

The Persistence of Mormon Plural Marriage

B. Carmon Hardy

This essay addresses the remarkable perseverance of Mormon polygamy.¹ I argue that its survival is chiefly explained by the emphasis it was given in the nineteenth-century Church. The cardinal significance early leaders granted plurality in their teachings, combined with spirited defenses in its behalf, so gilded the doctrine that its enduring attraction was assured. A great deal of research studying patriarchal marriage has occurred in the last thirty or so years. The history of Mormon polygamy rehearsed in this paper selectively appropriates that work, together with early Latter-day Saint discourse, to more fully exhibit the bright promise given plural marriage by the Church's founding generations. I will also recount the Saints' torturous detachment from the practice and, further supporting the paper's theme, summarize fundamentalist efforts to maintain a continuum with Mormonism's polygamous past. Finally, the essay concludes with comments of the implications for the persistence of plural marriage for official Mormonism and American society today.

Anxious that there be no doubt concerning their commitment to the monogamous home, contemporary spokesmen of the orthodox Church repeatedly issue firmly worded communiqués denying that their organization approves polygamous marriage or has any formal connection either with Mormon fundamentalists or other communities that do. In what is probably the most-often referenced statement of that kind, Church President Gordon B. Hinckley, in an interview with Larry King on CNN in 1998, said that the information he possessed was that only 2 to 5 percent of the Saints engaged in plural marriage, but added that it was a long time ago, was not now doctrinal, and was ended in 1890.

Hinckley went on to condemn its contemporary practice, emphasizing that it was illegal. Such statements are repeated on the internet and elsewhere by Church representatives who also seek to secure the use of “Mormon” exclusively for the mainline, monogamous denomination.²

By attempting to distance the Church from modern polygamous sects, however, official spokesmen obscure much of what we now know about the Church’s involvement with plural marriage in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Statements such as Hinckley’s constitute a glossed appropriation of Mormon history. Not only do they minimize the number of participants involved when Mormonism did approve polygamy, but they also fail to acknowledge that what fundamentalists seek is reinstatement of a practice once counted by the Saints as among their most important. Only by recalling the imposing role given polygamy in the early Church can we understand efforts presently made by communities in Utah, Texas, and elsewhere to renew it. From the time of its first appearance in the nineteenth century, through the long but failed Latter-day Saint effort to win tolerance for polygamy, and now with fundamentalist reiteration, plural marriage displays a tenacious, reclaiming tendency—notwithstanding determined efforts to repress and forget it by the Church that gave it birth.

I

While questions remain concerning the role of Joseph Smith’s social/sexual motivations in commencing the practice, the most compelling theological assumptions supporting plural marriage are found in teachings that evolved contemporaneously with it, doctrines still accepted as revealed truth by the Church today. These tenets contend that God once passed through a probationary existence similar to our own. By faithful behavior, He eventually acquired attributes of omnipotence and supernal majesty. And, the Prophet taught, all humankind could aspire to a similar metamorphosis.³ One of the requirements, however, most completely set forth in Smith’s 1843 revelation on the subject, was that couples must marry and be “sealed” to each other in eternal unions, rituals performed by Church authorities today. Closely connected to this concept, and integral to the revelation as an an-

swer to Smith's question about why ancient patriarchs married multiple women, the Prophet was told that Abraham and others like him did so with divine permission that they might aggrandize their family estates through eternity. Both God Almighty and His faithful servants in those early days, the Prophet was instructed, took immense, even preeminent reward from the propagation of their kind (D&C 132:30–31, 55, 63).⁴

Smith was told that plurality so lifted such worthies that they sat “on thrones, and are not angels but are gods.” And in language unexcelled in an age flowing with grandiosities, Smith said he was promised that God would “bless him, and multiply him, and give unto him an hundred fold in this world of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and lands, wives and children, and crowns of eternal life” (D&C 132:37, 55 *passim*). Benjamin F. Johnson, a close associate of the Church's founder, explained: “Dominion & Powr in the great Future would be commensurate with the no of Wives childin & Friends that we inheret here and that our great mission to earth . . . [is] to Organize a Neculi of Heaven to take with us.”⁵ Gary Bergera perfectly summarized the concept: “For Smith, plural marriage represented the pinnacle of his theology of exaltation: the husband as king and priest, surrounded by queens and priestesses eternally procreating spirit children. As these spirit offspring enter mortality, they, by their obedience, accrue both to themselves, through their own children, and to their eternal parents additional glory, power, and exaltation—the entire process of exaltation cycling forever worlds without end.”⁶

So justified, the Prophet and several of his disciples conformed their lives to heaven's word. Smith's devotion to the practice was so great that the most recent investigation of his plural marriages counts them at over thirty-five and indicates that, before his assassination, he invited between two and three dozen other men to similarly enlarge their families. The vigor displayed by the Prophet and his confidants in forming such relationships resulted in scores of women being taken into the arms of men committed to the arrangement.⁷ More than one of his associates commented that none was more active in such ventures than the Prophet himself. A nephew and later Church president, Joseph F. Smith, struck by his uncle's zeal in acquiring new wives, recalled it

as proof of the importance Mormonism's founder attached to the doctrine.⁸

Such activities inevitably brought scandal, arousing opposition in and outside the Church, inviting condemnation of such intimacies as no more than "abominations and whoredoms."⁹ And this, combined with other difficulties, fed the whorl of events culminating in the murders of Joseph and his brother Hyrum. There may have been overstatement in Sidney Rigdon's claim that plural marriage was "the thing which put them into the power of their enemies, and was the immediate cause of their death." But it was a slight exaggeration only.¹⁰

Violence seemed to steel Mormon conviction. In the years immediately following the Smiths' assassinations and during the Saints' hegira to the Valley of the Great Salt Lake, polygamous unions were formed in increasing numbers.¹¹ After their arrival, believing that vast plains and high mountains insulated them from persecution, the Mormons did little to conceal their enlarging households. Consequently, reports from forty-niners, non-Mormon government officials, and other itinerant "Gentiles" brought criticism, prompting Latter-day Saint authorities to fearlessly defend their new family order. And once launched, Mormon support for the Principle quickly assumed a surprisingly forthright character. In an 1852 address, described by Harold Bloom as "the most courageous act of spiritual defiance in all American history,"¹² at Brigham Young's invitation Apostle Orson Pratt asserted that the marriage of Mormon men to several wives was approved by the Bible. Mormon behavior, he said, was a heaven-inspired replication of deeds undertaken by father Abraham.¹³ Another apostle, Orson Spencer, in a pamphlet so valued by the Saints that they later included it in a time deposit in the nearly completed Salt Lake Temple, said if he had the voice of a trumpet he would call on congresses and parliaments everywhere to hearken to the saving qualities of "this one great foundation of society," the Abrahamic polygamous household.¹⁴ And in an address to the territorial legislature in 1855, Apostle Parley P. Pratt, Orson's older brother, urged that monogamy, with the laws supporting it, be "cast into the depths of the sea," like a "millstone," and there left to "sink with Great Babylon to rise no more." Not only Utah Territory, Pratt said, but all human societies could en-

dure only if they approved patriarchal homes emulating that of Abraham with his plurality of wives.¹⁵

An important strain in this anthem, one voiced by other religious reformers of the early nineteenth-century, was distrust for what Sidney Ahlstrom described as the “historical tradition[s] and accretions” of established Christianity.¹⁶ Mormon founder Joseph Smith Jr. said that God told him Christendom had fallen away from the teachings of the primitive Church and from commandments given in earlier dispensations of Judeo-Christian history.¹⁷ Consistent with the claim, Mormons faulted Catholics and Protestants for encouraging marriage doctrines that the Saints said led invariably to sexual immorality. By praising celibacy and approving monogamy, Mormons contended, not only had Christians departed from Jewish polygamous practice but by doing so had sown prostitution, adultery, and sexual decadence throughout the modern world. “The principal abominations upon the face of the earth,” said an 1853 editorial in Mormonism’s *Millennial Star*, were the product of marital practices introduced by Catholicism and persevered in by its Protestant offspring. Hence, it was said, “men must either take sides with the mother of harlots, and with her monogamy, and celibacy, and prostitution, or take sides with the Almighty, and with His holy law of polygamy, and sexual purity.”¹⁸

Carrying the argument of apostasy to its furthest extent, the Saints said that the rest of Christendom had turned away from the example of Jesus himself who, like God the Father, was both married and likely a polygamist.¹⁹ It was to be expected that the Saints would seek to mirror their deities. A primary theme running through the revelation of 1843 was that, by marrying multiple wives and producing numerous offspring, the faithful not only magnified the glory of God but qualified themselves to stand with Him, His Son, and others who had earned the Almighty’s favor, adding to and enlarging the exaltation of all. While many non-Mormon observers thought it a pagan heresy to say heaven was full of gods, to insist that they also joined with multitudes of female divinities in eternal, reproductive coupling seemed nothing less than blasphemous.²⁰ Nevertheless, Latter-day Saint advocates of plurality have, both in the early Church and among fundamentalists today, rooted their justifications for its employment in

descriptions of heaven's pantheon as family-centered and patriarchal—as a place where countless progeny, peopling and multiplying worlds, compound one's glory to infinity.

The Saints quickly developed additional arguments to recommend the system. One of these, only recently recognized for the importance it carried in nineteenth-century Mormon thought, was the claim that, if practiced as taught by their leaders, plural marriage would produce a generation of stronger, longer-living men and women, procuring for them the longevity of the ancients while saving their descendants from biological failings entailed by the alleged excesses of monogamy. By confining sexual intercourse to reproductive intent, the marriage of one man to several women accommodated greater male libidinous need within domestic boundaries while, at the same time, accomplishing the species' regenerative requirement and avoiding the dissipating, non-reproductive indulgences that Mormons believed sullied the monogamous bed.²¹ As late as 1885, despite the grip of federal anti-polygamy laws, First Presidency members unequivocally identified monogamy with contemporary biological and social ills. Legally confining men to one spouse, they said, was not "God's system." For monogamy "did not meet man's wants. Those channels which God has provided for the lawful exercise of the appetites with which He has endowed man, under the system now in vogue, have been dammed up, and the history of Christianity informs us with what terrible results—the degradation and prostitution of woman, and the spread of the most terrible scourge known to humanity, the social evil, with its train of loathsome horrors. With our knowledge of God's laws we never can adopt such a system and call it civilization."²²

Almost entirely forgotten by the modern Church, nineteenth-century Mormon advocates of polygamy were certain the practice could rejuvenate the species. One polygamous wife, repeating the teachings of her leaders, told a visitor to Utah in 1880 that polygamy was "given for the regeneration of humankind. There are no healthier, or better developed children than those born in polygamy."²³ George Q. Cannon said that, by obeying God's revelation approving plural marriage, Mormon offspring were becoming "healthy and vigorous," and were fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah that God's people would live to the age of a tree.²⁴ It was an antici-

pation repeated by others. Charles W. Penrose, a Mormon newspaper editor who became an apostle in 1904, told how “celestial marriage, called by the world polygamy,” was giving rise among the Latter-day Saints to “stalwart sons and fair and robust daughters. . . . The mountain boys of Utah, powerful and well developed . . . are the first fruits of the Lord’s great work of regeneration.”²⁵

Beyond its health-giving powers, plurality was recommended as a way to care for socially and economically marginalized females such as orphans, widows, or those enfeebled by age.²⁶ It also, said the Saints, made for happier households than monogamy.²⁷ It reinforced male authority in the home, restoring the domestic pattern of the ancient patriarchs and providing a remedy for what some believed was a serious structural ailment in the nineteenth-century family.²⁸ Altogether, plural marriage was held out as a tonic. In the words of Luke William Gallup, not then a polygamist but an advocate of the doctrine, those who practice plural marriage “are rewarded, becoming healthy & strong, and the Man who observes this & marries more than one wife for the sake of posterity will lengthen out his days, enjoying a long life & a happy one.”²⁹ Or as Charles Smith, who entered the Principle, put it to a yet-one-wifed friend: “I wish you were a polyomist [sic] there is Something immensely Godlike in it[.] It increases the powers of the mind, [and] brings forth in bold relief all the powers of the human Soul.”³⁰ The Mormon husband of two or more wives, another enthusiast said, did more for the race than “ten thousand monogamists who write and preach about morality and virtue.”³¹

Finally, the Saints were often told that only by entering plural marriage could they reach the highest level of glory in the next life. Eternal marriage and plurality of wives were inextricably connected. To forfeit one, it was said, would bring loss of the other.³² The 1843 revelation was placed in the Doctrine and Covenants in 1876 to buttress the contention of George Reynolds, then under indictment, that plural marriage was a commandment, a way of life required of him by his religion. By identifying the practice as a mandate imposed by Mormon doctrine, it was hoped that implementation of the Principle would find protection under the U.S. Constitution’s First Amendment. Daniel H. Wells, a counselor to President Brigham Young, in support of Reynolds, stated in open court that any who were physically able to enter the order but

failed to do so “would be under condemnation, and would be *clipped in their glory* in the world to come.”³³ As Brigham Young once put it, all should at least have faith in the doctrine and not oppose it, for “the only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy.”³⁴

And this, the prospective meed of godly thrones, combined with plurality’s temporal gifts, illustrates the compelling sweep of expectations that nineteenth-century Mormons were told they could look for if they lived the Principle. One modern writer, puzzling over why Latter-day Saints undertook such emotionally challenged marriages, concluded that it could only have been from unquestioning obedience to God’s inscrutable command.³⁵ On the contrary, Church authorities told their followers that plural marriage brought unnumbered compensations, here as well as in the life to come. In the words of nineteenth-century apostle Orson Hyde, polygamy was supported by “such a tide of irresistible arguments, that, like the grand Mississippi, it bears on its bold current everything that dares to oppose its course.”³⁶

Because of its transforming effects, plurality was said to have produced an unusual number of men raised to leadership in the Church and that its ethos resulted in an especially righteous and able generation of members.³⁷ Polygamy, some contended, would eventually be counted a blessing to everyone. Whether this meant that the Saints should engage in it only by themselves, leavening the social loaf through their polygamous practice alone, or whether it was a system suitable for humankind generally, was answered differently at different times. Especially when refuting charges that the Church sought to disseminate its domestic reform abroad, leaders emphatically denied that they intended doing so. It was, said Brigham Young, a commandment given by God only for his “faithful children.”³⁸ Heber C. Kimball described the practice as a means by which the Almighty intended to keep the Saints separate and distinct from the rest of the world.³⁹ Plurality, one Latter-day Saint pamphleteer stated, was to be confined geographically to Zion, a place intentionally set apart by God for that purpose.⁴⁰ And President John Taylor was told in a revelation that plurality was not to be proclaimed to nor urged upon the rest of the world unless they first accepted the “law of my Gospel and are governed thereby.”⁴¹

Nevertheless, moved by the lifting capacities claimed for patriarchal marriage, soaring expectations concerning its acknowledgment, if not its practice outside the Mormon fold, were also heard. After Orson Pratt's intrepid 1852 sermon, Brigham Young followed Pratt by predicting that the Principle would be accepted by "the more intelligent portions of the world" and praised as one of the best doctrines ever set forth.⁴² Rather than an innovation, it was described as an ancient family pattern superior to the monogamy of modern Christian nations, one yet to be seen in non-Euro-American societies. George Q. Cannon asserted that a survey of these cultures proved polygamy, though practiced by peoples unfamiliar with Mormonism, brought "greater good to them than the practice of monogamy or the one-wife system."⁴³ Thus, said another authority, echoing plurality's alleged eugenic effects, "the most stalwart and physically powerful men known are not found in Christian monogamic nations, but in polygamic Asia."⁴⁴

Mormon confidence in the superiority of plural marriage sometimes partook of a near hauteur. It was more than once described as their Church's "greatest gift" to humankind.⁴⁵ As late as the mid-1880s, when the national anti-polygamy crusade was near its height, Apostle Moses Thatcher reaffirmed that a major reason the Saints refused to give up polygamy was because, in his words, it was the "chief corner stone" by which they would establish a civilization "that will yet be the admiration of the world."⁴⁶ Helen Mar Kimball Whitney, writing near the same time, said Mormons were honored that the Almighty had chosen them to pioneer a domestic pattern that would bring greater health and happiness and that Mormons were the "advanced guard" for introducing this "practical reform in the marriage system."⁴⁷ Boasting that the Saints had the handsomest men and women, Apostle George A. Smith said this was because they better understood the correct relationship of the sexes and that Gentiles might properly envy them, for such unbelievers were "a poor, narrow-minded, pinch-backed race of men, who chain themselves down to the law of monogamy."⁴⁸ On account of their teachings, relocating to the valleys of the mountains was, a female Saint remembered, like "passing from one World to another!"⁴⁹ And a Mormon physician

and polygamous wife promised that, if plurality were universally accepted as taught by the Saints, the millennium would come.⁵⁰

Owing to such enthusiasm, we know plurality was practiced to a greater extent than traditional Church estimates admit. Though the number of pluralists after 1860 declined relative to the entire population of the Church, inquiries into the question find that, on average, between a fourth and a third of households in pre-Manifesto, Mormon Utah could be counted as polygamous; settlements with even higher proportions existed but were exceptional.⁵¹ As Lowell “Ben” Bennion, the foremost investigator of these matters, has suggested, even these percentages might have been larger except for demographic and other constraints, such as the number of eligible females. Beyond this, owing to their extensive social networks, most Mormons were closely connected in one way or another with friends and relatives who were pluralists. Because so many Church leaders were polygamous, an imprimatur that reinforced the doctrine’s importance, the mindset of Mormons both plural and monogamous was one that gave the Principle an august presence in their communities.⁵² In a recent survey, Bennion and co-author Thomas R. Carter conclude that plural marriage, in all its aspects, “was prevalent enough to label Utah *polygamous* in spite of its monogamous majority.”⁵³

Over the half century or more of Church approval for plurality, tens of thousands of men, women, and children lived beneath the roofs of Mormon Abrahams.⁵⁴ As such, excepting religious celibacy, the Mormon polygamous experience as a religio-cultural ideal as well as actual way of life, may have constituted the largest formal departure from monogamy in western European and American societies for centuries. After a visit to the American West, former Vice President Schuyler Colfax complained to Senator George Edmunds in 1882 that the Principle was so broadly embraced in Utah that he found monogamous Mormons committed to it just as poor whites in the South supported slavery.⁵⁵ With its theological prestige and socially suffused character, the comment of one adherent at the time of the national crusade against the practice is entirely comprehensible: “The ABANDONMENT OF POLYGAMY, that is considered by some to be so easy of accomplishment, is more untenable even than fighting. However much the people might desire to do this, they could not

without yielding every other principle, for it is the very key stone of our faith, and is so closely interwoven into everything that pertains to our religion, that to tear it asunder and cast it away would involve the entire structure.”⁵⁶

II

The energy Latter-day Saints brought to the support of their doctrine also explains the voltaic character of non-Mormon response. Sir Richard Burton commented on the level of passion displayed by the two sides in the debate over Mormon claims.⁵⁷ And Richard D. Poll, a twentieth-century Mormon historian, pointed out that attacks on the Saints and their polygamy were largely proportional to the intensity of Mormon attacks on the Gentiles and their monogamy.⁵⁸ The reaction of those opposing plurality was owing to widespread belief that, rather than what Latter-day Saints were saying, it was monogamous marriage that accounted for what was best in Western civilization. Ethnologist Lewis Henry Morgan said in the 1870s that monogamy was an evolved form, winnowed and proven superior to other marital arrangements by experience.⁵⁹ If polygamy were tolerated, it was believed, civility would regress, the status of women would decline, the nation’s democratic sensibilities would erode, and rank immorality would spread. As non-Mormon Americans enveloped the Mountain West, the Saints were predictably challenged by antagonists who insisted that monogamy alone could bring a happy and ordered society.

