a prohibition bill introduced by non-Federal Bunch Republican George M. Cannon in favor of a local option bill sponsored by Smoot's lieutenant Carl A. Badger. Though the Badger bill passed, William Spry pocket-vetoed it, to the chagrin of many supporters. In 1911, however the legislature revived and passed the Badger local option bill and this time Spry signed it.¹³

The fight over Prohibition between 1911 and 1917 was almost a replay of the local option battle between 1908 and 1911. Republican church leaders closely allied to the Federal Bunch favored Prohibition in public, but were equivocal in private. Fear of a backlash against the Church which might lead to the creation of a new anti-Mormon party, and fear of alienating gentile

businessmen from the Republican Party seem to have been the principal motives. In 1915, Spry pocket-vetoed a widely supported statewide prohibition bill. By 1916, the majority of Republicans could no longer support Spry, and Nephi L. Morris, president of the Salt Lake Stake, Progressive Party gubernatorial candidate in 1912 and an avowed prohibitionist, received the Republican Party nomination but lost the election. By that time local and national support for prohibition had developed to such an extent that virtually all church leaders and a large majority of all Utah citizens also supported Prohibition. Newly elected Democratic Governor Simon Bamberger and the Democratically controlled legislature enacted statewide Prohibition in 1917.

In the meantime, emphasis on the Word of Wisdom during Joseph F. Smith's administration continued essentially as in 1902. In a letter dated December 28, 1915, President Smith said that young "or middle-aged men who have had experience in the Church should not be ordained to the Priesthood nor recommended to the privileges of the House of the Lord unless they will abstain from the use of tobacco and intoxicating drinks." Since Prohibition had outlawed the legal use of alcohol, emphasis in church magazines and talks after 1917 centered on tobacco, and members were urged to support groups like the No-Tobacco League of America, the YMCA and the Salvation Army in their efforts to eradicate the use of tobacco.¹⁴

After the inauguration of Heber J. Grant's administration in 1918, however, the advice became less flexible. In 1921, church leadership made adherence to the Word of Wisdom a requirement for admission to the temple. Before this stake presidents and bishops had been encouraged to in this matter, but exceptions had been made. Apparently under this new emphasis, in March, 1921, George F. Richards, both as apostle and president of the Salt Lake Temple, phoned two Salt Lake City bishops about two tobacco users who had come to the temple and told the bishops "to try to clean them up before they come here again."¹⁵

Between 1921 and 1933, the adherence to the Word of Wisdom for full fellowship in the Church was made even more explicit. The 1928 *General Handbook of Instructions*, to guide bishops and stake presidents on church policy, reads: "It is important that all those who may desire to enter the temple for endowments or other ordinances should be encouraged by the bishopric to observe the principle of tithing as well as all other Gospel principles." The next edition of the *Handbook*, published in 1933, reads that members desiring temple recommends "should observe the law of tithing. The applicant should also observe all other principles of the Gospel, should keep the Word of Wisdom, not use profanity, should not join nor be a member of any secret oath bound organization and should sustain without reservation the general and local authorities of the church." Additionally, both the 1928 and 1934 editions of the *Handbook* — but not previous editions — listed "liquor drinking" and "bootlegging" among the "transgressions which are ordinarily such as to justify consideration by the bishop's court." To these the 1934 edition also added "drunkenness."¹⁶

With Prohibition an accomplished fact, the Church leadership also moved during the 1920s to incorporate the use of tobacco under legal sanctions.

Church members and leaders threw their strong support behind a bill introduced by State Senator Edward Southwick of Lehi to prohibit the sale of tobacco in Utah. The Church's Social Advisory Committee, students from Brigham Young University and other church groups lobbied for the bill which passed in 1921. By early 1922, however, massive disobedience brought about the revision of the Southwick law in 1923. This provided for controlled access and revenue for the state.¹⁷

Meanwhile, the Church continued its campaign against tobacco use. An article in the *Improvement Era*, March, 1923, argued that tobacco users naturally linked themselves with evil persons such as profaners, criminals, vagrants and prostitutes. Other articles argued that men believed women who smoke would become unladylike. In 1923, the MIA adopted anti-tobacco as its annual theme. Appeals to scientific authority were also used, including references to nicotine poisoning and smoke damage to mucus membranes and lungs.¹⁸

