

# MORMONS AND NEGROES

By Jerald and Sandra Tanner



Jane Elizabeth Manning - Black Mormon Pioneer

# MORMONS AND NEGROES

By Jerald and Sandra Tanner

1970  
(Digital version 2024)

Utah Lighthouse Ministry  
[www.utlm.org](http://www.utlm.org)



**Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0  
International (CC BY-NC 4.0)**

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

# CONTENTS

Black Skin .....	1
Note: Blacks Receive Priesthood .....	1
Pre-Existence.....	3
Sons of Cain .....	7
Through the Flood .....	8
One Drop.....	9
Negroes in Priesthood .....	11
Unhappy .....	22
Objections .....	23
For Cain's Sin.....	24
Egyptus and Pharaoh.....	25
Negroes and the Gospel.....	26
Nigerian Mission .....	28
Prejudice? .....	30
Civil Rights.....	40
Athletes Protest.....	47
Dissatisfaction.....	51
A Burning Issue .....	56
A Revelation.....	57
Joseph Fielding Smith.....	64
An Honest Solution.....	66
Papyri Undermines Doctrine.....	67
Appendix .....	69
Race Problems - As They Affect the Church .....	79
Address by Mark E. Petersen (August 27, 1954)	

# MORMONS AND NEGROES

In his book, *A Marvelous Work and a Wonder*, the Mormon Apostle LeGrand Richards made the following statements:

. . . the Lord has made it plain that all male members of the Church, who live worthily, may receive the priesthood and thus become an active force in establishing the Church and kingdom of God in the earth, . . . (*A Marvelous Work and a Wonder*, Salt Lake City, 1966, pp. 91–92)

You may search the world over and you will find no people today who answer this description as do the Latter-day Saints, for they truly have a “royal priesthood,” where every worthy male member of the Church over twelve years of age may be a bearer thereof, . . . (Ibid., pp. 163–164)

These statements by the Apostle Richards are actually very misleading, for Negroes are not allowed to hold the Priesthood or go through the Temple no matter how they live.\* The Mormon leaders teach that Negroes are cursed by God, and therefore they are not entitled to receive the Priesthood. The Mormon position concerning the Negro was clearly stated in a letter written by the First Presidency of the Mormon Church in 1947. In this letter the following appears:

From the days of the Prophet Joseph even until now, it has been the doctrine of the Church, never questioned by any of the Church leaders, that the Negroes are not entitled to the full blessings of the Gospel. (Letter from the First Presidency of the Mormon Church, July 17, 1947, quoted in *Mormonism and the Negro*, by John J. Stewart and William E. Berrett, part 1, pp. 46 and 47)

Bruce R. McConkie, of the Council of the Seventy, stated:

Negroes in this life are denied the priesthood; under no circumstances can they hold this delegation of authority from the Almighty. The gospel message of salvation is not carried affirmatively to them . . .

Negroes are not equal with other races where the receipt of certain spiritual blessings are concerned . . . (*Mormon Doctrine*, by Bruce R. McConkie, p. 477)

## Black Skin

In Mormon theology a black skin is a sign of God’s displeasure. In the Mormon publication, *Juvenile Instructor*, the following statement appeared:

We will first inquire into the results of the approbation or displeasure of God upon a people, starting with the belief that a black skin is a mark of the curse of Heaven placed upon some portions of mankind. Some, however, will argue that a black skin is not a curse, nor a white skin a blessing. In fact, some have been so foolish as to believe and say that a black skin is a blessing, and that the negro is the finest type of a perfect man that exists on the earth; but to us such teachings are foolishness. We understand that when God made man in his own image and pronounced him very good, that he made him white. We have no record of any of God’s favored servants being of a black race. All His prophets and apostles belonged to the most handsome race on the face of the earth—Israel, who still, as represented in the scattered tribe of Judah, bear the impress of their former beauty. In this race was born His Son Jesus, who, we are told was very lovely, and “in the express image of his Father’s person,” and every angel who ever brought a message of God’s mercy to man was beautiful to look upon, clad in the purest white and with a countenance bright as the noonday sun. (*Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 3, p. 157)

---

\***IMPORTANT NOTE ADDED JULY 5, 1978** — On page 63 of this book we stated: “If the pressure continues to increase on the Negro question, the leaders of the Mormon Church will probably have another revelation, or . . . they ‘will dissolve the doctrine on the Negro.’” On June 9, 1978, eight years after we made this statement, the Mormon leaders claimed that they had a revelation that blacks should be given the Priesthood and “every blessing” of the gospel. For more information on this matter see the *Salt Lake City Messenger*, July 1978.

The Book of Mormon tells of a people being cursed with a black skin:

. . . wherefore, as they were white, and exceeding fair and delightsome, that they might not be enticing unto my people the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them. (Book of Mormon, 2 Nephi 5:21)

And the skins of the Lamanites were dark, according to the mark which was set upon their fathers, which was a curse upon them because of their transgression and their rebellion against their brethren, . . . (Ibid., Alma 3:6)

In Mormon 5:15 of the Book of Mormon the following statement is made concerning the Indians:

. . . for this people shall be scattered, and shall become a dark, a filthy, and a loathsome people, beyond the description of that which ever hath been amongst us, . . .

The Book of Mormon, however, predicts that the Indians will repent of their sins and become white:

. . . and many generations shall not pass away among them, save they shall be a white and delightsome people. (Book of Mormon, 2 Nephi 30:6)

The *Juvenile Instructor* suggested that the Polynesians were also cursed with a dark skin:

We are asked if the natives of New Zealand and of the Samoan, Society and Sandwich Islands are descendants of the Nephites or of the Lamanites. If of the former, how can their dark color be accounted for? . . . If they are descendants of Nephi, how came they to be dark as the Lamanites?

It is plain from the history which the Lord has given us in the Book of Mormon that this dark skin has been brought upon them by transgression. Whether this transgression occurred before they left this continent or afterwards, is not clear. (*The Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 30, February, 1895, p. 129)

In another article in the *Juvenile Instructor* it was taught that even apostates in “our day” have turned dark:

The mark set upon Cain was without doubt such a mark as was placed upon the descendants of the rebellious sons of Lehi . . . We are expressly informed that “the Lord did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them.” They were to be made loathsome to the people of God, unless they repented of their iniquities. Not only did this curse fall upon them, but all they who intermarried with them, or mingled with them, were cursed with the same blackness and loathsomeness . . .

From this it is very clear that the mark which was set upon the descendants of Cain was a skin of blackness, and there can be no doubt that this was the mark that Cain himself received; in fact, it has been noticed in our day that men who have lost the Spirit of the Lord, and from whom His blessings have been withdrawn, have turned dark to such an extent as to excite the comments of all who have known them. (*Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 26, October, 1891, p. 635)

Although Mormon theology teaches that anyone who is born with a dark skin is inferior, the Negro is considered the most inferior of all. Joseph Fielding Smith, who is now President of the Mormon Church, once made this statement concerning the Negro:

Not only was Cain called upon to suffer, but because of his wickedness he became the father of an inferior race. (*The Way to Perfection*, p. 101)

Joseph Fielding Smith has even stated that the Negro’s dark skin is emblematical of eternal darkness:

. . . we will also hope that blessings may eventually be given to our Negro brethren, for they are our brethren—children of God—notwithstanding their black covering emblematical of eternal darkness. (*The Way to Perfection*, p. 102)

The following statement concerning the “pure Negro” is found in the *Juvenile Instructor*:

Their skin is quite black, their hair woolly and black, their intelligence stunted, and they appear never to have arisen from the most savage state of barbarism. (*The Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 3, October, 1868, p. 157)

Although all dark-skinned people are considered inferior, the Negroes are the only people who cannot hold the Priesthood. The Mormon writer John L. Lund states:

The Church leaders from the earliest times up to and including the present have never changed their position concerning the Negro. Simply stated, no one who is a descendant of Cain may function in any capacity requiring Priesthood. (*The Church and the Negro*, 1967, p. 111)

Wallace Turner, a correspondent for the *New York Times*, made this statement:

The Negro Mormon can hold no office whatsoever in a church which offers some office to every one of its male members at some time in his life. A gray-haired Negro Mormon who may have spent his adult life in the careful practice of all the complicated and demanding rules set down by the LDS church stands disenfranchised before the altar where a youth whose beard is just beginning to fuzz may preside. A twelve-year-old boy may become a member of the Aaronic priesthood, more than this Negro man has been able to achieve through a lifetime of devotion. To hold any church office, a Mormon must be a member of the priesthood. (*The Mormon Establishment*, Boston, 1966, pp. 243–244)

Some Mormons who have questioned this doctrine have found themselves in serious trouble with the Church. Grant Syphers wrote a letter in which he stated:

In all humility I must say that God has not inspired me to feel good about the Church's practices regarding Negroes. In fact, I have come to feel very strongly that the practices are not right and that they are a powerful hindrance to the accepting of the gospel by the Negro people.

As a result of my belief, when my wife and I went to San Francisco Ward's bishop to renew our temple recommends, he told us that anyone who could not accept the Church's stand on Negroes as divine doctrine was not supporting the General Authorities and could not go to the temple. Later, in an interview with the stake president we were told the same thing: if you express doubts about the divinity of this "doctrine" you cannot go to the temple. (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Winter, 1967, p. 6)

### Pre-Existence

To understand the Mormon attitude concerning the Negro, a person must first understand the Mormon doctrine of pre-existence. One of the basic doctrines of

the Mormon Church is that the spirit of man existed before the world was created. Joseph Smith once stated:

. . . the soul, the mind of man, the immortal spirit. All men say God created it in the beginning. The very idea lessens man in my estimation; I do not believe the doctrine, I know better . . . I am going to tell of things more noble . . .

The mind of man is as immortal as God himself . . . God never did have power to create the spirit of man at all. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 5, p. 615, reprinted in the *History of the Church*, Vol. 6, pp. 310 and 311)

Brigham Young once stated:

There never was a time when man did not exist, and there never will be a time when he will cease to exist. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, p. 5)

From this doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, came the idea of some spirits being more noble than others. The Apostle Orson Pratt expressed this idea as follows:

I have already told you that the spirits of men and women, all had a previous existence, thousands of years ago, in the heavens, in the presence of God; and I have already told you that among them are many spirits that are more noble, more intelligent than others . . . (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 1, p. 62)

In the Book of Abraham this statement appears:

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;

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 . . . and he said unto me: Abraham, thou art one of them; thou wast chosen before thou wast born. (*Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Abraham 3:22–23)

The Mormon leaders teach that the "more noble" or choice spirits are to be born as Mormons. The Apostle Orson Pratt stated:

. . . among the Saints is the most likely place for these spirits to take their tabernacles, through a just and righteous parentage. They are sent to that people that are the most righteous of any other people upon the earth; . . . this is the reason the Lord is sending them here, brethren and sisters . . . The Lord has not kept

them in store for five or six thousand years past, and kept them waiting for their bodies all this time to send them among the Hottentots, the African negroes, the idolatrous Hindoos, or any other of the fallen nations that dwell upon the face of the earth. They are not kept in reserve in order to come forth to receive such a degraded parentage upon the earth . . . (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 1, p. 63, sermon by Orson Pratt)

Heber C. Kimball, who was a member of the First Presidency of the Mormon Church under Brigham Young, stated:

I tell you there is not a purer set of women on God's earth than there is here; and they shall live and bear the souls of men, and bear tabernacles for those righteous spirits that are kept back for the last time, for the winding up scenery. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 5, p. 133)

Joseph Fielding Smith, who is now President of the Mormon Church, once made this statement concerning the Mormon people:

We are, notwithstanding our weaknesses, the best people in the world. I do not say that boasting, for I believe that this truth is evident to all who are willing to observe for themselves. We are morally clean, in every way equal, and in many ways superior to any other people. (*Doctrines of Salvation*, Vol. 1, p. 236)

Mormon theology teaches that the spirits who were not valiant in their "first estate" are born with a dark skin. Joseph Fielding Smith stated:

There is a reason why one man is born black and with other disadvantages, while another is born white with great advantages. The reason is that we once had an estate before we came here, and were obedient; more or less, to the laws that were given us there. (*Doctrines of Salvation*, Vol. 1, p. 61)

The Negro is considered to have been more unfaithful than any of the spirits who were allowed to take a body. In a letter dated April 10, 1963, Joseph Fielding Smith stated:

According to the doctrine of the church, the negro, because of some condition of unfaithfulness in the spirit—or pre-existence, was not valiant and hence was not denied the mortal probation, but was denied the blessings of the priesthood.

In the book, *Answers to Gospel Questions*, Vol. 2, Joseph Fielding Smith made this comment:

Well, there were other spirits there who were not faithful in the keeping of this first estate. . . . Therefore the Lord prepared a way through the lineage of Cain for these spirits to come to the earth, but under the restriction of priesthood. (*Answers to Gospel Questions*, Vol. 2, p. 186)

Bruce R. McConkie, of the Council of Seventy, stated:

Those who were less valiant in pre-existence and who thereby had certain spiritual restrictions imposed upon them during mortality are known to us as the negroes. Such spirits are sent to earth through the lineage of Cain, the mark put upon him for his rebellion against God and his murder of Abel being a black skin. (*Mormon Doctrine*, pp. 476–477)

The Mormon Historian B. H. Roberts made this statement concerning the "rebellion in heaven":

The contest was a severe one, and during its progress all degrees of integrity were manifest. Those who stood with Christ and the plan He favored for the salvation of man, formed one extreme, while those who stood with Lucifer and for the plan of salvation devised by him, which was destructive of man's agency, formed the other extreme; between these two extremes every shade of faith, fulness and indifference was exhibited. Only those, however, who wickedly rebelled against God were adjudged to deserve banishment from heaven, and become the devil and his angels. Others there were, who may not have rebelled against God, and yet were so indifferent in their support of the righteous cause of our Redeemer, that they forfeited certain privileges and powers granted to those who were more valiant for God and correct principles. We have, I think, a demonstration of this in the seed of Ham . . . I believe that race is the one through which it is ordained those spirits that were not valiant in the great rebellion in heaven should come; who through their indifference or lack of integrity to righteousness, rendered themselves unworthy of the Priesthood and its powers, and hence it is withheld from them to this day. (*The Contributor*, Vol. 6, pp. 296–297)

The Mormon Apostle Mark E. Petersen gives the following information concerning the doctrine of pre-existence:



Is there reason then why the type of birth we receive in this life is not a reflection of our worthiness or lack of it in the pre-existence life? . . .

. . . can we account in any other way for the birth of some of the children of God in darkest Africa, or in flood-ridden China, or among the starving hordes of India, while some of the rest of us are born here in the United States? We cannot escape the conclusion that because of performance in our pre-existence some of us are born as Chinese, some as Japanese, some as Indians, some as Negroes, some as Americans, some as Latter-day Saints. These are rewards and punishments, fully in harmony with His established policy in dealing with sinners and saints, rewarding all according to their deeds . . .

Let us consider the great mercy of God for a moment. A Chinese, born in China with a dark skin, and with all the handicaps of that race seems to have little opportunity. But think of the mercy of God to Chinese people who are willing to accept the gospel. In spite of whatever they might have done in the pre-existence to justify being born over there as Chinamen, if they now, in this life, accept the gospel and live it the rest of their lives they can have the Priesthood, go to the temple and receive endowments and sealings, and that means they can have exaltation. Isn't the mercy of God marvelous?

Think of the Negro, cursed as to the priesthood . . . This Negro, who, in the pre-existence lived the type of life which justified the Lord in sending him to the earth in the lineage of Cain with a black skin, and possibly being born in darkest Africa—if that Negro is willing when he hears the gospel to accept it, he may have many of the blessings of the gospel. In spite of all he did in the pre-existent life, the Lord is willing, if the Negro accepts the gospel with real, sincere faith, and is really converted, to give him the blessings of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost. If that Negro is faithful all his days, he can and will enter the celestial kingdom. He will go there as a servant, but he will get celestial glory. (*Race Problems – As They Affect the Church*, An Address by Mark E. Petersen at the Convention of Teachers of Religion on the College Level, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, August 27, 1954)

In 1845, Orson Hyde (an Apostle in the Mormon Church) explained that the Negroes were inferior spirits who lent an influence to the devil in the pre-existent state:

At the time the devil was cast out of heaven, there were some spirits that did not know who had authority, whether God or the devil. They consequently did not take a very active part on either side, but rather thought the devil had been abused, and considered he had rather the best claim to the government. These spirits were not

considered bad enough to be cast down to hell, and never have bodies; neither were they considered worthy of an honourable body on this earth: but it came to pass that Ham, the son of Noah, saw the nakedness of his father while he lay drunk in his tent, and he with "wicked joy," ran like Rigdon, and made the wonderful disclosure to his brethren; while Shem and Japheth took a garment, with pity and compassion, laid it upon their shoulders—went backwards and covered their father, and saw not his nakedness. The joy of the first was to expose—that of the second was to cover the unseemliness of their father. The conduct of the former brought the curse of slavery upon him, while that of the latter secured blessings, jurisdiction, power and dominion. Here was the beginning of blessing and cursing in the family of Noah, and here also is the cause of both. Canaan, the son of Ham, received the curse; for Noah wished to place the curse as remote from himself as possible. He therefore placed it upon his grandson instead of his son. Now, it would seem cruel to force pure celestial spirits into the world through the lineage of Canaan that had been cursed. This would be ill appropriate, putting the precious and vile together. But those spirits in heaven that rather lent an influence to the devil, thinking he had a little the best right to govern, but did not take a very active part any way were required to come into the world and take bodies in the accursed lineage of Canaan; and hence the Negro or African race. (*Speech of Elder Orson Hyde*, delivered before the High Priests' Quorum, in Nauvoo. April 27th, 1845, printed in Liverpool, p. 30)

The Mormon writer John J. Stewart claimed that the Negro was lucky to receive a body:

In our society today, from which situation is the Negro suffering most: (1) In not being permitted to hold the Priesthood in the LDS Church, or (2) In having a black skin and other Negroid features, which stigmatize him in the eyes of most Whites?

The answer is obvious.

And who controls the fact of his having these Negroid features? His Creator, of course.

When God allows a spirit to take on a Negroid body, do you suppose He is unaware of the fact that he will suffer a social stigma?

Therefore, if you say this Church is unjust in not allowing the Negro to bear the Priesthood, you must, to be consistent, likewise say that God is even more unjust in giving him a black skin.

. . . .  
. . . Is it not possible to see an act of mercy on the part of God in not having the Negro bear the Priesthood in this world, in view of his living under the curse of a black skin and other Negroid features? . . . With the social prejudice against him, imagine the obstacles that

the Negro would encounter in attempting to honor and magnify his Priesthood.

I believe that we should recognize the mercy as well as the justice of God in all things. The very fact that God would allow those spirits who were less worthy in the spirit world to partake of a mortal body at all is further evidence of his mercy. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 1, pp. 48–50)

Alvin R. Dyer, a General Authority who served in the First Presidency under David O. McKay, made these statements in a talk given to a group of missionaries in 1961:

We have talked a lot about missionary work and heard the testimonies of those who have spoken. I want to talk to you a little bit now about something that is not missionary work, and what I say is not to be given to your investigators by any matter of means. . . . Why is it that you are white and not colored? Have you ever asked yourself that question? Who had anything to do with your being born into the Church and not born a Chinese or a Hindu, or a Negro? Is God such an unjust person that He would make you white and free and make a Negro cursed under the cursing of Cain that he could not hold the Priesthood of God? . . .

When you begin to get the answers to these questions, then perhaps you will understand why the Gospel of Jesus Christ is being preached in the world today, . . .

I want to talk to you just briefly about this, not with any information that you would convey to your investigators, but that you, yourselves, may have a better understanding of what we are doing in the mission field today . . . There were three divisions of mankind in the pre-existence, and when you are born into this life, you are born into one of these three divisions of people. There is an imposed judgment placed upon everyone who leaves the Spirit World just the same as there will be when they leave this life and go into one of three places. When they left the Spirit World, they had already been judged by what they had done in the Spirit World and in their previous life. From what judgment is determined how they shall be born in this life? When you understand that, you know that God is not unjust to cause a righteous spirit to be born as a cursed member of the black race or to be cursed as one of the other people who have been cursed. Everything is in order. The procreation of man is orderly and in accordance with the plan of life and salvation.

In keeping with this thought, when Noah went into the Ark, here again he took with him his three sons—one representing the chosen lineage, the second representing the lineage of adoption and the third representing the cursed lineage. . . . Those who have been cursed in the pre-existence were born through this lineage of Ham.

I suppose, and you may have often heard missionaries say it or have asked the question: Why is a Negro a Negro? And, you have heard this answer. “Well, they must have been neutral in the pre-existence

or they must have straddled the fence.” That is the most common saying—they were neither hot nor cold, so the Lord made them Negroes. This, of course, is not true. The reason that spirits are born into Negro bodies is because those spirits rejected the Priesthood of God in the pre-existence. This is the reason why you have Negroes upon the earth.