Moved by such views, congressmen began enacting successively harsher statutes to suppress polygamy beginning in 1862, eventually patterning their laws on Reconstruction measures imposed on former Confederate states and subjecting Utah society to the political and judicial control of a federal commission. Mormon insistence that the freedom of religion clause in the First Amendment to the Constitution permitted them to configure marriage relations as they pleased was contradicted by the U.S. Supreme Court in the famous *Reynolds* case of 1879. In its decision, while affirming the authority of Congress to regulate marriage in territories such as Utah and establishing the rule that liberty under the First Amendment extended only to religious belief, not practice, the court also affirmed that “polygamy has al-

ways been odious among the northern and western nations of Europe, and, until the establishment of the Mormon Church, was almost exclusively a feature of the life of Asiatic and of African people.”⁶⁰

Sarah Barringer Gordon has shown that the campaign against polygamy, among other things, rested on suppositions knitting the nuclear family and the American Constitution together. For many, this alliance was anchored in the traditional, Protestant monogamous home. It was the presumed threat to monogamy, more than all else, that raised vehement opposition to plural marriage and moved the nation’s reformist focus from Reconstruction in the South to Reconstruction in the West.⁶¹ As expressed by the Utah Commission in its report for 1885, the nation’s anti-polygamy laws and imprisonment of Mormon pluralists occurred because of “the assault made by the Mormon Church upon the most cherished institution of our civilization—the monogamous system. The laws for the suppression of polygamy were chiefly inspired by the apprehension that if this practice should be . . . tolerated . . . in the United States it might one day become a serious menace to the institution of monogamy, which the world has come to consider the most potential factor for the advancement of civilization everywhere.”⁶²

Exercising authority given them by Congress, law-enforcement officers arrested so many “cohabs” that western prisons filled, making it necessary to incarcerate some as far east as Detroit, Michigan.⁶³ In addition to the imprisonment of Church members by the hundreds and loss of properties, scores fled across the nation’s boundaries, establishing colonies in Mexico and Canada where they looked to freely cultivate what George Alfred Townsend described as the “banyan” redundancies of Mormon polygamy.⁶⁴ Most onerous, perhaps, anticipating representations made of today’s fundamentalists, were exaggerated portrayals of Mormon plural marriage as nothing more than a system encouraging the lustful exploitation of women and young girls.⁶⁵ Fear that Mormons threatened traditional family life inspired an unsuccessful but decades-long national campaign to amend the U.S. Constitution and so forever prohibit polygamy.⁶⁶ International attention to “Mormon marriages,” as they were sometimes called, led to legislation outlawing polygamy in Canada, anti-Mor-

mon pamphleteering in Europe, and condemnation by the Pope.⁶⁷ In the words of one observer at the time, Hubert Howe Bancroft, the federal crusade against Mormon polygamy was a program “without parallel in the history of American morals.”⁶⁸

Though unrelenting, attacks on plurality were slow to extinguish Mormon attachment to the doctrine. The onslaught brought by their enemies seemed only to spur greater animation by defenders. As Mary Jane Mount Tanner put it to a family member in 1882, “Aunt Cornelia says why do I defend polygamy so strongly I tell her because she attacks it.”⁶⁹ Tempering their advocacy, Mormon leaders insisted they were not “propagandists” and had never actively sought universal adherence to “Bible marriage.”⁷⁰ At the same time, referring to the transforming power of plurality, those arrayed against them were, said Charles W. Penrose, seeking to “destroy the work of regeneration and reformation” Mormonism had brought to the world.⁷¹ Further, Eliza R. Snow warned that those seeking to forcefully engraft monogamy on them would not only be divinely punished but, if they succeeded in making the Latter-day Saints forfeit polygamy, would bear a greater burden before God than any people except the ancient Jews.⁷² They were, said the leaders, in circumstances similar to those of the Israelites in Egypt and the early Christians under Rome.⁷³ Church members were hated by the world, they were told, just as the righteous in every age had been. And fueling that “hate,” said George Q. Cannon, “head and front,” was Mormon audacity in urging plural marriage as a principle of religion.⁷⁴

Still, the Saints were assured, if they would hold fast to the practice, keeping “every commandment,” that God would stand as their protector—a contractual obligation that some later said the Saints failed completely to fulfill, thus explaining why the Lord eventually took plural marriage away from them with the Manifesto.⁷⁵ But as part of this penultimate phase of the struggle, believers were told that the campaign against polygamy was a dimension of the long-expected persecution and upheaval expected to precede the world’s end. This vision was often communicated to the Saints by their leaders, explaining that, if they endured, Mormon suffering brought by their enemies would be assuaged by terrible reckoning at the hand of God.⁷⁶ That is why, until the late 1880s when the Church became especially committed to pro-

jecting a reformed image of itself so as to win statehood for Utah and thereby acquire greater autonomy from federal control, leaders said that allegiance to polygamy was more important than obedience to secular laws criminalizing the practice.⁷⁷ Too much smoothed from Mormon memory today, efforts by the Saints to perpetuate the “higher law,” submitting to humiliation, impoverishment, dislocation, and imprisonment, were heroic. Their perseverance constitutes one of the longest instances of civil disobedience in United States history.

As the bite of anti-polygamy legislation was more keenly felt, Church spokesmen bent their defensive strategy, projecting the Mormon image as overwhelmingly monogamous, hoping thereby to persuade the nation that they were little different from other Americans in their home life. A major feature of this tack involved shuttering the Church’s devotion to plural marriage from public view while abating their criticism of traditional monogamy. In 1888 Wilford Woodruff told General Authority colleagues that, if anyone should commence talking about plurality at a general conference, they should throw their hats at him.⁷⁸

Church representatives attempted to persuade the government that the practice was nearly moribund, saying that the proportion of Latter-day Saints engaged in polygamy amounted to no more than 1 or 2 percent, and that those numbers were “diminishing with wonderful rapidity.”⁷⁹ At the same time, not only was approval for such marriages still given but, especially when speaking privately and within Church walls, authorities yet told members that the practice was essential for their highest exaltation in the hereafter and urged its observance.⁸⁰ Alarmed by their leaders’ public statements and fearing that a retreat in Church policy on polygamy was underway, Mormons serving time in prison complained to George Q. Cannon, a counselor in the First Presidency, that if this were true their sacrifices for the doctrine were in vain. Cannon assured them on October 2, 1888, that polygamy would not be given up.⁸¹ Recognizing the Janus-like character of its response to the nation’s campaign against Mormonism’s marital ideal in the 1880s, especially in the last few years of that decade, helps us better understand how the Church could issue the 1890 Manifesto and yet continue to approve new plural marriages for the next quarter century.⁸²

When in 1890 the Utah Commission impugned Mormon denials by announcing the discovery of dozens of recently solemnized polygamous unions and accused the Church of continuing to urge the doctrine, President Woodruff issued his famous Manifesto the week before October general conference. Consistent with what one critic called Mormonism's "wooden horse" tactic of seeking entry into the Union by publicly denying authorization of plural marriages while actually permitting them, Woodruff stamped the commission's allegations as false. He further declared his intent to personally submit to the laws of the land and "advised" other Latter-day Saints to do likewise.⁸³ The Mormon president indicated in his journal that he prepared the Manifesto to obtain "the Temporal Salvation of the Church."⁸⁴ And this was what the finished document, with its denials, genuflections to the law, and non-revelatory tone eventually accomplished. Consistent with earlier professions, using feint and circumvention, the object was to show federal lawmakers that they were *advising* members not to enter polygamous marriages, hoping thereby to obtain relief from the enforcement of anti-bigamy statutes, acquire statehood, but keep the Principle.

When it was learned that Secretary of the Interior John W. Noble, to whom a copy of Woodruff's statement had already been sent, would not accept it as persuasive unless ratified by Church members themselves, it was read and voted upon at a session of general conference, October 6, 1890. This was a significant step because members were now not only advised to obey the law but, by voting on the document, were making their obedience a rule of the Church. Although, in a statement following publication of the Manifesto as "Official Declaration-1" in contemporary editions of the Doctrine and Covenants, the vote on the Manifesto is reported to have been unanimous, it was not. Some of those present were deeply disturbed by the presentation. Nevertheless, enough lifted their hands that the statement passed and became official policy for the Church.⁸⁵

Woodruff's pronouncement, however, failed to address several important matters relating to Mormon plural marriage. Were men and women who married as plurals before the document's issuance, for example, affected by its language and now to be separated?⁸⁶ Was the proclamation applicable outside the United

States, as in Mexico where dozens of plural families resided?⁸⁷ And what implications did the document have for Mormon men then prosecuted or serving time for polygamous cohabitation?⁸⁸

None of these questions, however, proved so controversial as: Was the Manifesto a revelation? As already indicated, except that it was voted upon and made official policy, Woodruff's pronouncement differed little from other carefully worded retractions issued by the Church for years. Beyond this, nothing in its language resembled the style and form of revelations given by Church leaders in the past, including Woodruff's own of a decade before, in which the Almighty told him the nation would be punished for attempting to keep the Saints from "obeying the Patriarchal Law of Abraham which leadeth to a Celestial Glory."⁸⁹ When a Utah Commissioner said the Manifesto would have been more effective if it *had* been presented as a revelation, he was reproached by the editor of the Church's official newspaper who stated that when word came from on high it would be soon enough for the Church's president to say so.⁹⁰ Dissatisfaction on the question within, as well as outside of, the Church continued. Consequently, building on remarks made at the time of its presentation, President Woodruff was brought to affirm that the document was revealed and was a commandment from God.⁹¹ More than this, in the 1891 hearings before the Master in Chancery dealing with escheated Church properties, the Church president, somewhat unwillingly, was led to say that his declaration required Mormon adherence to all provisions of the law of the land, including the need to discontinue living with plural wives married before the Manifesto, and that anyone entering a new plural marriage would be "liable to excommunication."⁹²

Still, authorities see-sawed over the question for years. Disagreement on the matter fractured the Church's governing quorums. Some opposed permitting new polygamous marriages.⁹³ Others remained strongly committed to the Principle and secretly assisted faithful members wishing to take new wives into their homes. Supporting those who saw Woodruff's declaration as but a repetition of Church pretense in the 1880s was Apostle Mariner W. Merrill, one of those whom Woodruff consulted when the document was prepared. He said: "I do Not believe the Manifesto was a revelation from God but was formulated by Prest.

Woodruff and endorsed by His Councilors and the Twelve Apostles for expediency to meet the present situation of affairs in the Nation or those against the Church.”⁹⁴ Another apostle boldly stated in 1900 that the propagation of polygamous offspring would continue until the second coming of the Savior, adding, “I make this prophecy in the name of Jesus Christ.”⁹⁵ So far as deceit in the Church’s maneuverings is concerned, there was the alleged justifying remark of Apostle John Henry Smith that the Manifesto was but “a trick to beat the devil at his own game.”⁹⁶ It is significant that not only did those passages of the 1843 revelation commanding polygamy remain unchanged in the Doctrine and Covenants but also the Manifesto itself was not included in that canon until eighteen years after its formal presentation—and then, titled only an “Official Declaration,” was placed so far to the rear of the book that it followed both the index and concordance.⁹⁷

Whatever qualifications are raised concerning it, the Manifesto and its interpretive development ushered the Church into an era of unprecedented agreement with the nation. Utah’s territorial legislature in 1892, after nearly a half century of refusal to do so, criminalized polygamous cohabitation.⁹⁸ The arrest and jailing of Mormon polygamists largely came to an end. Mormons aligned themselves with national political parties, and Utah Territory in 1896 was granted full membership with other states in the Union. Most importantly, public statements by leaders that new polygamous marriages were no longer condoned were repeated with increasing frequency, acquiring more credibility with members and nonmembers alike. Many who had long been critical of the Church were persuaded that the Saints had made a genuine concession, had turned away from plural marriage, and were now a fully American people.⁹⁹

This said, nothing so speaks to the depth of the polygamous current in Mormon culture as the continued performance of new plural marriages during the 1890s and after, the Manifesto and promises by Church leaders notwithstanding. When word of such late unions emerged, Mormon spokesmen said they were the work of rebels and were few in number. Research shows, however, that high Church leaders, including members of the First Presidency, gave permission for many of these marriages, that they numbered in the hundreds, and that most who took additional

wives in the quarter century after the Manifesto could be described as among the most faithful in the Church. At least seven Apostles took new plural wives after Woodruff's 1890 declaration.¹⁰⁰ Churchmen did all they could to cloak such marriages from the majority of believers as well as outsiders, employing obfuscation, deception, and mistruth. What lay beneath this subterranean extension was the memory of strong commitments to "the higher law," commitments made again and again in holy places, memory of heroic sacrifices made in behalf of the Principle, sacrifices against which they were fortified not only by assurances that God would preserve both them and plural marriage but by the bold promise of polygamy's extraordinary rewards.

At the same time as officially approved post-Manifesto plural unions were occurring, the impetus of reform, both in fact and appearance, grew. Efforts to reconfigure the Church were energized by embarrassments arising from the B. H. Roberts and Reed Smoot cases in Congress. Roberts, who lived in a plural household and may have taken an additional spouse after the Manifesto, owing to vigorous criticism in both Congress and the nation's press, was refused his seat in the House of Representatives in 1900.¹⁰¹ In the wake of this episode, with revived suspicion concerning Mormon truthfulness in the air, Utah's Senator-Apostle Reed Smoot was elected and seated but challenged. This four-year-long senatorial inquiry, one of the longest in congressional history to that time, while acquitting Smoot of marrying additional women, demonstrated that numbers of others, including Church authorities, had taken new brides and lived with them as plural wives since the 1890 Manifesto.¹⁰² The awkward nature of these discoveries, abetted by urgings from Senator Smoot, persuaded President Joseph F. Smith to again strongly deny Mormon approval of plural marriage in 1904 and more resolutely halter other leaders in bringing the performance of such marriages to an end.¹⁰³

In addition to public disavowals of polygamous relationships, a committee of apostles chaired by Francis M. Lyman, the quorum president, undertook the investigation of cases rumored to involve such unions.¹⁰⁴ But signals from the leaders remained confusing. After delivering a firm address condemning new plural marriages at general conference in April 1914, for example,

President Smith hosted an entertainment the same evening honoring those who had suffered in prison for polygamous cohabitation.¹⁰⁵ Confused by the conflicting character of what leaders said and did, some Church members remarked that it seemed the Church was going in two directions at once.¹⁰⁶ For the most part, however, inconsistencies diminished and fissures of disagreement between high churchmen over the question gradually closed. Officially approved new polygamous unions appear to have completely ceased by the time of World War I, and certainly by Smith's death in 1918.¹⁰⁷

III

The rhetoric of heaven-approved deviance, an important historical theme in the Saints' self-image and one to which plurality had powerfully contributed, never completely displaced the wish by many for respect from American society. This desire, combined with the Church's official statements, moved followers closer to the American mainstream. It was what Utah Commissioner John A. McClernand referred to in an 1887 remark to President Grover Cleveland—that every time Mormons made a statement claiming polygamy was no longer a part of their way of life, the greater the likelihood that such a description would become true.¹⁰⁸ Leo Lyman's characterization of events during the 1880s aptly describes the process of change occurring in Mormonism after 1890 as well: “[Church] concessions . . . relating to polygamy [were] intended mainly to pacify the public and their elected representatives. The efforts at conciliation were done without actually altering any aspect of the practice, other than perhaps making it less visible and more of an individual responsibility. But each time a statement was made, Latter-day Saints who heeded the words of their ecclesiastical superiors were encouraged in their resolves not to practice polygamy.”¹⁰⁹

Growing acceptance by the larger membership of the Church of claims by their leaders concerning plurality's demise is the most significant alteration in Mormonism's countenance from the late 1880s and into the twentieth century. The contention that no more than 1 or 2 percent of their members had ever lived in plural arrangements became a fixed characterization of Mormonism's past, a generalization sincerely accepted as true by

members and, increasingly, by leaders themselves. The low figures adduced by Church defenders, sometimes lifted to 5 or 10 percent, were given throughout the twentieth century, as in President Hinckley's interview cited above.¹¹⁰ And as part of the changes taking place, encomiums bestowed on Abraham as a polygamous model fell silent. Church authorities increasingly insisted that the sealing of a monogamous couple in the temple was what the 1843 revelation required, not a man's marriage to multiple wives.¹¹¹ Contradicting the evidence of decades, polygamy was described by one high Church spokesman as never having been a "vital tenet" in Church teaching. It was no more than "an incident," never an "essential" of what Mormonism taught.¹¹²

And with plurality's diminished profile, fashion and idiom in Latter-day Saint communities increasingly resembled that of their Gentile neighbors. Writing early in the twentieth century, describing how the Church's assumed discontinuance of polygamy transformed life in Utah, one observer said: "Mormons and non-Mormons [now] blend in the marts of trade, as in the ranks of the Bench and Bar, in the highways of travel, in society, in gatherings of all kinds, and only those who are acquainted could tell one from another."¹¹³ The extent to which so many in the Church were brought to believe that God wanted Mormon men, at least in this world, to confine themselves to a single wife was one of Mormonism's most defining turns.

