The Subject of Marriage

[Doctrine and Covenants 132:18-19](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/132.18-19?lang=eng&clang=eng" \l "p17" \t "_blank)

18 And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife, and make a covenant with her for time and for all eternity, if that covenant is not by me or by my word, which is my law, and is not sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, through him whom I have anointed and appointed unto this power, then it is not valid neither of force when they are out of the world, because they are not joined by me, saith the Lord, neither by my word; when they are out of the world it cannot be received there, because the angels and the gods are appointed there, by whom they cannot pass; they cannot, therefore, inherit my glory; for my house is a house of order, saith the Lord God.

19 And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is anointed, unto whom I have appointed this power and the keys of this priesthood; and it shall be said unto them—Ye shall come forth in the first resurrection; and if it be after the first resurrection, in the next resurrection; and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights, and depths—then shall it be written in the Lamb's Book of Life, that he shall commit no murder whereby to shed innocent blood, and if ye abide in my covenant and commit no murder whereby to shed innocent blood, it shall be done unto them in all things whatsoever my servant hath put upon them, in time, and through all eternity; and shall be of full force when they are out of the world; and they shall pass by the angels, and the gods, which are set there, to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon their heads, which glory shall be a fulness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever.

The above seems to indicate that Marriage is essential for exaltation. Tradition implies that a marriage must be made on earth and not in Heaven because there is no marriage given in heaven:

[Matthew 22:30](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/nt/matt/22.30?lang=eng#29)

***27 And last of all the woman died also.***

***28 Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.***

***29 Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.***

***30 For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.***

***31 But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying,***

***32 I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.***

***33 And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine.***

Because Section 132 talks of those in the Old Testament who had more than one wife, causes problems. This is fine for Adam through Abraham but after Moses, the principals of the higher priesthood would not applied until Jesus Christ came. David had more than one wife but he committed murder by causing the shedding of the blood of Uriah to obtain his wife. All prophets were able to keep their wives save in the case of David who fell from his exaltation. If Section 132 were correct, Nathan the prophet would have to have the higher priesthood or any prophet has the power regardless of his priesthood. Then we have:

[Doctrine and Covenants 132:48-50](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/132.48-50?lang=eng&clang=eng#p47)

48 And again, verily I say unto you, my servant Joseph, that whatsoever you give on earth, and to whomsoever you give any one on earth, by my word and according to my law, it shall be visited with blessings and not cursings, and with my power, saith the Lord, and shall be without condemnation on earth and in heaven.

49 For I am the Lord thy God, and will be with thee even unto the end of the world, and through all eternity; for verily I seal upon you your exaltation, and prepare a throne for you in the kingdom of my Father, with Abraham your father.

50 Behold, I have seen your sacrifices, and will forgive all your sins; I have seen your sacrifices in obedience to that which I have told you. Go, therefore, and I make a way for your escape, as I accepted the offering of Abraham of his son Isaac.

The question remains today as to how do we know if Jesus Christ has given this power to give the Holy Spirit of Promise save in the case of Hyrum Smith.

[Doctrine and Covenants 124:124-125](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/124.124-125?lang=eng&clang=eng#p123)

124 First, I give unto you Hyrum Smith to be a patriarch unto you, to hold the sealing blessings of my church, even the Holy Spirit of promise, whereby ye are sealed up unto the day of redemption that ye may not fall notwithstanding the hour of temptation that may come upon you.

125 I give unto you my servant Joseph, to be a presiding elder over all my church, to be a translator, a revelator, a seer, and prophet.

The above was January 1841. This is two and one-half years before Brigham Young included section 132, which referred to the Holy Spirit of Promise regarding marriage. Does this mean that Hyrum Smith had the *sealing blessings* of the *church, even the holy spirit of promise*? Does the power to seal mean the power to give the Holy Spirit of Promise? Did Joseph Smith already have a clear indication about the Holy Spirit of promise mentioned in the section on eternal marriage? The above seems to indicate a difference in responsibility between Hyrum Smith and Joseph Smith. One may argue a difference between sealing blessings and the eternal marriage covenant, but both require the Holy Spirit of Promise. Regardless of this fact, tradition does not ask the appropriate questions. Tradition assumes that one on earth at a time his this power. Giving this power to Hyrum Smith is a contradiction to the underlined insert below:

[Doctrine and Covenants 132:7](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/132.7?lang=eng&clang=eng#p6)

7 And verily I say unto you, that the conditions of this law are these: All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations, that are not made and entered into and sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is anointed, both as well for time and for all eternity, and that too most holy, by revelation and commandment through the medium of mine anointed, whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power (and I have appointed unto my servant Joseph to hold this power in the last days, and there is never but one on the earth at a time on whom this power and the keys of this priesthood are conferred), are of no efficacy, virtue, or force in and after the resurrection from the dead; for all contracts that are not made unto this end have an end when men are dead.

An earlier part says regarding the Holy Spirit of promise, *of him who is anointed.* Is this not sufficient for marriage? Why the underlined insert. This comes before the earlier references above from section 132 and is quoted to prove authority by using *the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is anointed.* This agrees with Hyrum Smith being the one anointed, who had the power 1½ years before the above. D&C 124 above gives Hyrum Smith *to be a patriarch unto you* meaning Joseph Smith who received the revelation, or we have to interpret you as anyone reading. This causes confusion if Hyrum Smith did not confirm the responsibility to another. This is only a guess but keep in mind that the Holy Spirit of Promise is also the Second Comforter or in other words Jesus Christ. This differs form the Holy Ghost that is the first comforter. Why is a patriarch? Does he have the sealing blessings through the Holy Spirit of promise? Why would that be less than marriage?

Perhaps we read the case of Hyrum Smith incorrectly, especially because today we have no Church Patriarch yet patriarchal blessing are still given. Is it because there is no descendant of Hyrum Smith that is worthy?

What further seems to support this conclusion is the unnecessary insert of *(and I have appointed unto my servant Joseph to hold this power in the last days, and there is never but one on the earth at a time on whom this power and the keys of this priesthood are conferred).* I have always felt that the parenthesis holds the concept in limbo and we tend to miss the conclusion of the use of the verb *are* after closing the parenthesis. If the insertion was left out and mentioned in a separate concept it would be smoother because there is not one period or semicolon in the above very long statement. The problem with this is that Hyrum Smith already had the power. Also in verses 18-19 there is at least one semicolon in 18 and two in 19. *Of him who is anointed* is sufficient without the insert. To say that there is only one on earth at a time seems strange if that one can give the power to others. Then again, what about the church among the Nephites being one case and among the first Church of Christ being the second case? This gives us a contradiction. The only logical conclusion is the Brigham Young inserted it to give himself the power to live in polygamy and also give the Holy Spirit of Promise.

Polygamy did not begin with Joseph Smith; it was a problem in the LDS Church long before Section 132 was inserted.

History of the Church, Vol.6, Ch.2, p.46—October 1843

In the afternoon, rode to the prairie to show some of the brethren some land. Evening, at home, and walked up and down the streets with my scribe. Gave instructions to try those persons who were preaching, teaching, or practicing the doctrine of plurality of wives: for, according to the law, I hold the keys of this power in the last days; for there is never but one on earth at a time on whom the power and its keys are conferred; and I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time, unless the Lord directs otherwise.

The above, three months later, seems to have the same concept as given in Section 132 where Joseph said, *I hold the keys of this power in the last days; for there is never but one on earth at a time on whom the power and its keys are conferred.* Modern Mormon scholars, who have had access to records in the Church's archives, have found that this statement has been changed. Originally it condemned polygamy. The original quotation is in "an untitled journal of 278 manuscript pages," which is thought to be in the handwriting of Willard Richards, one of Joseph's scribes. Richards made the following entry:

Walked up and down St[reet] with Scribe and gave instructions to try those who were preaching, teaching, or practicing the doctrine of plurality of wives on this Law. Joseph forbids it and the practice thereof. No man shall have but one wife. [rest of page blank] {page 116} (Scott H. Faulring, ed., An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith, 417)

According to Church History, the above would have been in October 1843. Section 132 is listed as recorded in July 1843. This seems acceptable, but the idea that it was changed causes questions. Section 132 is referenced in LDS Church history in Vol. 5 introductions, and also at the end of chapter 26, page 501 under July 1843. The words that proceeded the revelation on marriage were: “Wednesday 12th, I received the following revelation in the presence of my brother Hyrum and Elder William Clayton:" Section 132 is listed but not inserted in the D&C until Brigham Young had done so in Salt Lake. The words after the revelation were, “Hyrum took the revelation to Emma Smith.” The chapter ended with an editorial about another item and a final few Entries. If this is Wednesday, July 12th, 1843, this is only one year before Joseph and Hyrum were killed. Why was the revelation indicated as recorded when revelations have always been indicated as *received*? Tradition has to many explanations to justify this but does not explain why polygamy existed before the date of the revelation.