Late in the 1920s Church leaders urged alternative anti-tobacco legislation, and in 1927, Elders Richard R. Lyman and Melvin J. Ballard asked church attorney Franklin S. Richards for information on the possibility of legislation preventing the advertising of cigarettes on billboards. Even though Richards believed that the Supreme Court would declare such a law unconstitutional, the 1929 legislature passed one anyway. The *Relief Society Magazine* in May, 1929, said it hoped that the courts would uphold the law and regretted that the Idaho legislature had not passed a similar law. In November, 1929, however, Judge David W. Moffatt of Utah's Third District Court ruled the billboard law unconstitutional.¹⁹

In spite of this legal setback, church leaders continued to preach and act against tobacco. Heber J. Grant in January, 1930, warned bishops that young men using tobacco were not to be called on missions. Ruth May Fox, President of the YWMIA, asked Mormon girls to abstain from smoking and drinking in order to "remove temptation from our husbands and brothers." At the June, 1930, MIA conference, President Grant urged all members to "study and know the laws regulating tobacco, liquor and safety." He said that "cigarettes degenerate the brain in an uncontrollable manner." He particularly urged that girls not be allowed to smoke, because, he said, "it destroys the God-given power to bring forth sons and daughters into this world."²⁰

Undoubtedly the most difficult public problem was the enforcement of state and nationwide Prohibition against those who chose to ignore the Word of Wisdom. At least twice during the 1920s the First Presidency injected itself into election campaigns to assist in defeating candidates for Salt Lake County Sheriff alleged to be lax in the enforcement of Prohibition legislation and in electing those who promised more vigorous action.²¹

Heber J. Grant stood clearly on the side of strict enforcement, and as pressure on prohibition enforcement mounted in the late twenties and early thirties, he assisted with church resources. On January 5, 1928, Stephen L. Richards, Milton Bennion and Heber Chase Smith of the Social Welfare and Betterment League called to discuss conditions in Salt Lake City. They told him of organized crime protected by a pliant police force, and President Grant

confided to his diary that he had lost considerable sleep over the matter. Bennion provided information on law-breaking for *Deseret News* editorials, and Heber J. Grant insisted in conversations with his brother B. F. Grant, the paper's business manager, that the *News* take a strong stand in favor of prohibition enforcement.²²

Some members were disturbed with the actions of the authorities in providing financial support for the League's efforts, but the church leadership continued to help. In August, 1931, the First Presidency, the Sunday School, the Relief Society and the MIA agreed to tax themselves to support League efforts. President Grant felt, however, that they could not continue "perpetually using Church funds for something that ought to be done by the Government."²³

Though the church leadership continued to fight to remain dry, Utah became the thirty-sixth state to vote for repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and thus to seal the end of Prohibition. Church leaders were not uniform in their assessment of the experiment. Heber J. Grant was very upset that Utahns had not followed his counsel to retain Prohibition. Joseph Fielding Smith said that with "all its abuses and corruption," Prohibition had nevertheless "been a boon to society and it would be a calamity of the gravest kind to repeal or modify it now." B. H. Roberts favored repeal, and Anthony W. Ivins, first counselor in the First Presidency, questioned its usefulness. He pointed out that enforcement had cost more than one-half billion dollars by 1931, with which, he thought, the country could have constructed 100,000 miles of paved road, or endowed 500 colleges with one million dollars each.²⁴

In addition to liquor, tobacco, tea and coffee, some members of the Church urged that the prohibitions of the Word of Wisdom ought to be broader. In March, 1917, Frederick J. Pack of the University of Utah published an article in the *Improvement Era* dealing with the question, "Should LDS Drink Coca-Cola?" His answer was no. His argument was not that the Word of Wisdom prohibited such drinks, but that such drinks contained the same drugs as tea and coffee.²⁵

Still, church members were not long in making the link between stimulants and additives on the one hand and the Word of Wisdom on the other. On October 15, 1924, representatives of the Coca-Cola Company called on President Grant to complain that non-Mormon Dr. T. B. Beatty, state Health Director, was using the church organization to assist in an attack on Coca-Cola. They asked President Grant to stop him, but he refused at first, saying that he himself had advised Mormons not to drink the beverage. Beatty, however, had been claiming that there was four to five times as much caffeine in Coke as in coffee, when in fact, as the representatives showed, there were approximately 1.7 grains in a cup of coffee and approximately .43 grains or about a fourth as much in a equivalent amount of Coke. After a second meeting, President Grant said that he was "sure I have not the slightest desire to recommend that the people leave Coca-Cola alone if this amount is absolutely harmless, which they claim it is." Beatty, however, insisted that he would still recommend against its use by children. The question was left

unresolved, and evidence indicates that while the First Presidency has taken no official stand on the use of cola drinks, some members urge abstinence.²⁶