Because some dissenters yet held that polygamy was a binding requirement for the faithful and continued to enter such relationships, the First Presidency issued a harsh warning in 1933 to all who resisted the Church's new course. The statement not only claimed that, in abandoning polygamy, Mormon leaders were conforming themselves to divine will but that further attempts to revive the Principle were inspired by Satan, that new plural relationships were adulterous, and that the president of the Church alone had authority to approve plural unions—permission he no longer granted.¹¹⁴ A further example of Mormonism's monogamous inflection occurred when Utah's state legislature enacted a criminal provision in 1935, supported by Church leaders, elevating conviction for polygamous cohabitation from a misdemeanor to a felony.¹¹⁵ Mormon assimilation of the monogamous ideal was carried to such an extent that the Church's Commissioner of

Education, Franklin L. West, whose father and grandfather were both devoted pluralists, told an audience of the faithful in 1937 that monogamy had proven itself superior in the experience of the race and that the one-wife system best harmonized with man's inherent nature, the needs of families, and religious tradition.¹¹⁶ Embracing these views, the Saints had completely wheeled round, using arguments identical to those made by critics of Mormon plural marriage during the anti-polygamy crusade.¹¹⁷ Replacement of the Abrahamic polygamous ideal with firm Latter-day Saint endorsements of monogamy constitutes one of the most dramatic reversals in modern denominational history.

IV

Commitment to the Principle, however, was far from spent. Numbers of old modelers, nourished by Mormonism's prodigious archive of polygamous commendation, were determined to keep plural marriage alive. It is a common pattern with ultra-orthodox dissenters to focus on a traditional tenet of the parent denomination, often one of distinguishing prominence, in this case Mormon polygamy, and to contend that repudiation of the precept occurred because of capitulation to secular influence.¹¹⁸ While most fundamentalists see official Mormonism as specially chosen in its youth, all consider it, in its maturity, to be a faith in peril. Replicating nineteenth-century Mormon indictments of Catholic and Protestant Christianity, Mormon fundamentalists accuse contemporary Latter-day Saints of no longer preaching the "fullness of the gospel," of surrendering to the world, especially on account of their retreats from plural marriage.¹¹⁹ The fundamentalist shoots that sprouted from mainline Mormonism's trunk in the nineteen-teens, twenties, and thirties grew directly from memories of the high importance given polygamy by the old Church and the decades-long refusal to surrender it. The concealed but Church-approved performance of such marriages that continued into the early twentieth century not only instanced the Principle's endurance but provided encouragement to individuals committed to a fight that they saw others relinquishing. Official Mormonism's post-Manifesto, covert involvement with plural marriage thus became a template for fundamentalist polygamy itself.¹²⁰

Increasingly active numbers of irreconcilables met privately in each other's homes, recalled the teachings of past leaders, and claimed that special authority for perpetuating polygamy was given them by Mormon President John Taylor when the Church was harassed and pressured to end the practice in the 1880s.¹²¹ As their following grew, several families relocated to the high desert lands of southern Utah and northern Arizona. There, the fundamentalist community of Short Creek, now grown to become the municipalities of Hildale and Colorado City, suffered periodic attacks from public agencies. The best-known of these was a government raid in 1953 by Arizona National Guardsmen under the direction of Arizona Governor Howard Pyle.¹²² The hardship created by the operation, combined with the exaggerations made to justify it and the financial costs incurred, led to a backlash in public opinion.¹²³ Nearly all taken in the raid later returned to the locale, plural marriage continued to be taught, and satellite communities were established as far away as Canada, Mexico, and, more recently, at the "Yearning for Zion" ranch near El Dorado, Texas. Most importantly, consistent with the major contention of this article, since the 1953 raid the number living in polygamous households in these settlements has increased from hundreds to thousands.¹²⁴ In 1991, considering themselves the authentic heirs of early Mormon preachment, the group officially named itself, "The Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints" (FLDS).

Another sect, the Apostolic United Brethren, emerged in the mid-twentieth century on account of controversy over leadership succession in the movement. Predominantly urban, members of this persuasion do not follow an antique dress code but firmly adhere to the importance of plural marriage. Living chiefly in and around Salt Lake City, colonies of AUB partisans have spread to other locations in Utah, to Montana, and a few even to Mexico, Germany, and the Netherlands. AUB and FLDS organizations together now tally their communicants at nearly 20,000. Other smaller organizations also exist, each claiming special endorsement from on high. Additionally, hundreds of men and women, unassociated with any formal group, steadfastly adhere to the polygamous ideals extolled by former Latter-day Saint leaders and their writings. It is estimated that these independents actually

constitute a majority of polygamous fundamentalists. Survey figures recently provided to me by Anne Wilde show organized and disparate adherents together totaling between 35,000 and 40,000 people, a substantial league of living advocates for the plural way of life.¹²⁵ And all, refusing to see God's hand in Mormonism's doctrinal evolution, view the official Church's opposition to plural marriage as evidence of its worldly thrall and oracular default.¹²⁶

But even with their continuing increase, Mormon fundamentalists remain a slender troop when compared to the swelling legions of the better-known, monogamous, mainline Church. Grown to become one of the faster expanding religious bodies in the United States, counting more American adherents than either Episcopalians or Presbyterians, the Saints are now a formidable cultural force in certain regions of the country.¹²⁷ And this—the impressive growth of monogamous Mormonism—constitutes a daunting riposte to any who would say that, by stepping aside from polygamy, Church leaders lost their way. Given its acquisitions of power, wealth, and influence, one can understand why Mormon authorities are disinclined to recall, much less reinstate, practices that once brought imprisonment and scorn. Still, the success that monogamous Latter-day Saints enjoy has not spared them irritation from claims by and public notice given to their polygamous cousins. Annoyed by their perseverance, the orthodox Church sharply enunciates differences between itself and the dissenters. Mormon authorities have vigorously sought to suppress fundamentalist activities by excommunication, loyalty oaths, cooperation with government officials in making arrests, refusing Church welfare assistance to fundamentalist families, and advising that their children be denied baptism into the parent, Salt Lake City denomination until old enough to denounce the practice that brought them into the world.¹²⁸

In concert with these policies toward contemporary polygamous groups, Latter-day Saint authorities give, at most, only cursive attention to their own Church's one-time commitment to plural marriage. Most approved biographies of early Mormon leaders say little, if anything, of their polygamous relationships. Almost no attention is given the subject in Latter-day Saint sermons, theological exposition, museum displays, or art.¹²⁹ Properly me-

morializing the courage of Mormon pioneers in their struggle against persecution, official accounts largely avoid discussion of what it was they were often persecuted for: the preaching and practice of polygamy. Anxious to present their history as doctrinally seamless and their teachings as unchanging, leaders must gray recollection of the most aberrant feature of their Church's past, cultivating what George D. Smith has termed "institutional forgetting."¹³⁰ When confronted with the impassioned advocacy of polygamy in the early Church, orthodox spokesmen call to their service exemptions permitted by "continuing revelation," a dispensation that with its approval of doctrinal amendment necessarily qualifies confidence in their leaders' prescience—as when President Heber J. Grant, condemning new plural marriages undertaken on the counsel of his predecessors, said "one living prophet [is] . . . worth twenty dead ones."¹³¹

To be sure, there are still vestiges within the mainline denomination that remind one of the profound place plurality once occupied in Mormon belief. Most conspicuously, the 1843 revelation justifying plural marriage is still a part of the Church's canon of scripture (D&C 132).¹³² Sublimating the Principle, it is sometimes said that, while the Church gave up the practice, it did not disavow the doctrine and that it will be implemented again in heaven.¹³³ There is also the prospect, at odds with the Church's opposition to the revival of plural relations in the present life, given to Latter-day Saint widowers who remarry women not already eternally promised to a former husband, that they—the widower, his deceased wife, and the new wife—may all live together as eternal companions in the world to come.¹³⁴ And, though little noticed, the Church's 1995 declaration, "The Family: A Proclamation to the World," exalting marriage and emphasizing the divinely mandated presence of both genders in marital relations, when literally read fails to exclude polygamy as an acceptable form of family life.¹³⁵ But these are anomalies, little diverting a Church now indefatigably crusading for the traditional, monogamous home.

V

In contrast to Mormonism's opposition to renewed polygamy and to religious groups that espouse it, other developments sug-

gest that the nation itself may be moving in a more generous direction, hinting at acceptance of what Latter-day Saint leaders would as soon forget. The much-publicized “Yearning for Zion” FLDS ranch in Texas, raided by state authorities in 2008, as at Short Creek, Arizona, in 1953, has seen many of its dislodged polygamous inhabitants peacefully return to their homes.¹³⁶ While widespread American offense is aroused by the patriarchal authoritarianism of some of their leaders, the sentiment is by no means without exception, especially when it comes to the women, children and even the plural marital arrangement itself.¹³⁷ On a different front, some recommend plural relationships as having advantages for the elderly. Because of actuarial differences between the genders, plurality offers greater opportunities for companionship to widowed and older women, providing a partial remedy for the loneliness encountered by both sexes in their later years.¹³⁸ There is also now a non-religious website where single women seriously interested in joining polygamous families can advertise themselves.¹³⁹ And success of the television series, *Big Love*, portraying not only the persistence but general workability of a polygamous family in modern life, suggests a growing lenience for the practice on the part of its viewing audience.¹⁴⁰

Although courts consistently uphold statutes criminalizing polygamy, there is evidence that greater permissiveness may be looked for in the future. In words that would have pleased the ears of earlier Mormons, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas’s delphic forecast in 1971 that “in time Reynolds will be overturned,” if not yet realized, foretells changing constitutional scenery ahead.¹⁴¹ Utah Attorney General Mark Shurtleff deemphasizes prosecutions for polygamy as such, allowing fundamentalists to communicate less defensively with his office and thereby more effectively deter crimes such as under-age marriages and welfare fraud.¹⁴² A Republican legislator in Utah bravely, but unsuccessfully, proposed that the state apologize to its fundamentalist citizens.¹⁴³ Canadians are examining the possibility of moderating their laws criminalizing plurality.¹⁴⁴ And the growing assent for the legalization of same-sex marriage both in the United States and abroad portends a more relaxed attitude generally toward marital relationships of many kinds between consenting adults—including plural wifery.¹⁴⁵

The possibility that this shift in attitude may eventually become dominant raises the question of official Mormonism's response. Is it conceivable that the main body of the Saints could return to the much-married, grandly multiplied patriarch as an ideal this side of the veil? Admitting, as Michael Quinn suggests, that the growth of Mormon membership among peoples in third world countries where polygamy is practiced could lead the Church to a revised interpretation of the Manifesto, my own expectation is that this will not soon occur.¹⁴⁶ I am also certain that, until sentiment within the United States becomes yet more permissive on social issues, jealous of its improving public image the official Church will not hazard so reactionary a course.¹⁴⁷ Mormonism's "passion for respectability," long frustrated by its polygamous reputation, is not yet fully sated.¹⁴⁸ Although, without returning to the *practice*, it is reasonable to assume that, so far as respectful forbearance of polygamy's presence among others is concerned, consistent with its altered stands on controversial subjects before, we can eventually expect to see Mormonism "backing," as Klaus Hansen put it, "into the future."¹⁴⁹

But this will most easily happen when leaders turn from obsession with the Mormon past as a proselytizing tool to an honest regard for its instructive potential.¹⁵⁰ An instance is found in one of the Church's responses when the nation's attack on its marriage practices became most intense in the 1870s and 80s. Departing from earlier policies, Church spokesmen began softening their censure of monogamy and took a broader, more pliant stance. While contending that plural marriage was the better way, and one that in all its requirements could be lived best only by Mormons themselves, inasmuch as polygamy and monogamy had existed together in other places, they observed, why not again—as, indeed, it did in Utah Territory at the time? Mormon polygamy, they pointed out, did not in fact endanger monogamy. So why not permit polygamy to be tried as an experiment, they asked, and then, based on observed effects, allow men and women freely to choose which marital philosophy to embrace? By showing no preference for a particular form of marriage in its laws, they argued, government would be "more complete and glorious . . . [permitting] the widest diversity in . . . social habits and institutions, as well as in religious faith."¹⁵¹ As an increasingly respected convert to the nation's mo-

nogamous bias, but one knowing the wrath of those opposed to an unpopular social philosophy, a more liberally inclined Mormonism could plead an easing of society's penalty-laden policies toward modern pluralists, summon its one-time prayer for the coexistence of differing domestic systems, and anoint tolerance as a favored response to those different from itself.¹⁵²

Beyond its relevance for relations with others, more open inquiry into the Church's polygamous past can bring special treasures to the mainline faithful themselves. As an organization claiming hallowed regard for early fathers and mothers, we should expect nothing less from the Saints than forthright accounts of those who courageously strove to do "the works of Abraham," multiplying wives and children on the promise that by so doing they were bringing greater radiance to their future estates.¹⁵³ If the family structure for which they toiled was set aside by a later generation, it does not diminish their immeasurable sacrifices in its behalf. Such lives are ill requited when accounts of what they believed in and died for are abridged. If Mormonism with its adherence to continuing revelation changed course, it does not disqualify the reverence owing men and women who, in their day, hearing a different call, followed a different furrow—one that they were promised would bring a greater harvest. The ancient Greeks sometimes went abroad to recover the bones of their heroes and wise men so as to give them an honorable place at home. It is said that their oracles told them that to do so would bless and prosper their native lands.¹⁵⁴ By more fully restoring the lives of polygamous pioneers to Mormonism's collective memory, Latter-day Saints will further venerate an already noble heritage.

VI

In a 1930 essay marking the centennial of Mormonism's birth, Bernard DeVoto described the Church as a "tamed heresy."¹⁵⁵ However tamed and congruent this best-known native faith has become, its best-known heresy survives. More than only threads in modern Latter-day Saint scripture and ritual, or as the subject of socio-historical investigation and cinematic portrayal, Mormon plural marriage is most visible in the lengthening rosters of contemporary, protesting fundamentalists. And these separatists,

convinced that heaven is on their side, may be engaged in nothing less than the birthing of a new religion. Following the church/sect declension familiar to all students interested in the sociology of religion, modern polygamy's disciples present us with behaviors that not only commonly attend the founding of new faiths but ones that replicate Mormonism's own beginnings: claims of divine approval for their dissenting path; adherence to unpopular social constructions; and the cobbling of liturgical usages from what they see as the detritus of an errant predecessor.¹⁵⁶ If not yet fully coalescent in an institutional sense, Mormonism's polygamous, fundamentalist strands, as with Catholicism's dissevering reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, follow religious compasses that share a common doctrinal north.

In conversations over many years, I often heard that plural marriage would inevitably be given up and left to fade from the historical consciousness of the Saints. Though a major relinquishment, it was said, this was a predictable outcome of the Church's inclining, assimilationist arc. I am now convinced that, when considered in its entirety, including its perpetuation by today's fundamentalists, larger Mormonism's experience with the practice suggests a different conclusion. Given plurality's deep intertwining with the Church's restorationist, family expansionist theology, the Prophet Joseph Smith's determined commitment to polygamy's implementation, the earnest arguments made by his followers in its defense, and the considerable number of men, women, and children who lived in the system, valiantly defying U.S. law for decades to preserve it, there was set to work a powerful, replicating momentum.

Contemporary standard bearers of the plural way, inheritors of the early Church's theological justifications and tradition of resistance, obstinately adhere to the Principle. Building their lives around a marital ideal once exalted by the parent creed as a *labarum*, then folded and put away, these modern votaries proudly herald its colors once more. Merging polygamous fundamentalism's resilient course with the pattern of Latter-day Saint plural marriage generally, a recent observer concluded: "So many times in the history of Mormon polygamy the outside world thought it had the movement on the ropes only to see it flourish anew."¹⁵⁷ The Church's greatest heresy, succored from its earliest days by

the faith and sacrifice of Mormonism's best, despite all trials and abandonments stubbornly continues to reemerge, recruiting eager Abrahams and Jacobs again and again.

Notes

1. Nineteenth-century Saints most often used the term "polygamy" interchangeably with "the Principle," "plural marriage," "celestial marriage," "patriarchal marriage," "Bible marriage," and "the higher law." I will use these historical terms rather than the anthropologically correct "polygyny" when referring to the simultaneous marriage among Mormons of two or more wives to the same man.