Why would so many teach marriage and spiritual wives months prior to the revelation being inserted by Brigham Young? The judgments against polygamy were far too many even before 1843. This has caused the LDS Church to assume that Joseph Smith had the revelation much earlier and discussed it with certain individuals. That is also why Brigham Young inserted the comment in parenthesis to give the feeling that he would have special powers by assuming all authority was passed to him. It would have been essential to change the reference regarding Josephs attempt to condemn polygamy. This caused Bingham Young to insert: *I hold the keys of this power in the last days; for there is never but one on earth at a time on whom the power and its keys are conferred.* This was not in diaries and journals of Joseph Smith. It is almost impossible to change history, but Brigham Young did this after he arrived in Sale Lake. The LDS saints do not have the correct history.

[Doctrine and Covenants 38:11-15](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/38.11-15?lang=eng&clang=eng#p10)

11 For all flesh is corrupted before me; and the powers of darkness prevail upon the earth, among the children of men, in the presence of all the hosts of heaven—

12 Which causeth silence to reign, and all eternity is pained, and the angels are waiting the great command to reap down the earth, to gather the tares that they may be burned; and, behold, the enemy is combined.

13 And now I show unto you a mystery, a thing which is had in secret chambers, to bring to pass even your destruction in process of time, and ye knew it not;

14 But now I tell it unto you, and ye are blessed, not because of your iniquity, neither your hearts of unbelief; for verily some of you are guilty before me, but I will be merciful unto your weakness.

15 Therefore, be ye strong from henceforth; fear not, for the kingdom is yours.

The above was in 1831. What is the *mystery, a thing which is had in secret chambers, to bring to pass even your destruction in process of time, and ye knew it not*? Because the saints refused to keep the Law of Consecration introduced as the Kingdom of Heaven, which never transpired completely. All the saints were able to retain was the Kingdom of God. The destruction of the Kingdom of Heaven is the destruction of the fullness of the gospel. Thus the confirmation of the covenant lasted only one of Daniel's weeks. That means that giving the Holy Spirit of Promise ended because Jesus Christ has not spoken since his last words to Bingham Young at Winter Quarters.

I looked up on LDS.org for "the sun shall hide his face" and found no reference to Section 88. I then shortened it to “hide his face” and found the reference in Section 88. This is a common practice with concepts but not with words that imply little in meaningful ideas.

[Doctrine and Covenants 88:87-90](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/88.87-90?lang=eng#p86)

87 For not many days hence and the earth shall tremble and reel to and fro as a drunken man; and the sun shall hide his face, and shall refuse to give light; and the moon shall be bathed in blood; and the stars shall become exceedingly angry, and shall cast themselves down as a fig that falleth from off a fig tree.

88 And after your testimony cometh wrath and indignation upon the people.

89 For after your testimony cometh the testimony of earthquakes, that shall cause groanings in the midst of her, and men shall fall upon the ground and shall not be able to stand.

90 And also cometh the testimony of the voice of thunderings, and the voice of lightnings, and the voice of tempests, and the voice of the waves of the sea heaving themselves beyond their bounds.

Almost every saint will take the above literally. The above has been used many times is scripture, mostly in the D&C and Mathew. The use of *not many days hence,* cannot be interpreted allegorically. *The earth* is simply allegory for the Kingdom of God. The Restored Church will *reel to and fro as a drunken man.* *The sun shall hid his face* is allegory for the Lord to hide from the Church. This is true regardless of what so many think. This is why the Lord said to Brigham Young *“Zion shall be redeemed in my own due time.”*  The moon reflects the light of the sun and scriptures reflect the words of Jesus Christ. When the scriptures turn to blood, they are misinterpreted or the words are changed because of Satanic desires. *The stars shall become exceedingly angry, and shall cast themselves down.* Brigham Young and his quorum did just this and this was with only ten. They changed history if not more regarding polygamy. *In the midst of her* refers to the Church. The *sea* is knowledge of the Lord and when *the waves of the sea heaving themselves beyond their bounds*, means the Knowledge of the Lord has been changed. It would most likely be in regards to polygamy, which has a false history during the restoration.

Polygamy Indictments

Some feel that many polygamous activities occurred at Nauvoo, a few cases had happened earlier at Kirtland. It is assumed that this was one reason why Joseph and the committee, which published the Doctrine and Covenants at Kirtland in 1835, included the article on "Marriage," which originally said for reference:

“Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.”

The above is from (DC [1835 Kirtland Edition] CI [101]: 4). In the 1844 Nauvoo Edition the "Marriage" article is CIX (109), and in the Liverpool Edition, published by Brigham Young, Jr., it is CIX (109). The "Marriage" article in Section 111 in the 1950 printing of the RLDS Doctrine and Covenants.[[1]](#endnote-1)

At the time the article was included in the D&C was perhaps after the revelation 108 regarding Lyman and the forgiving of his sins. It remained in the RLDS version as Section 111 until 1950. Since the article does not have a date but was earlier as Section 101, we have to assume that at least eight revelations were added before it. This would take us back to at least the end of 1833 that the article was inserted. We can only conclude that this was done to change history and justify polygamy as in prior cases. It is assumed that under Brigham Young's administration in Utah, it was deleted from the Doctrine and Covenants at the time Section 132 was inserted. Brigham Young is noted for change, especially if the rest of the nine apostles supported it. The number 10 is actual ash the Saints moved west and is used in prophecy. The most basic historical change is associated with tithing. This is when Brigham Young first taught tithe by income and two months after Joseph and Hyrum were killed composed a letter from the ten that the Lord meant *net income* for *net interest* instead of *net worth,* which defines interest according to an 1828 English Dictionary. Brigham Young also used a *tenth of what one possessed* instead of *all surplus*. Both changes would grind the faces of the poor and open more opportunities for the rich to advance in the church.

History of the Church, Vol.2, Ch.18, p.247

“The clerk of every church should keep a record of all marriages solemnized in his branch. All legal contracts of marriage made before a person is baptized into this Church should be held sacred and fulfilled. Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again. It is not right to persuade a woman to be baptized contrary to the will of her husband; neither is it lawful to influence her to leave her husband. All children are bound by law to obey their parents, and to influence them to embrace any religious faith, or be baptized, or leave their parents without their consent, is unlawful and unjust. We believe that husbands, parents, and masters, who exercise control over their wives, children, and servants, and prevent them from embracing the truth, will have to answer for that sin."

The above is also in the introduction in Vol. 5 of Church History:

History of the Church, Vol.5, Introduction, p.30

"Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again."

From this, it is evident that as early at least as 1835 a charge of polygamy was made against the Church. Why was that the case unless the subject of "polygamy" had been mooted within the Church? Is it not evident that someone to whom the Prophet had confided the knowledge of the revelation he had received concerning the rightfulness of plural marriage--under certain circumstances--had unwisely made some statement concerning the matter?

The first reference is dated as August 1935. This is two years later than estimated above. The second reference is only a repeat in 1844. If this were the conclusion, the article would have come into existence from late 1833 to August 1835, depending on the number of revelations inserted before the article on marriage. This is at least nine years before section 132. If you add section 133, actually given in 1831, it would be ten years. If we cannot accept the above and believe that Joseph Smith received Section 132 earlier and whispered its contents to certain individuals, you have to say the Joseph Smith emphatically lied in the courts because he was constantly trying to prove that he did not have seven wives. This doctrine began not with Joseph Smith but among some from Main probably before his first vision. The seven wives doctrine came from the following:

[Isaiah 4:1-2](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/ot/isa/4.1-2?lang=eng#p1)

1 And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach.

2 In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel.

There is no reason that other religious movements did not assume this prophecy to be literal rather than allegorical where woman means Churches and the one man means the Holy Order of the Son of God. Revelation 12 uses the same association but the man-child is thought to be the priesthood. The LDS have forgotten that the Lord was trying to establish the order of Enoch in the church. Enoch is where the meaning of Zion comes from. This is the same as the Holy Order of the Son of God. The saints would not keep the commandments and the Holy Order of the Son of God was taken up after the Church had just delivered it sufficiently to establish Zion an earth again.

Taking literal view caused so many problems regarding fundamentalism and this happened before the restoration in Maine and even England. Satan was attempting to destroy the restoration. The Lord knew it and was prepared. The point to understand is that the problem of polygamy came from outside the Church before Joseph Smith began teaching others about his visions.

If the section in the Doctrine and Covenants in 1835, with the reference to *fornication and polygamy,* were omitted, why would there be a need to change history? This is almost ten years before Brigham Young included the revelation of Section 132? Did the LDS Church remove the article on marriage at that time because the Church did not want the saints to know that polygamy was a problem long before. Did Bingham Young want everyone to think polygamy came from Joseph Smith?