You will observe that when Cain was influenced by the power of Lucifer to follow him . . . Cain rejected the counsel of God. He rejected again the Priesthood as his forebearers had done in the pre-existence. Therefore, the curse of the pre-existence was made institute through the loins of Cain. Consequently, you have the beginning of the race of men and women into which would be born those in the pre-existence who had rejected the Priesthood of God. . . . Ham reinstated the curse of the pre-existence when he rejected the Priesthood of Noah, and in consequence of that he preserved the curse on the earth. Therefore, the Negroes to be born thereafter, or those who were to become Negroes, were to be born through the loins of Ham.

All of this is according to a well worked-out plan, that these millions and billions of spirits awaiting birth in the pre-existence would be born through a channel or race of people. Consequently, the cursed were to be born through Ham, . . . The cursed people are the descendants of Ham. The chosen people are the descendants of Shem . . . Through these lineages the spirits that compare with their station are born in this life. This is why you have colored people, why you have dark people and why you have white people. . . .

I don’t know whether the knowledge or the revelation of these things will have an effect upon you as a missionary, but I know that it has an effect upon me . . . the day will come when you know who you are, because you are a person of nobility. You may not fully know that now, but you were a person of nobility in the pre-existence. If you were not, you would have been born into one of these other channels, and you would not have been born in this day and age, because the Lord has withheld the choice spirits of the pre-existence to come forth in this, the last dispensation, . . . I wanted you to know the reason why you are preaching the Gospel. There is a purpose behind it and knowing this as you do and knowing your nobility—what kind of a missionary are you going to be from this day to the end of your mission? . . .

I have always thought and have proven the point many times that if you will place into the mind of a boy or a girl, firmly, that they are noble persons born of noble heritage in the pre-existence, they will never stoop to anything that is sordid. . . . I have made known to you today something you may not have known before, but you know them now because the Spirit bears record.

May the Lord bless you in it and bless you with this knowledge. I bear record of its truthfulness in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen. (“For What Purpose?” A talk given by Alvin R. Dyer at the Missionary Conference in Oslo, Norway, March 18, 1961, printed in *The Negro in Mormon Theology*, pp. 48–58)

The Mormon writer John L. Lund gives this information:

It is the Mormon belief that in our pre-mortal state there were a large number of individuals who, due to some act or behavior of their own in the pre-existence, forfeited the right to hold the Priesthood during their mortal lives, but would be allowed to possess the Priesthood in the due time of the Lord. . . . We are told by our prophets, both ancient and modern, that these individuals would all be assigned to the same race and that they were all to come through a lineage which would be forbidden the Priesthood during mortality. . . . That group is known today as the Negroid race. . . . The Negro is thus denied the Priesthood because of his own behavior in the pre-existence. (*The Church and the Negro*, pp. 42–43)

It was the Lord's decision to send those spirits who proved themselves unworthy of the Priesthood in the pre-existence through the lineage of Cain . . . The Priesthood, which is the authority to act in the name of God in performing ordinances of the Gospel, is denied to the Negroes because of their behavior in the pre-mortal existence. . . . all those who are descendants of Cain have been restricted concerning the Priesthood because they were unworthy in the pre-existence.

The curse of no Priesthood for Cain was totally different from the curse of no Priesthood for the Negroes, who are the descendants of Cain. Negroes are kept from holding the Priesthood because of something they did before they came to earth; Cain was damned because of something he did while on the earth. (*Ibid.*, pp. 107–109)

Melvin J. Ballard, who was an Apostle in the Mormon Church, made this statement:

Of the thousands of children born today, a certain proportion of them went to Hottentots of South Africa; thousands went to Chinese mothers; thousands went to Negro mothers; thousands to beautiful white Latter-day Saint mothers. Now you cannot tell me that all these spirits were just arbitrarily designated, marked, to go where they did . . .

Why is it in this Church we do not grant the Priesthood to the Negroes? . . . I am convinced it is because of some things they did before they came into this life that they have been denied the privilege. (*Melvin J. Ballard—Crusader for Righteousness*, p. 218, as quoted in *The Church and the Negro*, p. 98)

The Mormon doctrine concerning the pre-existence is in some respects similar to that taught by Pythagoras, the Greek philosopher, about 550 years before Christ. *The Christian Baptist* for April 5, 1824, contained this statement concerning his teachings:

He taught that "All mankind lived in some pre-existent state, and that for the sins committed by them

in that state, some of their souls were sent into human bodies, and others into brutes, to be punished for, and to be purged from, their former sins." (*The Christian Baptist*, Vol. 1, p. 165)

Dr. Martin A. Larson gives some information on the "caste system" which reminds one of the Mormon idea that the Negro sinned in the pre-existence:

The concept of Karma was invented to account for and to justify the caste system. Naturally, those artificially excluded from social privilege or economic opportunity would point out that they were not inferior, either morally or mentally. To crush such sedition, the Brahmanas devised the doctrine of metempsychosis, or soul-transmigration, according to which all living creatures had an eternal generation . . . A soul inhabits every insect, fish, bird, animal, and human being . . . The condition under which each soul re-enters the world is predetermined by its karma, that is, by the quantity of virtue or wickedness, merit or demerit, which it has accumulated during former incarnations. Sudras are simply being punished for sins so perpetrated and Brahmanas rewarded for merits so earned; each may enjoy his privileges, or must endure his punishment in patience and resignation, for it is the decree of Brahman. . . . Not only did they account for evil and suffering in the world: they perfumed all human misery and injustice with the odor of sanctity. (*The Religion of the Occident*, New York, 1959, p. 112)

### Sons of Cain

Joseph Smith definitely taught that Negroes are the descendants of Cain. Under the date of January 25, 1842, we find this statement in Joseph Smith's History:

In the evening debated with John C. Bennett and others to show that the Indians have greater cause to complain of the treatment of the whites, than the negroes, or sons of Cain. (*History of the Church*, Vol. 4, p. 501)

Bruce R. McConkie, of the Council of the Seventy, explains the curse which was put on Cain as follows:

Though he was a rebel and an associate of Lucifer in pre-existence, and though he was a liar from the beginning whose name was Perdition, Cain managed to attain the privilege of mortal birth. Under Adam's tutelage, he began in this life to serve God. . . . he came out in open rebellion, fought God, worshiped Lucifer, and slew Abel. . . .

As a result of his rebellion, Cain was cursed with a dark skin; he became the father of the Negroes, and those spirits who are not worthy to receive the priesthood are born through his lineage. He became the first mortal to be cursed as a son of perdition. As a result of his mortal birth he is assured of a tangible body of flesh and bones in eternity, a fact which will enable him to rule over Satan. (*Mormon Doctrine*, p. 102)

In the Book of Moses, a revelation given to Joseph Smith in December 1830, it is stated that the “children of Canaan” were black:

For behold, the Lord shall curse the land with much heat, and the barrenness thereof shall go forth forever; and there was a blackness came upon all the children of Canaan, that they were despised among all people. (*Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Moses 7:8)

Brigham Young, the second President of the Mormon Church, declared that the flat nose and black skin were part of the mark put upon the descendants of Cain:

Cain slew his brother. Cain might have been killed, and that would have put a termination to that line of human beings. This was not to be, and the Lord put a mark upon him, which is the flat nose and black skin. . . . (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 7, pp. 290–291, as quoted in *Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 14)

The following is taken from the Mormon publication, the *Millennial Star*:

For instance, the descendants of Cain cannot cast off their skin of blackness, at once, and immediately, although every soul of them should repent, obey the Gospel, and do right from this day forward. . . . Cain and his posterity must wear the mark which God put upon them; and his white friends may wash the race of Cain with fuller’s soap every day, they cannot wash away God’s mark. . . . (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 14, p. 418)

Wilford Woodruff, who became President of the Mormon Church, made this statement:

What was that mark? It was a mark of blackness. That mark rested upon Cain, and descended upon his posterity from that time until the present. To day there are millions of the descendants of Cain, through the lineage of Ham, in the world, and that mark of darkness still rests upon them. (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 51, p. 339)

The Mormon writer John L. Lund makes these statements:

Frankly, sincerely, and somewhat abruptly, President Brigham Young has told us that the mark of Cain was a “black skin.” For the Latter-day Saint no further explanation is required. . . . The question as to what the mark of Cain was, and is, is thus answered—a black skin for him and his posterity. (*The Church and the Negro*, 1967, pp. 13–14)

By becoming a Son of Perdition Cain was cursed in that he could no longer have the Priesthood. He was also set apart by the Lord to become the father of the Negroid race. It was through Cain that those who were not to receive the Priesthood during their mortal existence were to come. (*Ibid.*, p. 18)

### Through the Flood

The Mormon Apostle Erastus Snow once stated:

. . . the offspring of Ham inherited a curse, and it was because, as a revelation teaches, some of the blood of Cain became mingled with that of Ham’s family, and hence they inherited that curse. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 21, p. 370)

John Taylor, the third President of the Mormon Church, stated that a descendant of Cain came through the flood so that the devil might be properly represented upon the earth:

Why is it that good men should be tried? Why is it, in fact, that we should have a devil? Why did not the Lord kill him long ago? Because he could not do without him. He needed the devil and a great many of those who do his bidding just to keep men straight, that we may learn to place our dependence upon God, and trust in Him, and to observe his laws and keep his commandments. When he destroyed the inhabitants of the antediluvian world, he suffered a descendant of Cain to come through the flood in order that he might be properly represented upon the earth. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 23, p. 336)

The Mormon leaders teach that it was Ham’s descendants who were “cursed as to the priesthood.” They claim that Ham married a Negro woman named Egyptus, and that the curse was continued “through Ham’s wife.” Bruce R. McConkie stated:

Noah’s son Ham married Egyptus, a descendant of Cain, thus preserving the negro lineage through the flood. (*Mormon Doctrine*, p. 477)

John Taylor, the third President of the Mormon Church, made this statement:

And after the flood we are told that the curse that had been pronounced upon Cain was continued through Ham's wife, as he had married a wife of that seed. And why did it pass through the flood? Because it was necessary that the devil should have a representation upon the earth as well as God . . . (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 22, p. 304)

In the Book of Abraham (the Book of Abraham is found in the *Pearl of Great Price* and is one of the four standard works of the Mormon Church) the following appears:

Now this king of Egypt was a descendant from the loins of Ham, and was a partaker of the blood of the Canaanites by birth.

From this descent sprang all the Egyptians, and thus the blood of the Canaanites was preserved in the land.

The land of Egypt being first discovered by a woman, who was the daughter of Ham, and the daughter of Egyptus, which in the Chaldean signifies Egypt, which signifies that which is forbidden.

When this woman discovered the land it was under water, who afterward settled her sons in it; and thus, from Ham, sprang that race which preserved the curse in the land.

Now the first government of Egypt was established by Pharaoh, the eldest son of Egyptus, the daughter of Ham, and it was after the manner of the government of Ham, which was patriarchal.

Pharaoh, being a righteous man . . . seeking earnestly to imitate that order established by the fathers in the first generations, in the days of the first patriarchal reign, even in the reign of Adam, and also of Noah, his father, who blessed him with the blessings of the earth, and with the blessings of wisdom, but cursed him as pertaining to the priesthood. (*Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Abraham 1:21–26)

In the *Juvenile Instructor* this statement appeared:

When God cursed Cain for murdering his brother Abel, He set a mark upon him that all meeting him might know him. No mark could be so plain to his fellow-men as a black skin. This was the mark God placed upon him, and which his children bore. After the flood this curse fell upon the seed of Ham, through the sin of their father, and his descendants bear it to this day. The Bible tells us but little of the races that sprung from Ham, but from that little, and from the traditions of various tribes, we are led to believe that from him came the Canaanites, the Philistines, the Egyptians and most of the earliest inhabitants of Africa. (*The Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 3, p. 157)

The Mormon writer Arthur M. Richardson made this statement concerning the Negro:

Referring to Elder Hyde's statement we find, then, that those assigned to a dishonorable body on this earth came through the accursed lineage of Canaan through Ham's wife who was a descendant of the first murderer Cain . . . (*That Ye May Not Be Deceived*, pp. 6 and 7)

Briefly stated, then, the Mormon doctrine concerning the Negro is this: In the "pre-existence" the Negroes "lent an influence to the devil." Because of their "unfaithfulness in the spirit world" they were "assigned to a dishonorable body on this earth." They come through "the accursed lineage of Canaan," and are "marked" with a "flat nose" and a "black covering" which is "emblematical of eternal darkness." They are a "vile" and "inferior" race. In fact, they are a "representation" of the "devil" upon the earth. They are "not equal with other races where the receipt of certain spiritual blessings are concerned," and they are not entitled to the full blessings of the gospel." They are "denied the priesthood," and they cannot be married in a Mormon temple. But, "in spite" of all they "did in the pre-existence," they can be baptized and receive the Holy Ghost. If a Negro is faithful all his life he will enter the celestial kingdom. The Apostle Mark E. Petersen says the Negro will be only a "servant" there, but he will get a "celestial glory."

### One Drop

The Mormon leaders have been very opposed to intermarriage to the Negro. The following appeared in the *Juvenile Instructor*:

We do not believe in the permanency of a race descended from people so wide apart as the Anglo-Saxon and Negro. In fact we believe it to be a great sin in the eyes of our Heavenly Father for a white person to marry a black one. And further, that it is a proof of the mercy of God that no such race appear able to continue for many generations. (*Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 3, p. 165)

Brigham Young, the second President of the Mormon Church, stated that if a person who belongs to the chosen seed mixes his blood with the Negro the penalty is death on the spot:

Shall I tell you the law of God in regard to the African race? If the white man who belongs to the chosen seed mixes his blood with the seed of Cain, the penalty, under the law of God, is death on the spot. This will always be so. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, p. 110)

One reason the Mormon leaders are so opposed to intermarriage is that they teach that “one drop of Negro blood” would prevent a person from holding the Priesthood. The Mormon Apostle Mark E. Petersen explained as follows:

Now what is our policy in regard to inter-marriage? As to the Negro, of course, there is only one possible answer. We must not inter-marry with the Negro. Why? If I were to marry a Negro woman and have children by her, my children would all be cursed as to the priesthood. Do I want my children cursed as to the priesthood? If there is one drop of Negro blood in my children, as I have read to you, they receive the curse. There isn't any argument, therefore, as to inter-marriage with the Negro, is there? There are 50 million Negroes in the United States. If they were to achieve complete absorption with the white race, think what that would do. With 50 million Negroes inter-married with us, where would the priesthood be? Who could hold it, in all America? Think what that would do to the work of the church! (*Race Problems—As They Affect The Church*, An Address by Mark E. Petersen at the Convention of Teachers of Religion on the College Level, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, August 27, 1954)

Brigham Young, the Second President of the Mormon Church, stated:

Any man having one drop of the seed of Cain in him cannot receive the priesthood . . . (*Wilford Woodruff*, by Mathias F. Cowley, p. 351, quoted in *That Ye May Not Be Deceived*, p. 8)

Mark E. Petersen quoted this same statement, however, he attributed it to Wilford Woodruff (actually the statement was originally made by Brigham Young but is found in the book, *Wilford Woodruff*):

President Woodruff added, “The Lord said, ‘I will not kill Cain, but I will put a mark upon him, and that mark will be seen upon every face of every Negro upon the face of the earth. And it is the decree of God that mark shall remain upon the seed of Cain, until the seed of Abel shall be redeemed, and Cain shall not receive the Priesthood until the time of that redemption. Any man having one drop of the blood of Cain in him cannot receive the Priesthood.’” (*Race Problems—As They*

*Affect The Church*, An Address by Mark E. Petersen at the Convention of Teachers of Religion on the College Level, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, August 27, 1954)

Joseph Fielding Smith, who is now President of the Mormon Church, made this statement in a letter to Morris L. Reynolds:

The descendants of Cain were barred from the blessings of the Priesthood. They may be baptized for the remission of their sins, but they cannot hold the Priesthood by divine decree, as pointed out in the Book of Abraham. It would be a serious error for a white person to marry a Negro, for the Lord forbid it. (Letter from Joseph Fielding Smith, dated May 9, 1966)

David L. Brewer interviewed several Church leaders. He quoted one leader as stating:

What can a Negro definitely want that I can't give him? He may want to go into the temple. He'll tell us we're discriminating, and I suppose we are, aren't we? Any red blooded American doesn't want his children to marry Negroes. (*Utah Elites and Utah Racial Norms*, by David L. Brewer, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, August, 1966, p. 148)

The Mormon writer John L. Lund makes these statements:

A second reason for the mark of a black skin deals specifically with the problems of intermarriage. The Lord did not want the seed of Cain to intermingle with the rest of Adam's children. (*The Church and the Negro*, 1967, p. 15)

. . . intermarriage with the Negro means the loss of Priesthood blessings . . .

Brigham Young made a very strong statement on this matter when he said, “I would like the President of the United States and all the world to hear this. Shall I tell you the law of God in regard to the African race? If the white man who belongs to the chosen seed mixes his blood with the seed of Cain, the penalty under the law of God, is death on the spot. This will always be so. God has commanded Israel not to intermarry. To go against this commandment of God would be to sin. Those who willfully sin with their eyes open to this wrong will not be surprised to find that they will be separated from the presence of God in the world to come. This is spiritual death. . . .

The reason that one would lose his blessings by marrying a Negro is due to the restriction placed upon them. “No person having the least particle of Negro Blood can hold the Priesthood.” It does not matter

if they are one-sixth Negro or one-one hundred and sixth, the curse of no Priesthood is still the same. If an individual who is entitled to the Priesthood marries a Negro, the Lord has decreed that only spirits who are not eligible for the Priesthood will come to that marriage as children. To intermarry with a Negro is to forfeit a “Nation of Priesthood holders.” (Ibid., pp. 53–55)

When people rebel against God’s commandments, either during their pre-earth life or while in mortality, they are given a dark skin so that those who are of the chosen seed will not intermarry with them. (Ibid., p. 102)

Outwardly the Mormon doctrine concerning the Negro seems to be firm and absolute. “One drop of negro blood,” the Mormon leaders declare, would prevent a man from holding the Priesthood. The truth is, however, that some people with Negro blood are being ordained to the Priesthood in the Mormon Church in spite of the fact that the Mormon leaders have tried to prevent it. John M. Whitaker related in his journal the struggle he had when a man he suspected of having Negro blood applied for a Temple Recommend. It is interesting to note Joseph F. Smith, the sixth President of the Mormon Church, was unable to help him decide whether the man was part Negro:

On the 10th, had a long conversation with brother Nelson Holder Ritchie, father of 12 children and living in the Pleasant View ward. As soon as he crossed the threshold of the front door, I felt that he had negro blood in him. He came for a recommend to go through the temple and I asked him many questions concerning his birth. He told me his father was a pure blooded Cherokee Indian and that he never knew his mother, but was told by some friends she was very dark, Creole or mulatto, and a woman by the name of Nancy McNeal raised him. He told me he explained to his present wife before he married her all he knew of his genealogy and they want to go through the temple. He has been faithful and a good provider and saw no reason why he could not; but that feeling still persisted and I had many conversations with him on the matter and finally sent for his wife and learned all the facts she knew, still I felt the same and told them how I felt. They were really disturbed over the matter and I told them I would take their genealogy and all the facts and submit the case to the First Presidency of the Church. I did and they held several meetings with the Twelve and finally President Smith sent for me and said: “Johnny (he always called me by that name for years) We have fully considered the case of Brother Ritchie, and have concluded that as you are common judge in Israel, we return the case to you to decide.” That was a terrible responsibility, but I again

had several meetings with the Richies and finally told them I still felt the same, that I appreciated they were good saints, and that feeling as I did, I dare not issue a recommend to the temple unless my feelings changed; that if they remained faithful and true, if they did not go to the Temple and died without getting in the Temple, the Lord would give them all that they were entitled to, but according to my understanding of the gospel anyone with negro blood was not entitled to the temple rights. They said their children, at least some of them had already been to the temple for their marriage. So I told them to be faithful and no one could eventually hinder them from receiving all blessings earned by them, but not to think I had any personal feelings in the least, but must not go against my continued impressions. I made them feel that I was responsible also for anything I did to hinder good people from going to the Temple, that thus far, no one has been given a recommend to go to the Temple by me unless my blessing went also. This case was a source of considerable sorrow to me for I believe they were good saints but [I] never gave the recommend. (“John M. Whitaker Journal,” Vol. 2, p. 625, typed excerpts)

### Negroes In Priesthood

Although we were aware of the fact that a “colored man” by the name of Elijah Abel held the Priesthood in the Mormon Church, we were very astonished to learn that his descendants have also been ordained to the Priesthood. This information was found by Bob Phillips—who has done a tremendous job of tracing Elijah Abel’s descendants. The following is a copy of a chart, given to us by Bob Phillips, showing that Elijah Abel and his descendants were ordained to the Priesthood:

#### Ordinations to Priesthood

Elijah Able	Ordained an Elder March 3, 1836. Ordained a Seventy April 4, 1841. Nauvoo, Illinois
Enoch Able (son of Elijah)	Ordained an Elder November 10, 1900. by John Q. Adams Logan 5th Ward, Utah
Elijah Able (grandson of Elijah, son of Enoch)	Ordained a Priest July 5, 1934. by J. C. Hogenson Ordained an Elder September 29, 1935. by Reuben S. Hill Logan 10th Ward, Utah

After receiving this chart we began to search through the records in the Genealogical Society, which is owned by the Mormon Church, to see if we could confirm the statement that Elijah Abel’s descendants

No. <b>81</b>	{Cancellation}	Name in Full <b>Elijah Ables</b>	on <b>Jan</b>		
Father's Name <b>Eason Ables</b>		Mother's Maiden Name <b>Mary Jardy</b>			
Born at <b>Logan, Utah</b>	DAY MONTH YEAR	Received from <b>Daniels, Malad</b>	DAY	MONTH	YEAR
Blessed by		Mission to			
Baptized by <b>Fred Gilgen Jr.</b>	<b>30 June 1917</b>	Married to			
Confirmed by <b>Lorenzo Eggert</b>	<b>30 June 1917</b>	Temple or Civil			
Priesthood when received	Ordained				
Ordained <b>Priest</b>	By <b>J. C. Hoganson</b>	Removed to			
Ordained <b>elder</b>	By <b>Ransom L. Hill</b>	Excommunicated for			
Ordained	By	Died of			
Ordained	By	Cancelled [see instructions]			

A photograph from the Record of Members of the Logan Tenth Ward for the years 1927–1943. This photograph proves that Elijah Abel, (the grandson of the Negro Elijah Abel) was ordained to the priesthood. Notice that he was ordained a priest July 5, 1934 and an elder September 29, 1935. This photograph was obtained with great difficulty from a microfilm in the Genealogical Library in Salt Lake City, Utah. The serial number for the this microfilm is 6360, and the part number is 22.



have been ordained to the Priesthood. We soon found out, however, that it is very difficult to trace Elijah Abel's descendants. We can not help but suspect that the Mormon leaders have tried their best to cover up the truth concerning Elijah Abel and his descendants. Bob Phillips claims that when he told one of the men in the Church Library of his findings in the Genealogical Building, the man was taken by surprise and made a statement to the effect that he thought that information had already been removed from the records in the Genealogical Building. With the help of Bob Phillips, however, we were able to find information that proves that the Negro blood in the Abel family has not prevented some of them from holding the Priesthood. We have obtained a photograph of Elijah Abel's grandson's ward membership record, which shows that he was ordained to the Priesthood. The Genealogical Library refused to make a photocopy of this record, however, after a great deal of trouble we found a way to get one. We have reproduced this photocopy in this study.