2. President Hinckley's comments regarding polygamy in the Larry King interview can be read in "Larry King interview—President Gordon B. Hinckley," <http://www.onlineutah.com/polygamyhinckley.shtml> (accessed July 18, 2011). Comments are in Peggy Fletcher Stack, "Hinckley on Polygamy: 'I Condemn It,'" *Salt Lake Tribune*, September 9, 1998, A1, A6. See also the remarks of Elder Quentin L. Cook where, admitting that plurality was "significant" in the Church's past, he states that it is not in the present. See "Polygamy: Not Practiced in the LDS Church," <http://www.lds.about.com/od/basicsgospelprinciples/a/polygamy.htm> (accessed April 10, 2009). A further review of Hinckley's statement and its implications is provided in Andrea Moore-Emmett, "Only for Eternity," *Salt Lake City Weekly* 15, no. 35 (January 28, 1999): 13–17. Reports of the Church's response to polygamists in Texas and elsewhere are numerous. Examples are: Newsroom: The Official Church Resource for News Media (hereafter cited as LDS Newsroom), "Church Seeks to Address Public Confusion over Texas Polygamy Group," entry posted June 26, 2008, <http://www.newsroom.lds.org/ldsnewsroom/eng/news-releases-stories> (accessed April 10, 2009); and Carrie A. Moore's review of official Church statements about fundamentalists, posted April 19, 2008, at "LDS Again Stress the Difference from FLDS," <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/1,5143,695271948,00.html> (accessed November 14, 2009). Attempts by the LDS Church to wrest use of the appellation "Mormon" from fundamentalist use (including attempts to patent the term), preserving it exclusively for itself, are examined in Ryan T. Cragun and Michael Nielsen, "Fighting over 'Mormon': Media Coverage of the FLDS and LDS Churches," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 42, no. 1 (Spring 2009): 65–104. This journal is hereafter cited as *Dialogue*.

3. Numerous references to these doctrines are found in Mormon scripture and literature. See, e.g., Moses 1:39; D&C 76:58; Joseph Smith's famous King Follett Discourse in Joseph Smith Jr. et al., *History*

of the *Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, edited by B. H. Roberts, 2d ed. rev. (6 vols., 1902–12, Vol. 7, 1932; rpt., Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1973 printing), 6:302–17 (hereafter *History of the Church*); discussions provided by Brigham H. Roberts in his *Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Century 1*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints/Deseret News Press, 1930), 2:390–403; Kurt Widmer, *Mormonism and the Nature of God: A Theological Evolution, 1830–1915* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 2000), 108–26; and Blake T. Ostler, *The Attributes of God*, Vol. 1 in *EXPLORING MORMON THOUGHT*, 3 vols. (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2001–08), 1:9–25 *passim*.

4. Two recent explorations of Smith's 1843 revelation and its meaning for Mormon doctrinal development are Newell G. Bringhurst, "Section 132 of the LDS Doctrine and Covenants: Its Complex Contents and Controversial Legacy," in Newell G. Bringhurst and Craig L. Foster, eds., *The Persistence of Polygamy: Joseph Smith and the Origins of Mormon Polygamy* (Independence, Mo.: John Whitmer Books, 2010), 59–86; and Craig L. Foster, "Doctrine and Covenants Section 132 and Joseph Smith's Expanding Concept of Family," *ibid*, 87–98.

5. Benjamin Franklin Johnson, Letter to George F. Gibbs, 1903, Benjamin Franklin Johnson Papers, LDS Church History Library, Salt Lake City. The multiplication of progeny was an assumed accompaniment of plural marriage and one often stressed in the nineteenth-century Church. As but two of many examples, see Brigham Young's statement concerning himself on September 9, 1860, *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (Liverpool: Franklin D. Richards et al., 1855–86), 8:178–79; and "Remarks by Prest. Heber C. Kimball," *Deseret News*, February 25, 1857, 405.

6. Gary James Bergera, "Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists, 1841–44," *Dialogue* 38, no. 3 (Fall 2005): 4. The expansive aspiration encouraged by such a view, repeated in Mormon explanations for polygamy throughout the nineteenth century, was remembered in the twentieth century by plural wife Annie Clark Tanner who said she was taught that the larger the family, the greater the kingdom over which the ruling male would preside in worlds to come. See her *A Mormon Mother: An Autobiography*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Tanner Trust Fund and University of Utah Library, 1973), 221.

7. George D. Smith, *Nauvoo Polygamy: "... but we called it celestial marriage"* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2008), 310 and Table 4.8, 311–12. For differing but generally parallel estimates, see Todd Compton's "Prologue: A Trajectory of Plurality: An Overview of Joseph Smith's Wives," in his *In Sacred Loneliness: The Plural Wives of Joseph Smith*

(Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1997), 1–23; D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Origins of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in Association with Smith Research Associates, 1994), 587–88; Quinn’s companion volume, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 1997), 178–79; Bergera, “Identifying the Earliest Mormon Polygamists,” 1–51; and the appendix titled, “Joseph Smith’s Plural Wives: Total Number, Reasons for, and Methods of Selection,” in Bringhurst and Foster, *The Persistence of Polygamy*, 290–98. For commentary on Smith’s dynastic proclivity, see Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 188–92. And for the role played by polygamy in cementing loyalty to the Prophet in times of crisis, see Kathryn M. Daynes, “Family Ties: Belief and Practice in Nauvoo,” *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal* 8 (1988): 63–75. For comparisons with utopian and other groups of the time, see Lawrence Foster’s often-referenced *Religion and Sexuality: Three American Communal Experiments of the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981). The best narrative overview remains that of Richard S. Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy: A History*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1989), 1–81.

8. “Discourse Delivered by Elder Jos. F. Smith,” *Deseret News Weekly*, September 11, 1878, 498. See also William Clayton, “Celestial Marriage: How and When the Revelation Was Given,” *Deseret Evening News*, May 20, 1886, 2; and George A. Smith’s remark as remembered by Lorenzo Snow, and quoted in *The Diaries of Heber J. Grant, 1880–1945 Abridged* (Salt Lake City: Privately Published, 2010), January 6, 1901, 280.

9. Preamble, *Nauvoo Expositor* 1, no. 1 (June 7, 1844): 1.

10. Sidney Rigdon, Letter to Mr. Editor, “Communications,” *Messenger and Advocate*, June 1846, 474–75; and the comment by Joseph Smith’s widow, Emma, to William Clayton that “it was secret things that had cost Joseph and Hyrum their lives.” George D. Smith, ed., *An Intimate Chronicle: The Journals of William Clayton* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 1991), 144.

11. See the tallies of George D. Smith in his *Nauvoo Polygamy*, Tables 4.8–10, 312–22, and summary p. 354.

12. Harold Bloom, *American Religion: The Emergence of a Post-Christian Nation* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 108.

13. Pratt’s sermon was printed with the minutes of, and other addresses given, at a special conference held in Salt Lake City on August 28–29, 1852. All are published in *Deseret News, Extra, Containing a Revelation on Celestial Marriage, A Remarkable Vision . . .*, September 18, 1852, 14–22. The Prophet’s revelation approving polygamy was, for the first time in Church history, published in the same organ and then again in

subsequent years. For a history of these printings through the mid-1860s, see “Plurality of Wives,” *Deseret News Semi-Weekly*, March 4, 1866, non-paginated.

14. Orson Spencer, *Patriarchal Order, Or Plurality of Wives!* (Liverpool: S. W. Richards, 1853), 8. David Whittaker provides an excellent summary of Spencer’s life as a Mormon apologist with analyses of other defenders of polygamy in “Early Mormon Polygamy Defenses,” *Journal of Mormon History* 11 (1984): 43–63.

15. “Marriage and Morals in Utah,” *Deseret News Weekly*, January 16, 1856, 356–57; then, as a separate pamphlet: *Marriage and Morals in Utah, An Address by P. P. Pratt*. . . (Liverpool: Orson Pratt/London: LDS Book & Star Depot, 1856).

16. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1972), 448.

17. The foundation on which, more than any other, Mormonism is built was the first-claimed revelation to Joseph Smith Jr. in which he was told that, of the many Christian denominations existing in 1820, none was correct. More than this, the fifteen-year-old Smith later reported that the deities appearing to him described all Christian persuasions at the time as “an abomination.” *History of the Church*, 1:5–8. The “great apostasy” is a common Mormon phrase referring to the loss of Christian truths after the death of Jesus, leaving humankind to wander in darkness for centuries. The “restoration” of these truths is commonly viewed by Mormons as Smith’s primary purpose and accomplishment. While many Mormon works treat the theme, the few cited here are representative: James E. Talmage, *The Great Apostasy Considered in the Light of Scriptural and Secular History* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1909); Brigham H. Roberts, *The Falling Away or the World’s Loss of the Christian Religion and Church* (n.p., 1929); T. Edgar Lyon, *Apostasy to Restoration: Course of Study for the Melchizedek Priesthood Quorums of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1960); Hugh Nibley, *When the Lights Went Out: Three Studies on the Ancient Apostasy* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1976); Dallin H. Oaks, “Apostasy and Restoration,” *Ensign*, May 1995, 84–87. An overview of Mormon restorationist thought is provided in Jan Shipp’s “The Reality of the Restoration and the Restoration Ideal in the Mormon Tradition,” in *The American Quest for the Primitive Church*, edited by Richard T. Hughes (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 181–95. Some recent Mormon historians, using contemporary scholarship, emphasize a more selective interpretation of “the falling away” from divine truth in early Christianity, an approach that looks to more closely define what was essential in the “restoration.” Mormonism’s nineteenth-century criticism of Catholic and Protestant

marriage practices has yet to be addressed by this revision. See Todd Compton, "Apostasy," *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1992), 1:56–58; and Eric Dursteler, "Inheriting the 'Great Apostasy': The Evolution of Mormon Views on the Middle Ages and the Renaissance," *Journal of Mormon History* 28, no. 2 (Fall 2002): 23–59.

18. Editorial, "Monogamy, Polygamy, and Christianity," *Millennial Star* 15, no. 32 (August 6, 1853): 517. Statements of this kind are numerous. As but a sampling, see Orson Pratt, *Deseret News Extra*, September 18, 1852, 20; an unsigned essay probably written by John Taylor while editing the *Mormon* in New York City: "Polygamy vs. Monogamy," *Mormon* 1, no. 42 (December 8, 1855): 2; "Remarks by Pres. Heber C. Kimball," *Deseret News Weekly*, August 12, 1857, 179; "Remarks by President Brigham Young," *Deseret News Weekly*, August 6, 1862, 41; and "Epistle of the First Presidency," April 4, 1885, in James R. Clark, ed., *Messages of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1833–1964*, 6 vols. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1965–75), 3:11.

19. Orson Pratt, "Celestial Marriage," *Seer* 1, no. 10 (October 1853): 158–60, and no. 11 (November 1853): 172; Jedediah M. Grant, August 7, 1853, *Journal of Discourses*, 1:346; "Lecture by Elder Orson Hyde," *Deseret News Weekly*, October 19, 1854, 1; and Benjamin F. Johnson, *Why the Latter Day Saints Marry a Plurality of Wives . . .* (San Francisco: Excelsior, 1854), 13–15. This position is now described as "opinion" and not official Mormon "doctrine." See "LDS Do Not Endorse Claims in 'Da Vinci,'" *Deseret Morning News*, May 17, 2006, at <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed July 18, 2011). There is also Richard Neitzel Holzapfel, Andrew C. Skinner, and Thomas A. Wayment, *What DaVinci Didn't Know: An LDS Perspective* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2006). For affirmations of the Church's earlier view by Mormon fundamentalists, see Ogden Kraut, *Polygamy in the Bible* (Salt Lake City: Kraut's Pioneer Press, 1983), 162–247; and David A. Dye, ed., *The Marriage of Christ: Sacred LDS Teachings* (Mona, Utah: privately published, 2007). The best account of the controversy over Jesus's marriage that I have read, especially as it relates to LDS teachings, is Scot Denhalter's review of Vern Grosvenor Swanson's *Dynasty of the Holy Grail: Mormonism's Sacred Bloodline* (2006), in *Journal of Mormon History* 35, no.1 (Winter 2009): 213–21.

20. Already astonished by Mormon descriptions of heaven, Victorians must have been staggered to hear one Church leader state that the gods reproduced spirit children in the same way offspring were conceived by mortals. "Remarks by Pres. H. C. Kimball . . . Nov. 29 1857," *Deseret News Weekly*, December 9, 1857, 315. For much the same from

Lorenzo Snow, see his quotation in *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, October 1, 1890, 123.

21. The Saints echoed non-Mormon, nineteenth-century health reformers who described the race as suffering from serious physical decline. See Lorenzo Niles Fowler, *Marriage: Its History and Ceremonies, with a Phrenological and Physiological Exposition . . .* (New York: Fowler & Wells, 1847), 10–11, 12; “Have Americans Degenerated?” [New York] *Daily Graphic*, November 21, 1873, 139; and the Frenchman, Benedict Morel, as discussed in Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1963), 14–17. Mormons argued that monogamy led men to cruelly impose on their wives when already pregnant, to visit prostitutes, and to generally surrender to sexual excess and lascivious habits. These tendencies, they said, were inherited by their offspring, dissipating their energy and hastening the moral and physical decline of the race. Mormons believed polygamy would remedy these faults. For the most extensive examination, see B. Carmon Hardy, *Solemn Covenant: The Mormon Polygamous Passage* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 84–126; with documents in B. Carmon Hardy, *Doing the Works of Abraham: Mormon Polygamy, Its Origin, Practice, and Demise* (Norman, Okla.: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 2007), 91–100, 130–40; and with Dan Erickson in “‘Regeneration—Now and Evermore!’ Mormon Polygamy and the Physical Rehabilitation of Humankind,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10, no. 1 (January 2001): 40–61.

22. “Epistle of the First Presidency,” April 4, 1885, in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:11. Repeating the same sentiment, an editorial in the Church’s newspaper stated: “It is only godless, human law that has written monogamy upon the institutions of marriage, and a pretty mess men have made of it.” “Monogamy and the Home,” *Deseret Evening News*, December 5, 1885, not paginated.

23. Mary Jane Mount Tanner, Provo, Utah, Letter to Hubert Howe Bancroft, holograph, October 29, 1880, P-F12, Hubert Howe Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California.

24. George Q. Cannon, “Improvement of Our Species,” *Western Standard* 2, no. 22 (August 7, 1857): 2. Cannon’s interpretation of scripture here is strained. See Isaiah 65:22.

25. For this and much else, see Charles W. Penrose, “Physical Regeneration,” *Millennial Star* 29, no. 32 (August 10, 1867): 497–99. Nor was it necessary to wait for such improvements in one’s children. Heber C. Kimball, a close friend of Brigham Young and a counselor in his First Presidency, in a statement often humorously quoted without sufficient regard for the serious eugenic promises that underlay it, valorously an-

nounced he could “promise a man who is sixty years of age, if he will take the counsel of br. Brigham and his brethren, that he will renew his age. I have noticed that a man who has but one wife, and is inclined to that doctrine, soon begins to wither and dry up, while a man who goes into plurality looks fresh, young, and sprightly.” “Discourse by President Heber C. Kimball, 6 April 1857,” *Deseret News*, April 22, 1857, 52. Again, the volume of expression contending for this view is surprising. For some of what are many possible illustrations, see Louis Alphonse Bertrand, *Mémoires d'un Mormon* (Paris: E. Jung-Treuttel, [1862]), 208; Albert Carrington, “Plurality of Wives—Physiologically and Socially,” *Millennial Star* 28, no. 22 (June 2, 1866), 340–41; Mary Jane Mount Tanner, Letter to Mary Bessac Hunt, Provo, Utah, July 16, 1882, in Mary Jane Tanner, *A Fragment: The Autobiography of Mary Jane Mount Tanner*, edited by Margery W. Ward and George S. Tanner (Salt Lake City: Tanner Trust Fund and the University of Utah Library, 1980), 188; Joseph Birch, “Is Polygamy Unnatural?” *Millennial Star* 36, no. 4 (January 27, 1874), 49; George Q. Cannon, statement to Journalists, March 20, 1882, Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (chronological scrapbook of typed entries and newspaper clippings, 1830–present), LDS Church History Library; a British visitor’s comment that one of “the strong arguments” made to her by the Saints was that polygamy alone would produce “a fine healthy race.” Catherine Bates, *A Year in the Great Republic*, 2 vols. (London: Ward and Downey, 1887), 2:225, 228; Eliza Roxcy Snow asserted that plurality was “producing a more perfect type of manhood mentally and physically, as well as . . . restoring human life to its former longevity.” Eliza Roxcy Snow, “Sketch of My Life,” in *The Personal Writings of Eliza Roxcy Snow*, edited by Maureen Ursenbach Beecher (Logan: Utah State University Press, 2000), 17; Eliza Roxcy Snow, Statements to Martin Luther Holbrook, editor of the New York *Herald of Health*, reproduced by Jill Mulvay Derr and Matthew J. Grow, “Letters on Mormon Polygamy and Progeny: Eliza R. Snow and Martin Luther Holbrook, 1866–1869,” *BYU Studies* 48, no. 2 (2009): 139–64.

26. For an analysis of how the Mormon polygamous marriage market worked, see Kathryn M. Daynes, *More Wives Than One: Transformation of the Mormon Marriage System, 1840–1910* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2001). Mormon polygamy also permitted married men to restore the ancient Jewish practice of the levirate wherein widows were married by a near relative of the deceased husband for the purpose of raising up children to his name, thereby enlarging his eternal kingdom. For Mormon endorsement of the practice, see John Jaques, “Polygamy: Is It Consistent with the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and the Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints?” *Mil-*

lennial Star 15, no. 6 (February 12, 1853): 99, 147; Jaques, "Polygamy," *Millennial Star* 15, no. 10 (March 5, 1853): 147–48; and the trying arrangement described by Mary Lois Walker Morris in Melissa Lambert Milewski, ed., *Before the Manifesto: The Life Writings of Mary Lois Walker Morris* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 2007), 115–16, 122–23.