History of the Church, Vol.5, Ch.1, p.14—May 1942

Saturday, 21.--I spent the day with the High Council of Nauvoo, investigating the case of Robert D. Foster, Chauncey L. Higbee, and others.

Joseph brought Chauncey before the Church's High Council for trial. Chauncey was found guilty of cohabitating with several spiritual wives. He made the following affidavit that Joseph had not taught him that illicit intercourse with women was justifiable under any circumstance three months later:

State of Illinois City of Nauvoo

Personally appeared before me Daniel H. Wells, an alderman of said city, C. L. Higbee, who being duly sworn according to law, deposeth and saith, that he never was taught anything in the least contrary to the strictest principles of the gospel or of virtue, of the laws of God or of man, under any circumstances or upon any occasion, either directly or indirectly, in word or deed by Joseph Smith, and that he never knew said Smith to countenance any improper conduct whatever, either in public or in private, and that he never did teach me in private or public that an illicit intercourse with females was under any circumstances justifiable and that he never knew him so to teach others. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of May 1842. Daniel H. Wells, Alderman. (Affidavits and Certificates, August 31, 1842)

Joseph Smith took immediate action when he discovered that Lawyer Chauncey L. Higbee had used his name to seduce women into practicing spiritual wifery. The Prophet was so disturbed by this news that he not only brought Chauncey before the Church's High Council and had him expelled from the Church, but he took the case two steps further: He sued Chauncey in Nauvoo before Justice of the Peace Ebenezer Robinson, and later in the Hancock County Circuit Court at the county seat at Carthage. In doing this, it is strong evidence that some other source of polygamy came from another source, referred to as Dr. Bennett's brand of Cochranism.[[2]](#endnote-2) How could the above not be true if Joseph had not yet received revelation Section 132 on marriage? Dr. Bennett’s polygamy eventually found its way into the early LDS Church.

It is important to be aware that the LDS Church did not address the People vs. Chauncey L. Higbee case in its official history. It mentioned Chauncey's promiscuity but refrained from giving details of the case regarding polygamy.

Polygamy existed before the revelation was inserted. Perhaps this is why B.H. Roberts, who published a popular six-volume history of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, indicated in his introduction that Joseph probably received the revelation on marriage in parts over a great length of time, perhaps starting as early at 1832. This is only my memory until I read Joseph Smith fought polygamy coming through the thoughts of the Restoration Church. That Church left the former Reorganized Church because they were changing doctrines to include the acceptance of women in the priesthood.

Polygamy actually started before the restoration in Saco, Maine. The Maine Historian Daniel Remich recorded:

One Jacob Cochrane, who started on his career from Fryeburg, Maine, about 1815, succeeded in creating a wonderful excitement and in gaining great numbers of proselytes in several towns in Oxford, Cumberland and York Counties during the years 1816, 1817 and 1818...

Cochrane soon gained a prominence and fame, which at the outset he had neither sought nor expected. The superstitious notion that led him to become a religious teacher had no basis of sound morality, no affinity with pure Christian faith. Surrounded and fawned upon, as he was, by females of all ages, it was easy for him to cast aside the modicum of spirituality that had influenced his action—if, indeed, he had ever been moved by such an influence—and to yield to the "lusts of the flesh," to devote his unexplainable gift to the basest purposes, to become an impostor and a scourge. There were among his followers' pure-minded, truly excellent men and women, who would not participate in the unhallowed practices of their leader. Some of these had sufficient intelligence and firmness to enable them to abandon the cause altogether. Others, weak-minded, credulous and superstitious, disapproved and lamented the gross corruption of their chief, but could not subdue the feeling that such power as had been imparted to him must be from above...

The Newburyport Herald (May or June 1819) says: "We have seen a pamphlet, published by a Baptist minister of regular standing in New Gloucester [Maine], giving an account of Cochrane and his deluded followers. It appears that under the guise of religion they have committed the most indecent and abominable acts of adultery...

One of their leading tenets was to dissolve the ties of matrimony as suited their convenience, and a promiscuous sexual intercourse was tolerated by each male, being allowed to take seven wives! It seems Cochrane, the high priest of iniquity, had had nearly half his female followers for wives in the course of his ministration, which has been two years standing." The principal places of resort of the disciples of Cochrane, so far as we can learn, were New Gloucester, Buxton, Saco, and Kennebunk. At the last-named place meetings were frequently held in Washington Hall, and there were in the village three private dwelling houses in someone of which a meeting was held every evening when the hall was not occupied for that purpose. In the largest and best of the three from ten to twenty of the brothers and sisters were accustomed to take up their abode from two to four weeks at a time, perhaps quarterly...

The time came when it was believed by the lovers of good order that these flagrant offenses against the best interests of society should be met by the fiat, "No farther." In February 1819, Cochrane was brought before Justice Granger, of Saco, on a complaint of gross lewdness, lascivious behavior, and adultery, filed against him by Mr. Ichabod Jordan. On examination, the allegations of the complainant were so well sustained by the evidence produced that the Justice ordered the accused to recognize in the sum of eighteen hundred dollars for his appearance before the Supreme Judicial Court, at York, on the third Tuesday in May following. This he did.[[3]](#endnote-3)

The story was also given in a Maine Historical Society document:

The history of fanaticism in this State can never be fully written, without a record of the rise, spread, character, and influence of Cochranism. It dates from 1817 or 1818 and onward. Its range was in York County [Maine], with a few converts in other places. It's center and fullest development was in the upper part of the town of Saco, Buxton, Hollis, North Kennebunkport, and Scarborough. It's chief instigator, teacher, "head centre" and actor was Jacob Cochran —hence it's name... The place where he won his greatest popularity and perpetrated his most infamous impostures lay between the Orthodox meeting houses of Saco, Buxton, and Scarborough...

Cochran commenced his public labors; and with a great show of sympathy, earnestness and deep religious feeling he took well with that people. He did not claim to belong to any existing sect; nor avow any design of forming a new one; but with a great show of sanctity strove to raise all believers to a greater degree of devotion;—to the state of primitive piety, and if that was accomplished he said they would secure the privileges of the primitive Christians, the working of miracles and apostolic gifts. He said but little of these points of difference and dwelt largely on those already believed by his hearers. Considering his attractions as a public speaker, and remembering his unparalleled, artful, cunning and deep penetration into human nature, it is not strange that the masses were drawn after him...

In the vicinity of the Heath Meeting House in Saco he still made his headquarters, and there in the Summer of 1818, there was an extensive and powerful revival... There was great excitement, loud responses, shouts, and various outbursts of emotion, but no grievous departures from rapturous religious feeling. It was for a while considered by many as a good work, and to some extent, so it proved. Two thousand were thought to be converted...

In this noted revival Cochran rose to the highest crest of his popular wave, and in consequence of it precipitated himself to his deepest disgrace. He could not modestly and temperately bear such unexpected popularity. He did not exalt the Devine Power and realize his own mere instrumentality. His most sanguine admirers became mentally intoxicated and did not repress indecent adulation. Females in the craze of their fanaticism would embrace him in public meeting and unblushingly kiss him, and he found an apology for it in "the holy kiss" of Scripture (italics added). Previous to this he had not broached any of his corrupt and damnable heresies. He had intimated innovations, but had not pressed them; had aspired to leadership, but moved towards it in an adroit and modest way. He now felt that Cochranism had become rooted, and he proceeded to give it a distinct from...

His fame spread, and other wandering stars scented from afar their disgusting idiosyncrasies and were drawn to his aid. For in other parts audacious heresies had been preached, and vile free love abominations practiced by the Osgoodites, and others, under the sacred garb of Christianity; and it is said that notorious adepts of this sort—pre-historic Mormons—came to Cochran's aid and helped sink him to his worst behavior...

His next, and worst of all his devices, was his assault upon the sacred bonds of matrimony for the most corrupt purposes, and by the most revolting machinations he attempted to demolish this divine and all prevalent institution. Given in Eden for the virtuous propagation of the race; as the guardian of the most precious social enjoyments, it has kept pace with the descending ages, defying barbarism, ignorance, heathenism, and lust; and yet this besotted fanatic, in the sacred name of religion thrust a dagger into its vitals…

There is more from the Restoration Church but the problem with their site is that so much is added by the use of italics that it becomes difficult to separate fact from added opinion. I used only historical documents above. To understand more we will take some words from Orson Hyde and Samuel Smith:

Orson wrote on June 29, 1832, at Boston:

Preached in the evening ... two ladies confessed their faith in the work, and a Miss and Mrs. [Augusta Adams] Cobb.

Samuel Smith penned on the same day:

Baptized three: Augusta Cobb, Elizabeth Harendeen and \_\_\_ Porter.