In addition, some scientists and health food faddists insisted that the Word of Wisdom included much more than the church leadership generally supported. In 1930, for instance, John A. Widtsoe published a tract entitled *The Word of Wisdom* which interdicted the use of refined flour and foods and "all drinks containing substances that are unnaturally stimulating." On November 23, 1930, James W. Fitches and Don C. Wood called on President Grant and asked permission to use Widtsoe's tract and to get the First Presidency to invest in their "Nature Way" health food company. Grant refused, saying that many points in Widtsoe's pamphlet and in their campaign "might be criticized because the actual teachings in the Word of Wisdom would hardly justify the conclusions drawn."²⁷

In the latter case, it seems probable that scientific evidence on the harmful effects of certain types of food and food additives played an influential role in the attempt to broaden the coverage of the Word of Wisdom. By the same token, similar scientific evidence also seems to have played an important role in the developing insistence that members abstain from tea, coffee, tobacco and liquor.

What role did revelation play in the matter? It is clear that Section 89 of the Doctrine and Covenants was given as a revelation to Joseph Smith. Advice that the members of the Church adhere to the Word of Wisdom was also undoubtedly given under inspiration. There is, however, no known contemporary evidence of which I am aware that a separate new revelation changed the Word of Wisdom from a "principle with promise" to "a commandment" necessary for full participation in all the blessings of church membership. One author on the subject has argued that the vote in 1880 sustaining the Doctrine and Covenants as binding on church membership was equivalent to a vote making the Word of Wisdom a commandment. If, however, the members were voting on the words contained in the book, what they did was to agree that the Word of Wisdom was "a principle with promise" not a commandment.²⁸

It is obvious that the Twelve and First Presidency prayerfully considered the conclusion that the Word of Wisdom ought to be a binding commandment for church members. Nevertheless, the main problem in interpreting the influence of revelation in these deliberations is the absence of references to revelations or even spiritual confirmation of specific positions in the diaries of those who participated in the meetings. The only references are statements or reminiscences of statements by previous authorities. It is much easier, therefore, to find references to previous statements than to see the presence of new, specific revelation. The inclusion of coffee and tea and the exclusion of cocoa, for instance, from the prohibited substances can probably be attributed to statements of Joseph and Hyrum Smith and Brigham Young rather than to specific revelations.²⁹

Other influences are much easier to document. Elder Grant's diary reveals the influence of Evangelical Protestant sentiment in his attitudes toward

liquor and tobacco. These attitudes had begun to develop in the Evangelical churches and certain sectors of the business community as early as the 1830s. The nationwide temperance movement of the 1830s and the prohibition movement of the early twentieth century were linked to Evangelical attitudes.³⁰ Utahns in general and Mormons in particular were rather late additions to the prohibition movement rather than its early leaders. The influence of the attitudes of these groups is easiest to see when one contrasts insistence on abstinence from liquor and tobacco with the rather tolerant attitude toward eating meat.

Sources of political attitudes toward the Word of Wisdom are also evident. Few of the General Authorities seem to have opposed the use of the state to enforce their moral code, and although some opposed the use of legal sanctions to enforce health restrictions like vaccination, Elder Grant believed in the use of state power to regulate the quality of milk and to control tuberculosis. He and many others also supported public sanctions against the use of alcohol and tobacco. The political sources of the attitudes of Reed Smoot and Joseph F. Smith in the period before 1916 are also evident. Both feared the tearing apart of the Republican Party and the possible rebirth of a new anti-Mormon party from the ashes of the old Liberal (1870–1893) and American (1904–1911) parties. By 1916, however, public sentiment was so strongly in favor of Prohibition that such fears were secondary to religious beliefs which insisted upon adherence to the Word of Wisdom.

How, then, does one draw all these influences together to understand what happened during the period under consideration, and what part did revelation play? Public and private statements indicate that the Church leaders were concerned about the moral tone of the community in which they lived. In an attempt to improve the tone, they sought guidance from scriptures, from statements of earlier leaders and from the Lord as they carried on their deliberations. In addition, contemporary political and social movements like the prohibition and anti-tobacco movements seemed to offer help in solving the problems they perceived. It was thus a number of forces, religious and secular, rather than a single force which led to the current interpretation of the Word of Wisdom. The decisions made under the confluence of these forces have had an important long range effect since nothing, with the possible exception of the wearing of the temple garments, serves to distinguish Latter-day Saints from the larger community more than does observance of the Word of Wisdom.