27. A former monogamist testified in the tabernacle that "no better time have I had in thirty years of married life than when I had three wives given me of God, . . . [all] occupying one habitation [together]." Henry W. Naisbitt, March 8, 1885, *Journal of Discourses*, 26:124. Brigham Young, August 19, 1866, *Journal of Discourses*, 11:271, claimed that there was at least ten times as much trouble in monogamous homes as in polygamous families. As but one of many additional examples, see Albert Carrington, "Plurality of Wives—Physiologically and Socially," *Deseret News Weekly*, March 29, 1866, 340–41. The claim that polygamy brought greater domestic bliss than monogamy persisted beyond the time of the Church's formal endorsement of the practice. See Apostle John A. Widtsoe, "Evidences and Reconciliations: Why Did the Church Practice Plural Marriage in Earlier Days," *Improvement Era* 46, no. 3 (March 1943): 191. The question of whether polygamy actually brought greater happiness to Mormon families than monogamy is probably impossible to establish in any general way. But studies finding a surprising amount of divorce in such households should be acknowledged. See Eugene E. Campbell and Bruce L. Campbell, "Divorce among Mormon Polygamists: Extent and Explanations," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (Winter 1978): 4–23; Phillip R. Kunz, "One Wife or Several? A Comparative Study of Late Nineteenth-Century Marriage in Utah," *The Mormon People: Their Character and Traditions*, Vol. 10 in CHARLES REDD MONOGRAPHS IN WESTERN HISTORY, edited by Thomas G. Alexander (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1980), 68–69; Lawrence Foster, "Polygamy and the Frontier: Mormon Women in Early Utah," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (Summer 1982): 284–88; and Daynes, *More Wives than One*, 141–70.

28. See, e.g., the following articles in *Deseret Evening News*: "Discourse by President Brigham Young," September 21, 1856, 235–36; "Discourse by Jedediah M. Grant," October 26, 1856, 275; "Discourse by Elder Orson Hyde," October 4, 1857, 251; documents, with comments, in Hardy, *Doing the Works of Abraham*, 125–29; and his "'Lords of Creation': Polygamy, the Abrahamic Household, and Mormon Patriarchy," *Journal of Mormon History* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 119–52.

29. Luke William Gallup, summary of a letter to his family, December 1866, in "Reminiscence and Diary," May 1841–March 1891, LDS Church History Library.

30. Charles Smith, Letter to Henry Eyring, February 1869, Charles Smith, Diaries, microfilm of typescript copy, L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah (hereafter Perry Special Collections).

31. "The Only Remedy," *Deseret News Weekly*, July 31, 1867, 244.

32. Orson Pratt, *Seer* 1 (April 1853), 58; Charles W. Penrose, "Plural Marriage," *Millennial Star* 45, no. 29 (July 16, 1883): 454; Penrose again in "Eternity of the Marriage Covenant," *Deseret Evening News*, February 20, 1886, not paginated; and "Discourse by Prest. Geo. Q. Cannon," *ibid*, January 12, 1884, 1. Responding to pressures of the anti-polygamy crusade, Church leaders commenced saying that the two were not inseparable and that it was only eternal marriage, not polygamy, that they urged on their followers. See note 111, below.

33. "The Reynolds Trial," *Deseret News Weekly*, December 15, 1875, 732; emphasis his. In his 1852 address, Orson Pratt described plural marriage as not only a part of Latter-day Saint religion but as "essential" and "necessary for our exaltation." *Deseret News Extra, Containing a Revelation on Celestial Marriage, A Remarkable Vision . . .*, September 18, 1852, 14.

34. Brigham Young, August 19, 1866, *Journal of Discourses*, 11:269. Some, attempting to justify the renunciation of polygamy by the present Church, point to Young's remark in this sermon that, "if it is wrong for a man to have more than one wife at a time, the Lord will reveal it by and by, and he will put it away that it will not be known in the Church" (268). But Young's comment was not a prophecy or prediction, only an acknowledgment of God's sovereign freedom to do as He pleased when He pleased. Moreover, if one's purpose is to determine Young's larger intent with the address, any fair reading of the entire text shows it to have been a strong affirmation of the high importance of the doctrine and the necessity of the Saints to live it. Young also spoke emphatically on other occasions of the need to live in plurality if one wished to obtain the highest blessings of God. See, e.g., his sermon on July 14, 1855, *Journal of Discourses*, 3:264-67.

35. Kunz, "One Wife or Several?," 69.

36. "Lecture by Elder Orson Hyde," *Deseret News Weekly*, October 19, 1854, 1.

37. Comments to this effect were heard from sundry sources in orthodox Mormon congregations when I was a boy, sixty years ago. The contention that polygamy was responsible for producing many who were leaders in the Church was cited by one Utah authority in the 1930s as evidence of plurality's divinity when discussing the subject with a member of the Reorganized Church. LeGrand Richards, Letter to Mrs. Mary S.

Gilstrap, November 22, 1935, fd. 78, Community of Christ Library-Archives, Independence, Missouri. The same view was often heard from Mormon colonists in Mexico where polygamy was both common and approvingly perpetuated well after the Manifesto. See, e.g., Leroy Eyring, Oral History, interviewed by Leonard R. Grover, April 24, 1980, Scottsdale, Arizona, typescript, 7–8, Polygamy Oral History Project, Charles Redd Center, Brigham Young University (hereafter cited as BYU Polygamy Oral History Project); and from the same collection, Katherine Cannon Thomas, Oral History, interviewed by Leonard Grover, March 25, 1980, Provo, Utah, typescript, 2, 7. The most comprehensive treatment of the incidence of polygamy among Mormon leaders is that of Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, Appendix 2, 641–725.

38. Brigham Young, July 14, 1855, *Journal of Discourses*, 3:265.

39. Heber C. Kimball, April 4, 1866, *Journal of Discourses*, 11:210.

40. Jesse Haven, *Celestial [sic] Marriage and the Plurality of Wives . . . (Cape Town, South Africa: W. Foelscher, 1853)*, 2.

41. “Celestial Marriage: Rev[elation]s Purportedly Given John Taylor, 25, 26 June 1882,” LDS Church History Library. A Mormon editorial intended to answer concerns that polygamy would spread if Utah were admitted as a state explained that, because Utah’s laws were more liberal than in most other states, marriage was left to individuals. “Bible marriage,” as the editorial called polygamy, was no more legally prescribed than monogamy. Plurality was not likely to become popular on account of its economic and emotional requirements. Only when reinforced by religious guidance could it be successfully implemented. Therefore, the nation had no reason to fear Utah’s entrance into the Union. “Shall Polygamy Become National,” *Deseret Evening News*, October 21, 1878, 2.

42. Orson Pratt, [Address], *Deseret News Extra, Containing a Revelation on Celestial Marriage, A Remarkable Vision*, September 18, 1852, 25.

43. George Q. Cannon, October 9, 1869, *Journal of Discourses*, 13:202.

44. The entirety of Albert Carrington’s article, beyond the quotation used, is remarkable. See his “Plurality of Wives—Physiologically and Socially,” 1–4.

45. Esther Romania Bunnell Pratt Penrose, microfilm of handwritten memoir, 1881, 6–7, LDS Church History Library. For a few of many statements expressing similar sentiments, see the following *Deseret Evening News* reports: “Provo Conference: Remarks by Prest. Brigham Young,” November 14, 1855, 282; Editorial, “Plurality of Wives, March 8, 1866, 108; George A. Smith, “The Opposers of Celestial Marriage,” October 27, 1869, 452; and “Discourse by Apostle George Teasdale,” February 6, 1884, 35.

46. "Remarks by Apostle Moses Thatcher," *Deseret News Weekly*, May 7, 1884, 242.

47. Helen Mar Whitney, *Why We Practice Plural Marriage: By a "Mormon" Wife and Mother . . .* (Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1884), 53–55. The same writer remembered that her father, Apostle Heber C. Kimball, expecting widespread recognition of the practice's advantages, prophesied that the United States would, in no more than half a century from his time, pass laws permitting polygamy. See her "Scenes and Incidents in Nauvoo," *Woman's Exponent* 10 (November 1, 1881): 83.

48. George A. Smith, April 6, 1856, *Journal of Discourses*, 3:291.

49. Hannah Tapfield King, "Brief Memoir of the Early Mormon Life of Hannah T. King," (1880?) P-F12, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California.

50. Romania Bunnell Pratt, "Extract from Dr. R. B. Pratt's Lecture," *Woman's Exponent* 10 (June 15, 1881): 16.

51. Regarding the post-1860 relative decline of polygamous marriages, see the quantitative patterns in nineteenth-century Manti: Daynes, *More Wives than One*, Table 3, Figure 3, pp. 101–2. Studies enlarging the percentage of nineteenth-century Mormon polygamous households beyond the single-digit figures commonly given by the Church have accrued for decades. See, e.g., Dean L. May, "People on the Mormon Frontier: Kanab's Families of 1874," *Journal of Family History* 1 (1876): 172; James E. Smith and Phillip R. Kunz, "Polygyny and Fertility in Nineteenth-Century America," *Population Studies* 30, no. 3 (November 1976): 468–71; Lowell "Ben" Bennion, "The Incidence of Mormon Polygamy in 1880: 'Dixie versus Davis Stake,'" *Journal of Mormon History* 11 (1984): 27–42; Bennion, Alan L. Morrell, and Thomas R. Carter, *Polygamy in Lorenzo Snow's Brigham City: An Architectural Tour* (Salt Lake City: College of Architecture & Planning, University of Utah, 2005), 26; Larry M. Logue, *A Sermon in the Desert: Belief and Behavior in Early St. George, Utah* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 44–71; Irwin Altman and Joseph Ginat, *Polygamous Families in Contemporary Society* (New York City: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 460–61; Marie Cornwall, Camela Courtright, and Laga Van Beek, "How Common the Principle? Women as Plural Wives in 1860," *Dialogue* 26, no. 2 (Summer 1993): 152–53; Daynes, *More Wives than One*, 100–101; and most recently, Lowell C. "Ben" Bennion and Thomas R. Carter, "Touring Polygamous Utah with Elizabeth W. Kane, Winter, 1872–1873," *BYU Studies* 48, no. 4 (2009): 159–92.

52. Logue, *A Sermon in the Desert*, 51–52; Bennion, "The Incidence of Mormon Polygamy," 41–42; Bennion, Morrell, and Carter, *Polygamy*

in Lorenzo Snow's Brigham City, 26; and especially Bennion and Carter, "Touring Polygamous Utah," 164–65, 183–85. For more on the emergence of polygamy as a centerpiece of the Mormon self-image, especially during the national crusade against the Saints, see Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 44, 329–30. For the incidence of polygamous marriage among Mormon bishops, see D. Gene Pace, "Wives of Nineteenth-Century Mormon Bishops: A Quantitative Analysis," *Journal of the West* 21, no. 2 (April 1982): 51. On its prevalence among men in positions of authority between 1845 and 1888, see again Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Extensions of Power*, 180. For patterns of polygamous practice, as well as doctrinal, demographic, and geographic influences, see all of both Jessie L. Embry, *Mormon Polygamous Families: Life in the Principle* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1987); and Daynes, *More Wives than One*.

53. Bennion and Carter, "Touring Polygamous Utah," 164, 183–85; emphasis theirs. See also Bennion, "The Incidence of Mormon Polygamy," 41; Bennion, Morrell, and Carter, *Polygamy in Lorenzo Snow's Brigham City*, 26; and Logue, *A Sermon in the Desert*, 51–52. The Utah Commission found Utah society in 1887 to be identical with Bennion and Carter's description: "While all did not enter into polygamy, all believed it right as a divine revelation and upheld it in those who chose to enter into the relation. The system was united by ties of kindred with nearly every Mormon family in the Territory." "Report of the Utah Commission," *Report of the Secretary of the Interior: Multi-Volume Compilation of Messages and Documents Communicated to the Two Houses of Congress by the Secretary of the Interior Annually, Containing Reports by Territorial Governors and, from 1882 through 1896, Reports of the "Utah Commission"* (Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office, 1887), 2:1325–26.

54. Responding to Mormon claims in 1879 that, if anti-polygamy laws were enforced, 50,000 women and their children would be left homeless, the *Salt Lake Tribune* stated that the actual figure was closer to 10,000. But even this, if extrapolated to the entire period during which the Church formally endorsed polygamy, would amount to many thousands of people. For the controversy, see these *Salt Lake Tribune* articles: "More Lies from the Hens," January 16, 1879, 1; "Washington," January 23, 1879, 4; and "Address to Congress," February 9, 1879, 2. George D. Smith, *Nauvoo Polygamy*, 310, provides as likely an estimate as seems presently possible: "Before it was closed down as an option for mainstream LDS members, tens of thousands of polygamists were generated from the culture Smith began in the Midwest and Young amplified in Utah."

55. Quoted in O. J. Hollister, *Life of Schuyler Colfax* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886), 473.

56. An Old Timer, "Expressions from the People," *Deseret Evening News*, April 14, 1885, 4. See similar statements by Heber C. Kimball, October 12, 1856, *Journal of Discourses*, 5:203-4; and by George Q. Cannon as quoted in Davis Bitton, *George Q. Cannon: A Biography* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1999), 275.

57. Richard F. Burton, *The City of the Saints and across the Rocky Mountains to California*, edited with an introduction and notes by Fawn M. Brodie (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 478-79.

58. Richard D. Poll, "The Mormon Question, 1850-1865: A Study in Politics and Public Opinion" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1948), 25.

59. Lewis Henry Morgan, *Ancient Society; or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (London: Macmillan, 1877), 512. See also William E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, 2 vols. (London: Longman's Green & Co., 1869), 2:294-95; and "Evolution of Marriage," *Boston Herald*, February 26, 1884, 1.

60. See *Reynolds v. United States* (1879), 98 U.S. beginning at p. 153. Sarah Barringer Gordon, *The Mormon Question: Polygamy and Constitutional Conflict in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 233, points out that the court's distinction between belief and action has become more complicated on account of twentieth-century decisions. See her analysis of the Reynolds case in the shift from Reconstruction in the South to Reconstruction in Utah (119-45). See also the helpful commentary in Edwin Brown Firmage and Richard Collin Mangrum, *Zion in the Courts: A Legal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830-1900* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 151-59.

61. Gordon, *The Mormon Question*, 183-220, emphasizes that opposition to political and economic monopoly also contributed to anti-polygamy rhetoric at the time.

62. "Report of the Utah Commission," *Report of the Secretary of the Interior* (1885), 2:887-88.

63. B. Carmon Hardy, "'The American Siberia': Mormon Prisoners in Detroit in the 1880s," *Michigan History* 50, no. 3 (September 1966): 197-10. The number of works treating the anti-polygamy crusade is large and growing, but one can make a good start by reading in Robert J. Dwyer, *The Gentile Comes to Utah: A Study in Religious and Social Conflict (1862-1890)*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Western Epics, 1971); Gustive O. Larson, *The "Americanization" of Utah for Statehood* (San Marino, Calif:

Huntington Library, 1971); Richard D. Poll, "The Legislative Anti-Polygamy Campaign," *BYU Studies* 26, no. 4 (Fall 1986): 107–21; Edward Leo Lyman, *Political Deliverance: The Mormon Quest for Utah Statehood* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986); Joan Smith Iversen, *The Antipolygamy Controversy in U.S. Women's Movements, 1880–1925: A Debate on the American Home* (New York City: Garland Publishing, 1997); David L. Bigler, *Forgotten Kingdom: The Mormon Theocracy in the American West, 1847–1896*, Vol. 2 in KINGDOM IN THE WEST: THE MORMONS AND THE AMERICAN FRONTIER, general editor Will Bagley (Spokane, Wash: Arthur H. Clark, 1998); Gordon, *The Mormon Question*; and, carrying Gordon's attention further to racial concerns as motivating anti-polygamy reformers, Kelly Elizabeth Phipps, "Marriage and Redemption: Mormon Polygamy in the Congressional Imagination, 1862–1887," *Virginia Law Review* 95, no. 435 (April 2009): 435–87.

64. George Alfred Townsend, *The Mormon Trial in Salt Lake City* (New York: American Press, 1871), 11. For more on the Mormon colonies in Mexico, see Moisés González Navarro, *La Colonización en México 1877–1910* (México: Talleres de impresión de estampillas y valores, 1960), 63–70; Thomas Cottam Romney, *The Mormon Colonies in Mexico* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1938); and F. LaMond Tullis, "Early Mormon Exploration and Missionary Activities in Mexico," *BYU Studies* 22, no. 3 (Summer 1982): 289–310. For settlements in Canada, see "Brief Account of the Early History of the Canadian Mission, 1887–1895," typescript, n.d., LDS Church History Library; Archie G. Wilcox, "Founding of the Mormon Community in Alberta" (M.A. thesis, University of Alberta, Calgary, Canada, 1950); and Dan Erickson, "Alberta Polygamists? The Canadian Climate and Response to Mormonism's 'Peculiar Institution,'" *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 86, no. 4 (Fall 1995): 155–64.

65. Descriptions of this kind are countless. As but one example, from an organ especially active in purveying such images, see "Beauties of Polygamy," *Anti-Polygamy Standard* 1, no. 1 (April 1880): 1.

66. One researcher found no fewer than seventeen congressional proposals for an anti-polygamy amendment during the 1880s. Herman Ames, *Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States during the First Century of Its History* (1896; rpt., New York: Lenox Hill, 1970), 272. It became a staple of Utah Commission recommendations. See, for example, the 1887 "Annual Report of the Utah Commission," 2:1354. And, with equal zeal, Mormon leaders opposed such measures. Quoting from the *St. Paul and Minneapolis Pioneer*, the campaign for a constitutional curb on polygamy had become, the Mormon editor said, as wearisome as that against "free whiskey." See editorial, "Constitutional

Amendment Craze,” *Deseret Evening News*, November 22, 1883, not paginated.