Orson recorded on July 1, while still in Boston:

…attended to Sacrament, considerably disturbed by false spirits in a man and woman that believed in the Cochranite Doctrine. We cried against them and after a little got them considerably quelled... Not a very good time because of disturbance.

Samuel Smith wrote of that meeting:

Somewhat interrupted this day in the meeting by a man and woman that taught the doctrine of the devil, such as ... having spiritual wives... They came to our meeting. The woman arose and began to preach and we requested her to stop and she would not, and we cried against her spirit, for we knew that it was an unclean spirit, and we cried against it that it was of the devil, and it made a considerable stir. The man that had the same spirit tempted us, saying: "Cast the Devil out," crying amen to the words of the woman. After considerable muttering and grumbling and shaking of her frame, she stopped and we proceeded with our meeting.

This was the first time that Orson and Samuel mentioned *Cochranism* in their journals. Note that *Augusta Cobb*, one of the baptismal candidates, was in the meeting where Cochranites were present. She later became a plural wife of Brigham Young.[[4]](#endnote-4)

Orson Hyde and Samuel Smith were not the only missionaries who journeyed through the Cochranite areas. Other Church ministers traveled and preached throughout the region with great success during the Kirtland and Nauvoo eras. Saco, Maine, a Cochranite stronghold, was one of the most fruitful fields for missionary work—so much so that a conference was held in Saco on June 13, 1834 (The Evening and the Morning Star 2 [August 1834].

If Brigham Young added the parenthesis insert in Section 132:7, It would make sense that it would be added in every case possible because he would have remembered such a small concept. Bingham Young and others never referred to that part in the revelation where one must have the permission of the first wife before they take another. It was always some authority in order to give one a sense of power over their affairs. The revelation in no condition states that it is a commandment to live in polygamy. The problem is that there are two parts that seem unrelated in addition to the insert. The two parts are separated by so few verses that they themselves do not make sense in the revelation without actually being received at different times. I will consider those verses.

[D&C 132:51-57](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/132.51?lang=eng#50)

51 Verily, I say unto you: A commandment I give unto mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife, whom I have given unto you, that she stay herself and partake not of that which I commanded you to offer unto her; for I did it, saith the Lord, to prove you all, as I did Abraham, and that I might require an offering at your hand, by covenant and sacrifice.

What does this mean when the Lord commands Emma not to take what Joseph offered her?

52 And let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; and those who are not pure, and have said they were pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord God.

This is an apparent contradiction to verse 51.

53 For I am the Lord thy God, and ye shall obey my voice, and I give unto my servant Joseph that he shall be made ruler over many things; for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

This we assume by tradition that Joseph was commanded to live in polygamy.

54 And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law.

This suggests that Emma also must obey.

55 But if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her, even as he hath said; and I will 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 lives in the eternal worlds.

This extends the idea of polygamy.

56 And again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses; and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me; and I, the Lord thy God, will bless her, and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice.

What did Joseph do that required Emma to forgive Joseph?

57 And again, I say, let not my servant Joseph put his property out of his hands, lest an enemy come and destroy him; for Satan seeketh to destroy; for I am the Lord thy God, and he is my servant, and behold, and lo, I am with him, as I was with Abraham, thy father, even unto his exaltation and glory.

What does the word property mean? These verses cause far too much confusion and although they sound like the word of the Lord, there are far too many concepts that cannot be rectified if given as shown in section 132. Only if they were given at different times could they make any sense? Let us try a different arrangement:

52 And let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; and those who are not pure, and have said they were pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord God.

53 For I am the Lord thy God, and ye shall obey my voice, and I give unto my servant Joseph that he shall be made ruler over many things; for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

54 And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law.

55 But if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her, even as he hath said; and I will 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 lives in the eternal worlds.

56 And again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses; and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me; and I, the Lord thy God, will bless her, and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice.

If the above covers the subject of polygamy, it would make perfectly good sense. It closes with Emma forgiving Joseph Smith. The problem with this conclusion is Joseph Smith would already have taken more wives in contradiction to not receiving the revelation until at this point. This destroys the compilation of Brigham Young. Was it more than one revelation? Did Joseph keep things in pieces or some other way of an order that he only would understand? Brigham Young said he had a copy of the revelation. That certainly had to be explained because it is not in Church History other than the combined revelation as inserted. There are many stories to explain but how can you trust such a period of confusion when anyone will say what is desired to be accepted by a living prophet. If we separate from the above out of the revelation and put it in a previous one and then ad a third revelation that would include:

51 Verily, I say unto you: A commandment I give unto mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife, whom I have given unto you, that she stay herself and partake not of that which I commanded you to offer unto her; for I did it, saith the Lord, to prove you all, as I did Abraham, and that I might require an offering at your hand, by covenant and sacrifice.

Now everything makes sense if Brigham Young put this at the beginning rather than a separate revelation according to when Joseph Smith actually received it. The Lord here dissolves the commandment and compares it with the commandment given to Abraham that was taken back by an angel with a ram.

Why would the Lord test Abraham and Joseph Smith with a commandment that was not really correct? If they obey without questioning the Lord, then the Lord has to intercede and correct his own commandment. This has a message but who will understand. Brigham Young did not understand, otherwise, he would have received more revelations equal to the one he received at Winter Quarters. Brigham Young botched Section 132 and was never able to receive a revelation since Winter Quarters. This was mostly because he adopted a form of polygamy that was not of the Lord. Why did the Lord talk to him at Winter Quarters? This question must be answered by the Church leaders or make more sense of why open revelation stopped. Perhaps Brigham Young sensed this and practiced according to his own mind.

Perhaps Joseph received revelation because of his quest to understand, was at one point commanded to test him and then the commandment was taken away. In the meantime, Joseph was sealed to some women by Hyrum Smith to increase his rewards after the resurrection. Why Joseph Smith did not ad these revelations at the time was because he was troubled by the many accusations against him regarding the practice of polygamy among the saints without his suggestion to do so. This is contrary to tradition but make far more sense to understand why Joseph was persecuted in courts that were so much related to the Saints practice of polygamy.

We really need to understand Brigham’s connection to polygamy. Brigham Young had a thorough knowledge of Cochranism, for he made several missionary journeys through the "Cochranite territory" from Boston to Saco and later married Augusta Cobb as noted above. He attended the 1835 Church conference in Saco. Brigham chose to travel alone in Cochranite territory instead of going with another elder, "two by two" as the Scriptures direct. The High Council met at Kirtland on February 20, 1834, and its record states:

The council also decided that Elder Brigham Young should travel alone it being his own choice ... and that there should be a general conference held in Saco, in the state of Maine, on the 13th day of June 1834. (Times and Seasons 6 [November 1, 1845]: 1022–1023;

Brigham continued to work in that area and he reported that he also had been to a conference in Maine on August 12, 13, and 14, 1836, where fifty-two members of the Saco Branch attended (Messenger and Advocate 2 [September 1836]: 381–382).

Brigham's presence in and around Saco during the Cochranite era is evidence that he was very familiar with Cochranite polygamy.

We should also understand that the Church opened its mission in England one year after in 1837 by sending apostles and elders to conduct missionary work there. Their new followers idolized the apostles, and temptations naturally followed. To make matters worse, polygamy was a common topic of discussion in both England and America at the time. Did the LDS Saints practice polygamy because of this? Brigham eventually declared "the doctrine" of polygamy was revealed to him in a vision and revelations while in England in 1839:

While we were in England, (in 1839 and 40)

I think the Lord manifested to me by vision and his Spirit things [concerning polygamy] that I did not then understand. I never opened my mouth to anyone concerning them, until I returned to Nauvoo; Joseph had never mentioned this; there had never been a thought of it in the Church that I ever knew anything about at that time, but I had this for myself, and I kept it to myself. And when I returned home, and Joseph revealed those things to me, then I understood the reflections that were upon my mind while in England. This communication with Joseph on the subject was not until after I had told him what I understood—this was in 1841.

The revelation of Section 132 of the Doctrine and Covenants was given in 1843, but Brigham Young assumed he had the first revelation.[[5]](#endnote-5) This statement by Brigham is very important because he admits that polygamy was not a doctrine of the Church before 1839 or 1840: *"There had never been a thought of it in the Church."* This destroys the LDS Church's teachings that polygamy was even thought of as a Church doctrine as early as 1832 in Kirtland. The reason for this assumption is to avoid any idea that polygamy came from some other place or time than from Joseph Smith.