Elijah Abel (who was the grandfather of the Elijah Abel who was ordained in the Logan 10th Ward) was born July 25, 1810. He joined the Mormon Church in 1832. He was ordained an Elder on March 3, 1836, and in the June, 18q36 issue of the *Messenger and Advocate* he is listed second on the "List containing the names of Ministers of the Gospel, belonging to the church of the Latter Day Saints, whose Licenses were recorded, the preceding Quarter, in the License Records, in Kirtland, Ohio" (*Messenger and Advocate*, Vol. 2, p. 335). Elijah Abel's name also appears on a list of the members of the "Kirtland Safety Society" (see the *Messenger and Advocate*, Vol. 3, p. 476). On April 4, 1841, he was ordained a Seventy. He was an undertaker in Nauvoo, Illinois, and Andrew Jenson (who was the Assistant Church Historian) states that he was "intimately acquainted with the Prophet Joseph Smith." Kate B. Carter made the following statement concerning Elijah Abel:

After his conversion to Mormonism, Elijah Abel moved to Nauvoo where at the request of the Saints he became the leading mortician. In Nauvoo he lived in the home of the Prophet Joseph. (*The Negro Pioneer, Daughters of Utah Pioneers, Lesson For May, 1965, p. 511*)

The following statement by a "Mr. W." appears in the book, *Mormon Portraits*:

Mr. W: "Abel was the name of a colored man in Nauvoo who had received the Priesthood from Joseph. This was an exception to the rule, colored people not being entitled to the blessings of Mormon Priesthood (but Joseph and Co. fixed it)." (*Mormon Portraits, 1886 edition, p. 51*)

In a meeting held May 31st, 1879, Zebedee Coltrin was reported as saying:

... Brother Abel was ordained a Seventy because he had labored on the Temple, ... (*Journal History, quoted in Mormonism and the Negro, part 2, p. 10*)

In the *History of the Church* Joseph Smith states that when he was arrested Elijah Able was among those who tried to rescue him:

Sunday, 6. — News of my arrest having arrived in Nauvoo last night, and being circulated through the city, Hosea Stout, Tarleton Lewis, William A. Hickman, John S. Higbee, Elijah Able, Uriel C. Nickerson, and George W. Clyde started from the Nauvoo landing, in a skiff in order to overtake me and rescue me, if necessary. (*History of the Church, Vol. 4, p. 365*)

At the funeral of Eugene Burns, who was Elijah Abel's grandson, a Patriarch by the name of Miner spoke of Elijah Abel's "loyalty and service to Joseph the Prophet." The following appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

Eugene Burns, colored, died last week at his home, 249 East Sixth South street, of a severe attack of typhoid fever of short duration and was buried last Sunday. He was employed as a scene shifter at the Salt Lake theater before his death. He was 24 years of age and was to have been married on the day on which his funeral occurred.

Funeral services over the remains of the dead man were held at the residence Sunday afternoon. At the request of the family Rev. D. A. Brown, pastor of the First Baptist church, conducted the services. Following his remarks of condolence and sympathy to the bereaved friends who had gathered, Patriarch Miner, president of one of the quorums of the seventies of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, made a few remarks. In the course of the dissertation he stated in substance that all that ever existed of the dead man lay in the casket before the altar.

SOUL WAS DOOMED.

He further said that an Ethiopian could not reach the state of exaltation necessary to entrance into heaven. His soul was doomed before his birth. The patriarch's remarks caused awe and consternation among the hearers and precipitated an ecclesiastical scrimmage. The Rev. Mr. Brown replied to the remarks of the patriarch, referring to a quotation from the Bible to prove his contention that any man can be saved on the conditions of salvation laid down in the Scriptures. Bishop N. A. Empey, president of the State Fair association, attempted to reply to Mr. Brown, but was denied permission to talk. Accordingly the war of ideas was averted and the services continued.

he possesses a large property. I would say to him, get his brother Adanson Bentley (for he is an animal of his own kidney) and go there; he is now about eighty years of age, & of course it is will-making time, and about the right age for Bentley to prevail on him to make a will that will disinherit a monstrous heretic. I think it is probable there will be no difficulty in engaging Bentley in his service; seeing he has been so successful in his former attempt with old Mr. Brooks, my wife's father, and got his own wife so well fattened on other people's property.— He can, no doubt, be engaged again for the same service. Be sure my uncle is not a Campbellite in religion, but a regular Baptist; but that will not make any difference; for Bentley can become all things to all men, that he may gain some.

This course I think may satisfy Simons until his chastisement works out the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and I will escape being sued; and if my family should lose a few thousand dollars, if Bentley's wife only gets it, it is as well; it is all in the family.

Simons would do well also to say to his brother Darwin Atwater, as he has a great deal of labor to carry about and read Howe's book, that he can be favored with the history of old Clapp, his wife's father, to carry with him; so that he can show the people Campbellism unveiled also.

Yours in great haste, and you may well think, not without some anxiety too.

SIDNEY RIGDON.

#### CONFERENCE.

We are requested by our Elders now in Tennessee and Kentucky, to notify our brethren and friends, that a conference of elders and brethren of the church of Latter Day Saints will be held on the first Friday, Saturday, and Sabbath, in September next, at Daymons creek, Calloway co. Kentucky.

Kirtland, Ohio, June 3, 1836.

The following is a List containing the names of Ministers of the Gospel, belonging to the church of the Latter Day Saints, whose Licenses were recorded, the preceding Quarter, in the License Records, in Kirtland, Ohio.

THOMAS BURDICK,

Recording Clerk

#### First, names of the Elders:

Milo Andrus	Arvin A Avery
Elijah Abel	Samuel Avard
Hazen Aldrich	Martin C Allred
Stephen Barnet	Loren Babbit
Elias Bannet	William Bondley
Henry Bannet	Nathan B Blakwin
Hiram Blackman	Francis G Bishop
Joseph B Bostworth	Israel Barlow
George W Brooks	Albert Browa
Alva Beiman	Peter Buchanan
Reuben Barton	Josiah Butterfield
James Braden	Thomas Burdick
Benjamin Brown	George Burket
George Boosinger	John F Boynton
James Burnham	Lorenz Booth
Seymour Brunson	John F Barnard
Lorenzo Barnes	Michael Barkdull
Harrison Burgess	Peletiah Brown
Almon Babbit	Alden Burdick
Oliver Cowdery	Jared Carter
Simoneo Carter	William O Clark
Jacob K Chapman	Lyman Curtis
William Carpenter	Alpheus Cutler
John Carrill	Anthony Cooper
Lalbeus T Coons	David Clough
Elijah Cheney	Reynolds Cahoon
Zebedes Coltrin	William F Cahoon
Warren A Cowdery	Perry Durfee
Osmyn M Deuel	Jabez Durfee
Moses Daily	Edmond Durfee
Peter, Dustin	Isaac Decker
James Daily	Israel Duty
Chapman Duncan	George W Dunham
Solomon W Denton	William Draper Sea
Hiram Dayton	David Evans
James Emmett	David Elliot
Frazier Eaton	Solon Foster
King Follet	Rufus Fisher
Noah M Fannce	Hezekiah Fisk
Elijah Fordham	James Foster
Edmond Fisher	William A Fry
Elisha H Groves	Alpheus Gifford
William Gould	Jedediah M Grant
John Gould	Sherman Gilbert
Michael Griffith	Hervey Green
Moses I Gardner	John P Groens
Salmon Gee	John Galord
Sciah J Griffin	Levi Gifford
Thomas Grover	Oliver Granger
Thomas Gorden	Jonathan H Holmes
Joshua S Holman	Levi W Hancock
Elias Higbee	Solomon Hancock
Joel Haskins	Milton Holmes
Nelson Higgins	Reuben Hadlock
Elias Hutchings	Orson Hyde
Jesse Huntsman	John Harret
Richard Howard	William Harris
George M Hinkle	Heman Hyde
Samuel James	John Johnson
Henry Jacobs	Truman Jackson
Michael Jacobs	Lake Johnson

ABEL, Elijah, the only colored man who is known to have been ordained to the Priesthood, was born July 25, 1810, in Maryland. Becoming a convert to "Mormonism" he was baptized in September, 1832, by Ezekiel Roberts and, as appears from certificates, he was ordained an Elder March 3, 1836, and a Seventy April 4, 1841, an exception having been made in his case with regard to the general rule of the Church in relation to colored people. At Nauvoo, Illinois, where he resided, he followed the avocation of an undertaker. After his arrival in Salt Lake City he became a resident of the Tenth Ward, and, together with his wife, he managed the Farnham Hotel in Salt Lake City. In Nauvoo he was intimately acquainted with the Prophet Joseph Smith and later in life was the especial friend of the late Levi W. Hancock. In 1883, as a member of the Third Quorum of Seventy, he left Salt Lake City on a mission to Canada, during which he also performed missionary labors in the United States. Two weeks after his return he died, Dec. 25, 1884, of debility, consequent upon exposure while laboring in the ministry in Ohio. He died in full faith of the gospel.

**ADAIR, Thomas Jefferson**, an Elder who died away from home, filling a mission for the Church, was born May 28, 1884, at Nutrioso, Apache county, Arizona, the son of Samuel Newton Adair and Helen J. Brown. His grandparents on his father's side were among the noted residents of Nauvoo, Illinois, and his grandparents on his mother's side were associated with the Church in Kirtland, Ohio, where his grandfather Brown assisted in the erection of the Kirtland Temple. His parents were among the early settlers in Apache county, Arizona, and were staunch Latter-day Saints. Thomas J. was

offices of Priest and Elder. He was set apart for a mission to the Southwestern States April 1, 1904, and was appointed to labor in Arkansas, where he spent twenty-eight months as a faithful energetic missionary. While thus engaged he contracted a disease and being released from his mission he started for home and arrived at St. Johns, Arizona, July 23, 1904. His parents, who lived about seventy-five miles from St. Johns, were notified, but when they arrived at his bedside he was unable to travel further, and getting gradually worse, he died Aug. 1, 1906, at St. Johns. Elder Adair was greatly respected by all who knew him. He had received a good education, had attended the Stake academy at St. Johns, and taken the missionary course prior to going on his mission. He was noted for his exceptionally energetic and lively disposition and ever showed the greatest loyalty and devotedness to the Church.

**ADAMS, Barnabas L.**, one of the original Utah pioneers of 1847, was born August 28, 1812, near Pearth, Upper Canada, of Vermont parents and was educated in the Methodist faith, several of his immediate relatives being preachers in that denomination. He became a convert to "Mormonism" when about twenty-three years of age and afterwards gathered to Missouri, traveling to that State in what was known as the Canada Camp, led by Elder John E. Page. Together with his co-religionists he was expelled from the State of Missouri by mobocratic violence, and settled with the Saints in Illinois. There he afterwards became subject once more to the ruthless hand of persecution, and during the general exodus in 1846 he came west, having lived for some time in Montrose, Lee county, Iowa. In June, 1846, he married Julia Ann Bawker at Montrose. She was a

A photograph of the *L.D.S. Biographical Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3, page 577. This was written by the Assistant Church Historian Andrew Jenson. It proves that Elijah Abel, a Negro, was ordained to the Priesthood.

Burns was a grandson of Abel, the body servant of Joseph the Prophet. Abel was a negro, and, according to the remarks of Patriarch Miner, is the only one of his race who ever succeeded in gaining entrance within the pearly gates. The reason he was so successful in accomplishing that feat, according to the patriarch, was his loyalty and service to Joseph the Prophet, and his belief that the Mormon religion is the only one that ever happened.

#### ABEL, SON OF HAM.

Abel, the son of Ham and body servant of Joseph the Prophet, died and was translated. The children whom he left in this world may never be exalted to that state, according to the patriarch. The reason assigned by the patriarch for the non-admission of Ethiopians to the other side is the fact of their dusky skins. No man with black skin may enter the gates of heaven, said the patriarch.

#### TRUTH NEVER HURTS.

"This is hardly the place to bring forth matters of truth," said the venerable patriarch as he ascended the pulpit after Mr. Brown had concluded his remarks, "but the truth ought always to be told. The truth never hurts."

Immediately before the altar rested the casket containing the remains of the young man. In life he was upright, his friends said, and naught had been said against him. The church edifice was packed to the doors with sorrowing friends. Both black and white, who had known him in life, attended the services to mourn his death. There were tears and sorrow from relatives and friends.

#### WHAT MINER SAID.

"I repeat, the truth must be told," continued the aged man in continuing the strange panegyric. He quivered and shook in the throes of intense excitement. "I am president of a quorum of seventies of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. I am here to bear testimony not to the man who is dead, but to his grandfather, Abel.

#### STAYED WITH THE PROPHET.

"I cannot refrain from speaking of the exceptional qualifications of Abel, the body servant of Joseph the Prophet. His loyalty to the prophet was wonderful. He stayed constantly at his side until the prophet was translated. He believed implicitly in the Mormon faith and was rewarded for that belief. For his services to the prophet and his faith in our religion he was raised to the order of the Melchisedek priesthood. He was the only colored man who ever lived that belonged to that order.

#### THREE CLASSES OF SPIRITS.

"It is not to be wondered at, too, when you consider the teachings of our church in relation to the colored people. We believe that there are three orders of spirits.

In the first class are included the spirits that have never been incarnated. Having never been given a human body they are doomed to grope in darkness throughout eternity. There is no redemption for them."

The second class includes the spirits which have been incarnated. They have been given the privilege of coming into the world and being redeemed through the plan of salvation that is open to us. That class is the whites.

The third and last class of spirits is the class that fell. Because of their fall they are compelled to reside in bondage. They are given carnate bodies, but can never lift the yoke of bondage. That class of spirits includes the negroes.

Abel, the body servant of the prophet believed in Joseph Smith as a prophet and the latter-day dispensation. Hence he was exalted, and, so far as is known, he is the only one of his race who ever overcame the conditions of his bondage.

#### JUST ONE CHANCE.

For the colored race, however, there is an exalted state in the next world into which they may go. Provision has been made in the teachings of the Prophet Joseph so that the negro may step up into that preliminary state of exaltation, and when he gets there a chance is given him to accept redemption, according to the teachings of Joseph Smith.

#### MR. BROWN OBJECTS.

Mr. Brown immediately arose and declared that no such teachings existed in the Bible. In refutation of the assertions of the patriarch he read several selections from the Bible, citing instances where men with black skins had been saved. He attempted to calm the feelings that had been aroused by the remarks of the patriarch. He offered assurances of hope and salvation to the friends of the dead man.

Bishop N. A. Empey then attempted to gain the attention of the audience to reply to Mr. Brown. He was refused the privilege of speaking by those in charge of the services.

Burns's family are Mormons, though the young man is said to have never affiliated himself with the church. He was a member of the Stage Men's union and other orders of this city. Members of the union were pallbearers and the union attended the services in a body. (*The Salt Lake Tribune*, November 1, 1903, p. 8)

Andrew Jenson (who was Assistant Church Historian) made this statement concerning Elijah Abel:

After his arrival in Salt Lake City he became a resident of the Tenth Ward, and, together with his wife, he managed the Farnham Hotel in Salt Lake City. (*L.D.S. Biographical Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3, p. 577)

With this information in mind we searched in a microfilm of the United States Census Records for the year 1870, but we were unable to find Elijah Abel in the Tenth Ward in Salt Lake City. Bob Phillips, however, told us that Elijah Abel was in Ogden at the time this census was taken. Annie Hermine Chardon Shaw, who lived in Ogden, made this statement concerning the Abel family:

My first recollection of Ogden was when my father would bring me with him while he was clearing the ground on 5th and Washington so he could build his carding mill. . . .

. . . . .  
There was a family of colored folks by the name of Able who went around from ward to ward and put on performances for the public. They were converts to the Mormon Church and I think there were the older couple and they had two or three daughters. I guess they traveled all around in Utah putting on minstrel shows. (Utah State Historical Society, Manuscript File, Federal Writer's Project, Mrs. Annie Hermine Chardon Shaw, pp. 1 and 5)

Elijah Abel and his family are found on page 44 of the United States Census Records, Weber County, Ogden, July 16, 1870. A microfilmed copy of this census report is on file in the Genealogical Library in Salt Lake City, Utah. This census report is very interesting because it lists Elijah Abel, his wife and all of his family as mulattoes. According to this report, Elijah Abel had six daughters and two sons. The sons were named "Elijah" and "Enoch."

Kate Carter made the following statement concerning Elijah Abel:

. . . he was an active Latter-day Saint. . . . People described Elijah as a fine looking person whose ability as a speaker indicated he was a man of great knowledge. (*The Negro Pioneer*, Daughters of Utah Pioneers, Lesson For May, 1965, p. 511)

In 1883 Elijah Abel went on a mission for the Mormon Church, and two weeks after he returned (which was in 1884) he died. The following obituary appeared in the *Deseret News*:

ABLE. — In the 13th Ward, December 25th 1884, of old age and debility, consequent upon exposure while laboring in the ministry in Ohio, Elijah Able. Deceased was born in Washington County, Maryland, July 25, 1810; joined the Church and was ordained an Elder as appears by certificate dated March 3d, 1836; was subsequently ordained a Seventy as appears by certificate dated April 4, 1841; labored successfully in Canada and also performed a mission to the United

States, from which he returned about two weeks ago. He died in full faith of the Gospel.