67. The Canadian law, drafted in response to Mormon polygamous settlements in Alberta, is found in *Statutes of Canada*, 53 Victoria, c. 37, sec. 11, subsections a–d (1890). For extended accounts of anti-polygamous sentiment in both Mexico and Canada and its legal reification, see B. Carmon Hardy, “Mormon Polygamy in Mexico and Canada: A Legal and Historiographical Review,” in *The Mormon Presence in Canada*, edited by Brigham Y. Card, Herbert C. Northcott, John E. Foster, Howard Palmer, and George K. Jarvis (Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 1990), 186–209; and Hardy, *Solemn Covenant*, 167–82. Anti-Mormon pamphleteering in Europe, of course, had occurred for years. See, e.g., Craig L. Foster, *Penny Tracts and Polemics: A Critical Analysis of Anti-Mormon Pamphleteering in Great Britain, 1837–1860* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2002). And such criticism persisted beyond the Manifesto: Malcolm R. Thorp, “‘Mormon Peril’: The Crusade against the Saints in Britain, 1910–1914,” *Journal of Mormon History* 2 (1975): 69–78; and Peter J. Vousden, “English Editor and the ‘Mormon Scare’ of 1911,” *BYU Studies* 41, no. 1 (2002): 65–75. Condemnation by the Pope can be read in, Encycl., *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae*, sec. 13, February 10, 1880.

68. Hubert Howe Bancroft, *Literary Industries: A Memoir*, Vol. 39, in THE WORKS OF HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT (San Francisco: The History Company Publishers, 1890), 759. Another scholar described it as “unequaled in the annals of federal law enforcement.” See Orma Linford, “Mormons and the Law: The Polygamy Cases,” Pt. 2, *Utah Law Review* 9, no. 3 (Summer 1965): 585.

69. Mary Jane Mount Tanner, Letter to “Dear Aunt Mary,” June 18, 1882, in Tanner, *A Fragment*, 186.

70. “An Epistle from the First Presidency,” October 6, 1885, in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:36. The appellation “Bible marriage,” used at least as early as 1878, represented a Mormon attempt to juxtapose anti-polygamy sentiment in the nation to a form of matrimony permitted in the Bible. For examples of its use, see “Shall Polygamy Become National,” *Deseret Evening News*, December 21, 1878, 2; and “Marriage as a Test,” *Deseret Evening News*, August 5, 1879, 2.

71. Editorial, “Secret Leagues,” *Deseret Evening News*, November 21, 1883, not paginated. The number of messages delivered to the Saints in this vein is quite large. See, e.g. from the *Journal of Discourses*: Charles W. Penrose, August 17, 1879, 20:296–99; Franklin D. Richards, October 6, 1879, 20:312–16; Erastus Snow, October 8, 1879, 20:374; Moses Thatcher, April 7, 1883, 24:111; and Joseph F. Smith, April 8, 1883, 24:173. See

also George Teasdale, quoted in January 25, 1885, in A. Karl Larson and Kathryn Miles Larson, eds., *Diary of Charles Lowell Walker*, 2 vols. (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1980), 2:642.

72. Eliza R. Snow, "Joseph the Seer's Plural Marriages," *Deseret News Weekly*, October 22, 1879, 1.

73. The practice of contrasting themselves to secular society and comparing the Saints to the righteous who were persecuted in previous dispensations was a drumbeat-like theme repeated again and again from the 1850s into the 1890s. See, as only a few examples, Orson Pratt, "Celestial Marriage," *Seer* 1 (May 1853): 75; Scott G. Kenney, ed., *Wilford Woodruff's Journal, 1833-1898*, typescript, 9 vols. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1983-91), February 18, 1873, 7:123; Henry Eyring, "Reminiscences," January 27, 1883, typescript, LDS Church History Library; Gibson Condie, *Reminiscences and Diary*, March 3, 1889, film of holograph, LDS Church History Library; and "Discourse Delivered by President George Q. Cannon, at the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, February 23, 1890," in Brian H. Stuy, comp. and ed., *Collected Discourses Delivered by Wilford Woodruff, His Two Counselors, the Twelve Apostles, and Others, 1886-1889*, 5 vols. (Burbank, Calif.: BHS Publishing, 1987-92), 2:15.

74. George Q. Cannon, December 7, 1884, *Journal of Discourses*, 26:42-44.

75. It was not an unwillingness to enter new plural marriages that led some later to say the Saints failed to meet God in the bargain. Rather, illustrative of the private anguish many felt in their conjugal lives, it was belief that too many had surrendered to the pleasures of sexual indulgence with their plural partners. See B. Carmon Hardy, "Self-Blame and the Manifesto," *Dialogue* 24, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 43-57. An example of leaders urging perseverance with promise of support from heaven is: "An Epistle from the First Presidency," October 6, 1885, First Presidency Circular Letters, 1855-1996, Box 1, fd. 1, LDS Church History Library.

76. See the excellent chapter, "Millennialism and the Anti-Polygamy Campaign," in Dan Erickson, *"As a Thief in the Night": The Mormon Quest for Millennial Deliverance* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1998), 179-211.

77. Speaking in the Tabernacle, Wilford Woodruff told his listeners that God had revealed to them "the Patriarchal order of Marriage & has said if we do not obey it we shall be damned. Congress has said if [we] do obey it we shall be damned. Now, which shall we obey God or Congress? For it is God & Congress for it. The assembly shouted in By acclamation we will obey God." Wilford Woodruff, *Wilford Woodruff's Journal*, January 9, 1870, 6:518-19. See also "Shall Polygamy Be Put in Abeyance," *Deseret News*, August 30, 1879, not paginated; Orson Pratt, October 6,

1879, *Journal of Discourses*, 20:327; and the “promise” exacted from members as described in Larson and Larson, *Diary of Charles Lowell Walker*, March 27, 1880, 2:491–92; George Teasdale, January 13, 1884, *Journal of Discourses*, 25:19–22; and George Q. Cannon, November 20, 1884, *Journal of Discourses*, 26:8–9. Statements were often nuanced, as when President John Taylor told members to fulfill the law so far as was “practicable” while yet observing “principle.” They should, he said, “be wise as serpents and harmless as doves.” John Taylor, April 9, 1882, *Journal of Discourses*, 23:67–68.

78. Woodruff, Letter to Franklin S. Richards and Charles W. Penrose, April 12, 1888, Wilford Woodruff Letterpress Copy Book, LDS Church History Library.

79. Portrayals of this nature occurred again and again throughout the 1880s. See statements and low estimates given by Franklin S. Richards in U.S. Congress, *Admission of Utah as a State in the Union. Memorial of Citizens of the Territory of Utah Asking for the Admission of Utah as a State in the Union*, April 27, 1882, House Misc. Doc. 43 (47–1) 1882, Serial 2046, 6–7. See also “Epistle of the First Presidency,” April 4, 1885, in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:11; the slightly higher figures (5–7 percent) given by the same authorities in “An Epistle from the First Presidency to the Officers and Members of the Church,” October 6, 1885, in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:31; Angus M. Cannon, quoted in “Church Suits,” *Deseret Evening News*, February 29, 1888, 3; U.S. Congress, *Admission of Utah: Argument of Hon. Jeremiah M. Wilson, Made before the House Committee on Territories, January 19–22, 1889* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1889), 11–12; and “Mormons Abandon Polygamy: President Woodruff Says the Church Means to Obey the Law,” *New York Herald*, October 13, 1889, 17. Representations of this kind became especially pronounced in the two or three years preceding the Manifesto. In addition to a precipitous decline in published defenses of the practice in organs such as the *Deseret News*, the proposed state constitution (art. 15, sec. 12), which was included with the 1887 petition for statehood, barred “bigamy and polygamy.” Of course, both “bigamy” and “polygamy” were formal, legal terms that left the private ceremonies joining Mormons in plural unions as untouched as the language in the old Morrill Act of 1862. It was a ruse that fooled nobody, which was one reason Congress rejected the 1887 petition for statehood. See my *Doing the Works of Abraham*, 328–29. “Polygamy Prohibited,” *Deseret Evening News*, July 5, 1887, 3; “Constitution,” *Deseret Evening News*, July 8, 1887, 2. Finally, any overview of Mormon efforts to blunt the anti-polygamy crusade and obtain statehood cannot ignore the Church’s vigorous lobbying of important political figures. The commanding study of these activ-

ities remains Lyman, *Political Deliverance*, who points out that the Church's posturing was "intended to be but a temporary stance until after statehood was accomplished" (291). Anthony W. Ivins once described such efforts as attempts "to sail into the union under false colors." *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, July 25, 1887, 36.

80. Senator George F. Edmunds commented on the surprising resilience of Mormon plurality in his "Political Aspects of Mormonism," *Harper's* 64 (January 1882): 287. And the "Annual Report of the Utah Commission," *Report of the Secretary of the Interior* (1884), 2:517-18, said that, during the early 1880s, "Mormon fanaticism" had been "blown into a flame" and that there was "a polygamic revival" among the people. See also Stanley S. Ivins's tabulation in his pioneering article, "Notes on Mormon Polygamy," *Western Humanities Review* 10, no. 3 (Summer 1956): 231-32. Apostle Francis M. Lyman later commented that because "the principle" was urged with such energy during the 1880s he could understand why some Mormons continued to enter the practice after the 1890 Manifesto. *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, January 3, 1911, 293. An example of continued commitment to the Principle by authorities in those years is the case of Malinda Jane Morrill. When she asked President John Taylor if the monogamous marriage to her husband, sealed in the temple, was not enough to earn them a place in the highest echelons of heaven, she was told that plural marriage alone brought that reward. Malinda Jane Morrill, Letter to President John Taylor, January 2, 1883, John Taylor Presidential Papers, 1877-87, Box 13, fd. 9; and Taylor's reply, copied into Thomas Memmott, *Journals: Quotation Book—Book of Genealogy*, Reel 3, 98-100, both in LDS Church History Library. As another female writer reminded her readers, when it came to polygamy, "None can disobey it, and be exalted in His presence." Mary F., "Patriarchal Order of Marriage," *Woman's Exponent* 10, no. 16 (January 15, 1882): 121.

81. M. Hamlin Cannon, ed., "The Prison Diary of a Mormon Apostle," *Pacific Historical Review* 16, no. 4 (November 1947): 401; see Franklin D. Richards's similar comment in *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, December 20, 1888, 89. That equivocation was sometimes felt by the leaders is illustrated by Apostle John Henry Smith's 1888 suggestion that the Church should consider temporarily suspending plurality. John Henry Smith, Letter to Joseph F. Smith, April 3, 1888, John Henry Smith Letterbooks, George A. Smith Family Papers, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. A deeper allegiance, however, was shown on September 16, 1890, only ten days before President Woodruff penned his Manifesto, when Smith told an audience of believers in southern Utah that "no principle or revelation that God ever gave to his

people was to be laid on the shelf as a thing of the past." Quoted in Larson and Larson, *Diary of Charles Lowell Walker*, 2:718.

82. The axial nature of the Church's posturing in the 1880s as constituting a more crucial, reorienting phase in Mormon history than the 1890 Manifesto has been stressed by scholars for some time. See Henry J. Wolfinger, "A Reexamination of the Woodruff Manifesto in the Light of Utah Constitutional History," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (Fall 1971): 328-49; Lyman, *Political Deliverance*, 43-46, 60; and Hardy, *Solemn Covenant*, 53-55.

83. "Official Declaration-1" appears in editions of the Doctrine and Covenants printed since 1981. The "Annual Report of the Utah Commission," *Report of the Secretary of the Interior* (1890), 3:414-21, describes the continued teaching and performance of plural marriages by the Church. For the Commission's earlier allegation that Mormons were publicly denying what they were secretly doing for the purpose of obtaining statehood, and therewith engaging in a "wooden horse" policy, see "Annual Report of the Utah Commission," *Report of the Secretary of the Interior* (1888), 3:669. Territorial Governor Arthur Thomas described Church spokesmen as employing "evasions, meaningless words, or words of double meaning, hypocritical pretenses, false assertions, and every helpful evasion of word or act." "Report of the Governor of Utah," *Report of the Secretary of the Interior* (1889): 3:496, and *ibid.* (1890), 3:660-61.

84. Woodruff, *Wilford Woodruff's Journal*, September 25, 1890, 9:112-14. See also Leo Lyman's account of pressures and events surrounding the issuance of the document in his "The Political Background of the Woodruff Manifesto," *Dialogue* 24, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 21-39.

85. For other examples contending that the vote was unanimous, see "Official Declaration," *Deseret Weekly*, October 11, 1890, 526; Orson F. Whitney, *History of Utah*, 4 vols. (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon & Sons, 1892-1904), 3:746; "Official Statement from the First Presidency," June 17, 1933, in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:324; and Joseph Fielding Smith, *Essentials in Church History*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1971), 495. For more extensive treatment of events attending the preparation of and presentation of the Manifesto, see Hardy, *Solemn Covenant*, 127-38.

86. Uncertainties surrounding the Church's policy on continued cohabitation with plural wives married before 1890 can be read in the distressed conversations of apostles reported in the Abraham Hoagland Cannon, *Journal*, November 11 and 12, 1891, and April 1, 1892. Contending that the Saints were a law-abiding people, one modern author argued that most Mormon polygamists stopped living with their plural wives when the first Edmunds Act was passed in 1882. Paul E. Reimann,

Plural Marriage Limited (Salt Lake City: Utah Printing, 1974), 130–32, 134–35. An actual survey of their cases, however, found that so far as the General Authorities of the Church were concerned, “a substantial majority” continued to live with their plural wives after the Manifesto. Kenneth L. Cannon II, “Beyond the Manifesto: Polygamous Cohabitation among LDS General Authorities after 1890,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (Winter 1978): 24–36.

87. Scores of Mormon colonists residing in Mexico and Canada both entered and lived in polygamous marriages after the Manifesto. Mexico proved more convenient than Canada. Church authorities continued to send couples wishing to be married in plurality there until the settlers were temporarily forced to leave Mexico at the time of the Mexican Revolution in 1912. For a discussion of this practice, in both Mexico and Canada, especially with regard to legal issues involved, see Hardy, “Early Mormon Polygamy in Mexico and Canada,” 186–209.

88. On December 19, 1891, the entire First Presidency and all twelve apostles in a formal petition to U.S. President Benjamin Harrison asked that Mormons charged with the crime of polygamous cohabitation, whether in prison or hiding from officers of the law, be granted amnesty. It explicitly referred to polygamy as “celestial marriage” and admitted that it was taught as necessary for exaltation “up to a short time before September, 1890.” Then, the petition stated, President Woodruff was given divine permission to suspend “the law commanding” its practice. Inasmuch as the Mormon people had now “put aside” something that all their lives they had believed was a sacred principle, the petition asked that all be granted forgiveness just as those who arose in rebellion against the Union had been forgiven at the close of the Civil War. Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 3:229–31. The “Annual Report of the Utah Commission,” *Report of the Secretary of the Interior* (1892), 3:428, called it “the most important of the documents the church has issued, and contains the most direct and positive statements of its desires and promises for the future which has yet come from that source.” To Woodruff’s disappointment, however, Harrison’s proclamation of amnesty in early January 1893 pardoned only those who had neither taken new plural wives since nor lived with those married before November 1, 1890. *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal*, January 5, 1893, 9:235; Lyman, *Political Deliverance*, 189–90, 205; and Jean Bickmore White, ed., *Church, State, and Politics: The Diaries of John Henry Smith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 1990), 264–66.

89. “A Revelation given to Wilford Woodruff in the Wilderness of San Francisco Mountain in Arizona On the 26 day of Jan 1880,” in *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal*, 7:615.

90. "A Utah Commissioner's Perversions," *Deseret News Weekly*, October 11, 1890, 2. For more on this episode, see Hardy, *Doing the Works of Abraham*, 348.

91. Because fundamentalists yet question the Manifesto as an authentic revelation, the modern Church has sought to refute their doubts by reprinting statements by Woodruff indicating his belief that the document was heaven inspired. "Excerpts from Three Addresses by President Wilford Woodruff Regarding the Manifesto," appended to Official Declaration-1, 1981 D&C pp. 292-303. For a fuller account illustrating Woodruff's step by step, sometimes uneasily articulated advance to fully embracing his declaration as divinely willed, see Hardy, *Solemn Covenant*, 146-52; and, with illustrative documents, Hardy, *Doing the Works of Abraham*, 341-56. For Woodruff's views on inspiration/revelation generally, see Thomas G. Alexander, "Wilford Woodruff and the Changing Nature of Mormon Religious Experience," *Church History* 45, no. 1 (March 1976): 56-69.

92. "The Church Cases," *Deseret News Weekly*, October 24, 1891, 577-79. For the apostles' dissatisfaction and Woodruff's admission that, in answering the master in chancery's questions, "he was placed in such a position . . . that he could not answer other than he did." Abraham Hoagland Cannon, *Diary*, August 22, 1891.

93. Illustrative of emphatic declarations that the Church had discontinued plural marriages after the Manifesto is a statement to the press by Church President Lorenzo Snow, made at the time of the Brigham H. Roberts case in Congress: "I declare most emphatically . . . ever since the issuance of the manifesto on this subject by President Wilford Woodruff, my predecessor in office, polygamy or plural marriages have entirely ceased in Utah." "Mormon Head to the World," *New York World*, December 30, 1898, 177. For studies documenting new plural marriages approved both before and after Snow's denial, see note 100, below.