Brigham Young met Augusta Adams Cobb, who was acquainted with members of the Cochranite sect and their teachings, and Brigham Young later took her to Nauvoo and married her as his polygamous wife—before Joseph's death. When Joseph discovered the polygamous practices of Brigham Young and others. Joseph sought to bring them to trial but was assassinated before he could do so.[[6]](#endnote-6)

In the fall of 1843 Augusta deserted her husband and all of her children but the two younger ones—Charlotte, six, and Brigham, only a few months—and went with Brigham Young to Nauvoo to become his plural wife While on the journey to Nauvoo the infant, Brigham, became ill and died at Cincinnati, Ohio. "She had it put in a tin box and took it with her" to Nauvoo. A Nauvoo newspaper, the Nauvoo Neighbor of November 8, 1843, announced the death of Brigham Cobb, age five months and twenty days.[[7]](#endnote-7)

I had a close friend check Family Search and it was determined that Brigham Young Cobb was born in 1838 and died in 1843. This is five years old. The older sister does not have a first name listed but died the in 1838 the year she was born. Charlotte Ives Cobb was born in 1837. This would make her 6-7 years old by 1843. Did Brigham Young Cobb have a paternal twin sister that died given that they were born on the same month of September or was Brigham Young Cobb really born later as indicated above? Why was the child named Brigham Young and born so early? What is interesting is that Charlotte Ives Cobb was not baptized while living. It also seems that Family Search lists each woman with her first husband and not a second. Brigham Young Cobb is listed as the child of her first husband.

Brigham Young was already a polygamist at the time he married Augusta on November 2, 1843. He took his first plural wife in June 1842, when he married twenty-year-old Lucy Decker Seely, wife of William Seely. Lucy had borne Mr. Seely three children. [[8]](#endnote-8)

In spite of the fact that some of the LDS Church's historical references state that Lucy was a widow, she was not. Official church archive records in the Genealogical Society Library in the LDS Church's headquarters building in Salt Lake City show that William Seely did not die until May 20, 1851. Further, references in the dozens of records give no concrete evidence that Lucy and William Seely were ever divorced. Therefore, Brigham was guilty of polygamy and Augusta and Lucy were both guilty of polyandry—the having of plural husbands.[[9]](#endnote-9)

In 1847 Henry Cobb sued Augusta for a divorce. This action and her polygamous marriage to Brigham received nationwide publicity through the newspapers.

The following account of the Cobb divorce case was printed in the Boston Post and reprinted in the Quincy (Illinois) Whig for December 22, 1847. Only a portion is given:

Supreme J. Court—Boston. [Cobb Divorce Case]

Divorced from a Woman who had become the "Spiritual Wife" of a Mormon Leader.—Henry Cobb vs. Augusta Cobb. This was a libel alleging crim con on the part of the respondent [Augusta Adams Cobb] with Brigham Young, in Nauvoo, in August 1844, and December 1845. After living 21 years in good repute with her lawful husband, the respondent became led away with Mormonism, leaving her husband, went to Nauvoo, and joined the church there. After a year's trial of the system she returned to Boston, but not being able to content herself here, she made another trip to Nauvoo; returned to Boston again, and again went off, and she is now supposed to be in California [Utah Territory] with Young. Her conduct in Nauvoo was fully described in the deposition of George J. Adams, better known under the name of "Elder Adams," who testified that he knew Mrs. Cobb, when she lived in the house of Brigham Young, at Nauvoo.

A widow lady, who had been to Nauvoo, corroborated the testimony of Mr. Adams.

Judge Wilde decreed a full divorce from the bonds of matrimony.

Cochranism was not the only source of polygamy. Indeed, polygamy was a common subject of discussion in America and England during the 1830s.

These three movements, which have a great deal in common, began without concert, in distant parts of the world, under separate church rules, and in widely different social circumstances. The first movement was in Ost Preussen [Germany]; the second in England; the third, and most important, in Massachusetts and New York. They had these chief things in common; they began in colleges, they affected the form of family life, and they were carried on by clergymen; each movement in a place of learning and of theological study; that in Germany at the Luther-Kirch of Königsberg, that in England at St. David's College, that in the United States at Yale College. (Dixon, Spiritual Wives 1:84–85)

Books published in England attest to the fact that polygamy had long been a subject of discussion in that country before the LDS Church missionaries arrived in 1837. They include:[[10]](#endnote-10)

T. T. Payen, The Cases of Polygamy, Concubinage, Adultery, Divorce, etc., Seriously and Learnedly Discussed (London: 1732);

James Cookson, Thoughts on Polygamy Including Remarks on Theolyphtora and Its Scheme (Winchester, England: J. Wilkes for the author, 1782);

Delany Patrick, Reflections on Polygamy (London: 1739);

Johannes Lyser, Polygamia Triumphtrix (Europe: 1682);

John Towers, Polygamy Unscriptural (London: 1780);

William Hepworth Dixon, Spiritual Wives, 2 vols., 1868.[[11]](#endnote-11)

If the above is true, it was most likely started by the power of Satan. His motive would be to upset the restoration. The Lord would certainly know this and would use it to his advantage. The Lord would know that the more fundamentalist mind would be drawn to the restoration. They were the Gentiles that the Book of Mormon predicted would come. The Lord also knew that they would reject his Law. This was the Law of Consecration. The Lord needed the 62nd week of Daniel to restore the Kingdom of God. This he did but because of the sanctuary or the law of heaven being destroyed in the midst of the week, the Lord had to end giving the Holy Spirit of Promise. As strange Gentiles, most of which would be attracted to polygamy, would be forced to gather to a new location. The restoration was a perfect motive to gather these fundamentalists. Satan did not understand how the Lord would use his efforts to build the restored Kingdom of God. In time the Lord always wins. The Lord also knew that he would have to reveal his secrets as it pertained to plural marriage. He did this with Joseph Smith, knowing that Joseph would fear rejection and Brigham Young would use the ideas to give the saints gall to drink. This was all they were worthy to receive. It is only strange that Joseph Smith did not include his revelation in the Doctrine Covenants. Perhaps it was because so many were practicing polygamy before the revelation. If would cause justification rather than repentance.

As early as August 30, 1831, the Lord said:

[D&C 63:14](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/63.14?lang=eng#13)

13 Nevertheless, I give commandments, and many have turned away from my commandments and have not kept them.

14 There were among you adulterers and adulteresses; some of whom have turned away from you, and others remain with you that hereafter shall be revealed.

15 Let such beware and repent speedily, lest judgment shall come upon them as a snare, and their folly shall be made manifest, and their works shall follow them in the eyes of the people.

The Lord was always teaching his truth but so many refused to follow his commandments. Joseph Smith suffered many times because of the sins of the saints. This is evident in Isaiah 52 as, “*but he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities.”* This is not Jesus Christ but a prophecy of Joseph Smith. The following is one of the best examples of Joseph Smith suffering for the sins of the saints as the saints practiced the false doctrine of polygamy that had nothing to do with the revelation. The following is not complete but is one month before Joseph and Hyrum were killed. This was not the first but probably the last accusation of Joseph Smith having seven wives or practicing spiritual wifery. If you are a fundamentalist type of thinker, you will want to believe that Joseph was hiding the truth and lying because he had received the revelation on polygamy that so many believe the revelation was as Brigham Young inserted. If you look at the revelation as being a test for Joseph Smith and any marriage was only according to a pre-temple ceremony for the next life and not an assumed a command for this life, Joseph then would despise polygamy in this life and would not be lying. The following are given with month and year in order to indicate the early representation of polygamy.

History of the Church, Vol.2, Ch.18, p.247—August 1935

"The clerk of every church should keep a record of all marriages solemnized in his branch. All legal contracts of marriage made before a person is baptized into this Church should be held sacred and fulfilled. Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again. It is not right to persuade a woman to be baptized contrary to the will of her husband; neither is it lawful to influence her to leave her husband. All children are bound by law to obey their parents, and to influence them to embrace any religious faith, or be baptized, or leave their parents without their consent, is unlawful and unjust. We believe that husbands, parents, and masters, who exercise control over their wives, children, and servants, and prevent them from embracing the truth, will have to answer for that sin."

It was important for historians to correct the history of polygamy. They did this with an introduction to Vol. 3. This was followed by an introduction to Vol. 5

History of the Church, Vol.3, Introduction, p.67

"About the year 1831-2, the Mormons settled in Jackson County, Mo….During their sojourn in Missouri the Mormons did not practice or teach polygamy, so that question did not enter into it.

History of the Church, Vol.5, Introduction, p.30

Corroborative evidence of the fact of the revelation having been given thus early in the Prophet's career are to be found in the early charges against the Church about its belief in "polygamy." For example: When the Book of Doctrine and Covenants was presented to the several quorums of the priesthood of the Church for acceptance in the general assembly of that body, the 17th of August, 1835, an article on "Marriage" was presented by W. W. Phelps, which for many years was published in the Doctrine and Covenants. It was not a revelation, nor was it presented as such to the general assembly of the priesthood. It was an article, however, that represented the views of the assembly on the subject of marriage at that time, unenlightened as they were by the revelation already given to the Prophet on the subject. What the Prophet Joseph's connection was with this article cannot be learned. Whether he approved it or not is uncertain, since he was absent from Kirtland at the time of the general assembly of the priesthood, which accepted it, on a visit to the Saints in Michigan.