An understanding of the way in which the current interpretation of the Word of Wisdom developed is significant because it provides a case study of the usual method of revelation and hence of doctrinal and policy development in the Church. Evidence seems to suggest that change has ordinarily come about through prayerful consideration over time of contemporary problems in the context of tradition (including previous scriptures and statement), immediate conditions (including political, social, and economic problems) and alternative courses of action. Other examples of similar patterns of revelation for which we have good documentation include the decision to locate in Utah, the current Welfare Plan and even the doctrines of God and Man.³¹

Thus, the student of Latter-day Saint doctrinal and policy development will paint a more detailed picture if he conceives his task more broadly than the narrow context of looking only at the scriptures and at public statements of church leaders. If a study of the interpretation of what the Word of Wisdom can tell us anything, it is that such change does not take place in a vacuum.

NOTES

¹Diary of Heber J. Grant, May 5, and June 30, 1898, LDS Church Archives; "Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (JH), May 5, 1898, LDS Church Archives, Microcopy in BYU Library. See George D. Watt, et al. eds *Journal of Discourses*, 26 Vols. (Liverpool, 1855–85), 12: 27ff.

The standard sources on the history of the Word of Wisdom are the excellent studies by Paul H. Peterson, "An Historical Analysis of the Word of Wisdom" (M.A. Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1972), and Leonard J. Arrington, "An Economic Interpretation of the Word of Wisdom," *BYU Studies* 1 (Winter, 1959), pp. 37–49.

²Journal of Anthon H. Lund, January 9, August 31, and September 2, 1900, July 10, 1901, LDS Church Archives; Journal of Emueline B. Wells, September 8, 1900, February 4, 1902; February 19, 1903, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library; George Albert Smith Journal, March 10, 1905, Smith Family Papers, Western Americana Collection, University of Utah Library.

³Brigham Young, Jr., Journal, January 9 and July 9 and 11, 1901, LDS Church Archives; Grant Diary, July 11, 1901. Lorenzo Snow to Ephraim Caffall, March 18, 1901, First Presidency, letters sent, Church Archives.

⁴Grant Diary, June 30, 1898, August 17, 1900, and July 11, 1901.

⁵*Improvement Era*, May, 1902, p. 559; July, 1902, p. 731; Lund Journal, June 26, 1902; First Presidency to C. R. Hakes, August 1, 1902, First Presidency, letters sent; First Presidency to John W. Hess, October 31, 1902, *ibid*; First Presidency to H. S. Allen, November 1, 1902, *ibid*.

⁶First Presidency to L. B. Felt, December 13, 1905, *ibid*; John Henry Smith Journal, July 5, 1906, Smith Family Papers, Western Americana Collection, University of Utah Library; George Albert Smith Journal, August 5, and September 2, 1905; George F. Richards Journal, May 27, June 2, and June 16, 1906, Church Archives.

⁷Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963), pp. 31–34, 36, 56, 71, 83, 87, and 100–103; other discussions of the prohibition movement include: Joseph H. Timberlake, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement, 1900–1920* (New York: Atheneum, 1970) and Norman H. Clark, *Deliver Us from Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1976).

⁸This interpretation is a summary of Bruce T. Dyer's "A Study of the Forces Leading to the Adoption of Prohibition in Utah in 1917," (M.A. Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1958) and Jan Shipps, "Utah Comes of Age Politically: A Study of the State's Politics in the Early Years of the Twentieth Century," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 35 (Spring, 1967), pp. 91–111.

⁹Dyer, "Adoption of Prohibition," p. 2; John R. Winder to Reed Smoot, December 9, 1907, in James R. Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency* 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1966–1975), 4:163.

¹⁰Edward H. Anderson, "Events and Comments," *Improvement Era*, January, 1908, pp. 234–36; Lund Journal, January 3, 1908; Grant Diary, January 5, 1908.

¹¹*Ibid.* and March 18, 25 and 21, 1908.

¹²Dyer, "Adoption of Prohibition," pp. 14–19.