Funeral at 16th Ward Assembly Rooms Saturday, Dec. 27th, at 10 a.m. Friends invited. (*Deseret News*, December 26, 1884)

Andrew Jenson (who was the Assistant Mormon Church Historian) said the following concerning Elijah Abel:

ABEL, Elijah, the only colored man who is known to have been ordained to the Priesthood, was born July 25, 1810, in Maryland. Becoming a convert to "Mormonism" he was baptized in September, 1832, by Ezekiel Roberts and, as appears from certificates, he was ordained an Elder March 3, 1836, and a Seventy April 4, 1841. An exception having been made in his case with regard to the general rule of the Church in relation to colored people. At Nauvoo, Illinois, where he resided, he followed the avocation of an undertaker. After his arrival in Salt Lake City he became a resident of the Tenth Ward, and, together with his wife, he managed the Farnham Hotel in Salt Lake City. In Nauvoo he was intimately acquainted with the Prophet Joseph Smith and later in life was the especial friend of the late Levi W. Hancock. In 1883, as a member of the Third Quorum of Seventy, he left Salt Lake City on a mission to Canada, during which he also performed missionary labors in the United States. Two weeks after his return he died, Dec. 25, 1884, of debility, consequent upon exposure while laboring in the ministry in Ohio. He died in full faith of the gospel. (*L.D.S. Biographical Encyclopedia*, Vol. 3, p. 577)

In the United States Census for the year 1880 Elijah Abel's sons, Enoch and Elijah, were listed as miners at the Silver District, Little Cottonwood Canyon. Although we do not know too much concerning Elijah, Bob Phillips claims that he was also ordained to the Priesthood. In the year 1915 the Salt Lake City Directory gave Elijah's address as 728 West South Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah. In the 1924 Salt Lake City Directory his address was listed as 1384 Pacific Avenue. According to the Utah Cemetery Records, Vol. 6, page 332, Elijah died on November 12, 1941.

Enoch Abel evidently married a "white" woman by the name of Mary Jordi. They lived in the city of Logan, Utah, and they were members of the Logan 5th Ward. Enoch Abel worked as a butcher. He was ordained an Elder November 10, 1900, which was only about three months before his death. He died on February 21, 1901, and was buried in the Logan City Cemetery. The people in Enoch Abel's ward must have known that he was a Negro, for when the local newspaper announced his death they called him a "colored" man:

**THE JOURNAL**

is published every

Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday Morning

—AT—

Logan City, Cache County, Utah.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**

One Year 6 Months 3 Months  
\$3.00 \$1.50 75 cts.  
Single copy, 5 cents.  
Cash in Advance.

**ADVERTISING RATES.**

Local lines, 20 cts. per line each insertion.  
Reading Notices, 10 cts. per line each  
insertion.  
Miscellaneous Column, 1/2 c. a word each  
insertion.  
Rates on Display advertisements made  
known on application.

Advertisements not accompanied by written  
directions will be inserted until for-  
bidden, and charged accordingly.

**LOCAL POINTS.**

**GARDEN and flower seeds at The  
Logan Nurseries.**

**MEDICINES** of every description  
at Cy Napper's Drug Store 3rd St.\*

**MR. M. H. FARZES** is down from  
Rebourg on a visit to relatives and  
friends here.

**EVERYBODY** is invited to call at  
L. DeWitt's New Club Saloon,  
West North Main street and sample  
his wines, liquors and cigars.

**INSURE** with The Mutual Life  
the oldest, biggest, and best in-  
surance company in the world. H.  
C. Hansen, Agent.

**FINEST Line of Toilet Articles**  
enter in this city at Cy Napper's  
Drug Store 3rd St. 3 Doors West  
of Post Office.

**ENOCH ABLE**, a colored resident  
of the Fifth ward, died at noon on  
Thursday of pneumonia. Able  
left a wife and large family in des-  
titute circumstances.

The Sociological club of the A.  
C. U. held its regular meeting at  
the residence of Dr. J. F. Engle  
on last Monday evening. Prof.

Now is the time to buy house  
plants at The Logan Nurseries. \*

**FAMILY Recipes** a specialty at  
Cy Napper's Drug store 3rd St. 3  
Doors West of P. O.

You'll miss a treat if you miss  
the Fifth Ward concert Saturday  
night.

Subscriptions will be re-  
ceived at this office, \$1.00 a year,  
for a weekly paper published at  
Lincoln, Nebraska, by William J.  
Dryan.

The basket ball teams of the  
Brigham Young College, and the  
Salt Lake Business College, played  
a very interesting game at the B.  
Y. gymnasium yesterday after-  
noon. Twenty minute halves  
were played and the visitors won  
by a score of 24 to 14.

**ELDER ORSON SMITH** will deliver  
a lecture upon his travels in  
Alaska, under the auspices of the  
13th quorum of Elders, in the  
Fifth ward assembly hall, on Mon-  
day evening, February 25th. The  
lecture will be interesting, is free,  
and a general invitation is extend-  
ed to the public.

A PROMINENT social event of  
the week was the party given in  
honor of Mr. and Mrs. J. Toombs  
on Wednesday evening, by the  
Island Social Club. A large number  
of club members were present and  
they made things pleasant as only  
members of that organization can.  
The party was held at the residence  
of Mr. and Mrs. N. W. Haws.  
Napper was served, and then the  
merry pastimes of the season held  
away until a late hour. It was  
voted the nicest Club party of the  
season.

**Got Away With His Lunch.**

Night-watchman David Dry-  
dale had another experience the  
other night. The jail was occupied  
by a small suspect on the night  
mentioned, and when a transient  
applied to Officer King for lodging  
the latter had to put him in police  
headquarters.

Finally the officer arrested a  
drunk, and he too was locked in

at Winnemucca.

The deceased young man was in  
the 21st year of his age, and had  
been working in Southern Cali-  
fornia, and was evidently on his  
way home. The news of his death  
was a terrible shock to his parents.

**Judge Flenner To Lecture Here.**

The lecture of Judge J. D.  
Flenner which had to be postponed  
on account of the visit of the legis-  
lature to this city, will be given  
next Monday evening, at 7:30, in  
the Brigham Young College.

The lecture will be under the  
auspices of the Polysophical  
Society, which is making every  
effort to secure a good audience  
for the distinguished orator from  
Idaho. It will of course be free  
to the general public.

Mr. Flenner needs no introduc-  
tion to Logan people. He has  
spoken here on several occasions,  
and greatly delighted his auditors  
with his eloquent, witty speech.  
His theme will be: "Bright and  
Happy Homes." Excellent  
musical selections will also be  
rendered, and a very pleasant even-  
ing is assured those who attend.

**A Quick Capture.**

On Thursday Sheriff Rigby re-  
ceived word from Lewiston that  
two men who had been in charge  
of a farm there, belonging to a  
Mr. Kent, had suddenly left Lewis-  
ton, taking with them property  
belonging to Kent. One of them,  
Hoddy Carter by name, it was  
learned had gone north with two  
horses and a buggy, said to belong  
to Kent, and the other had gone  
south.

After considerable work the  
Sheriff located Carter at Blackfoot,  
Idaho, on Thursday morning, and  
ordered his arrest. He was taken  
into custody there, and Sheriff  
Rigby went north after him last  
night. It is not known whether  
the other man, Pitman by name,  
has any of Kent's property with  
him, so no particular effort has  
been put forth to catch him.

**Council Minutes.**

to purchase  
part of the  
until one o-  
get into lin  
25 people to  
one can pu

The stan-  
established.  
two general  
stead of ou-  
master is n-  
matter, for  
for every i  
his disposal  
the fact th  
better posta

An old ge-  
ward furnis  
ber of outlo  
a good deal  
ing to unlc  
boxes, and  
vited him to  
ting one op  
and worked  
tion for an  
to open it.  
and did some  
day tried th  
he is still s  
yet, and d  
when he'll c

**THE HEL**

Rantoul,  
private banl  
B. Vennum  
hamlet in Ch  
robbed today  
man, who s  
o'clock Art  
boy aged 22,  
in a quiet t  
money, at t  
the clerks v  
ler, Arthur  
the money  
ber backed

All alarm  
fore the re  
freight tra  
yards, tal  
gine. Sever  
selves and  
the train  
They crawl

**Logan City  
Death and  
Burial List**

To aid genealogists the fol-  
lowing record of deaths and  
burials in Logan city is re-  
corded by city officials, is pub-  
lished. The record begins in  
1865 and closes March 1932.  
Unless otherwise indicated  
the persons named here were  
buried in Logan city cemetery.

This is the first installment of  
the record of deaths and burials  
in Logan city as recorded by the  
city officials. The record begins  
in 1865 and closes March 1932. Un-  
less otherwise indicated the per-  
sons named here were buried in  
Logan city cemetery.

Able, Ardella. Father Enoch  
Able, mother Mary Jordi, b Jan. 3,  
1890 at Logan, Utah. d Sept. 6,  
1908.

Able, Enoch. Father Elijah Able.  
o Sept. 6, 1852 at Cincinnati, Ohio.  
d Feb. 22, 1901.

Able, Tracy W. No record.

Abelscher, Louis. Father Louis  
Abolscher, mother May, wife Eliza-  
beth Kunz, b Nov. 21, 1829, at  
Switzerland, d Mar. 18, 1919.

Abrahamson, Dortha C. b 1801. d  
May 6, 1871.

Achsenben, John Alfred. Father  
John Achsenben, Mother Elizabeth  
Bowman, b Aug. 24, 1831 at Bern  
Switzerland, d Oct. 17, 1931.

Adams, Emily. Father Hugh Ad-  
ams. Mother Alice Smith, b July 23,  
1817 at Logan, Utah. d July 23,  
1877.

Adams, Albert. Father Hugh  
Adams. Mother Mary Horlacher, b  
Oct. 9, 1876 at Logan, Utah. d  
July 20, 1878.

Adams, Alice Smith. Father  
Ralph P. Smith, mother Marion  
Cookston, b Apr. 6, 1874, at  
Trent Hedington, Scotland. d  
Oct. 3, 1927.

Adams, Alice Louisa. Father  
Hugh Adams. Mother Alice Smith,  
o Jan. 10, 1868, at Logan, Utah.  
d Mar. 1, 1868.

Adams, Alexander I. Father  
James H. Adams. Mother Agnes  
L. Izatt, b Nov. 19, 1893 at Logan,  
Utah. d Sept. 5, 1910.

Adams, Beth. Father Floyd Ad-  
ams. Mother Ethel Munro, b Oct.  
4, 1924 at Logan, Utah. d Oct. 9,

Feb. 5, 1931.  
Adams, Geo. W. Father Hugh  
Adams. Mother Margaret Webster.  
b Sept. 21, 1862 at Logan, Utah.  
d Mar. 2, 1905.  
Adams, Hugh. Father George  
Adams. Mother Margret Adams.  
b June 4, 1829 at Scotland. d  
July 23, 1917.  
Adams, Hugh J. Father Hugh J.  
Adams. Mother Margaret. b May  
11, 1857 at Utah. d Aug. 3, 1925.  
Adams, Ida Clarissa. Father Rob-  
ert Clarkson. Mother Ann Clegg.  
b Sept. 9, 1859 at New York. d  
Feb. 1, 1922.  
Adams, Ida C. Father Hugh J.  
Adams. Mother Ida C. Clarkson.  
b July 15, 1892 at Logan, Utah. d  
June 21, 1902.  
Adams, James. Father George  
Adams. Mother Margaret Adams.  
b Mar. 9, 1831 at Scotland. d Nov.  
26, 1914.  
Adams, James Hugh. Father  
James Adams. Mother Margaret  
Moffitt, b Nov. 17, 1860 at Logan,  
Utah. d May 9, 1922.  
Adams, Le. Mayne D. Father  
William G. Adams. Mother Vir-  
ginia Beun, b Jan. 27, 1906 at East  
Garland, Utah. d Sept. 3, 1920.  
Buried at Garland, Utah.  
Adams, Mary Horlocher. Father  
Jacob Horlocher. Mother Margret  
Aperman, b Mar. 17, 1831 at Can-  
ton Araw, Switzerland. d Oct. 27,  
1887.  
Adams, Marion N. Father John  
Nielsen. Mother Marion McNeil.  
o Oct. 17, 1861 at Logan, Utah. d  
Apr. 21, 1902.  
Adams, Marion. Father George  
T. Adams. Mother Eilon Smith.  
b Nov. 14, 1893 at Logan, Utah. d  
June 11, 1906.  
Adams, Margaret J. Father Jo-  
seph Moffitt. Mother Elizabeth  
Moffitt, b Jan. 24, 1830, at Red-  
ron Edenburay, Scotland. d Oct.  
14, 1905.  
Adams, Margaret, b Mar. 24,  
1831. d Sept. 21, 1862.  
Adams, Peter. Father Hugh Ad-  
ams. Mother Alice Smith, b Apr. 3,  
1873, at Logan, Utah. d Apr. 3,  
1873.  
Adams, Sarah U. Father John  
Q. Adams. Mother Sarah M. Cow-  
ley, b Feb. 20, 1804 at Logan, Utah.  
d Feb. 28, 1894.  
Adams, Sarah M. Father Neph-  
Cowley. Mother Unity Appery, b  
Feb. 4, 1870 at Logan, Utah. d Feb.  
28, 1894.  
Adams, Samuel M. Father James  
Adams. Mother Margret Moffett, b  
Jan. 12, 1863 at Logan, Utah. d  
Aug. 25, 1913.

FEB 1 1936  
Adams, William George. Father

A photograph from *The Journal*, a newspaper published in Logan, Utah. This paper, dated February 23, 1901, shows that the people in Logan knew that Enoch Abel was a "colored" man.

A photograph of a clipping from the *Herald-Journal*, February 1, 1936. This clipping shows that Enoch Abel was the son of Elijah Abel.



ENOCH ABLE, a colored resident of the Fifth ward, died at noon on Thursday, of pneumonia. Able left a wife and large family in destitute circumstances. (*The Journal*, Logan City, Utah, Saturday, February 23, 1901)

John Q. Adams, the man who ordained Enoch Abel an Elder, later became Bishop of the Logan 5th Ward. The following statement appears on page 709 of the book, *Pioneers and Prominent Men of Utah*:

ADAMS, JOHN QUINCY (son of Hugh Adams and Mary Horlocher). Born Dec. 16, 1866, Logan, Utah

... Elder seventy and high priest; formerly second, then first, counselor to Bishop William Hyde, fifth ward, Logan; chosen and sustained as bishop of same ward 1907 . . .

When the *Deseret News* announced that Enoch Abel had died, they stated that he had seven children:

Special Correspondence.

Logan, Cache Co., Feb. 22. — Enoch Abel, a well known butcher of this city, died today from pneumonia. He had been sick about two weeks, and leaves a wife and seven children. (*Deseret News*, February 23, 1901, p. 6)

Enoch Abel had a son that he named Elijah. The Logan 5th Ward records state that Elijah was born December 26, 1892. The Church Census records, however, state that he was born in 1893. He was baptized June 30, 1917. Sometime between 1917 and 1925 he was ordained to the Priesthood, for the Church Census Records for 1925 list him as a Deacon. These records have been microfilmed, and a copy is on file at the Genealogical Building. By the year 1934 he was a member of the Logan 10th Ward. On July 5, 1934, he was ordained a Priest by J. C. Hogenson. On September 29, 1935, he was ordained an Elder by Reuben L. Hill. This information can be found in two places on a microfilm in the Genealogical Building. This microfilm is a record of members for the Logan 10th Ward. Under the section Record of Members, 1927–1943, Elijah Abel appears as number 81. This membership record tells of his ordination to the Priesthood (a copy of it is reproduced in this book). On page 539, under the section Cache Stake, Tenth Ward, Ordinations to the Priesthood, 1934, Elijah Abel is listed as a Priest. On page 614 he is listed as an Elder. The Serial Number for this microfilm is 6360 and the Part Number is 22. This definitely proves that the Negro blood in the Abel family has not prevented them from being ordained to the Priesthood.

Bob Phillips states that there are at least sixty descendants of Elijah Abel (that is the Elijah Abel

who was born in 1810, who is not to be confused with his grandson who was also named Elijah Abel) in the Mormon Church. At least forty of these live within a radius of 100 miles of Salt Lake City, and, of course, some of them hold the Priesthood and are doing missionary work for the Church. It should be remembered that Elijah Abel had six daughters, therefore many of his descendants do not have the name of Abel. Some of their children were apparently adopted into “white” families in Utah. It is evident, then, that some members of the Mormon Church who believe that they are “white” are in reality part Negro. Bob Phillips claims that some of Elijah Abel’s descendants think he was an “Indian.” Perhaps some of those people who are defending the Mormon doctrine concerning the Negro are themselves descendants of Elijah Abel. There are many members of the Mormon Church who have the name “Abel” who are not descendants of the Negro Elijah Abel, but, on the other hand, there are members of the Mormon Church who are descendants of Elijah Abel who do not go by the name of “Abel.”

There were other Negroes, who were not related to the Abel family, who have held the Priesthood in the Mormon Church. Leonard Kirkpatrick made this statement:

To begin with, Negroes were admitted to full membership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. (*The Negro and the L.D.S. Church*, *Pen*, Winter, 1954, p. 12)

William E. Berrett, Vice Administrator of the Brigham Young University, tells of a Negro who was ordained to the Priesthood:

It appears that one person of Negro blood had been ordained an Elder by William Smith while he was on his mission in New York State as evidenced by a letter appearing in *Journal History*, June 2, 1847:

“At this place (Batavia, New York) I found a colored brother by the name of Lewis, a barber and an Elder in the Church ordained by William Smith. This Lewis, I am also informed, has a son who is married to a white girl and both are members of the Church.” (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 7)

Another Negro who was apparently ordained to the Priesthood was Edward Leggroan. In the 1914 Church Census the Leggroans are listed as “Colored.” Kate B. Carter reproduces the following letter from Sarah Leggroan:

Dear Mrs. Carter:

Edward Leggroan lived in the 9th Ward. He was a deacon. In those days the deacons cleaned the church, looked after the lamps and fire. There was another

family came at the same time from Mississippi, Samuel D. Chambers and Amanda, his wife, and a son Peter.

Amanda is Edward Leggroan's sister.

Sincerely,

Sarah Leggroan

(*The Negro Pioneer*, Daughters of Utah Pioneers, Lesson For May, 1965, p. 547)

There were probably other Negroes who were ordained to the Priesthood. L. H. Kirkpatrick made the following statement:

The reason there might have been other colored members in full standing is that some of the first converts and branches of the Church were long on faith, but short on records. (*Pen*, Winter, 1954, p. 12)

Joseph Fielding Smith, now President of the Church, has done his best to cover up the fact that Negroes have been ordained to the Priesthood. On June 8, 1960, a woman, who is a member of the Mormon Church, wrote a letter to Joseph Fielding Smith (who is the Church Historian and President of the Council of the Twelve Apostles) asking him concerning the ordination of Negroes. In this letter she stated:

Dear Brother Joseph Fielding Smith,

.....  
Last night at our Mutual class we were studying the 38 Sec. of Doctrine and Covenant verse 16, where in—All flesh is mine and I am no respecter of persons. This led on to discussion and some one remarked that negroes were ordained Elders in the early church.

Will you please tell me who the man was, at what time did this happen, and who ordained him? . . . Was more than one negro ordained an Elder? . . .

The answer she received was postmarked June 10, 1960, and read as follows:

Negroes were not ordained in the early Church.

Lately the truth about Elijah Abel has become more generally known, and in a letter dated April 10, 1963, Joseph Fielding Smith stated:

. . . this statement that Elijah Abel was so ordained has traveled to the end of the earth.

In the same letter Joseph Fielding Smith admitted that Elijah Able was ordained:

It is true that elders of the church laid hands on a Negro and blessed him "apparently" with the Priesthood, but they could not give that which the Lord had denied. It is true that Elijah Able was so "ordained."

In less than three years Joseph Fielding Smith had to change his story from "Negroes were not ordained in the early Church" to "It is true that elders of the church laid hands on a Negro and blessed him 'apparently' with the Priesthood . . . It is true that Elijah Abel was so 'ordained.'"

It is very interesting to note that Joseph Fielding Smith has criticized the Reorganized Church for ordaining a "few" Negroes to the Priesthood:

In the "Reorganized" Church they have a few, at least, of the Negro race, that they have "ordained to the priesthood," but it is contrary to the word of God. (*Origin of the Reorganized Church and the Question of Succession*, by Joseph Fielding Smith, p. 130)

William E. Berrett, Vice Administrator of the Brigham Young University, admitted that two Negroes were ordained to the Priesthood in the early Church, however, he stated that in a meeting held May 31, 1879, the "leaders of the Church reapproved" that Negroes could not hold the Priesthood. William E. Berrett states that Elijah Abel was "light of color," and he infers that the man who ordained him may not have known that he was a Negro:

It is not known who ordained him or whether or not it was known at the time that he had Negro blood. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 7)

William E. Berrett quotes Zebedee Coltrin as making the following statement:

Brother Coltrin further said: Brother Abel was ordained a seventy . . . and when the Prophet Joseph learned of his lineage he was dropped from the Quorum, and another was put in his place. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 10)

This argument is absolutely ridiculous. Bob Phillips found a photograph of a portrait of Elijah Abel which was made in Galesburg, Illinois. This portrait reveals that Elijah Abel had very definite Negro features. Joseph Smith would have had to have been almost blind not to have recognized that Elijah Abel was "colored."