In this article on marriage the following sentence occurs:

" And if there are any among you who aspire with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again."

From this, it is evident that as early at least as 1835 a charge of polygamy was made against the Church. Why was that the case unless the subject of "polygamy" had been mooted within the Church? Is it not evident that someone to whom the Prophet had confided the knowledge of the revelation he had received concerning the rightfulness of plural marriage--under certain circumstances--had unwisely made some statement concerning the matter?

The above is an attempt to rewrite history and accuse Joseph Smith of receiving the revelation on marriage much earlier and *confiding the knowledge of the revelation* to others. If *a charge of polygamy was made against the Church* in *1835,* this could be an indication that polygamy started before the revelation or Joseph revealed his secret. If Joseph revealed any secret, it would be more about the sealing blessings rather than polygamy. This would be if we conclude that they are different revelations. If they were, we can conclude that Joseph would have included the sealing blessing by the Holy Spirit of Promise earlier. Then we have the following:

This leads me to strongly believe that Brigham Young added the insert in order to claim that he got if from Joseph Smith. If not then this gives us at least two by revelation to Joseph Smith that indicates there is more than one on earth at a time. Otherwise, how do we explain the Holy Spirit of promise as given to Hyrum? Everyone will have a different interpretation to fit modern tradition but where is a Church Patriarch today? Did the Lord take him away and not appoint another in his stead? Hyrum Smith could certainly receive a revelation regarding the ceiling of blessings and there was no indication that he gave the power to others. Tradition assumes it was his son but the includes a patriarchal blessing and not receiving the Holy Spirit of Promise. If they are the same, why do we not live the Law of Consecration in which all saints make a covenant to do so? If the church takes the covenant out of the Temple, they have a lot of explaining to do.

You cannot say that everyone sealing a marriage receives a revelation do so. Did more than one apostle, after Jesus Christ left, have the power to give the Holy Spirit of promise? What about the case with the Nephites of the same period? You cannot assume that **only** **one on earth at a time** can give the Holy Spirit of Promise in a blessing or by marriage. It must have been important to Brigham Young to doctor the section on marriage to justify his actions. Otherwise, the power to give the Holy Spirit of promise has been taken away since no one can see the face of Jesus Christ, as indicated in the first of this article. Hyrum Smith gave the following affidavit concerning Bennett as a source of polygamy. This was July 1842.

History of the Church, Vol.5, Ch.4, p.71.

On the seventeenth day of may, 1842, having been made acquainted with some of the conduct of John C. Bennett, which was given in testimony under oath before Alderman G. W. Harris, by several females, who testified that John C. Bennett endeavored to seduce them and accomplished his designs by saying it was right; that it was one of the mysteries of God, which was to be revealed when the people was strong enough in the faith to bear such mysteries—that it was perfectly right to have illicit intercourse with females, providing no one knew it but themselves, vehemently trying them from day to day, to yield to his passions, bringing witnesses of his own clan to testify that there were such revelations and such commandments and that it was of God; also stating that he would be responsible for their sins, if there was any; and that he would give them medicine to produce abortions, providing they should become pregnant.

John C. Bennett had a long history with promiscuity and teaching of spiritual wives and fighting against Joseph Smith through legal channels. This was up to the point of his martyr. Where did Dr. Bennett get these concepts?

Hyrum’s testimony continues…..

One of these witnesses, a married woman that he attended upon in his professional capacity whilst she was sick, stated that he made proposals to her of a similar nature; he told her that he wished her husband was dead, and that if he was dead, he would marry her and clear out with her; he also begged her permission to give him [her husband] medicine to that effect; he did try to give him medicine, but he would not take it. On interrogating her what she thought of such teaching, she replied she was sick at the time, and had to be lifted in and out of her bed like a child. Many other acts as criminal were reported to me at the time. On becoming acquainted with these facts, I was determined to prosecute him, and bring him to justice. Some person knowing my determination, having informed him of it, he sent to me William Law and Brigham Young, to request an interview with me, and to see if there could not be a reconciliation made. I told them I thought there could not be, his crimes were so heinous; but told them I was willing to see him; he immediately came to see me; he begged on me to forgive him this once, and not prosecute him and expose him; he said he was guilty, and did acknowledge the crimes that were alleged against him; he seemed to be sorry that he had committed such acts, and wept much and desired that it might not be made public for it would ruin him forever; he wished me to wait, but I was determined to bring him to justice, and declined listening to his entreaties; he then wished me to wait until he could have an interview with the Masonic fraternity; he also wanted an interview with Brother Joseph; he wished to know of me if I would forgive him, and desist from my intentions, if he could obtain their forgiveness; and requested the privilege of an interview immediately. I granted him that privilege as I was acting as master protemp at that time; he also wished an interview first with Brother Joseph; at that time Brother Joseph was crossing the yard from the house to the store, he immediately came to the store and met Dr. Bennett on the way; he reached out his hand to Brother Joseph and said, Will you forgive me? weeping at the time; he said, Brother Joseph, I am guilty, I acknowledge it, and I beg of you not to expose me, for it will ruin me; Joseph replied, Doctor! why are you using my name to carry on your hellish wickedness? Have I ever taught you that fornication and adultery were right, or polygamy or any such practice? He said, You never did. Did I ever teach you anything that was not virtuous--that was iniquitous, either in public or private? He said, You never did. Did you ever know anything unvirtuous or unrighteous in my conduct or action at any time, either in public or private? He said, I did not. Are you willing to make oath to this before an alderman of the city? He said I am willing to do so. Joseph said, Doctor, go into my office and write what you can in conscience subscribe your name to, and I will be satisfied. I will, he said, and went into the office, and I went with him, and he requested pen, ink and paper of Mr. Clayton, who was acting clerk in that office, and was also secretary pro tem, for the Nauvoo Lodge, U. D. William Clayton gave him paper, pen and ink, and he stood at the desk and wrote the following article which was published in the 11th No. of the Wasp; sworn to and subscribed before Daniel H. Wells, Alderman, 17th day of May, A. D. 1842. He called in Brother Joseph and read it to him, and asked him if that would do; he said it would; he then swore to it as before mentioned, the article was as follows:

History of the Church, Vol.5, Ch.4, p.79 July 1842 one year before Section 132 was added.

It may be asked why it was that we would countenance him so long after being apprised of his iniquities, and why he was not dealt with long ago. To this we would answer, that he has been dealt with from time to time; when he would acknowledge his iniquity, ask and pray for forgiveness, beg that he might not be exposed, on account of his mother, and other reasons, saying, he should be ruined and undone. He frequently wept like a child, and begged like a culprit for forgiveness, at the same time promising before God and angels to amend his life, if he could be forgiven. He was in this way borne with from time to time until forbearance was no longer a virtue, and then the First Presidency, the Twelve, and the Bishops withdrew their fellowship from him, as published in the 16th number of this paper. The Church afterward publicly withdrew their fellowship from him, and his character was published in the 17th number of this paper; since that time he has Published that the conduct of the Saints was bad--that Joseph Smith and many others were adulterers, murderers, etc., that there was a secret band of men that would kill people, etc., called Danites--that he was in duress when he gave his affidavit, and testified that Joseph Smith was a virtuous man--that we believed in and practiced polygamy, that we believed in secret murders, and aimed to destroy the government, etc., etc. As he has made his statements very public, and industriously circulated them through the country, we shall content ourselves with answering his base falsehoods and misrepresentations, without giving publicity to them, as the public is generally acquainted with them already."

A footnote referring to the above states, *"A distinction here must be kept in mind between the ‘polygamy' charged against the saints by Bennett and plurality of wives allowed under certain restrictions by a revelation on the Eternity of the Marriage Covenant."*

History of the Church, Vol.5, p.79, Footnotes

A distinction here must be kept in mind between the "polygamy" charged against the saints by Bennett and plurality of wives allowed under certain restrictions by the revelation on the Eternity of the Marriage Covenant. It was the vicious, promiscuous polygamous associations charged by Bennett that belief in and practice of by the saints that is here denied, not the plural relations under seal and covenant of the marriage law in the aforesaid revelation. See Bennett's "History of the saints," (1842), pp. 217-260.

This footnote was placed in Church History many years later in order to make a distinction between polygamy by revelation and polygamy by personal preference. If you separate the two concepts you also have to separate the revelation in two parts. The latter only gives permission on the consent of the first wife. In this case, we should consider a prophecy of the problem of polygamy during and after the restoration from the book of **Malachi**.

[Malachi 2:1-10](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/ot/mal/2.1-4,8-10?lang=eng)

The priests are reproved for not keeping their covenants and not teaching the people—The Jews are condemned for dealing treacherously with one another and with their wives.