94. Marriner Wood Merrill, *Journal*, 6 vols., holograph, August 20, 1891, LDS Church History Library. See also Abraham Hoagland Cannon, *Diary*, August 20, 1891.

95. Apostle Abraham O. Woodruff, quoted in Juarez Stake Conference, clerk Joseph Charles Bentley, "Journal and Notes," November 18-19, 1900, 61, LDS Church History Library. See Apostle Marriner W. Merrill's nearly identical statement quoted in Rudger Clawson, *Diary*, July 11, 1899, Box 4, bk. 11, 39, Special Collections, Marriott Library. Declarations of this kind were made in the highest councils of the Church both before and after the 1890 Manifesto. See quotations in *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, May 17, 1888, 79 (Wilford Woodruff); April 1,

1896, 219 (Marriner W. Merrill and Lorenzo Snow); and January 6, 1901, 280–81 (Lorenzo Snow).

96. Walter M. Wolfe, quoted in “Manifesto Only Trick to Beat Devil at Own Game,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, January 16, 1906, 1–2. On the use of mistruth, see Appendix I, “Lying for the Lord: An Essay,” in Hardy, *Solemn Covenant*, 364–88.

97. Doctrine and Covenants, 1908 edition, pp. 543–44. Richard O. Cowan, *The Church in the Twentieth Century* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1985), 33, mistakenly contends that President Joseph F. Smith directed that the Manifesto be added to the Doctrine and Covenants in 1904.

98. “An Act to Punish Polygamy and Kindred Offenses,” *Laws of the Territory of Utah* (1892), 30th sess., ch. 8, sec. 2:5–7.

99. Plural marriage was but one of many challenges facing Mormonism and requiring adaptation. Thomas G. Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition: A History of the Latter-day Saints, 1890–1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986). On the question raised at that time and continuing today about whether Mormonism is an “American religion,” including the complicated issue of Mormon responses to surrounding society throughout its history, see Klaus Hansen’s superb historiographical review: “Mormon History and the Conundrum of Culture: America and Beyond,” in *Excavating Mormon Pasts: The New Historiography of the Last Half Century*, edited by Newell G. Bringhurst and Lavina Fielding Anderson (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2004), 1–26.

100. For extensive documentation on the performance of Church-approved, post-Manifesto plural marriages, see D. Michael Quinn, “LDS Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890–1904,” *Dialogue* 18, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 9–105; and Hardy, *Solemn Covenant*, 167–335.

101. For the official record, see U.S. Congress, *Case of Brigham H. Roberts of Utah . . . Report [to accompany H.Res. 107] January 20, 1900*, House Report 85, 2 pts. (56–1) 1900, Serial 4021. A good secondary study is Davis Bitton, “The B. H. Roberts Case of 1898–1900,” *Utah Historical Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (Winter 1957): 27–46. For Roberts’s account, see his *Comprehensive History*, 6:363–74.

102. The implications of the Smoot hearings are treated with particular skill by Kathleen Flake, *The Politics of American Religious Identity: The Seating of Senator Reed Smoot, Mormon Apostle* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004). The question of whether Mormonism was genuinely “American,” as it arose in connection with the hearings, is further explored in Konden R. Smith, “The Reed Smoot Hearings and the Theology of Politics: Perceiving an ‘American’ Identity,” *Journal of Mormon History* 35, no. 3 (Summer 2009): 118–62. For the hearings, see U.S. Congress, Senate, *Proceedings before the Committee on Privileges and Elec-*

tions of the United States Senate in the Matter of the Protests against the Right of Hon. Reed Smoot, a Senator from the State of Utah, to Hold His Seat, 4 vols. Senate Doc. 4865 (59-1) 1906, Serial 2932-35 (hereafter Smoot Hearings).

103. *Seventy-Fourth Annual Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Held in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, April 3rd, 4th and 6th, 1904 . . .* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1904), 75-76; Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 4:84-85; and the discussion in Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition*, 60-73.

104. On the Lyman committee, see Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition*, 67-68. The number of new plural marriages discovered by the committee was so great that Apostle Heber J. Grant, a member of the committee, remarked on how "refreshing" it was when one couple was at last found to be falsely charged in the matter. *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, January 25, 1916, 306.

105. *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, April 7, 1914, 301-2.

106. Tanner, *A Mormon Mother*, 223; Juliaetta Bateman Jensen, *Little Gold Pieces: The Story of My Mormon Mother's Life* (Salt Lake City: Stanway, 1948), 134-36; and the confusion expressed by John Mills Whitaker, *Journal*, November 1, 1917, typewritten transcript, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah.

107. It was, however, a passage in Church history strewn with intramural conflict, especially the expulsion of Matthias F. Cowley and John W. Taylor from the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles. For this and related tensions, see Victor W. Jorgensen and B. Carmon Hardy, "The Taylor-Cowley Affair and the Watershed of Mormon History," *Utah Historical Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 4-36; Hardy, "Late Efforts and Polygamy's Decline," in *Solemn Covenant*, 310-35; and Alexander, *Mormonism in Transition*, 60-73.

108. John A. McClernand, Letter to President Grover Cleveland, June 30, 1887, in Grover Cleveland Papers, ser. 1, film, reel 50, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

109. Lyman, *Political Deliverance*, 294.

110. Exemplary of many instances, see President Joseph F. Smith, *Smoot Hearing*, 1:108-9, 324-25; John Henry Evans, *One Hundred Years of Mormonism: A History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints from 1805 to 1905*, 3rd ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Sunday School Union, 1909), 481; John A. Widtsoe, *Evidences and Reconciliations: Aids to Faith in a Modern Day* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1943), 85; Heber J. Grant, *Gospel Standards: Selections from the Sermons and Writings of Heber J. Grant, Seventh President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Improvement Era, 1941), 159; Heber J. Grant, quoted in William E.

Berrett and Alma P. Burton, eds., *Readings in LDS Church History from Original Manuscripts*, 3 vols. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1953–58), 3:122–23; earlier authorities quoted in Reimann, *Plural Marriage, Limited*, 111–15; and, Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton, *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), 199. Importantly, some Mormon historians are beginning to acknowledge the large numbers of nineteenth-century Saints who practiced polygamy. See, e.g., Danel W. Bachman and Ronald K. Esplin, “Plural Marriage,” *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 4 vols. (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1992), 3:1095.

111. An early example, possibly prepared for defensive purposes, saying that polygamy was practiced by permission only, that it was not mandatory, and that “celestial” marriage was not synonymous with polygamy, is John Taylor, *On Marriage: Succession in the Priesthood* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Company, 1882), 5. The distinction continued to be drawn in succeeding years and is accepted as doctrinally correct today. Evans, *One Hundred Years*, 476–77; Joseph F. Smith, testimony in *Smoot Hearing*, 1:133; deliberations described in a typewritten extract from a meeting of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, February 17, 1908, Stanley Snow Ivins Collection, Box 11, fd. 10, Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City; First Presidency circular to stake presidents and counselors, January 31, 1914, in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:326; and Church spokesman Dale Bills as quoted in Moore-Emmett, “Only for Eternity,” 14. For an illustration of attention to Abraham without discussing his polygamy, see Spencer W. Kimball, “Example of Abraham,” *Ensign*, June 1975, 3–7. Acknowledgment of Abraham’s relationship with Hagar occurs but is not cited as polygamous or as part of the restored “Abrahamic covenant,” still binding on the Saints in modern times. “Eternal marriage” and “celestial marriage” are terms used in connection with Abraham but not “plural marriage.” See, as examples, in the quasi-official *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*: E. Douglas Clark, “Abraham,” 1:7–9; Ellis T. Rasmussen, “Abrahamic Covenant,” 1:9–10; and Joel A. Flake, “Gospel of Abraham,” 2:555–56. As but one of many instances where polygamy is now ignored when describing advancement to the celestial kingdom of heaven, see Renato Maldonado, “The Three Degrees of Glory,” *Ensign*, April 2005, 62–65.

112. James E. Talmage, *The Story of “Mormonism” and the Philosophy of “Mormonism”* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1914), 89. See also Evans, *One Hundred Years of Mormonism*, 476–77.

113. *History of the Bench and Bar of Utah* (Salt Lake City: Interstate Press Association, 1913), 51.

114. “An Official Statement from the First Presidency of the Church

of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,” *Deseret News*, June 17, 1933, Church Section [later named *LDS Church News*], 1–4; also reproduced in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:315–30. The best scholarly account of J. Reuben Clark and his role in preparing the statement is D. Michael Quinn, *J. Reuben Clark: The Church Years* (Provo, Utah: BYU Press, 1983), 179–86. The 1933 declaration was preceded by at least nine other pronouncements of similar substance, commencing with President Joseph F. Smith’s well-known 1904 statement of denial. A list, with dates, is in Clark, *Messages of the First Presidency*, 5:194.

115. “Unlawful Cohabitation,” March 21, 1935, ch. 112, sec. 103–51–2, *Laws of the State of Utah* (1935), 220.

116. Franklin L. West, quoted in “Utah Liquor Chief Urges Effective Prohibition, at B.Y. Leadership Institute,” *Deseret News*, January 27, 1937, 13.

117. The irony of contemporary Mormonism’s hostility toward renewed plurality and the similarity of its criticisms of those continuing the practice to those directed at its own attachment to the system in the nineteenth century has been observed for decades. See, e.g., Nels Anderson, *Desert Saints: The Mormon Frontier in Utah* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 417; Fawn M. Brodie, *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet*, 2d ed. rev. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971), 401; Davis Bitton, “Mormon Polygamy: A Review Article,” *Journal of Mormon History* 4 (1977): 101; and Gordon, *The Mormon Question*, 234.

118. Fundamentalist movements generally focus on “a rediscovery of founding principles.” John C. Super and Briane K. Turley, *Religion in World History: The Persistence of Imperial Communion* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 15. As described by a leading scholar of the phenomenon, it involves looking back to an earlier order, “determined to rebuild the original faith” by relying on “Scripture,” which is interpreted “literally and often reductively.” Karen Armstrong, *The Battle for God* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), 90.

119. Using the same language as nineteenth-century Mormons, the first issue of fundamentalism’s best-known journal contended that modern Christian society was collapsing on account of monogamy. Polygamy as taught by the nineteenth-century Church, with its “great social law” of correct sexual behavior, was the only remedy. “Announcement,” *Truth* 1 (June 1, 1935): 1. See also Joseph W. Musser, comp., *Celestial or Plural Marriage: The Mormon Marriage System* (Salt Lake City: Truth Publishing, 1944), 132–33; Lynn L. Bishop and Steven L. Bishop, *The Keys of the Priesthood Illustrated* (Draper, Utah: Review and Preview Publishers, 1971), 321–24; Dennis R. Short, comp., *Questions on Plural Marriage* (Salt

Lake City: Author, 1974), 5, 8, 39. For a compilation of early orthodox (and now Mormon fundamentalist) comments on the transformative powers of sexual relations when used primarily for reproductive purposes, see [Gilbert Fulton?], *The Law of Chastity* (N.p.: Gems Publishing, n.d.). And, of course, apart from sexual requirements attending its practice, fundamentalists remain firmly allegiant to Mormonism's earlier emphasis on the necessity of living polygamy to attain the greatest glory in the next life. Anne Wilde, *An Essential for Exaltation: Celestial Plural Marriage Essential for the Highest Degree of the Celestial Kingdom* (Salt Lake City: Pioneer Press, 1998).

120. Joseph W. Musser made this point in his *Celestial or Plural Marriage*, 147. See also the case of Esleie D. Jenson, described in Brian C. Hales, *Modern Polygamy and Mormon Fundamentalism: The Generations after the Manifesto* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2006), 219, 233 note 34; and Short, *Questions on Plural Marriage*, 22.

121. The authenticity of President Taylor's alleged revelation authorizing the continued performance of plural marriages elicits vigorous debate. Fundamentalists, however, commonly reference it and describe the experience as confidently as orthodox Mormons do when talking about the first visions of Joseph Smith. One can commence a survey of literature on the subject with B. Harvey Allred, *A Leaf in Review of the Words and Acts of God and Men Relative to the Fullness of the Gospel*, 2nd ed. rev. by Rhea Allred Kunz et al. (Draper, Utah: Review and Preview Publishers, 1980), 183–93, Appendices I and II, pp. 229–38; all of Fred C. Collier, "Re-examining the Lorin Woolley Story," *Doctrine of the Priesthood* 1, no. 2 (February 1981); and the recounting by President Taylor's grandson, Samuel W. Taylor, *The Kingdom or Nothing: The Life of John Taylor, Militant Mormon* (New York City: Macmillan Publishing, 1976), 364–68. For more critical accounts, see Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy*, 183–88; Brian C. Hales and J. Max Anderson, *The Priesthood of Modern Polygamy: An LDS Perspective* (Salt Lake City: Northwest Publishing, 1992), esp. 45–78; and Hales, *Modern Polygamy and Mormon Fundamentalism*, 37–41, 146–48, 152–57 passim. A good précis of the Mormon polygamous, fundamentalist movement is provided by Jessie L. Embry in her *Setting the Record Straight: Mormons & Polygamy* (Orem, Utah: Millennial Press, 2007), 59–66.

122. Martha Sonntag Bradley, *Kidnapped from That Land: The Government Raids on the Short Creek Polygamists* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993); Wiley S. Maloney, "Short Creek Story," *American West* 11, no. 2 (1974): 16–23, 60–62; Hales, *Modern Polygamy and Mormon Fundamentalism*, 309–15.

123. "Too Many Wives?" *Newsweek*, November 21, 1955, 98–99; and

Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy*, 195–208. Addressing parallels between the 1953 Short Creek raid and that at Eldorado, Texas, in 2008, Martha Sonntag Bradley points to the need for greater caution by government authorities in dealing with polygamous communities. See her “A Repeat of History: A Comparison of the Short Creek and Eldorado Raids on the FLDS,” in Cardell K. Jacobson and Lara Burton, eds., *Modern Polygamy in the United States: Historical, Cultural, and Legal Issues* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3–39. The same volume includes the insightful chapter: Gary Shepherd and Gordon Shepherd, “Learning the Wrong Lessons: A Comparison of FLDS, Family International, Branch Davidian Child-Protection Interventions,” 237–58.

124. See the examinations provided in D. Michael Quinn, “Plural Marriage and Mormon Fundamentalism,” *Dialogue* 31, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 1–68; and the many publications by Kenneth David Driggs, including: “After the Manifesto: Modern Polygamy and Fundamentalist Mormons,” *Journal of Church and State* 32, no. 2 (Spring 1990): 367–89; “Imprisonment, Defiance, and Division: A History of Mormon Fundamentalism in the 1940s and 1950s,” *Dialogue* 38, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 65–95.

125. The figures used here first appeared in Brooke Adams’s “LDS Splinter Groups Growing,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, August 9, 2005, B1, B6, where it was described as an “informal survey” prepared by Anne Wilde of Salt Lake City. Wilde mailed a copy of the survey to me in 2010. It is a one-page bar graph titled, “Fundamentalist Mormons by Affiliation.” Other recent estimates, while varying, are close in their aggregates to Wilde’s findings. See, for example, Heber B. Hammon and William Jankowiak, “One Vision: The Making, Unmaking, and Remaking of a Fundamentalist Polygamous Community,” in Jacobson and Burton, eds., *Modern Polygamy*, 73 note 1; Ken Driggs, “Twenty Years of Observations about the Fundamentalist Polygamists,” in *ibid.*, 88–89; Janet Bennion, “History, Culture, and Variability of Mormon Schismatic Groups,” *ibid.*, 103–8; and Arland Thornton, “The International Fight against Barbarism: Historical and Comparative Perspectives on Marriage Timing, Consent, and Polygamy,” *ibid.*, 272. Because these groups are constantly growing, the figures cited here undoubtedly understate the magnitude of contemporary Mormon fundamentalist movements. See also the listing in Andrea Moore-Emmett, *God’s Brothel: The Extortion of Sex for Salvation in Contemporary Mormon and Christian Fundamentalist Polygamy and the Stories of 18 Women Who Escaped* (San Francisco: Pince-Nez Press, 2004), 25–29; and the map showing locations of fundamentalist communities in the western United States in Jacobson and Burton, eds., *Modern Polygamy*, xvi.

126. As but two of numerous examples, see Ogden Kraut, *Compromise and Concession* (N.p.: Kraut's Pioneer Press, 1977); and the fundamentalist advertisement, authored by Joseph L. Jensen, Chair of Star of Truth Publishing, "Shall We Excommunicate Joseph Smith?" *Salt Lake Tribune*, March 30, 1980, A3.

127. For Mormonism's American membership compared to that of other churches, see "Largest Religious Groups in the United States of America," based on a National Council of Churches survey at http://www.adherents.com/rele_USA.html#bodies (accessed July 23, 2009). For the Church's emergence as a unique Judeo-Christian development, see Jan Shippo, *Mormonism: The Story of a New Religious Tradition* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985), esp. 148–49; and Rodney Stark's analysis and projections based on Mormonism's dramatic membership growth, "The Rise of a New World Faith," in Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Mormonism*, edited by Reid L. Neilson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 139–46. However, for a more sobering description of flat-lining membership growth and possible causes, see in this issue, Frederick Mark Gedicks, "Mormonism in Western Society: Three Futures," and Armand L. Mauss's "Rethinking Retrenchment: Course Corrections in the Ongoing Campaign for Respectability," examining what seems like greater sensitivity to assimilation issues.