It should be remembered that Joseph Smith lived in Kirtland at the time Elijah Abel was there. Zebedee Coltrin admits that he knew that Elijah Abel was a Negro. William E. Berrett quotes him as saying:

In the washing and anointing of Brother Abel at Kirtland, I anointed him and while I had my hands upon his head, I never had such unpleasant feelings in my life. And I said, "I never would again anoint another person who had negro blood in him unless I was commanded by the Prophet to do so." (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 11)

If Zebedee Coltrin knew that Elijah Abel was a Negro, is it possible to believe that Joseph Smith did not know this? Bob Phillip's photograph of Elijah Abel's portrait reveals that he had very prominent Negroid features. Joseph Smith must have been well aware of the fact that he was a Negro. Arthur M. Richardson uses the same type of argument as William E. Berrett:

Much is made of the fact that a Negro, Elija[h] Abel was given the Priesthood during the early days of the Church. It should be pointed out, however, that this was done without the Prophet Joseph's knowledge and that when he found out he had Elijah Abel dropped from the quorum. (Church Library). (*That Ye May Not Be Deceived*, p. 8)

Notice that the only source Mr. Richardson gives for this statement is the "Church Library." Since the Church Library has thousands of books and manuscripts, we believe that Mr. Richardson should have been more specific in his reference. In his other references he tells the name of the book and the page number. Perhaps he was referring to the statement by Zebedee Coltrin; if so, it must be remembered that this statement was made at least thirty years after the event was supposed to have occurred. But even if it was possible for Mr. Richardson to prove that Elijah Abel was "dropped from the quorum," how would he explain the fact that "In 1883" Elijah Abel was a "member of the Third Quorum of Seventy?"

When A. William Lund, Assistant Church Historian, was asked if Elijah Abel was a Negro, he gave this reply:

You ask the question, "Was Elijah Able only part negro, and could a person tell that he had negro blood?"

The only answer I can give you is, I do not know if Elijah Abel was part negro or not. (Letter by A. William Lund to Morris L. Reynolds, dated June 21, 1966)

The Mormon writer John L. Lund is more direct with regard to this matter, for he admits that Elijah Able was a Negro and that he was ordained to the Priesthood:

"History records an incident of Elijah Abel, a Negro, being given the Priesthood" (*The Church and the Negro*, p. 76). Nevertheless, Mr. Lund argues that Elijah Able was later dropped from his Priesthood Quorum:

... when the Church leaders became aware that this man had Negro blood, his Priesthood was suspended ...

That Elijah Abel was a good man is not in question. The fact that he held the Priesthood is also a matter of record ... Once it was discovered that Elijah Abel was of Negroid ancestry, he was dropped from his Priesthood Quorum (1879) ... he did have Negro blood and was therefore not eligible for the Priesthood. (*The Church and the Negro*, pp. 76-77)

Like Mr. Richardson, Mr. Lund's only source for this statement is listed as: "Record in Church Historian's office." And, strange as it may seem, on the same page that Mr. Lund states that Elijah Abel was dropped from his Quorum, he quotes Andrew Jenson (who was the Assistant Church Historian) as saying that Elijah Abel was still a member of the "Third Quorum of Seventy" in "1883." On the next page, Mr. Lund makes his argument even weaker, for he admits that Elijah Abel's descendants were apparently ordained:

It is also apparently true that several other Negroes, including some of Elijah Abel's descendants, have been ordained to the Priesthood. It is the policy of the Church in these and other cases to suspend the Priesthood from those who are known to be of the seed of Cain. It is admitted that the Priesthood has been mistakenly given to some Negroes who are light of color. However, the Church wishes to follow the order of heaven and the commandments of God; therefore, when Negro ancestry is discovered in a man who holds the Priesthood, he is suspended in the use of that Priesthood. (*The Church and the Negro*, p. 78)

It is not possible for us to believe that the Mormon leaders ordained Elijah Abel by mistake, took away his right to function in the Priesthood, and then "mistakenly" ordained his descendants. Mr. Lund claims that the policy of the Church is to "suspend the Priesthood" from those who have Negro blood, yet he furnishes no evidence to show that Elijah Abel's descendants have been suspended in the use of their Priesthood. We do not believe that the Mormon leaders will suspend the Priesthood from Elijah Abel's descendants. They would probably rather keep the matter quiet. If they really believe that it is "contrary to the word of God" to ordain Negroes (as Joseph Fielding Smith claims) why don't they search out the descendants of Elijah Abel and take away their Priesthood? Of course they will not do this because they know that there are many other people in

the Church who have Negro blood in them. According to an article in *Time Magazine* almost all white people have at least a small amount of Negro blood in them:

A glance tells that many Americans who are classified as Negro have plenty of European "blood"; white people with Negro blood are harder to distinguish, their African genes may not affect their appearance and they usually do not know that some of their ancestors "passed." In the *Ohio Journal of Science*, Sociologist Robert P. Stuckert of Ohio State University attempts to estimate how many white Americans have some African ancestry . . . When Dr. Stuckert has constructed his table for each census year, he reaches the conclusion that of 135 million Americans classified as white in 1950, about 28 million (21%) had some African ancestry. Of the 15 million classified as Negro, slightly more than 4,000,000 (27%) were of pure African descent. During 1941–50, he estimates, about 155,000 Negroes moved into the white category . . . people with ancestors who lived in the Roman Empire, including England and part of Germany, are descended from a broad cut of the empire's population.

The Roman Empire had no color line, and streams of people moved through it for centuries in every direction. Africans including those with Negro ancestry, fought in the legions, traveled as merchants or seamen, everywhere they went they left their immortal genes; so few white Americans can claim to have none of them, and none can prove it. (*Time Magazine*, June 30, 1958, p. 47)

If Brigham Young's statement that even one drop of Negro blood would exclude a person from the Priesthood were true, many of the Mormons would have to relinquish their Priesthood. It would be impossible to do as much missionary work in the South as the Mormon Church does and not convert many people who have Negro ancestry.

The Mormon writer Armand L. Mauss made the following statements in an article published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*:

One wonders, for example, why the Lord permitted the ordination of Elijah Abel (and I have even heard it claimed that Church records would show Abel's sons and grandsons to have been ordained too, although I have never seen any such records or their facsimiles). One wonders also how we can be sure that all who are given the Priesthood are free of even remote Hamitic lineage, especially in such ethnically mixed areas as Latin America and Fiji. I know first hand of at least one case (my boyhood friends) in which a family of completely Caucasian appearance was denied the Priesthood for years because of genealogical evidence of remote Hamitic (i.e. Negro) ancestry. Even appeals to the General Authorities were to no avail, until the evidence itself was impeached and finally found to

be dubious. Since then, members of the family have been ordained, but not, it should be noted, because of a relaxation in the policy itself . . . In cases of ordinations which seem to constitute "exceptions," or are otherwise questionable, it is not my responsibility to offer "explanations"; these must come, if they are to come, from the Prophets themselves, who, we must presume, know what they are doing. Nothing is to be gained, it seems to me, by nit-picking about occasional exceptions to Church policies anyway, as long as these are rare . . . (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Winter, 1967, p. 24)

Wallace Turner gives this information in his book, *The Mormon Establishment*:

The continual LDS insistence on racial bigotry has another serious defect, too, since it assumes that the prohibition is equal to all Negroes and always has been. This is untrue. All Mormons who have ever studied the matter know that Elijah Abel, the Nauvoo mortician who was a friend of Joseph Smith, was a priesthood member, even becoming a Seventy . . .

Various excuses and misdirections about Elijah Abel are found in LDS literature about Negroes. When all this has been sifted, the fact remains that this Negro was a full member of the Mormon priesthood for almost a half century, that he lived out his life in Salt Lake City during the period when the anti-Negro position of the church was becoming hardened into the condition we find today . . .

Jerald and Sandra Tanner, in a short book they call *Joseph Smith's Curse Upon the Negro*, assert that Enoch Abel, a son of Elijah, was ordained as an elder in Logan, Utah, and that his son, Elijah, a grandson of the first Elijah Abel, was ordained a priest in 1934 and as an elder in Logan in 1935. About the descendants of the pioneer Negro Mormon, the Tanners write:

"At least forty of these live within a radius of 100 miles of Salt Lake City, and, of course, some of them hold the Priesthood and are doing missionary work for the church." (*The Mormon Establishment*, pp. 241–243)

One indication of potential change is the astounding fact that in the past year or so the Mormons have been ordaining Fiji islanders into the priesthood. It came about gradually. For many years the church maintained missions among the Polynesians, first in Hawaii, then through the Pacific Islands. The Polynesians, of course, are brown but not Negroid in appearance.

The Mormon mission worked through the Polynesians on Tonga and then moved to the Melanesians on Fiji. The Melanesians are black—very black—and are described in reference works as Negroid in appearance except that their noses are not so flat as African Negroes and their hair is more inclined to stand out from their heads than to be coiled closely to it. It was impossible to get a clear-cut answer to questions tracing the background of the decision to make these Negroid

Pacific islanders into Mormon priests. But it is obvious that someone advanced the argument successfully that they were not African Negroes and therefore—whatever their skin color—were not the bearers of the curse of Cain.

A different thing is going on in South America where the Mormon missionaries are pushing ahead full throttle. There the former careful selection to keep out “white Negroes” has been allowed to slide a little.

But, sadly, sometimes the missionaries get orders from Salt Lake City to go to a new elder and tell him that he should not try to exercise his priestly authorities, that he has a Negro ancestor and everything was a big mistake.

“There is no question but that in Brazil they have been ordaining priests who are part Negro,” said one careful observer. (Ibid., pp. 262–263)

Speaking of Brigham Young’s statement that one drop of Negro blood would exclude a person from the Priesthood, Jim Todd made these observations:

Sweeping as this statement is, it can have no literal meaning without causing great, if not total reduction, in the numbers holding the LDS priesthood.

Of course Brigham Young made his statement a long time ago, and did not have access to later scientific concepts. Nevertheless as his words stand, they comprise an absolute bar. Unfortunately for Pres. Young, absolutes do have a way of being quite impractical . . .

It has been claimed that probably no European is totally free of Negro genes . . . It is one thing to say that most Europeans have relatively few Negro genes. That fact is certainly true. But they do have some, certainly more than the “one drop” mentioned by Brigham Young.

Obviously, few if any Eu[r]opeans are barred from the LDS priesthood. Yet do not Brigham Young’s words require they should be so barred? Where, then, could the line be drawn?

What possible method could be used to detect a person who had a single Negro ancestor as few as four generations ago? Furthermore, what if the colored ancestor was eight or ten generations back?

As a matter of actual fact, even if possession of relatively large amounts of Negro genes did, in theory, bar such a person (who probably would not even know of his Negro ancestry), the fact could not be detected, and he would be routinely ordained to the priesthood along with all the other 12-year-old LDS males. Therefore, unless drastically modified, there is no way Brigham Young’s statement can have any real meaning.

Yet just what are the reasons that the Negro is denied the LDS priesthood? Are they only trivial and unimportant? An apparent injustice such as this which moves against the winds of change merits a reasonable and public explanation. Why is there at present no convincing, or even any official, explanation?

Perhaps sooner rather than later, the LDS hierarchy will consider this an issue of the times, and either resolve it or clarify it. (*The Daily Utah Chronicle*, University of Utah, November 22, 1966)

Mormons claim that the “mark of Cain” was a “black skin,” yet they admit that all Negroes are not black. John L. Lund makes these statements:

Therefore, no one who is a descendant of Cain, regardless of whether he is black, brown, red, yellow, or white is allowed to hold the Priesthood. (*The Church and the Negro*, pp. 101–102)

The mark of Cain . . . was a black skin for Cain and his posterity. This distinguishing characteristic served several purposes. It marked Cain as the Father of the Negroid race. It also acted as a sign of protection for Cain and set his seed apart from the rest of Adam’s children so there would be no intermarriage.

Some have believed that the mark and the curse of Cain were one and the same. The mark of a dark skin was separate from the curse although generally the two are found together. It is possible to have a light-colored skin and still carry the curse of no Priesthood. (Ibid., p. 106)

In a letter published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Gary Lobb wrote the following:

We must therefore ask, “Just who is a Negro?” We, as a Church, have decided that the Melanesian Fiji Islanders are not while the Papuans of neighboring New Guinea are. In some of the branches of the Church which my wife and I have attended here in Brazil, there appear to be priesthood bearers who possess the essential characteristics of the Negroid races. I am reminded that someone of authority decided that these people are not.

These, I believe, are some legitimate questions for us as individuals within the Church to examine, and we should examine them within a context of our testimonies and with the assurance of the divine mission of Joseph Smith. (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Autumn 1967, p. 8)

## Unhappy

Joseph Fielding Smith, now President of the Church, would have us believe that the Negroes who are in the Church (and are denied the Priesthood) accept this doctrine without question:

Fortunately for the Negro, he is not denied entrance into the Church. . . . We have in the Church many good, honest, faithful Negroes who fully understand. (*Answers to Gospel Questions*, Vol. 2, p. 178)

This statement by Joseph Fielding Smith is in direct contradiction to a statement made by a Negro member of the Church by the name of Monroe Fleming. In a letter to us Mr. Fleming stated:

Dear brother Tanner:

I wish to state that the statement that the Negro is contented as a member in the church without the priesthood, is not true. I know most of the members of the Negro race in the Church and know that they feel that they should have the priesthood if they live a life based upon the principles of the Gospel.

Sincerely,

M. H. Fleming.

At a meeting held in Centerville, Utah, a Negro member of the Church stated that he was having a hard time explaining to his son why he could not hold the Priesthood. The boy had a paper route, and when he went out on the route he saw that many of the members of the Church were not following the teachings of the Church. His father was having a hard time explaining to him why he should be denied the Priesthood while those other people were not. Kate B. Carter made the following statement concerning a Negro who was a member of the Church:

John was a devout Latter-day Saint and the fact that he could not hold the Priesthood caused him genuine sorrow. (*The Negro Pioneer*, Daughters of Utah Pioneers, Lesson For May, 1965, p. 510)

On page 523 of the same book, Kate B. Carter made this statement concerning a Negro woman who was a member of the Mormon Church:

She had a great desire to go to the temple, and when she found that the temple was closed to Negroes, she scratched her arm until it bled and said: "See, my blood is as white as anyone's."

On page 535 of the same book, Mrs. Carter quotes Mary Lee Bland Ewell as saying:

Mammy Chloe loved the Gospel. I taught her to read, and she often remarked: "I'd be willen, honey, to be skinned alive if I could jus' go in dat Temple."

Edgar Whittingham, a Negro who is a member of the Mormon Church, made these statements:

When I made it known that I had decided to take steps to become a member of the Church, my friend, the person who actually taught me the Gospel or discussed

it with me or explained most of its features to me, very hesitatingly approached me one day and said that he had something very special to tell me. Then he proceeded to explain the curse on the Negroes. Naturally I was deeply hurt and greatly upset about it. I guess my emotions got the best of me. I didn't do anything irrational, but having been deeply wounded in the house of my friends, I left the Church and stayed away for approximately a year. . . . In time I gradually overcame the emotional hurt and after much reflective thinking, I returned to the LDS branch. . . . Up until the time I was told that because I was a Negro I could not hold the Priesthood, my knowledge of Christianity in the Methodist Church had persuaded me to believe that regardless of color we would all have the opportunity to do the same things or acquire the same glories. My reaction to being told I could not hold the priesthood was that it was a stigma of discrimination. Now this is the general belief that I think most Negroes hold today. Perhaps the only reason I am a member of the Church today is that I heard the Gospel before I had known of this particular curse. . . .

I've had contact with many Negroes since joining the Church who have not pursued their interests in the Church because they were repelled by awareness of inability to acquire full Priesthood fellowship. Even as a member of the Church, I still find the "curse" very difficult to understand. I find others also have difficulty understanding this problem. . . . I believe that through revelation a change may be made. . . . Whether or not Negroes will receive the Priesthood during my life I don't know. . . . ("Is the Negro My Brother?" Unpublished paper of Dr. Wilford S. Smith, as quoted in *The Church and the Negro*, pp. 70-72)

## Objections

Many objections can be found to the Mormon doctrine concerning the Negro. One of the most important is that it is not in harmony with the Bible. In Acts 10:34 we read:

Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.

In Acts 10:28 Peter said, ". . . God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." William E. Berrett admits that the Bible does not lend much support to the idea that the Negro should be forbidden any rights in the Church:

While the Bible contains no account of a Negro bearing the Priesthood of God, one would find rather

scant materials upon which to base any policy limiting the rights and participation of the Negro in God's Church. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 3)

Although the Book of Mormon states that the Indians were cursed with a dark skin, it does not say anything concerning the Negro. In fact, it states that all men, whether they are black or white are alike unto God. In 2 Nephi 26:28 we read:

Behold, hath the Lord commanded any that they should not partake of his goodness? Behold I say unto you, Nay; but all men are privileged the one like unto the other and none are forbidden.

In 2 Nephi 26:33 this statement appears:

. . . he inviteth them all to come unto him and partake of his goodness; and he denieth none that come unto him, black and white, bond and free, male and female; and he remembereth the heathen; and all are alike unto God, both Jew and Gentile.

David O. McKay, the ninth President of the Mormon Church, made this statement:

I know of no scriptural basis for denying the Priesthood to Negroes other than one verse in the Book of Abraham (1:26); however, I believe, as you suggest, that the real reason dates back to our pre-existent life. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 19)

Joseph Fielding Smith, the new President of the Church, admits that he has not found any scriptural basis for not allowing the Negro to hold the Priesthood other than the statement in the Book of Abraham, which is part of the *Pearl of Great Price*. He states as follows:

It is true that the negro race is barred from holding the Priesthood, and this has always been the case. The Prophet Joseph Smith taught this doctrine, and it was made known to him, although we know of no such statement in any revelation in the Doctrine and Covenants, Book of Mormon, or the Bible. (*The Improvement Era*, Vol. 27, p. 565)

### For Cain's Sin?

The second Article of Faith of the Mormon Church reads as follows:

We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression. (*Pearl of Great Price*, p. 60)

To avoid the idea that Cain's descendants were punished for his "transgression," the Mormon leaders have taught that the Negroes were "indifferent in their support of the righteous cause" in the pre-existence. Gaylon L. Caldwell made the following statement:

This doctrine is not without logical difficulties, however. Considering the Latter-day Saint dictum that "man is punished for his own sins," the curse on Cain is understandable and consistent with Mormon philosophy, since the Mormon scripture insists that he sinned knowingly and wilfully. But how is one to account for the penalty on all his alleged descendants? An arbitrary God who would permit millions of people to be deprived of the priesthood and hence its concomitant blessings, by accident of birth simply does not fit into the Mormon theology. As would be expected, this problem has led to the formulation of several theses. One of the most popular was framed by B. H. Roberts from a suggestion by Orson Hyde, early Apostle. Roberts suggested that since all spirits before living in the flesh had an opportunity to prove their fidelity to God and His laws during the "war in heaven" some of them might have been neutral, or proved less valiant than others, and thus lost the right of priesthood during their earthly sojourn. (*Western Humanities Review*, Winter 1959, p. 105)

The Mormon writer John J. Stewart stated:

Note, also, that part of Cain's curse was to have as his posterity those spirits unable to bear the Priesthood in this life. . . .

To suppose that the Negroes, the descendants of Cain, are born with black skins and are denied the Priesthood merely to perpetuate God's curse upon Cain, is alike an affront to reasoning man and to the justice and mercy of God. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 1, pp. 44 and 45)

Strange as it may seem, however, the idea that the Negroes did something wrong in the pre-existence (which the Mormon Church leaders now teach) is contradicted by a statement which Brigham Young attributes to Joseph Smith:

President Brigham Young, answering a question put to him by Elder Lorenzo D. Young in a meeting held December 25, 1869, in Salt Lake City, said that Joseph Smith had declared that the negroes were not neutral in heaven, for all the spirits took sides, but “the posterity of Cain are black because he (Cain) committed murder. He killed Abel and God set a mark upon his posterity. But the spirits are pure (i.e. innocent. See D.C. 93:38.) that enter their tabernacles and there will be a chance for the redemption of all the children of Adam, except the sons of perdition. (*The Way to Perfection*, by Joseph Fielding Smith, pp. 105–106)

To show how confused the Mormon writers are concerning the pre-existence, we have only to compare two statements they have made concerning Cain. John J. Stewart states that Cain was “valiant” in the pre-existence and did not fall to the temptations of Satan until he came to this earth:

Cain, a son of Adam and Eve, apparently had quite a different record in the Spirit world. He was likely one of the valiant ones there, and thus was born into this world under the most favorable circumstances, of a noble sire and mother, and was even privileged to walk and talk with God. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 1, p. 39)

Bruce R. McConkie, on the other hand, states:

Though he was a rebel and an associate of Lucifer in pre-existence, and though he was a liar from the beginning whose name was Perdition, Cain managed to attain the privilege of mortal birth. (*Mormon Doctrine*, p. 102)

### Egyptus and Pharaoh

Dr. Milton R. Hunter made the following statement concerning Egyptus (Egyptus was supposed to have been Ham’s wife):

Since Ham was a son of Noah, it is quite definite that he did not have a black skin and was not a descendant of Cain. But the scripture seems to indicate that the wife of Ham was a descendant of Cain and through her the curses were preserved (verses 21–25). Her name was Egyptus, “which signifies that which is forbidden.” Also, her daughter was known by the name of Egyptus, and Pharaoh was her grandson. He and his descendants could not hold the Priesthood (verses 21, 25–27). (*Pearl of Great Price Commentary*, p. 141)

One very interesting thing concerning the name Egyptus, which appears in the Book of Abraham 1:23,

is that it is read as Zep-tah in the original manuscript. The following is copied from a microfilm of the original manuscript which is in the Church Library:

The land of Egypt being first discovered by a woman, who was the daughter of Ham; and the daughter of Zep-tah, which in the Chaldea[n] signifies Egypt, which signifies that which is forbidden.