*The Jews* are used in the introduction when the whole chapter referred to the priests.

1 And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you.

2 If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the Lord of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings: yea, I have cursed them already, because ye do not lay it to heart.

3 Behold, I will corrupt your seed, and spread dung upon your faces, even the dung of your solemn feasts; and one shall take you away with it.

4 And ye shall know that I have sent this commandment unto you, that my covenant might be with Levi, saith the Lord of hosts.

…

8 But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts.

9 Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law.

10 Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?

No one can even suggest that the above was to the Jews. It was a prophecy of conditions related to the restoration. The priests of the early LDS saints *departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi…ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law.* If the reader does not agree then they have to assume that all prophecy is literal and the Lord does not use physical terms of the day to show the failure of the saints in the future. When we profane *the covenants of our fathers,* we deal treacherously against our brother.

11 ¶ Judah hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god.

12 The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this, the master and the scholar, out of the tabernacles of Jacob, and him that offereth an offering unto the Lord of hosts.

Judah is used for modern Israel that has *dealt treacherously. The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this.* This actually happened when the Lord hid his face.

13 And this have ye done again, covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth it with good will at your hand.

14 ¶ Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant.

Joseph called Emma the wife of his youth and it is simple to understand that Joseph did nothing against Emma. The elders of the restoration caused great strife, *covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping.* The *Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of the youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously.* The first wife is the wife of the covenant. The covenant is none other than a promise of salvation if the saints keep the commandments. If they do, only then can they receive the Holy Spirit of promise or sure sign.

15 And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth.

16 For the Lord, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away: for one covereth violence with his garment, saith the Lord of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.

17 ¶ Ye have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet ye say Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?

Did not the Lord *make one* wife, *yet had he the residue of the spirit, and wherefore one.* The early saints including all fundamentalist since have indicated the many wives are essential in order to bring more spirits into life or into better conditions. The latter was a reason for the ancients, but not modern man. More spirits came because of polygamy in Utah, but that also created health issues for a lack of clean DNA. The Lord *hateth putting away* because *one covereth violence with his garment.* Those who justify polygamy should understand that they should *deal not treacherously.* We weary the Lord *when ye say, every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord.* Reason then asks, “***Where is the God of judgment***?”

Every prophecy was fulfilled during the first generation of the restoration. Even the prophecy that Joseph or the rood of Jesse would have to endure the sins of the elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, was fulfilled.

History of the Church, Vol.6, Ch.2, p.46—October 1843

In the afternoon, rode to the prairie to show some of the brethren some land. Evening, at home, and walked up and down the streets with my scribe. Gave instructions to try those persons who were preaching, teaching, or practicing the doctrine of plurality of wives: for, according to the law, I hold the keys of this power in the last days; for there is never but one on earth at a time on whom the power and its keys are conferred; and I have constantly said no man shall have but one wife at a time, unless the Lord directs otherwise.

This is October 1843 and Brigham Young inserted Section 132 only three months prior in the time sequence. In 1843, the use of *keys of this power in the last days,* come from the revelation insert. How clever to insert this after the revelation and say nothing of the insert. If elders were practicing polygamy, how could this be only three months after the revelation unless it came from some other source some time ago?

History of the Church, Vol.6, Ch.19, p.405—May 1844

Saturday, 25.--At home, keeping out of the way of the expected writs from Carthage. Towards evening, Edward Hunter and William Marks, of the grand jury returned from Carthage; also Marshal John P. Greene and Almon W. Babbitt, who informed me there were two indictments found against me, one charging me with false swearing on the testimony of Joseph H. Jackson and Robert D. Foster, and one charging me with polygamy, or something else, on the testimony of William Law, that I had told him so! The particulars of which I shall learn hereafter. There was much false swearing before the grand jury. Francis M. Higbee swore so hard that I had received stolen property, &c., that his testimony was rejected. I heard that Joseph H. Jackson had come into the city. I, therefore, instructed the officers to arrest him for threatening to take life, &c.

This was only seven months after the revelation that Joseph Smith was continually charged with the crime of polygamy. The fundamentalists like this in order to give more credits to justify their actions. It is hard to believe that polygamy would be such a problem up until ten months after the revelation was inserted. Either the LDS Church changes the insertion date or admits that polygamy existed before the revelation and perhaps the cause of the revelation. Either way, something has been amiss in the church for almost 200 years. It cannot be corrected honestly.

History of the Church, Vol.6, Ch.19, p.410-411—May 1844

Another indictment has been got up against me. It appears a holy prophet has arisen up, and he has testified against me; the reason is he is so holy. The Lord knows I do not care how many churches are in the world. As many as believe me, may. If the doctrine that I preach is true, the tree must be good. I have prophesied things that have come to pass, and can still. Inasmuch as there is a new church, this must be old, and of course, we ought to be set down as orthodox. From henceforth let all the churches now no longer persecute orthodoxy. I never built upon any other man's ground. I never told the Old Catholic that he was a fallen true prophet God knows, then, that the charges against me are false. I had not been married scarcely five minutes and made one proclamation of the Gospel before it was reported that I had seven wives. I mean to live and proclaim the truth as long as I can.

This new holy prophet [William Law] has gone to Carthage and swore that I had told him that I was guilty of adultery. This spiritual wifeism! Why, a man dares not speak or wink, for fear of being accused of this. William Law testified before forty policemen, and the assembly room full of witnesses, that he testified under oath that he never had heard or seen or knew anything immoral or criminal against me. He testified under oath that he was my friend and not the "Brutus." There was a cogitation who was the "Brutus." I had not prophesied against William Law. He swore under oath that he was satisfied that he was ready to lay down his life for me, and he swears that I have committed adultery. I wish the grand jury would tell me who they are--whether it will be a course or blessing to me. I am quite tired of the fools asking me.

A man asked me whether the commandment was given that a man may have seven wives, and now the new prophet has charged me with adultery. I never had any fuss with these men until that Female Relief Society brought out the paper against adulterers and adulteresses.

…

There is another Law, not the prophet, who was cashiered for dishonesty and robbing the government Wilson Law also swears that I told him I was guilty of adultery. Brother Jonathan Dunham can swear to the contrary. I have been chained. I have rattled chains before in a dungeon for the truth's sake. I am innocent of all these charges, and you can bear witness of my innocence, for you know me yourselves.

…

What a thing it is for a man to be accused of committing adultery and having seven wives when I can only find one.

I am the same man, and as innocent as I was fourteen years ago, and I can prove them all perjurers. I labored with these apostates myself until I was out of all manner of patience; and then I sent my brother Hyrum, whom they virtually kicked out of doors.

…

Dr. Bernhisel and Elder Rigdon know that I speak the truth. I cite you to Captain Dunham, Esquires Johnson and Wells, Brother Hatfield and others, for the truth of what I have said. I have said this to let my friends know that I am right.

This sermon is extremely important because in it Joseph Smith declared, just one month and one day before his martyrdom, that he had only one wife and did not commit adultery. I search all of the Church History and found “one wife” listed about six times, all of which referred to the actual meaning it was supposed to mean. In other words, Joseph Smith declared that he was not a polygamist. It is significant that this sermon is published by the LDS Church history. It was also preached many times by the sisters:

We the undersigned members of the ladies' relief society, and married females do certify and declare that we know of no system of marriage being practiced in the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints save the one contained in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and we give this certificate to the public to show that J. C. Bennett's "secret wife system" is a disclosure of his own make.

Emma Smith, President,  
Elizabeth Ann Whitney, Counsellor,  
Sarah M. Cleveland, Counsellor,  
Eliza R. Snow, Secretary,  
Mary C. Miller, Catharine Pettey,  
Lois Cutler, Sarah Higbee,  
Thirza Cahoon, Phebe Woodruff,  
Ann Hunter, Leonora Taylor,  
Jane Law, Sarah Hillman,  
Sophia R. Marks, Rosannah Marks,  
Polly Z. Johnson, Angeline Robinson,  
Abigail Works.

(Times and Seasons 3 [October 1, 1842]: 940)

Even though Eliza R. Snow was married to Brigham Young, she was a devout preacher against polygamy. She had a head of her own and no one could stop her. The fundamentalist mind will have a different story, all of which is to please tradition and be accepted by men who are also fundamentalists.

After Joseph's death, Brigham Young expanded his polygamous base by bringing more and more Saints into the polygamy fold. After he had led his followers to Utah and Joseph had been dead for eight years, Brigham publicly presented to the Saints a mysterious document (Section 132 of the LDS Doctrine and Covenants). He claimed that it was only a copy of an original revelation, which Joseph had received. A copy is interesting and many fundamentalists will have their own story to tell. Brigham claimed that he had kept the copy secretly hidden in his desk. He declared:

This revelation has been in my possession for many years; and who has known it? None but those who should know it. I keep a patent lock on my desk, and there does not anything leak out that should not. (Supplement to Millennial Star 15 [1853]: 31.