128. Evidence for these policies and more can be read in "Mass Excommunications," *Truth* 1 (March 1936): 114–21; "State Rests Case in Polygamy Trial," *Salt Lake Tribune*, December 11, 1935, 7; "Excommunications," *Deseret News*, March 29, 1939, 13; See also "An Official Letter," *Truth* 5 (November 1939): 141–42; "Forty-Six Seized in Three-State Polygamy Drive," *Salt Lake Tribune*, March 8, 1944, 1, 2; "LDS Leaders Uphold Action to Stamp Out Polygamy," *ibid.*, 1; "The Mark E. Petersen Letter," *Truth* 10 (January 1945): 207–8; and what appears to be a copy of the loyalty oath in Stanley Snow Ivins Collection, Box 12, fd. 13, Utah State Historical Society. For secondary accounts, see Van Wagoner, *Mormon Polygamy*, 195–98; Bradley, *Kidnapped from That Land*, 16–17, 52–63, 86–87; Bradley, "Changed Faces: The Official LDS Position on Polygamy, 1890–1990," *Sunstone* 14 (February 1990): 26–33; Quinn, "Plural Marriage and Mormon Fundamentalism," 26–27; Hales, *Modern Polygamy and Mormon Fundamentalism*, 248–49, 254–55; and Marianne T. Watson, "The Fred E. Curtis Papers: LDS Church Surveillance of Fundamentalist Mormons 1937 to 1954," paper presented at Sunstone Symposium, Salt Lake City, August 10, 2001.

129. Bradley, "Changed Faces," 32–33. For the controversy aroused by a Church manual's failure to acknowledge Brigham Young's plural marriages, see Vern Anderson, Associated Press, April 4, 1998, "Mor-

mon Church Manual Paints Polygamist Young as a Monogamist,” <http://www.lds-mormon.com/byoung.shtml> (accessed August 10, 2009).

130. George D. Smith, “The Forgotten Story of Nauvoo Plural Marriage,” *Journal of Mormon History* 36, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 163–65. Institutional efforts to avoid any suggestion of continued Mormon acceptance of the Principle sometimes had sad personal consequences. In the early twentieth century, when members of approved plural marriages were yet alive, they were sometimes told to separate their households geographically to be less conspicuous. The son of an approved, early twentieth-century polygamous marriage was offended because Church leaders did not acknowledge surviving plural wives and families when speaking at a deceased’s funeral. The daughter of polygamous parents told how she was instructed as a child to use mistruth at school to mask her polygamous parentage. References to these cases are found, in the order mentioned, in Grant Ivins’s memories as related in A. C. Lambert, “Heber J. Grant Would Have Totally Ruined the Mormon Church,” handwritten account of conversation with Heber Grant Ivins, A. C. Lambert Collection, Special Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah; the recollection of Guy C. Wilson Jr., *Memories of a Venerable Father and Other Reminiscences*, a published interview with B. Carmon Hardy (Fullerton: Oral History Program of California State University, Fullerton, 1988), 105–6, 111–12; and Katherine C. Thomas, interviewed by Leonard Grover, March 25, 1980, Provo, Utah, typewritten transcript, 3–4, BYU Polygamy Oral History Project.

131. *Heber J. Grant Diaries*, March 15, 1921, 317. Focusing on this point, Fundamentalists say that by yielding to the world and its “humanism,” Mormon doctrine has changed so much that what was “a holy principle” one day has become “a sin the next.” Joseph L. Jensen, Chairman of Star of Truth Publishing, “Shall We Excommunicate Joseph Smith?” *Salt Lake Tribune*, March 30, 1980, A3.

132. Despite the Church’s one-time approval of plural marriage and the continued inclusion of the revelation approving the practice in its canon of scripture, inattention to polygamy in official study guides and manuals is sometimes glaring. See, for example, Lesson 45, “The Family Is Ordained of God,” *Doctrine and Covenants and Church History: Gospel Doctrine Teacher’s Manual* (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2003), 260–65. For what *may* have been an attempt (though clearly an unsuccessful one) to edit the revelation on polygamy out of popular summaries of the Doctrine and Covenants in the 1930s, thus reducing its visibility, see Ken Driggs, “A New Future Requires a New Past,” *Dialogue* 41, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 73.

133. Numerous individuals have said they believe the Principle will

be revived, whether here or hereafter, and that it has only been “suspended.” This was, in part, how B. H. Roberts was reconciled to the Woodruff Manifesto. John Sillito, ed., *History’s Apprentice: The Diaries of B. H. Roberts, 1880–1898* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books in association with Smith Research Associates, 2004), February 10, 1893, 226–27. See also the comments of President Wilford Woodruff and George Q. Cannon. Abraham Hoagland Cannon, *Journal*, April 5, 1894, 18:70–71; expectations voiced by Church members in the twentieth century in the BYU Polygamy Oral History Project, as illustrated by Winnie Haynie Mortensen, interviewed by Leonard R. Grover, January 26, 1980, 20–21; and Leroy Eyring, interviewed by Leonard R. Grover, April 24, 1980, 7. See also Edward Christian Eyring, quoted in Nelle Spilsbury Hatch and B. Carmon Hardy, comps. and eds., *Stalwarts South of the Border* (Anaheim, Calif: privately published, 1985), 150. Finally, Apostle Bruce R. McConkie stated: “Obviously the holy practice [of plural marriage] will commence again after the Second Coming of the Son of Man and the ushering in of the millennium.” *Mormon Doctrine*, 2d ed. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1966), 578. This work has now officially been taken out of print.

134. For this practice and the distress it causes some Mormon women, see anonymously authored “Spiritual Polygamist,” *Sunstone* 22, no. 1 (March–April 1999): 3–5; Moore-Emmett, “Only for Eternity,” 15, 17; and Lisa Miller’s “Beliefwatch: Ever After,” *Newsweek*, September 3, 2007, 13. As it relates to divorced men, see the anonymously authored “Spiritual Polygamist.”

135. This document was first formally presented by President Gordon B. Hinckley at the women’s general conference session in September 1995 and has been reprinted several times. See “The Family: A Proclamation to the World,” *Ensign*, November 1995, 99–100. The language used throughout endorses families involving “a man and a woman” and “a father and a mother” as families of which God approves, descriptions that clearly accommodate plural relationships. It is also significant that Apostle Boyd K. Packer, president of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, described the statement as “revelatory” and “scripturelike in its power.” The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, *Worldwide Leadership Training Meeting: Building Up a Righteous Posterity* (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2008), 5. But cf. Scott Trotter, Church spokesman, October 8, 2010, <http://www.ksl.com/index.php?nid=299&sid=12749665&pid=1> (accessed October 12, 2010).

136. The amount of press coverage and commentary on this episode is enormous. See the many blog entries in <http://texaspolygamy.blogspot.com/>; and “Post Raid Events,” “Court Rulings,” and “Other

Criticisms” in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/YFZ_Ranch#cite_note-88 (both accessed June 29, 2010).

137. For examples of at least quasi-sympathetic description, with photos, of family life among YFZ residents, see Alex Tresniowski et al., “This Is Home,” *People*, March 23, 2009, 60–61; the editorial essays, “State vs. Church,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 22, 2008, A16; and “Texas Officials Stung by Fallout from FLDS Raid,” *ibid.*, May 31, 2008, A1, A14; the summary provided in “Nation Reacts to Texas Raid on FLDS Compound,” *Sunstone*, July 2008, 70–73; and, finally, the scholarly concern with the way state authorities handled the 2008 episode that is expressed in study after study gathered in Jacobson and Burton, eds., *Modern Polygamy*.

138. Victor Kassel, “Polygyny after Sixty,” *Geriatrics* 21 (April 1966): 214–18; and Alf Pratte’s description of the findings of sociologist Jerry H. Borup, in “Sociologist Sees Future Rebirth of Polygamy,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, November 6, 1986, B4. Not all news concerning polygamy and health is positive. Some have alleged that FLDS members living in socially enclosed communities are vulnerable to genetically induced diseases inherited from common ancestors. See Kevin Duignan, “Fumarase Deficiency and the FLDS: A Tragic Secret,” http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/724053/fumarase_deficiency (accessed September 1, 2009). This, however, should be read in connection with the comments of Deborah L. Cragun and Ryan T. Cragun, “The Intricacies and Ethics of Parental Genetic Testing,” in Jacobson and Burton, eds., *Modern Polygamy*, esp. 338–41. But the old biological arguments with which pluralists were pelted in the nineteenth century—saying that a plurality of wives was causing Mormons to deteriorate into an inferior species—have no more foundation now than then. For the nineteenth-century allegations, see Lester E. Bush Jr., “Mormon ‘Physiology,’ 1850–1875,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 56 (Summer 1982): 218–37. Following the 1953 raid on Short Creek, a federal investigation of allegations that polygamist children were physically and socially injured by the practice of plural marriage found no evidence to support them. Except that underage girls were sometimes co-opted into plural unions and could thereby be characterized as juvenile delinquents, and that conditions in some households were “Spartan,” the hearings concluded that children in the community were generally healthy, well cared for, and well behaved. U.S. Senate, *Juvenile Delinquency (Plural Marriages): Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Cong., 1st Sess., Pursuant to Sen. Res. 62, April 28 and May 2, 1955* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955).

139. 2Wives.Com. The descriptive note accompanying the site

reads: "If you *really* seek for 2 wives or more in your family, then 2Wives.com is the *real* place for you! 2Wives.com is a non-religious site for **good people** seeking **polygamy** (or, more specifically, polygyny)" (emphasis in original).

140. Regarding the show's popularity with the American public, see Mary McNamara, "Big Love': Disillusioned But Still Smitten," *Los Angeles Times*, March 10, 2010, D1, D9. An eastern journalist remarked that *Big Love* was raising tolerance for polygamy in a manner similar to that enjoyed by advocates of gay marriage. John Pomfret, "Polygamists Fight to Be Seen as Part of Mainstream Society," *Washington Post*, November 21, 2006, at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/21/AR2006112100206.html> (accessed June 11, 2009). And an LDS reviewer remarked that the series was succeeding because of the "surprising *normalcy*" (emphasis in original) of the show's polygamous family. Kent R. Bean, "Mark V. Olsen and Will Scheffer, Creators, *Big Love*, Season 1 (2006) and Season 2 (2007); HBO Pictures," *BYU Studies* 47, no. 2 (2008): 184. See also the approving review by Margaret M. Toscano, "Mark Olsen and Will Scheffer, Co-Creators, Writers, and Producers: *Big Love*, the First Four Seasons on DVD, Home Box Office," *John Whitmer Historical Association Journal* 30 (2010): 239-44.

141. William O. Douglas, in *Wisconsin v. Yoder et al.*, 406 U.S. 205 (1971), 247. Suggestions bearing on the legalization of polygamy reach back decades. See, for example: Ralph Slovenko, "The De Facto Decriminalization of Bigamy," *Journal of Family Law* 17 (1978-79): 297-308; and G. Keith Nedrow, "Polygamy and the Right to Marry: New Life for an Old Lifestyle," *Memphis State University Law Review* 11 (Spring 1981): 303-49. See also Firmage and Mangrum, *Zion in the Courts*, 129-209; the letter of Richard Eugene Harris to the editor, "Legalize Polygamy," *Salt Lake Tribune*, February 19, 1979, A13; "ACLU Seeks Overturning of Polygamy Laws," *Sunstone* 14 (October 1990): 63; comments in Quinn, "Plural Marriage and Modern Fundamentalism," 63-65; and more recently the letter of Vincent Marcus, Secretary of the Utah Libertarian Party, "Decriminalize Polygamy," *Salt Lake City Weekly*, 28, no. 10 (July 28, 2011), 4.

142. Articulating his policy repeatedly in recent years, Mark Shurtleff has shared views with law-enforcement agencies in other states and Canada. Hoping to increase dialogue between pluralists and the government in Utah, he discussed his approach with polygamists, attorneys, and law officers at a special conference titled, "Family or Felony? Polygamy and the Law," Snowbird, Utah, September 25, 2009. On another occasion, regarding Utah's polygamous community, Shurtleff was quoted as saying: "This is a big group of people. They are not going away. You

can't incarcerate them all. You can't drive them out of the state. So they are here. What do we do about it?" Pomfret, "Polygamists Fight to Be Seen as Part of Mainstream Society."

143. Representative David Zolman of Taylorsville, Utah, reported January 25, 2005, by Dan Harrie, <http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=> (accessed July 23, 2009).

144. Events in Canada are changing so rapidly it is difficult to remain current with them. But one can begin with Dean Beeby, "Federal Study Urges Canada to Scrap Ban on Polygamy," *Toronto Star*, January 13, 2006, A2. For this reference and other relevant developments, I am indebted to Amy J. Kaufman, Public Services Librarian, Lederman Law Library, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. See the work by her and Martha Bailey, *Polygamy in the Monogamous World: Multicultural Challenges for Western Law and Policy* (Santa Barbara, Calif: Praeger, 2010), 143–87.

145. There is extensive evidence of growing diversity in sexual and marital relationships in the United States, some of it purposefully non-traditional. "Multiple Intimate Relationships: A Summary of Liberated Christians' Views," <http://www.libchrist.com/> (accessed November 15, 2009). Also see Carol J. Williams, "Same-Sex Marriage Gains Legal Ground—Gradually; Even in States that Ban it, Court Decisions on Divorce, Custody and More Give Incremental Rights to Gay Couples," *Los Angeles Times*, May 4, 2009, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed July 18, 2011); and Kate Linthicum, Ari Bloomekatz, and Scott Gold, "Data Show State Families Changing; U.S. Census Figures Reveal a Strong Increase in Nontraditional Households," *Los Angeles Times*, June 23, 2011, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed July 18, 2011).

146. Quinn explored this question in his article, "Plural Marriage and Mormon Fundamentalism," 61–65.

147. Mormon assimilation into the American mainstream and efforts by the Church to retain a distinct religious image is most extensively explored in Armand L. Mauss, *The Angel and the Beehive: The Mormon Struggle with Assimilation* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994). See also his more contemporary analysis, "Rethinking Retrenchment," in this issue.

148. The phrase is taken from the "Epilogue" of Fawn M. Brodie in her *No Man Knows My History*, 401.

149. Klaus Hansen, *Mormonism and the American Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 205.

150. Encouragement for such a development may be taken from Carrie A. Moore's finding, reported in "LDS in Survey Call for Unvarnished History," *Deseret Morning News*, May 27, 2007, <http://www>.

proquest.com (accessed July 18, 2011). Considering the support given by the Church to Ronald W. Walker, Richard E. Turley Jr., and Glen M. Leonard to produce *Massacre at Mountain Meadows* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), one wonders if similar candor on the part of Church leaders regarding the history of polygamy can be far behind. See Phillip L. Barlow, "Roundtable on Massacre at Mountain Meadows," *Dialogue* 42, no. 1 (Spring 2009): 114–27; and Klaus Hansen's review of the same volume as a possible "turning point in Latter-day Saint historiography," *Journal of American History* 96, no. 2 (September 2009): 503.

151. "Utah," *Deseret Evening News*, July 18, 1877, 1. For other relevant articles at or near the same period, most being editorials in the *Deseret Evening News*, see "If the Mormon People Had Taken Our Advice," May 4, 1877, 2; "The 'Christian Advocate's' 'Parity of Reasoning,'" May 5, 1877, 2; "The Marriage Question," June 9, 1877, 2; "Anti-Polygamic Failures," January 23, 1878, 2; "Marriage as a Test," August 5, 1879, 2; "Not for General Practice," November 23, 1885, not paginated; and "Monogamy and the Home," December 5, 1885, not paginated.

152. President Gordon B. Hinckley instructed Church members: "We must not be clannish . . . we must never adopt a holier-than-thou attitude." This statement may be portentous. "Leader Tells Mormons to Welcome Non-Mormons," *Los Angeles Times*, July 28, 2001, B18. A more recent statement is that of President Dieter F. Uchtdorf, quoted in Peggy Fletcher Stack, "LDS Embrace All," *Salt Lake Tribune*, April 6, 2010, <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed April 14, 2010); and Marlin K. Jensen, "Those Who Are Different," *Ensign*, August 2010, 44–46.

153. Church members are told not only to search out their ancestors but to reverently acquaint themselves with the history of their religion's past. Those living now, the Saints are told, cannot be saved without their forebears, nor those who lived before without those presently alive. See Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook, eds. and comps., *The Words of Joseph Smith: The Contemporary Accounts of the Nauvoo Discourses of the Prophet Joseph* (Provo, Utah: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1980), 10. Mormon preachment is rich in admonitions on the importance of Church history and its significance for LDS worship. See, as recent General Authority statements published in the *Ensign*: Marlin K. Jensen, "Remember and Perish Not," May 2007, 36–38; Henry B. Eyring, "O Remember, Remember," November 2007, 66–69; Eyring, "There Shall Be a Record Kept among You," December 2007, 28–33; Russell M. Nelson, "Salvation and Exaltation," May 2008, 7–10; Dieter F. Uchtdorf, "Heeding the Voice of the Prophets," July 2008, 5; and M. Russell Ballard, "Learning the Lessons of the Past," May 2009, 31–34.

154. As told in Martin P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion*, trans. F. J. Fielden, rev. ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1964), 235–36.

155. Bernard DeVoto, “The Centennial of Mormonism,” *American Mercury*, January 1, 1930, 7.

156. For an overview of distinctions between cults, sects, and churches as well as heuristic accounts of the way sects split from established churches, with a history of such theories, see Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), esp. 19–37, 99–125. So far as Mormon fundamentalist sects are concerned, Martha Sonntag Bradley, “A Repeat of History,” 24, points out that they have become increasingly “distinct” over the decades of their estrangement from mainline Mormonism. Kathryn Daynes sketches differences between modern fundamentalist polygamy and that of the nineteenth-century Mormon Church in her “Differing Polygamous Patterns: Nineteenth-Century LDS and Twenty-First-Century FLDS Marriage Systems,” in Jacobson and Burton, *Modern Polygamy*, 125–48.

157. Scott Anderson, “The Polygamists: An Exclusive Look inside the FLDS,” *National Geographic*, February 2010, 57.