In the Book of Abraham this has been changed to read:

The land of Egypt being first discovered by a woman, who was the daughter of Ham, and the daughter of Egyptus, which in the Chaldean signifies Egypt, which signifies that which is forbidden. (*Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Abraham 1:23)

This change was evidently made by Joseph Smith when the Book of Abraham was first published. James R. Clark, of the Brigham Young University, made this statement concerning this problem:

From his original manuscript of the translation of Abraham 1:23 we find he first transliterated the name *Egyptus* as *Zeptah*. When he revised his translation for publication in 1842 (see H.C. 4:519, 548) he evidently changed the transliteration to *Egyptus* for that is the way it appears in his first publication of the text (*Times and Seasons* 3:705).

Shouldn’t [t] Joseph Smith have transliterated this name only one way. Not necessarily! The Lord told Oliver Cowdery on the occasion (D. & C. 9:8–9) of a previous experience with translation that he had failed in his translation because he had made this very error of assuming that he would be given a correct translation the first time he looked at the characters. (*The Story of the Pearl of Great Price*, pp. 126–127)

Mormon writers claim that since the word *Egyptus* means “that which is forbidden” Ham must have married a “Negress.” Since the name first appeared as “Zeptah,” however, we feel that this casts a shadow of doubt upon Joseph Smith’s ability as a translator. If he made a mistake concerning the name, how do we know that he did not make a mistake concerning the meaning of the name?

Bruce R. McConkie, in his book, *Mormon Doctrine*, page 314, states that the name Ham is “a name meaning black,” and Joseph Fielding Smith infers that he received this name because of the fact that he married a black woman:

It is very possible that Ham received his name due to the fact that he married a black woman. We learn that the names of many individuals in those early years were given them—and often changed—due to incidents which occurred in their lives. . . . It is likely that Ham's name was changed because he had a black wife, for ham is an adjective in Egyptian for black. (*Answers to Gospel Questions*, Vol. 2, p. 176)

In the Book of Abraham 1:25, we read that Pharaoh was the son of Egyptus, the daughter of Ham:

Now the first government of Egypt was established by Pharaoh, the eldest son of Egyptus, the daughter of Ham. . . .

In verse 27 of the same chapter we read:

Now, Pharaoh being of that lineage by which he could not have the right of Priesthood, notwithstanding the Pharaohs would fain claim it from Noah, through Ham, therefore my father was led away by their idolatry;

In Facsimile No. 3, which is found in the Book of Abraham, there appears a drawing of "Pharaoh." Now, according to the teachings of the Mormon leaders, we would expect "Pharaoh" to be a "black" man. Instead, however, we find that he has the appearance of a "white" man. There is a "black" man in the drawing but he is "a slave belonging to the prince." The following is a

photograph of Facsimile No. 3 which is taken from the Book of Abraham (*Pearl of Great Price*, p. 42)

In order to show that the Negroes are cursed as to the Priesthood the Mormon leaders try to prove that they are descendants of Ham. The *Messenger and Advocate* for April, 1836, contains a statement by Joseph Smith himself which indicates that the Negroes are the "sons of Ham."

### Negroes and the Gospel

The Bible teaches that the Gospel is to be carried to all people. Jesus is recorded as saying:

And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. (Mark 16:15)

Jesus also said:

Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. (Matthew 28:19)

Philip was actually commanded to preach the gospel to an Ethiopian (see Acts 8:26–39). An Ethiopian is defined in the dictionary as a Negro. Jeremiah asks, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin," (Jeremiah 13:23). In Acts 8:38 it tells us that Philip baptized the Ethiopian.



#### EXPLANATION OF THE ABOVE CUT

1. Abraham sitting upon Pharaoh's throne, by the politeness of the king, with a crown upon his head, representing the Priesthood, as emblematical of the grand Presidency in Heaven; with the scepter of justice and judgment in his hand.
  2. King Pharaoh, whose name is given in the characters above his head.
  3. Signifies Abraham in Egypt—referring to Abraham, as given in the ninth number of the *Times and Seasons*. (Also as given in the first facsimile of this book.)
  4. Prince of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, as written above the hand.
  5. Shulem, one of the king's principal waiters, as represented by the characters above his hand.
  6. Olimlah, a slave belonging to the prince.
- Abraham is reasoning upon the principles of Astronomy, in the king's court.

Although the Bible teaches that the Gospel is to be carried to all people, including the Negro, the Mormon Church has tried to avoid doing missionary work among the Negro people. Bruce R. McConkie, of the Counsel of the Seventy, stated:

The gospel message of salvation is not carried affirmatively to them. (*Mormon Doctrine*, p. 477)

William E. Berrett, Vice Administrator of the Brigham Young University, stated:

. . . no direct efforts have been made to proselyte among them. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 5)

The Mormon writer Arthur M. Richardson very bluntly stated:

. . . The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, has no call to carry the Gospel to the Negro, and it does not do so. (*That Ye May Not Be Deceived*, p. 13)

Dr. Glen Davidson makes the following statement concerning Mormon missionaries:

Mormon missionaries are directed not to proselytize Negroes and to keep out of "areas of transition." Not even Joseph Fielding Smith's invitation to "darkies" is tolerated in the mission program. The membership ranks are being filled with those whose religious commitment is to the maintenance of a racist society and who find Mormon theology a sanctimonious front for their convictions. (*The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, p. 1183)

The Mormon publication, *The Pearl of Great Price*, is used by Mormon writers to justify not taking the Gospel to the Negro. In the Book of Moses, which is part of the *Pearl of Great Price*, we read:

. . . and there was a blackness came upon all the children of Canaan, that they were despised among all people. . . .

And it came to pass that Enoch continued to call upon all the people, save it were the people of Canaan, to repent. (*Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Moses 7:8 and 12).

Joseph Fielding Smith, who is now President of the Mormon Church, made this statement:

The Canaanites before the flood preserved the curse in the land; the Gospel was not taken to them, and no other people would associate with them. (*The Way to Perfection*, p. 108)

The Mormon Apostle Mark E. Petersen made this statement:

When he told Enoch not to preach the gospel to the descendants of Cain who were black, the Lord engaged in segregation. (*Race Problems—As They Affect The Church*, p. 5)

The Mormon writer Arthur M. Richardson stated:

Also, the gospel was not carried to this segregated black group.

"And it came to pass that Enoch continued to call upon all the people, save it were the people of Canaan, to repent."

These quotations so far point out that the Negroes tread the earth with black dishonorable bodies as a judgment of God because at the time of decision in the pre-existence they were faint-hearted and exhibited an infirmity of purpose—they were not valiant in the cause of the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, they were entitled to no better earthly lineage than that of the first earthly murderer, Cain. They were to be the "servant of servants." They were to be segregated. No effort was made to carry the gospel to them as a people. (*That Ye May Not Be Deceived*, pp. 9 and 10)

In the *National Observer* for June 17, 1963, the following appeared:

It's hardly a surprise then that the Mormon Church has only a few hundred Negroes on its rolls. And, though Mormon missions seek new members in most parts of the world, its voice is strangely silent in the Negro nations of Africa.

In 1947 the Mormon Church was considering doing missionary work in Cuba. On June 20, 1947, a Mission President wrote Lowry Nelson, a "nationally prominent sociologist" (who was also a member of the Mormon Church) desiring to know whether missionary work could be done in Cuba without bringing people with Negro blood into the Church. In this letter he stated:

A short time ago at the request of the First Presidency I visited Cuba in view of doing missionary work on that island. While there I met Mr. Chester W.



Young . . . He was very helpful to us and in the course of our conversation I learned that he was very well acquainted with and wished to be remembered to you. . . .

He advised me that you spent some two years in Cuba making a study of rural communities. Your study there would be very helpful to us. I would appreciate your opinion as to the advisability of doing missionary work particularly in the rural sections of Cuba, knowing, of course, your concept of the Negro and his position as to the Priesthood.

Are there groups of pure white blood in the rural sections, particularly in the small communities? If so, are they maintaining segregation from the Negroes? The best information we received was that in the rural communities there was no segregation of the races and it would be difficult to find, with any degree of certainty, groups of pure white people. (Letter dated June 20, 1947, typed copy)

On June 26, 1947, Lowry Nelson replied. In this reply he stated:

The attitude of the Church in regard to the Negro makes me very sad. . . . I do not believe that God is a racist. But if the Church has taken an irrevocable stand, I would dislike to see it enter Cuba or any other island where different races live and establish missionary work. The white and colored people get along much better in the Caribbean and most of Latin-America than they do in the United States. . . . For us to go into a situation like that and preach a doctrine of "white supremacy" would, it seems to me, be a tragic disservice. . . . I am sad to have to write you and say, for what my opinion is worth, that it would be better for the Cubans if we did not enter their island—unless we are willing to revise our racial theory. To teach them the pernicious doctrine of segregation and inequalities among races where it does not exist, or to lend religious sanction to it where it has raised its ugly head would, it seems to me, be tragic. It seems to me we just fought a war over such ideas. (Letter dated June 26, 1947, typed copy)

On October 8, 1947, Lowry Nelson wrote to the First Presidency protesting the church's doctrine concerning the Negro. On November 12, 1947, the First Presidency—i.e. George A. Smith, J. Rueben Clark and David O. McKay—wrote him a letter in which they stated:

We feel very sure that you understand the doctrines of the Church. They are either true or not true. Our testimony is that they are true. Under these circumstances we, may not, permit ourselves to be too much impressed by the reasonings of men, however well-founded they may seem to be. We should like to

say this to you in all sincerity, that you are too fine a man to permit yourself to be led off from the principles of the Gospel by worldly learning. You have too much of a potentiality for doing good and we therefore prayerfully hope that you can re-orient your thinking and bring it in line with the revealed word of God.

Twenty years later Lowry Nelson wrote a letter which shows that he was not satisfied with the answer given by the First Presidency. In this letter he stated:

. . . it is twenty years ago this summer that I was first shocked into a realization of the implications of the present policy and began a "dialogue" with the First Presidency. I had spent twelve months beginning in September, 1945, making a study of rural life in Cuba for the Department of State. The following year, 1947, a friend of college days was sent by the Church Authorities to investigate the possibility of establishing mission work there. Upon learning of my having been in Cuba, he wrote me to inquire if I had found many white people there. In retrospect, I realize that I was very naive. But the truth is, that it was my first real confrontation with this question. Inevitably, in growing up in a Mormon Utah village, I had become familiar with such phrases as "white and delightful," "cursed with a dark skin," the "third who sat on the fence," but they were just "phrases" that went in one ear and out the other. The Negro never came to our village. In my correspondence with the First Presidency, I was truly troubled to find myself in opposition to a fixed dogma. I decided to let the matter drop. . . .

. . . mission work among the blacks has been studiously avoided. Witness my Cuban inquiry.

7. Since we claim to be a universal church whose message is to go to "every kindred, tongue, and people," how can we justify the exclusion of over 100 million human beings? (Letter by Lowry Nelson, published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Autumn 1967, pp. 8–9)

### Nigerian Mission

On January 11, 1963, the President of the Mormon Church surprised the world by announcing that the Church was going to send a mission to Nigeria. Wallace Turner made this statement in the *New York Times*:

The Mormons are vigorous proselyters, maintaining missions all over the world, except in the Negro nations in Africa. They have a mission among the whites in the Union of South Africa.

Earlier this year a plan was announced to send a mission to Nigeria, but the mission has not left Salt Lake City. (*The New York Times*, Western Edition, June 7, 1963)

A few months after the Church announced the mission it became apparent that something was wrong. On August 7, 1963, we called the Mormon Church offices and asked if there was still going to be a mission to Nigeria. The woman in the Missionary department stated that conditions were “unsettled.” Then she stated: “We have been asked not to give out any information about it.”

It has now been seven years since the Church announced this mission, but the mission has still “not left Salt Lake City.” It appears that before the Mormon Church was able to establish their mission a Nigerian student, who was attending college at San Luis Obispo, California, wrote an article which was published in the *Nigerian Outlook*. In this article he stated:

In San Luis Obispo where I am attending college they have a very beautiful building. They use it as a Church and a place of meeting. The beautiful design of the house and architectural style—I am not an architecture major—was attractive to me. It was my first week in the city and the first time I heard of the existence of the Church.

I went inside and inquired what the beautiful building was used for. I was shown around the building by a student of our college. The interior does not give one the impression of a house of prayer—but this is beside the point. It was cozily furnished like a big conference hall.

The student invited me to their prayer meeting the following Sunday at 4 p.m. I was intrigued and went out of curiosity. I did not want to sit with the congregation. The white boy sat with me behind the large curtains that span the width of the very large hall. When they brought their bread and water I did not accept.

When their prayers broke up I was introduced to the leader of the Church in the city. We had a very long and friendly chat. But the evening got ruined when my curiosity again started wandering away. There was a large map of the world on the wall and on this map was shown the areas of Mormon activities. An innocent question popped out:

Why have you no mission anywhere in Africa except in South Africa? Mr. Roy said:

“Ambrose, my reply, I am afraid would wound your feelings.”

This, of course, made me more curious. I insisted for an answer. He gave it.

“It is our article of faith that the Negro was cursed by God and this makes him unworthy to hold the office of a priest or elder in our Church.”

#### UNGODLY RACE SUPERIORITY

I can't tell you here now how long we talked. But it was over three hours. In the end he lent me one of the most important books of their religion—*Mormonism and the Negro*. I did not eat or sleep until I finished reading the book. The following day I returned the book to him. When he asked me what I thought of the book I told him it was fatuous.

Their God is not our God. I do not believe in a God whose adherents preach the superiority of one race over the other. And this is what the Mormons preach.

The big question is: why should the Mormons leave proselytising among the Negroes in America and decided to go to Nigeria? The statement by one of the Mormon leaders about a “cautious and guarded approach” to proselyting actively among Negroes, in Nigeria should make Nigerians “cautious and guarded” too. Nigeria has the largest Negro population in the world (seconded by U.S.A.).

The Mormons could by trickery establish a church in Nigeria and use this as massive propaganda for propagating and spreading their religion of race hate and race superiority and discrimination in America.

Some may say that they want to change their policy. I do not think this would be a correct assumption. Why, let them start in America where Mr. Smith started his religion with his wife and relations-in-laws barely 100 years ago. Let them first of all make themselves acceptable to the Negroes here in the States before venturing to distant Nigeria.

... Nigeria is a Godly country. Mormonism is godlessness and I do not think it is wrong for any country to check the growth of godlessness in her society.

There may not be anything wrong for any individual to hold the views the Mormons hold; but there is everything wrong when a group of individuals join themselves together to preach a gospel of race hate and race superiority; and are determined to carry this doctrine into the very portals of the people it is discrediting. (Taken from an article by Ambrose Chukwu, published in the *Nigerian Outlook*, March 5, 1963, Enugu, Nigeria)

The Editor of the *Nigerian Outlook*, in another article in the same paper, promised to help keep the Mormon Church out of Nigeria:

Elsewhere on this page we publish an article by a Nigerian in the United States on a new but dangerous religious organisation known as Latter Day Saints. The formation of a religious body in far away America should not have been the concern of any Nigerian but for the fact that this sect, otherwise known as Mormons, believe as a cardinal of their faith that the Negro race is not equal to any other race in the eyes of God, as a result of which Negroes who are foolish enough to choose Mormonism as their religion can never be ordained priests.

Our correspondent has gone into great pains to expose this organisation because he fears it may come to Nigeria thoroughly disguised... These so-called Latter Day Saints must be recognised for what they are—godless Herrenvolkism—and must not be allowed into this country.

... since the United States Government preaches the equality of all races, Mr. Kennedy must ban this anti-Negro organisation that preaches heretic doctrines.

We must congratulate our correspondent for having the courage of warning us in good time and we would like to assure him that he has our full support in his campaign against this evil body. (Article in the *Nigerian Outlook*, March 5, 1963, published daily in Enugu, Nigeria)

Ambrose Chukwu was successful in his attempt to keep the Mormon missionaries out of Nigeria. The Nigerian government has refused to give resident visas to the Mormon missionaries. This has caused the Mormon Church leaders a real problem. The following appeared in *Time Magazine*:

Pending a new revelation, possible at any time, Mormons are committed to a certain degree of built-in segregation: Negroes cannot be admitted to the church's priesthood. For this reason, Mormon missionaries have never tried very hard to make converts in black Africa. Yet Mormons also believe that Negroes may be admitted to the priesthood in heaven. This apparently is good enough for 7,000 Ibibio, Ibo and Efik tribesmen in eastern Nigeria, who have gone ahead to organize their own branch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

... Fascinated by the dramatic life of the Mormon prophet, Anie Dick Obot of Uyo decided to form a branch of the church in Nigeria, and wrote for more information to Mormon headquarters in Salt Lake City. Mormon leaders sent back books explaining their laws and doctrines, and in 1959 dispatched to Africa Elder Lamar Williams, who was much impressed by the Nigerian's zeal and orthodoxy. Since then, the Nigerian Saints, governed by Obot and a council of 75 elders, have established branches in six cities.

Church chiefs are somewhat at a loss on how to deal with their new African converts, especially since the Nigerian government will not give resident visas to any missionaries from the U.S. "This is quite a unique situation," admits Hugh B. Brown, Mormon first counselor. One problem now is that in the absence of supervision from Utah the Nigerian Saints appear to be deviating somewhat from strict adherence to revelation. Some Nigerian Mormons practice polygamy— forbidden in the U.S. church since 1890—and the converts already seem to have established their own black hierarchy, priests and all. "I don't have to wait for revelation to know that I am the natural head in Nigeria," snaps Obot, who is accepted by his elders as their bishop. "Nigerian priests will run their own branch. This is their creation, and they are in their own country. (*Time Magazine*, June 18, 1965, p. 56)

Dr. Glen W. Davidson made this statement concerning the failure of the Nigerian mission:

Most of the Mormon hierarchy did not regret their inability to send missionaries into "black Africa" nearly as much as they regretted the unfavorable publicity. (*The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, p. 1184)

### Prejudice?

An examination of early Mormon history plainly reveals that the doctrine concerning the Negro grew out of prejudice. At the time the Mormon leaders were formulating this doctrine slavery was an accepted practice in the southern part of the United States and other parts of the world. In many places Negroes were treated as animals. In the *Life of David Livingstone* the following statement appears:

Added to the lack of rain was the threatening attitude of the Boers of the Transvaal, who hated Livingstone because of his attempts to christianize the natives, whom they regarded as without souls and made only to serve the white man, and who were seeking an occasion of quarrel as a pretext for breaking up the mission. (*The Life of David Livingstone*, by Mrs. J. H. Worcester, Jr., p. 32)

William E. Berrett made this statement:

True, wherever the Negro existed under conditions of slavery as in the Southern States of America he was considered as inferior to the Whites and was usually segregated in Church services. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 3)

The Mormon writers would not, of course, want us to believe that their leaders were influenced by the prejudice of their time. John J. Stewart stated:

The Prophet's whole life shows beyond doubt that he was not afraid of persecution nor public censure nor ridicule. He openly taught his convictions of truth, no matter how much trouble and hardship it brought upon him. He even gave his life rather than yield to such pressure or to compromise on truth.

To suppose that he would curry the favor of the world by manifesting a prejudice against the Negro is an affront to this courageous man, and to the known facts of history. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 1, p. 15)

In the *Utah Chronicle* (the newspaper published by the Associated Students of the University of Utah) for April 7, 1965, the following statement appeared in a letter to the editor:

. . . Joseph Smith and other church leaders brought upon themselves the wrath of the non-Mormons in the communities where they lived by denouncing slavery and the suppression of human rights and dignity. This has been a consistent and unwavering stand by church leaders throughout the history of the church.

Actually, the truth of the matter is that the leaders of the Mormon Church did show prejudice against the Negro, and some of them declared that slavery was a divine institution.