At the meeting in which Brigham introduced the polygamy document (Section 132) to the public in 1852, the apostle Orson Pratt gave a stirring sermon citing polygamist practices of the patriarchs of the Old Testament *as a reason for polygamy.*[[12]](#endnote-12)Orson became a husband of ten wives. Four were from the British Isles.[[13]](#endnote-13)

History of the Church, Vol.4, Ch.15, p.285

Which Twelve hold the keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth, and after that to send my word to every creature?

They are Heber C. Kimball, Parley P. Pratt, Orson Pratt, Orson Hyde, William Smith, John Taylor, John E. Page, Wilford Woodruff, Willard Richards, and George A. Smith;

There are only 10 listed above. In 1844, William Smith was on a mission and never went west. John E. Page was disfellowshiped from the Quorum February 1846. Samuel Smith was an apostle but died shortly after the death of Joseph and Hyrum. Amasa Lyman was added by a prior request of Joseph Smith. That means 10-2+1 = 9 + Brigham Young was the president of the Quorum of Twelve, making a total of 10. We are led that only ten remained in the Church at Winter Quarters and only ten changed tithing by *interest* to tithing by *income.* This wasonly two months after Joseph and Hyrum were killed.

One Final Note on Marriage

Remarks from Joseph Smith at Ramus Illinois.

History of the Church, Vol.5, Ch.20, p.391—May 1843

Your life is hid with Christ in God, and so are many others. Nothing but the unpardonable sin can prevent you from inheriting eternal life for you are sealed up by the power of the Priesthood unto eternal life, having taken the step necessary for that purpose

Except a man and his wife enter into an everlasting covenant and be married for eternity, while in this probation, by the power and authority of the Holy Priesthood, they will cease to increase when they die; that is, they will not have any children after the resurrection. But those who are married by the power and authority of the priesthood in this life, and continue without committing the sin against the Holy Ghost, will continue to increase and have children in the celestial glory. The unpardonable sin is to shed innocent blood, or be accessory thereto. All other sins will be visited with judgment in the flesh, and the spirit being delivered to the buffetings of Satan until the day of the Lord Jesus. The way I know in whom to confide--God tells me in whom I may place confidence.

I am bothered by the idea that some who are married in the temple *will continue to increase and have children in the Celestial glory* if they do not *commit the sin against the Holy Ghost*. I cannot accept this conclusion because scripture does not verify procreating spirits after the resurrection. If this was in May 1843 then Joseph Smith had already received at least the part of section 132 that discussed the Holy Sprit of Promise. If so, then Brigham Young inserted it more than two months too late. We then need to question the copy that Brigham Young had and how much of the conversation was added before and after the revelation.

Increase could mean eternal progression and the obtaining of more responsibility over more spirits. If many wives are part of the program, why do we assume sex is involved? Are not the spirits of women more qualified to teach younger spirits? Why do we have to use procreation instead of evolution—the way intelligence works. We know that a physical body can have offspring but how can a resurrected physical body produce offspring that is spiritual and not physically immortal. Likeness begets likeness. If intelligence cannot be created or made, why do we assume spirits can be procreated? If intelligence evolves, why do not sprits also evolve? Creation does not always mean procreation. It means to organize that which comes from intelligence such as when God created the Kingdom of Heaven. If sprits have to be procreated and they choose evil continually, what is outer darkness? Is it just that they do not have truth and light. Is this a loss of intelligence or is it that they cannot be taught? This is confusing unless Satan would diminish over time and have to start at some point way back just to see if he can do it right. Ether this or Satan is just an allegory. Internal damnation is God’s damnation because eternal is his name. Spiritual life is different than mortal life. Why do we have to assume it is the same? If spirits can become good, they can also become evil, otherwise there is no agency. This agency comes from our individual intelligence and not some imaginary physical procreation. If a spirit has free will, it comes from the intelligence. Do our physical bodies have free will or do they simply obey what our intelligence commands it. If spirits do not have free will of themselves and they are procreated then you have to create a biological system that works the same as it does in mortality. This is just carnal thinking and based on limited understanding. Joseph Smith said that the meteorites that fell from the sky were stars predicted that would fall in the last days. This is because he did not understand prophecy. I suggest that he assumed too much when it came to an immortal life.

[Abraham 3:18-19](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/pgp/abr/3.18-19?lang=eng#p17)

18 Howbeit that he made the greater star; as, also, if there be two spirits, and one shall be more intelligent than the other, yet these two spirits, notwithstanding one is more intelligent than the other, have no beginning; they existed before, they shall have no end, they shall exist after, for they are gnolaum, or eternal.

19 And the Lord said unto me: These two facts do exist, that there are two spirits, one being more intelligent than the other; there shall be another more intelligent than they; I am the Lord thy God, I am more intelligent than they all.

I prefer Abraham who received of the Lord and was not speculating. *If tere be two spirits, and one shall be more intelligent than the other…have no beginning; they existed before, they shall have no end…they are gnolaum, or eternal.* Then the Lord associated spirits with intelligence, which we know cannot be created or made. Joseph Smith should have known better. It was some time since Joseph Smith had received an open revelation if you exclude section 132. It was March 1841. That is three years that speculation had entered his heart.

[Abraham 3:21-23](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/pgp/abr/3.21-23?lang=eng#p19)

…I rule in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath, in all wisdom and prudence, over all the intelligences thine eyes have seen from the beginning; I came down in the beginning in the midst of all the intelligences thou hast seen.

22 Now the Lord had shown unto me, Abraham, the intelligences that were organized before the world was; and among all these there were many of the noble and great ones;

23 And God saw these souls that they were good, and he stood in the midst of them, and he said: These I will make my rulers; for he stood among those that were spirits, and he saw that they were good; and he said unto me: Abraham, thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born.

If Abraham saw *all the intelligences thine eyes have seen from the beginning…that were organized before the world was,* what are we to conclude that if *many were the noble and great ones.* If one intelligence is greater than another, what is the body of spirit. Are they souls with the spirit body having a beginning? Even after the resurrection, we will not have the same body. Several did not recognize Jesus. The only reasonable solution is the body takes on the appearance of the spirit.

The following appeared after the above Church History reference:

History of the Church, Vol.5, Ch.20, p.392—May 1843

In the celestial glory there are three heavens or degrees; and in order to obtain the highest, a man must enter into this order of the priesthood, [meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage;] and if he does not, he cannot obtain it. He may enter into the other, but that is the end of his kingdom: he cannot have an increase."

Only this part appeared in the Doctrine Covenants as shown below.

[D&C 131:1-4](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/131.1-4?lang=eng#p1)

1 In the celestial glory there are three heavens or degrees;

2 And in order to obtain the highest, a man must enter into this order of the priesthood [meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage];

3 And if he does not, he cannot obtain it.

4 He may enter into the other, but that is the end of his kingdom; he cannot have an increase.

To assume that there are three degrees in the Celestial kingdom seems to be a contradiction to the following:

[D&C 88:28-29](https://www.lds.org/scriptures/dc-testament/dc/88.28-29?lang=eng#p27)

28 They who are of a celestial spirit shall receive the same body which was a natural body; even ye shall receive your bodies, and your glory shall be that glory by which your bodies are quickened.

29 Ye who are quickened by a portion of the celestial glory shall then receive of the same, even a fulness.

The above clearly indicates if we *are quickened by a portion of the celestial glory shall then receive of the same, even a fullness.* Whenever Joseph speculated, he did so without understanding. He sometimes assumed. You would then have to say that even to get into the Celestial Kingdom you would have to be married by the Holy Spirit of promise. What about just being an angel in order to serve those who receive a greater weight of glory? It gets far too confusing when we apply our mortal experiences to a time after the resurrection. We can try but how much is the thought of fear covering you lack of understanding.

I close with the following from Joseph Smith:

And if there are any among you who aspire after their own aggrandizement, and seek their own opulence, while their brethren are groaning in poverty, and are under sore trials and temptations, they cannot be benefited by the intercession of the Holy Spirit, which maketh intercession for us day and night with groanings that cannot be uttered.

One should ask if the Holy Spirit is the Holy Ghost or something more. Writers and translators often do not understand. Did Joseph Smith understand? How about tradition? Based upon all that has happened and that the stars fell from the heaven that was introduced by Jesus Christ, and because they turned the law upside down, causing the moon to turn to blood, the Lord had to hide his face at the end of the 62nd week of Daniel’s seventy week prophecy. Will we be ready in the mist of the 69th week? This is the redemption of Zion. To this date the LDS Church is still leading the saints astray because the leaders do not prepare us on how to avoid the final tribulation, which begins at the end of the 70th week.
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