¹³*Ibid.*, pp. 10–11 and 43–44; Lund Journal, January 23, 26 and 27, 1909; John Henry Smith Journal, January 26, 1909.

¹⁴Joseph F. Smith to C. Elmo Cluff, December 28, 1915, Joseph F. Smith Letterbooks, Church Archives; *Improvement Era*, March 16, 1916, p. 461; *ibid.*, April, 1917, pp. 555–58; *ibid.*, Novem-

ber, 1917, pp. 11, 64; *ibid.*, March 1919, pp. 371–80; *Relief Society Magazine*, February, 1918, p. 160; April, 1919, pp. 238–39; February, 1918, p. 146; September, 1919, pp. 527, 593.

¹⁵George F. Richards Journal, March 26, 1921. Information on the Temple recommend book from K. Heybron Adams, formerly of the LDS Church Archives.

¹⁶LDS Church, *Handbook of Instructions*, No. 14, 1928 (n.p., 1928), p. 11; *idem. Handbook of Instructions*, No. 15, 1934 (n.p., 1933), p. 10.

¹⁷John S. H. Smith, "Cigarette Prohibition in Utah, 1921–23," *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 41 (Autumn, 1973), pp. 358–372.

¹⁸*Improvement Era*, March, 1923, p. 472; September, 1923, p. 1041; November, 1923, p. 145; April, 1926, p. 713; November, 1927, pp. 5–19; December, 1927, p. 109.

¹⁹Grant Diary, January 21, 1927; JH, March 26, 27, and 29, and November 24, 1929; *Relief Society Magazine*, May, 1929, p. 245.

²⁰JH, January 29, April 9, and June 8, 1930; *Improvement Era*, August, 1930, pp. 659–60.

²¹Richards Journal, November 1, 1922; Grant Diary, November 1, 1922, October 23, 29, and 30, 1930; James E. Talmage Journal, Special Collections, Brigham Young University Library, November 1, 1922; Reed Smoot Diary, *ibid.*, November 1, 1922, March 29, 1923, October 30, 1930.

²²Grant Diary, January 5, 10 and 14, 1928.

²³*Ibid.*, October 27 and November 17, 1930, July 17 and August 3, 1931.

²⁴JH, October 3, and December 1, 1929; June 9, and November 28, 1930; Journal of Anthony W. Ivins, Utah State Historical Society, Notes for 1931; John Keames, "Utah, Sexton of Prohibition," *Utah Historical Quarterly*, 47 (Winter, 1979), pp. 17–18.

²⁵*Improvement Era*, March, 1971, pp. 432–35.

²⁶Grant Diary, October 15, November 11, 12, and 16, 1924; First Presidency Letter of May 6, 1971, Edgemont South Stake Letter Files. See also Lester E. Bush, Jr., ed. "Mormon Medical Ethical Guidelines," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* XII (No. 3), pp. 102–104, for the only official guidance to date on cola drinks.

²⁷[John A. Widtsoe] "The Word of Wisdom," (British Mission, 1930); Grant Diary, November 23, 1930.

²⁸Roy W. Doxey, *The Word of Wisdom Today* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1975), pp. 13–14.

²⁹Some of the statements and reminiscences are cited in Doxey, pp. 10–13 and in John A. Widtsoe and Leah D. Widtsoe, *The Word of Wisdom: A Modern Interpretation* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1937), p. 28. Here I am speaking of specific revelations rather than the type of revelation mentioned later in this article. I would differentiate between what might be termed instant and unexpected revelations and revelations derived from long and prayerful consideration of a particular problem under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

³⁰On this point see W. J. Rorabaugh, *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979) and Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815–1837* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978). Joseph Gusfield in *Symbolic Crusade* has argued that the prohibition movement was part of the attempt of an increasingly displaced Protestant middle class to regain status. It seems to me, however, that Norman Clark in *Deliver Us From Evil* has the better of the argument when he points to the sincere belief that the elimination of alcohol would improve the moral tone of society, and that the support for the movement was extremely widebased.

³¹James B. Allen and Glen M. Leonard, *The Story of the Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1976), pp. 213–214; Leonard J. Arrington, Feramorz Y. Fox, and Dean L. May, *Building the City of God: Community and Cooperation Among the Mormons* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1976), pp. 341–348; Thomas G. Alexander, "The Reconstruction of Mormon Doctrine: From Joseph Smith to Progressive Theology," *Sunstone* 5 (July–August, 1980), pp. 24–33.