One of the first Negroes to join the Mormon Church was known as "Black Pete." In a discourse delivered by George A. Smith we find the following statement:

There was at this time in Kirtland, a society that had undertaken to have a community of property; it has sometimes been denominated the Morley family. . . . These persons had been baptized, but had not been instructed in relation to their duties. A false spirit entered into them, developing their singular, extravagant and wild ideas. They had a meeting at the farm, and among them was a Negro known generally as Black Pete, who became a revelator. Others also manifested wonderful developments; they could see angels, and letters would come down from heaven, they said, and they would be put through wonderful unnatural distortions. Finally on one occasion, Black Pete got sight of one of those revelations carried by a black angel, he started after it, and ran off a steep wash bank twenty-five feet high, passed through a tree top into the Chagrin river beneath. He came out with a few scratches, and his ardor somewhat cooled. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 11, pp. 3-4)

It would appear that at first the Mormon Church had no doctrine concerning the Negro. By the year 1833, however, some members of the Mormon Church began to compromise with regard to the Negroes to appease their slave holding neighbors. In the Mormon Church paper, *The Evening and Morning Star*, July 16, 1833, the following appeared:

Having learned with extreme regret, that an article entitled, "Free People of Color," in the last number of the *Star*, has been misunderstood, we feel in duty bound to state, in this *Extra*, that our intention was not only to stop free people of color from emigrating to this state, but to prevent them from being admitted as members of the Church. (Reprinted in the *History of the Church*, Vol. 1, pp. 378 and 379)

John J. Stewart claimed that Joseph Smith invited an abolitionist to speak in Kirtland:

In the early 1830's he wrote and published in the *Messenger and Advocate*, the Church newspaper at Kirtland, Ohio, an editorial suggesting that leading men

in the southern states should take measures to liberate the slaves, so that the Negro could enjoy the blessings of a free nation. He also invited an abolitionist to give a public speech in Kirtland at a time when abolitionists were generally hated in the North as well as in the South. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part I, p. 16)

Mr. Stewart does not tell which issue of the *Messenger and Advocate* contains this information, however there is an article written by Joseph Smith for the *Messenger and Advocate*, (later reprinted in the *History of the Church*) which shows that he favored the practice of slavery and was very opposed to abolitionists. Joseph Smith stated:

DEAR SIR:—This place (Kirtland) having recently been visited by a gentleman who advocated the principles or doctrines of those who are called Abolitionists, and his presence having created an interest in that subject, if you deem the following reflections of any service, or think they will have a tendency to correct the opinions of the Southern public, relative to the views and sentiments I entertain, as an individual, and which I am able to say from personal knowledge are the sentiments of others, you are at liberty to give them publicity in the columns of the *Advocate*. . . . I fear that the sound might go out, that "an Abolitionist" had held forth several times to this community. . . . I am happy to say that no violence, or breach of the public peace, was attempted; so far from this, all, except a very few, attended to their own vocations, and left the gentleman to hold forth his own arguments to nearly naked walls. I am aware that many, who profess to preach the Gospel, complain against their brethren of the same faith, who reside in the South, and are ready to withdraw the hand of fellowship, because they will not renounce the principle of slavery, and raise their voice against every thing of the kind. This must be a tender point, and one which should call forth the candid reflections of all men, and more especially before they advance in an opposition calculated to lay waste the fair states of the South, and let loose upon the world a community of people, who might, peradventure, overrun our country, and violate the most sacred principles of human society, chastity and virtue.

. . . I do not believe that the people of the North have any more right to say that the South shall not hold slaves, than the South have to say the North shall.

How any community can ever be excited with the chatter of such persons, boys and others, who are too indolent to obtain their living by honest industry, and are incapable of pursuing any occupation of a professional nature, is unaccountable to me; and when I see persons in the free states, signing documents against slavery, it is no less, in my mind, than an army of influence, and a declaration of hostilities, against the people of the South. What course can sooner divide our union?

After having expressed myself so freely upon this subject, I do not doubt, but those who have been forward in raising their voices against the South, will cry out against me as being uncharitable, unfeeling, unkind, and wholly unacquainted with the Gospel of Christ. . . . the first mention we have of slavery is found in the Holy Bible. . . . And so far from that prediction being averse to the mind of God, it remains as a lasting monument of the decree of Jehovah, to the shame and confusion of all who have cried out against the South, in consequence of their holding the sons of Ham in servitude.

. . . but I can say, the curse is not yet taken off from the sons of Canaan, neither will be until it is affected by as great a power as caused it to come; and the people who interfere the least with the purposes of God in this matter, will come under the least condemnation before Him; and those who are determined to pursue a course, which shows an opposition, and a feverish restlessness against the decrees of the Lord, will learn, when perhaps it is too late for their own good, that God can do his own work, without the aid of those who are not dictated by His counsel. (*History of the Church*, by Joseph Smith, Vol. 2, pp. 436–438)

It would seem, then, that Joseph Smith did “curry the favor of the world by manifesting a prejudice against the Negro.” Jan Shipps stated:

It is not surprising that Smith turned about and published an elaborate defense of slavery based on biblical justification of the peculiar institution. In an article published in the *Messenger and Advocate*, a Mormon newspaper, in 1836, the prophet not only defended slavery, but condemned the abolitionists of the North. (“Second-class Saints,” by Jan Shipps, *The Colorado Quarterly*, Autumn, 1962, p. 186)

In the same issue of the *Messenger and Advocate* (April, 1836) in which Joseph Smith defended slavery, this statement by W. Parrish appeared:

Not long since a gentleman of the Presbyterian faith came to this town (Kirtland) and proposed to lecture upon the abolition question. Knowing that there was a large branch of the church of Latter Day Saints in this place, who, as a people, are liberal in our sentiments; he no doubt anticipated great success in establishing his doctrine among us. But in this he was mistaken. The doctrine of Christ and the systems of men are at issue and consequently will not harmonize together. . . . we stand aloof from abolition societ[i]e[s]. . . .

We also believe that the constitution of these United States, is the best form of government that exists upon the foot-stool of God. Our wise legislators who

framed it were elected by the voice of the people, and after taking into consideration the general good of this republic have deemed it expedient to guarantee to the Southern States the right of holding slaves;—And we do not feel disposed to rise up in opposition to it. It is their right, and we expect they will be as tenacious of their privileges as we are of ours. . . .

And although political demagogues, and religious fanatics, in their blind zeal, may bustle and rage, and compass sea and land with the pretention to [word unclear] the condition of Ham’s descendants, yet God’s curse pronounced by his servant Noah will remain upon them; and Canaan must dwell in the tents of Shem and be his servant until He, who pronounced it shall order it otherwise. And all the abolition societies that now are or ever will be, cannot cause one jot or tittle of the prophecy to fail. . . . We would therefore be distinctly understood, that we do not countenance the abolition system, nor fellowship those who advocate its principles. . . . (*Messenger and Advocate*, Vol. 2, pp. 295–296)

In the same issue of the *Messenger and Advocate* another article appeared which denounced the abolitionists. In this article we find the following:

We particularly invite the attention of our readers to those communications upon the subject of Slavery. . . .

If those who run through the free states, exciting their indignation against our brothers of the South, feel so much sympathy and kindness towards the blacks, were to go to the southern states, where the alleged evil exists, and warn those who are guilty of these enormous crimes, to repent and turn from their wickedness, or would purchase the slaves and then set them at liberty, we should have no objections to this, provided they would place them upon some other continent than ours. Then we should begin to believe they were acting honestly; but till something of this is manifested, we shall think otherwise. What benefit can the slave derive from the long harrangues and discussions held in the north? Certainly the people of the north have no legal right to interfere with the property of the south, neither have they a right to say they shall, or shall not, hold slaves. . . .

Where can be the common sense of any wishing to see the slaves of the south set at liberty, is past our comprehens[i]on. Such a thing could not take place without corrupting all civil and wholesome society, of both the north and the south! Let the blacks of the south be free, and our community is overrun with paupers, and a reckless mass of human beings, uncultivated, untaught and unaccustomed to provide for themselves the necessaries of life—endangering the chastity of

every female who might by chance be found in our streets—our prisons filled with convicts, and the hang-man wearied with executing the functions of his office! This must unavoidably be the case, every rational man must admit, who has ever travelled in the slave states, or we must open our houses, unfold our arms, and bid these degraded and degrading sons of Canaan, a hear[t]y welcome and a free admittance to all we possess! A society of this nature, to us, is so intolerably degrading, that the bare reflection causes our feelings to recoil, and our hearts to revolt. . . . if ever the condition of the slave is bettered, under our present form of government, it must be by converting the master to the faith of the gospel and then teaching him to be kind to his slave. The idea of transportation is folly, the project of emansipation is destructive to our government, and the notion of amalgamation is develish!—And insensible to feeling must be the heart, and low indeed must be the mind, that would consent for a moment, to see his fair daughter, his sister, or perhaps, his bosom companion, in the embrace of a NEGRO! . . .

There is a strange mysteriousness over the face of the scripture with regard to servitude. The fourth son of Ham was cursed by Noah, and to this day we may look upon the fulfilment of that singular thing. When it will be removed we know not, and where he now remains in bondage, remain he must till the hand of God interposes. As to this nation his fate is inevitably sealed, so long as this form of government exists. (*Messenger and Advocate*, Vol. 2, pp. 299–301)

In the May, 1836, issue of the *Messenger and Advocate* a letter appeared in which the following was stated:

But, latterly, circumstances have transpired which would render longer forbearance, on our part, a “Sin”.—I mean the efforts that have been, and are now making, by the band of disorganizers, those enemies to all that is dear to us as a people, especially to our Southern brethren,—the “ABOLITIONISTS”. With the rest of the Reserve, one of their number, not long since, gave Kirtland the honor of his gracious presence; in order I presume, that he might teach us poor “deluded”, “benighted” “Mormons” that we were certainly out of the way, and would have no chance of gaining our salvation except we joined in and threw up our caps for his glorious doctrine of AMALGAMATION! But when the time come to count noses, he found he had “waked up the wrong passengers,” and instead of having the

“Mormons,” he had gathered together a little squad of Presbyterians,—those, who you know, are always foremost in every thing that would tend to subvert our blood-bought liberties. For we as a society, do not hold to any such doctrines—neither do we fellowship those who do, . . . (*Messenger and Advocate*, Vol. 2, p. 313)

In 1838 Joseph Smith answered the questions “which were frequently” asked him. Question number thirteen was concerning slavery:

Thirteenth—“Are the Mormons abolitionists?”

No, unless delivering the people from priestcraft, and the priests from the power of Satan, should be considered abolition. But we do not believe in setting the negroes free. (*History of the Church*, Vol. 3, p. 29)

At times the leaders of the Mormon Church have been very disrespectful to the Negro race. The following appeared in the *Elders’ Journal*, a Mormon paper which was edited by Joseph Smith:

We have often heard it remarked by slave holders, that you should not make a negro equal with you, or he would try to walk over you. We have found the saying verified in this pious Doctor, for truly this niggardly spirit manifested itself in all its meanness; even in his writings. . . . Nor was this niggardly course confined to himself, but his sons also, were found engaged in the same mean business.

. . . One thing we have learned, that there are negroes who were white skins, as well as those who wear black ones. (*Elders’ Journal*, August, 1838, p. 59)

Toward the end of his life Joseph Smith seemed to change his mind somewhat concerning the Negro and even spoke against slavery. Under the date of January 2, 1843, Joseph Smith recorded the following in his history:

The slaves in Washington are more refined than the presidents, . . . (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 20, p. 278)

Later Mormon Historians evidently felt that he had gone too far, so they changed his statement to read:

The slaves in Washington are more refined than many in high places, . . . (*History of the Church*, Vol. 5, p. 217)

Under the same date (January 2, 1843) Joseph Smith recorded this statement in his history:

Had I anything to do with the negro, I would confine them by strict law to their own species, and put them on a national equalization. (*History of the Church*, Vol. 5, p. 218)

Joseph Smith was Mayor of Nauvoo; under the date of February 8, 1844, he records the following in his history:

Thursday, 8.—Held Mayor's court; and tried two negroes for attempting to marry white women: fined one \$25, and the other \$5. (*History of the Church*, Vol. 6, p. 210)

In a letter dated January 2, 1844, Joseph Smith referred to the Negroes as "niggers":

. . . and rebellious niggers in the slave States. . . . (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 22, p. 602)

When the Mormon Historians reprinted this in the *History of the Church*, they changed it to read:

. . . and rebellious negroes in the slave States. . . . (*History of the Church*, Vol. 6, p. 158)

After Joseph Smith's death the Mormon leaders continued to speak against the Negro. The following appeared in the April 1, 1845, issue of the *Times and Seasons* (the *Times and Seasons* was a Mormon publication and was edited by John Taylor, who later became President of the Church):

After the flood and after Ham had dishonored the holy priesthood, Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his younger son (Ham,) had done unto him. And, as the priesthood descended from father to son, he delivered the following curse and blessing, as translated by King James' wise men and recorded in Genesis:

"And he said, cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren."

"And he said, blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

"God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

History and common observation show that these predictions have been fulfilled to the letter. The descendants of Ham, besides a black skin which has ever been a curse that has followed an apostate of the holy priesthood, as well as a black heart, have been servants to both Shem and Japheth, and the abolitionists are trying to make void the curse of God, but it will require more power than man possesses to counteract the decrees of eternal wisdom. (*Times and Seasons*, Vol. 6, p. 857)

On page 858 of the same volume this statement appears:

Like the fable of the dog and the meat, the Christian community are preparing to lose what little religion they may have possessed, by jumping after the dark shade of abolitionism.—So passes falling greatness.

Because the Mormon Church believed the Negroes were an "inferior race" it was easy for them to accept the practice of slavery. Slavery was an accepted practice in the territory of Utah. The following appeared in the *Millennial Star* in 1851:

We feel it to be our duty to define our position in relation to the subject of Slavery. There are several men in the Valley of the Salt Lake from the Southern States, who have their slaves with them. (*Millennial Star*, 1851, p. 63)

Wallace Turner made this observation: "The speeches and writings of the early Mormon leaders in Utah again and again make it clear that they were running a white theocracy, and that Negroes were not wanted. They would accept them, but only as servants—now and in the hereafter" (*The Mormon Establishment*, p. 225). David L. Brewer stated: "Abolitionism was ridiculed in early Utah, and some slavery was practiced" (*Utah Elites and Utah Racial Norms*, by David L. Brewer, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, August, 1966, p. 148). Stanley P. Hirshon cites the *New York Herald* for May 4, 1855. In this issue Brigham Young stated that the Negro "is damned":

Like many defenders of slavery, Young considered Negroes the children of Canaan, who in the Bible had been made a "servant of servants" to his brothers. "The negro is damned," Young preached in 1855, "and is to serve his master till God chooses to remove the curse. . . . These are my views—and, consequently, the views of all the saints—on abolitionism. (*The Lion of the Lord*, by Stanley P. Hirshon, New York, 1969, p. 256)

In his Master's thesis, James Boyd Christensen wrote:

In 1850 Utah was the only western territory which had Negro slaves. It was one of the few places in the United States where Negro and Indian Slavery occurred in the same locale in the same period. It is interesting to draw a parallel between the attitudes of the Mormon

colonizers toward Negro slavery and the Indian slave trade. In short, they countenanced slavery of Negroes among them while they abhorred the slave traffic among the Indians and legislated against it. ("A Social Survey of the Negro Population of Salt Lake City, Utah," Unpublished Master's thesis, Library, University of Utah, pp. 11, 12)

On page 98 of the same thesis Mr. Christensen states:

The slaves were held primarily by converts to the Mormon Church from the South. According to the compromise of 1850, Utah was left open to slavery, and by the compromise of 1859 it was to be a slave state when admitted to the Union.

The following appeared in the *Utah State Historical Quarterly*:

According to Dr. John Z. Brown, his father obtained Betsy Brown, a 16 year old mulatto girl from St. Louis and brought her to Lehi, Utah, in 1848. At the time of the emancipation she married a colored barber, Flewellen. . . .

Monroe Perkins owned another negro slave named Ben, whom he sold in Utah to Sprouse, a southerner. . . .

I have been informed by Atty. Benjamin L. Rich of Salt Lake City that his grandfather Charles C. Rich, in whose honor Rich County, Utah, was named, owned three pairs of slaves that were later liberated in California when Rich went there in 1851. . . . A few of the slave-owners went with Amasa M. Lyman to San Bernardino, California, in 1851, to establish an L.D.S. colony; among these were Charles C. Rich, William Mathews, Daniel M. Thomas, William Crosby and William Smith. Their slaves were liberated in California as that state was then free soil. Mr. Lyman, Jr. relates that when William Smith realized that his slaves would become free in California, he tried to take them to Texas, but his slaves desiring freedom, refused to go with him . . . According to the U.S. census of 1850, Utah was the only western state or territory having slaves.

The U.S. census for 1860 gives the number of colored persons in the Territory of Utah as 59, 30 free colored and 29 slaves. Of the slaves, Davis County had 10 and Salt Lake County 19. ("Negro Slaves in Utah," by Jack Beller, *Utah State Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 2, pp. 124-126)

James Boyd Christensen says the following concerning the slaves that got their freedom in California:

It is logical to assume that the slaves desired their freedom in Utah as much as they did in California, but after 1850, Utah was open to slavery, and they could legally be held as slaves, while California was free territory.

During the period from 1850 until the Emancipation Proclamation of President Lincoln, Negro slave trading was carried on to a small extent in the territory. ("A Social Survey of the Negro Population of Salt Lake City, Utah," thesis, University of Utah, pp. 8-9)

The *Salt Lake Tribune* gives definite proof that slave trading was carried on in the Utah territory:

Patrick J. Sullivan, employee of a Salt Lake Abstract firm, while searching the records for real estate information, came across the copy of a bill of sale for a negro boy named "Dan" in a book containing transactions for the year 1859.

The slave was sold by Thomas S. Williams of "Great Salt Lake City" to William H. Hooper, same address, for \$800 . . . (*Salt Lake Tribune*, May 31, 1939)

Kate B. Carter has a photographic reproduction of the bill of sale in her book, *The Negro Pioneer*. It reads as follows:

Territory of Utah  
County of Great Salt Lake

I Franklin B. Woolley recorder in and for the county of Great Salt Lake and Territory of Utah, duly qualified by law to take acknowledgements, certify that Seth M Blair, personally known to me appeared this Seventeenth day of august A.D. 1859 and acknowledged that he of his own choice executed the foregoing transfer and mortgage for the uses and purposes therein Set forth.

Recorded aug 22nd 1859.

Franklin B. Woolley

Know all men by these presents. That I, Thomas S. Williams of Great Salt Lake City in the Territory of Utah, for and in consideration of the Sum of eight hundred dollars, to me in hand paid at and before the ensembling and delivery of these presents by Wm H Hooper of the city and territory afore Said the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have bargained and Sold and by these presents, do grant bargain and Sell and convey unto the Said Wm H Hooper, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, one negro boy "Dan"; the Said negro boy is twenty-six years of age, was born the property and Slave of Williams Camp on the 15th day of October A.D. 1833 in the town of Dresden Weekly County State of Tennessee; and by the Said Williams Camp was Sold to me in the year 1858, a bill of sale having been executed to me by the said Williams Camp for the said negro boy "Dan." To have and to hold the Said negro boy "Dan" unto



the Said Wm H Hooper his executors, administrators and assigns, against all and every person and persons whomsoever

Attest—

A. R. Jackman T. S. Williams Charler Evans

Great Salt Lake City

Sept 7th 1859

Recorded September 8th, 1859

F. B Woolley Recorder

(*The Negro Pioneer*, by Kate B. Carter, Daughters of Utah Pioneers, Lesson for May, 1965, p. 538)

John Brown “consecrated and deeded” his “African Servant Girl” to the Church. The following appears in the book, *The Negro Pioneer*:

From the autobiography of John Brown, we quote:

On the 8th of January 1857, I consecrated and deeded to the church the following:

Property and Improvements of real estate -----	\$ 775.00
Cattle, Wagon and Pigs -----	541.00
Farming Tools and Rifle -----	105.00
Household Furniture, Bedding, etc. -----	150.00
Twelve Sheep and Two Pistols -----	72.00
Silver Watch and Cooking Stove -----	55.00
Sixty Bushels Wheat -----	120.00
Corn, Vegetables, etc. -----	145.50
Sundries-----	75.00
African servant girl -----	1,000.00
	3,038.50

(*The Negro Pioneer*, Daughters of Utah Pioneers, Lesson For May, 1965, p. 528)

According to the diary of Hosea Stout, a slave owner’s right to hold a slave by force was upheld in the “Probate Court”:

Wednesday 18 June 1856. Law Suit before probate on an examination People vs William Camp et al. for kidnapping a Negro Dan. The case commenced Monday evening and lasted yesterday & to day till noon

It appears that Camp was the owner of Dan who had ran away and C. had went with three others to bring him back. The court acquitted them Carrington atty Genl for the people & Mr T. S. Williams & self for defts

(*On The Mormon Frontier, The Diary of Hosea Stout*, Ed., Juanita Brooks, Vol. 2, p. 597)

Brigham Young, the second President of the Mormon Church, taught that slavery was a “divine institution” and that the Civil War could not free the slaves. He stated:

Ham will continue to be servant of servants, as the Lord decreed, until the curse is removed. Will the present struggle free the slave? no; but they are now wasting away the black race by thousands. . . .

Treat the slaves kindly and let them live, for Ham must be the servant of servants until the curse is removed. Can you destroy the decrees of the Almighty? You cannot. Yet our Christian brethren think that they are going to overthrow the sentence of the Almighty upon the seed of Ham. They cannot do that, though they may kill them by thousands and tens of thousands. (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 25, p. 787; also published in *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, p. 250)

On February 18, 1855, Brigham Young said:

We knew that the children of Ham were to be the “servant of servants,” and no power under heaven could hinder it, so long as the Lord should permit them to welter under the curse, and those were known to be our religious views concerning them. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 2, p. 172)

On another occasion Brigham Young stated:

The seed of Ham, which is the seed of Cain descending through Ham, will, according to the curse put upon him, serve his brethren, and be a “servant of servants” to his fellow creatures, until God removes the curse; and no power can hinder it. These are my views upon slavery. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 2, p. 184)

George A. Smith made this statement:

Many men are foolish enough to think that they can thwart the power of God, and liberate the sons of Ham from that curse before its time has expired. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 2, p. 216)

What is the cause of all this waste of life and treasure? To tell it in a plain, truthful way, one portion of the country wish to raise their negroes or black slaves, and the other portion wish to free them, and, apparently, to almost worship them. Well, raise and worship them, who cares? I should never fight one moment about it, for the cause of human improvement is not in the least advanced by the dreadful war which now convulses our unhappy country.

Ham will continue to be the servant of servants, as the Lord has decreed, until the curse is removed. Will the present struggle free the slave? No; but they are now wasting away the black race by thousands. Many of the blacks are treated worse than we treat our dumb brutes; and men will be called to judgment for the way they have treated the negro, and they will receive the condemnation of a guilty conscience, by the just Judge whose attributes are justice and truth.

Treat the slaves kindly and let them live, for Ham must be the servant of servants until the curse is removed. Can you destroy the decrees of the Almighty? You cannot. Yet our Christian brethren think that they are going to overthrow the sentence of the Almighty upon the seed of Ham. They cannot do that, though they may kill them by thousands and tens of thousands.

According to accounts, in all probability not less than one million men, from twenty to forty years of age, have gone to the silent grave in this useless war, in a little over two years, and all to gratify the caprice of a few,—I do not think I have a suitable name for them, shall we call them abolitionists; slaveholders, religious bigots, or political aspirants? Call them what you will, they are wasting away each other, and it seems as though they will not be satisfied until

they have brought universal destruction and desolation upon the whole country. It appears as though they would destroy every person; perhaps they will, but I think they will not.

God rules. Do you know it? It is the kingdom of God or nothing for the Latter-day Saints.

Do you know that it is the eleventh hour of the reign of Satan on the earth? Jesus is coming to reign, and all you who fear and tremble because of your enemies, cease to fear them, and learn to fear to offend God, fear to transgress his laws, fear to do any evil to your brother, or to any being upon the earth, and do not fear Satan and his power, nor those who have only power to slay the body, for God will preserve his people.

We are constantly gathering new clay into the mill. How many of the new comers I have heard say, "Oh that I had been with you when you had your trials." We have promised them all the trials that are necessary, if they would be patient.

Are you going to be patient and trust in God, and receive every trial with thanksgiving, acknowledging the hand of the Lord in it? You will have all the trial you can bear. The least thing tries some people. Brother Heber and myself going to the island in Great Salt Lake, a week ago last Friday, created numerous surmisings and misgivings with some. I have thought that it might, perhaps, be well to notify you regularly, through the *Deseret News*, of my outgoings and in-comings; and I may as well now notify you that it is my intention to visit Sanpete, and, perhaps, our southern settlements this fall. If I should do so, I hope that my brethren and sisters will feel satisfied, for I shall go, come, stay and act as I feel dictated by the Spirit of God God being my helper, asking no odds of any person.—Amen.

were destroyed by the Indians. That unfortunate affair has been laid to the charge of the whites. A certain judge that was then in this Territory wanted the whole army to accompany him to Iron county to try the whites for the murder of that company of emigrants. I told Governor Cumming that if he would take an unprejudiced judge into the district where that horrid affair occurred, I would pledge myself that every man in the regions round about should be forthcoming when called for, to be condemned or acquitted as an impartial, unprejudiced judge and jury should decide; and I pledged him that the court should be protected from any violence or hindrance in the prosecution of the laws; and if any were guilty of the blood of those who suffered in the Mountain Meadow massacre, let them suffer the penalty of the law; but to this day they have not touched the matter, for fear the Mormons would be acquitted from the charge of having any hand in it, and our enemies would thus be deprived of a favorite topic to talk about, when urging hostility against us. "The Mountain Meadow massacre! Only think of the Mountain Meadow massacre!" is their cry from one end of the land to the other.

"Come, let us make war on the Mormons, for they burnt government property." And what was the government doing there with their property? They were coming to destroy the Mormons, in violation of every right principle of law and justice. A little of their property was destroyed, and they were left to gnaw, not a file, but dead cattle's bones. I was informed that one man brought five blood hounds to hunt the Mormons in the mountains, and that the poor devil had to kill them and eat them before spring to save himself from starving to death, and that he was fool enough to acknowledge it

afterwards in this city. This is the kind of outside pressure we have to meet with. Who wanted the army of 1857 here? Who sent for them? Liars, thieves, murderers, gamblers, whoremasters, and speculators in the rights and blood of the Mormon people cried to government, and government opened its ears, long and broad, saying, "I hear you, my children, lie on, my faithful sons Brocchus, Drummond and Co.," and so they did lie on until the parent sent an army to use up the Mormons. Now I say, for the consolation of all my brethren and sisters, they cannot do it; and that is worse to them than all the rest; they cannot do it.

The rank, rabid abolitionists, whom I call black-hearted Republicans, have set the whole national fabric on fire. Do you know this, Democrats? They have kindled the fire that is raging now from the north to the south, and from the south to the north. I am no abolitionist, neither am I a pro-slavery man; I hate some of their principles and especially some of their conduct, as I do the gates of hell. The Southerners make the negroes, and the Northerners worship them; this is all the difference between slaveholders and abolitionists. I would like the President of the United States and all the world to hear this.

Shall I tell you the law of God in regard to the African race? If the white man who belongs to the chosen seed mixes his blood with the seed of Cain, the penalty, under the law of God, is death on the spot. This will always be so. The nations of the earth have transgressed every law that God has given, they have changed the ordinances and broken every covenant made with the fathers, and they are like a hungry man that dreameth that he eateth, and he awaketh and behold he is empty.

The following saying of the prophet is fulfilled: "Now also many nations

A photograph of the *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, page 110. Brigham Young states that marriage to an African should be punished by death on the spot.

On September 23, 1855, George A. Smith stated:

For the last hundred years, philanthropists, who were ignorant of the order of God—of the irrevocable decrees of the Almighty—have exerted themselves vigorously to thwart the purposes of the Almighty, in trying to remove the curse of servitude from the descendants of Canaan; but their endeavors are vain and useless; it is labor lost, and answers no end. . . .  
(*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 3, p. 29)

On October 9, 1859, Brigham Young made this remark:

. . . the Lord put a mark upon him, which is the flat nose and black skin. Trace mankind down to after the flood, and then another curse is pronounced upon the same race—that they should be the “servant of servants;” and they will be, until that curse is removed; and the abolitionists cannot help it, nor in the least alter that decree. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 7, p. 290)

On another occasion Brigham Young made this statement concerning slavery:

In our nation slavery is the great bone of contention. Do we oppose the principle of servitude? I oppose it not in my judgment. If I have a man-servant or a maid-servant, they are flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone—they are the children of God as much as I am. In the providences of God their ability is such that they cannot rise above the position of a servant, and they are willing to serve me and have me dictate their labor. Then let them do service to me, and it is my duty to treat them kindly and reward them accordingly. . . . If he has given me power to rule this people, or to own a hundred slaves, he requires at my hands how I use this influence and power over his creatures, and he will punish me if I abuse it. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, p. 190)

In a sermon delivered August 31, 1856, Brigham Young stated:

If Utah was admitted into the Union as a sovereign State, and we chose to introduce slavery here, it is not their business to meddle with it; and even if we treated our slaves in an oppressive manner, it is none of their business and they ought not to meddle with it. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 4, p. 40)

A. L. Neff in his book, *History of Utah*, gives us some very interesting information concerning Brigham Young’s viewpoints on slavery:

The Mormon viewpoint with reference to the peculiar institution of the South was admirably set forth in the famous interview between abolitionist Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*, and President Brigham Young, at Salt Lake City, July 13, 1859:

H.G.—What is the position of your church with respect to slavery?

B.Y.—We consider it of divine institution, and not to be abolished until the curse pronounced on Ham shall have been removed from his descendants.

H.G.—Are any slaves now held in this territory?

B.Y.—There are.

H.G.—Do your territorial laws uphold slavery?

B.Y.— Those laws are printed—you can read for yourself. If slaves are brought here by those who owned them in the states, we do not favor their escape from the service of those owners. (*History of Utah*, by A. L. Neff, p. 618)

Horace Greeley was disturbed because the Mormon people did not seem to be opposed to slavery. The Mormon Historian B. H. Roberts made this statement concerning Mr. Greeley’s visit to Salt Lake City:

Mr. Greeley was disappointed in the lack of abolition sentiment in Salt Lake City, which he resented by saying at a banquet given in his honor: “I have not heard tonight, and I think I never heard, from the lips of the journals of your people, one word in reprehension of that national crime and scandal, American chattel slavery. \* \* \* This obstinate silence, this seeming indifference on your part, reflects no credit on your faith and morals, and I trust they will not be persisted in. (*Comprehensive History of the Church*, by B. H. Roberts, Vol. 4, p. 533)

John Taylor, who became the third President of the Mormon Church, made this statement concerning Horace Greeley:

I was thrown in his society in travelling from Boston, and occasionally met him afterwards; but I would not talk to him: I felt myself superior to such a mean contemptible cur. I knew he was not after truth, but falsehood.

This Greeley is one of their popular characters in the East, and one that supports the stealing of niggers and the underground railroad. . . . I speak of him, because he is one of the prominent newspaper editors in the Eastern country, and he is a poor, miserable curse. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 5, p. 119)

George A. Smith, who was an Apostle in the Mormon Church, was very disrespectful of the Negro race:

There is not a man, from the President of the United States to the Editors of their sanctuaries, clear down to the low-bred letter-writers in this Territory, but would rob the coppers from a dead nigger's eyes, if they had a good opportunity. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 5, p. 110)

Catharine V. Waite, a non-Mormon writer, claims that in a speech delivered March 3, 1863, Brigham Young stated:

You have just heard read the Message of Governor Harding, . . . While being fair of speech, and specious of promise, and lavish in his expressions of good-will toward us, he has been insidiously at work to prejudice the General Government against us, and in the secrecy of his private room has concocted measures which he urged upon Congress to pass, which, if successful, would deprive us of the dearest rights of freemen, and render us the abject subjects of this man, who has been sent here to govern the Territory. Man, did I say?—thing, I mean,—a nigger worshipper,—a black-hearted abolitionist is what he is, and what he represents; and that I do naturally despise. (*The Mormon Prophet*, by Mrs. C. V. Waite, pp. 90–91)

Although the *Deseret News* gave a summary of this speech, they did not report it in full. There are, however, sermons by Brigham Young which are printed in the *Journal of Discourses* which sound very similar to this one. In a sermon delivered August 31, 1856, Brigham Young stated:

Brother Robbins also spoke of what they term the "nigger drivers and nigger worshippers," and observed how keen their feelings are upon their favourite topic slavery. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 4, p. 39)

In another sermon Brigham Young stated:

The rank, rabid abolitionists, whom I call black-hearted Republicans, have set the whole national fabric on fire. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, p. 110)

Stanley P. Hirshon quotes Heber C. Kimball, a member of the First Presidency, as making the following statements:

The Abolitionists of the North stole the niggers and caused it all. The nigger was well off and happy. How do you know this, Brother Heber? Why God bless your

soul, I used to live in the South, and I know! Now they have set the nigger free; and a beautiful thing they have done for him, haven't they? (*Lion of the Lord*, p. 267)

The Territory of Utah gave up the practice of slavery along with the slave-holding states; however, the fact that they countenanced it when it was being practiced shows how insensitive they were to the feelings of the Negro people. Even after the slaves were set free the Mormon leaders continued to talk against the Negro. John Taylor, the third President of the Mormon Church, said that the Negroes are a "representation" of the "devil" upon the earth. In the year 1884, Angus M. Cannon stated that the Negroes could not enter the highest celestial glory of the kingdom of God. The *Salt Lake Tribune* reported him as saying the following:

I feel it an insult heaped upon Mr. Caine to ask him to go to Washington as our Delegate, because he [he ?] will have to tell Congress that he believes in the highest law known to God and man, but has not had courage to live up to it. . . . I had rather see a colored man, who is my friend here, sent to Washington, because he is not capable of receiving the priesthood, and can never reach the highest celestial glory of the kingdom of God. This colored man could go and stand upon the floor of Congress as the peer of every man there, and would be able to say conscientiously that he had not accepted the doctrine of plurality, because he could not. This man could not, of course, represent the kingdom of God in these valleys of the mountains, but would be a consistent Delegate. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, Oct. 5, 1884)

At the time that Angus Cannon made the statement that a Negro could not enter into plural marriage, the Mormon leaders were teaching that polygamy was essential for the highest exaltation in the Kingdom of God. In 1891 the Presidency and Apostles of the Mormon Church made the following statement in a petition to the President of the United States:

We, the first presidency and apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, beg to respectfully represent to Your Excellency the following facts:

We formerly taught to our people that polygamy or celestial marriage as commanded by God through Joseph Smith was right; that it was a necessity to man's highest exaltation in the life to come.

That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our president, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago, and was steadily taught and impressed upon the Latter-Day Saints up to September, 1890. (*Reed Smoot Case*, Vol. 1, p. 18)

The information which we have presented clearly shows that Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, John Taylor and other Mormon leaders did “curry the favor of the world by manifesting a prejudice against the Negro,” and their doctrine concerning the Negro grew out of the prejudice that they had in their own hearts.

It is very hard to determine just when the Mormon leaders decided that the Negro could not hold the Priesthood. Zebedee Coltrin claimed that in the year 1834, Joseph Smith said that the Negro could not hold the Priesthood:

Brother Joseph kind of dropped his head and rested it on his hand for a minute, and then said, “Brother Zebedee is right, for the spirit of the Lord saith the Negro has no right nor cannot hold the Priesthood.” He made no reference to Scripture at all, but such was his decision. I don’t recollect ever having any conversation with him afterwards on this subject. But I have heard him say in public that no person having the least particle of Negro blood can hold the Priesthood. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 10)

It should be remembered, however, that this statement was not made until 45 years after the alleged event occurred. It should also be remembered that Zebedee Coltrin was prejudiced against the Negro. He claimed that when he annointed Elijah Abel, he had “unpleasant feelings,” and he said that he “never would again annoint another person who had Negro blood in him” unless he “was commanded by the Prophet to do so.” A. O. Smoot also claimed that Joseph Smith told him not to “confer the Priesthood” upon the Negro in the South.

William Smith, who was Joseph Smith’s brother, ordained a Negro to the Priesthood in Batavia, New York, however, a member of the Church demanded to know if this was tolerated:

I wish to know if this is the order of God or tolerated, to ordain Negroes to the priesthood and allow in our organization. If it is I desire to know it as I have yet got to learn it. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 7)

As the years passed, this deep prejudice against the Negro began to work its way into the doctrines of the Mormon Church. Finally, in 1855, Brigham Young published a statement that said Negroes were “not entitled to the Priesthood.”

## Civil Rights

The Mormon Church has been very slow in allowing the Negroes equal rights. In the *First Year Book in the Seventy’s Course in Theology*, written by the Mormon historian B. H. Roberts, and published in 1931, the idea of integration and social equality for the Negro is condemned. Mr. Roberts stated:

Perhaps the most convincing book in justification of the south in denying to the Negro race social equality with the white race is the one written by William Benjamin Smith, entitled *The Color Line, A Brief in Behalf of the Unborn*, from which the following is a quotation:

“Here, then, is laid bare the news of the whole matter: Is the south justified in this absolute denial of social equality to the Negro, no matter what his (personal) virtues or abilities or accomplishments?

“We affirm, then that the south is entirely right in thus keeping open at all times, at all hazards, and at all sacrifices an impassible social chasm between black and white. This she must do in behalf of her blood, her essence, of the stock of her Caucasian race. . . . The moment the bar of absolute seperation is thrown down in the south, that moment the bloom of her spirit is blighted forever. . . . That the Negro is markedly inferior to the Caucasian is proved both craniologically and by six thousand years of planet-wide experimentation; and that the commingling of inferior with superior must lower the higher is just as certain as that the half-sum of two and six is only four.” (*The Color Line*, pp. 7–12). (*First Year Book in the Seventy’s Course in Theology*, pp. 231–233)

Mark E. Petersen, a present day Apostle in the Mormon Church, made this statement:

The discussion on civil rights, especially over the last 20 years, has drawn some very sharp lines. It has blinded the thinking of some of our own people, I believe. They have allowed their political affiliations to color their thinking to some extent, and then, of course, they have been persuaded by some of the arguments that have been put forth.

. . . We who teach in the Church certainly must have our feet on the ground and not be led astray by the philosophies of men on this subject any more than on any other subject.

. . . . .  
I think I have read enough to give you an idea of what the negro is after. He is not just seeking the opportunity of sitting down in a cafe where white people eat. He isn’t just trying to ride on the same streetcar or the same Pullman car with white people. It isn’t that he just desires to go to the same theater as the white people. From this, and other interviews I have read, it appears that the negro seeks absorbtion with the white race. He will not be satisfied until he achieves it by intermarriage. That is his objective and we must face it. We must not allow our feeling to carry us away, nor

must we feel so sorry for negroes that we will open our arms and embrace them with everything we have. Remember the little statement that we used to say about sin, "First we pity, then endure, then embrace."

....

Now let's talk segregation again for a few moments. Was segregation a wrong principle? When the Lord chose the nations to which the spirits were to come, determining that some would be Japanese and some would be Chinese and some Negroes and some Americans, He engaged in an act of segregation. . . . When he told Enoch not to preach the gospel to the descendants of Cain who were black, the Lord engaged in segregation. When He cursed the descendants of Cain as to the Priesthood, He engaged in segregation.

....

Who placed the Negroes originally in darkest Africa? Was it some man, or was it God? And when He placed them there, He segregated them. . . .

The Lord segregated the people both as to blood and place of residence. At least in the cases of the Lamanites and the Negroes we have the definite word of the Lord Himself that He placed a dark skin upon them as a curse—as a punishment and as a sign to all others. He forbade intermarriage with them under threat of extension of the curse (2 Nephi 5:21). And He certainly segregated the descendants of Cain when He cursed the Negro as to the Priesthood, and drew an absolute line. You may even say He dropped an Iron curtain there.

....

Now we are generous with the Negro. We are willing that the Negro have the highest kind of education. I would be willing to let every Negro drive a cadillac if they could afford it. I would be willing that they have all the advantages they can get out of life in the world. But let them enjoy these things among themselves. I think the Lord segregated the Negro and who is man to change that segregation? It reminds me of the scripture on marriage, "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Only here we have the reverse of the thing—what God hath separated, let not man bring together again. (*Race Problems—As They Affect The Church*, An Address by Mark E. Petersen at the Convention of Teachers of Religion on the College Level, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, August 27, 1954)

Bruce R. McConkie, of the Council of the Seventy, stated:

Certainly the caste systems in communist countries and in India, for instance, are man made and are not based on true principles.

However, in a broad sense, caste systems have their root and origin in the gospel itself, and when they

operate according to the divine decree, the resultant restrictions and segregation are right and proper and have the approval of the Lord. To illustrate: Cain, Ham, and the whole negro race have been cursed with a black skin, the mark of Cain, so they can be identified as a caste apart, a people with whom the other descendants of Adam should not intermarry. (*Mormon Doctrine*, 1958 Edition, pp. 107–108)

This teaching has deeply affected the attitude of the Mormon people toward the Negro. George A. Meyer made the following criticism of this teaching:

"The saddest part about holding to, and teaching such a doctrine, is not that it keeps Negroes from a position of honor in the Church . . . The tragedy consists in what the doctrine does to the minds of church people who accept it. Psychologists know that it is practically impossible for a person who has been taught in childhood that God put a curse on certain people to be able to accept those people in normal, civilized, unselfconscious association. If, in addition, the curse is related to a black skin, certain prominent facial features, the impossibility is heightened. Add to that, the denial of the right of such people to perform what the child's religion tells him is the most lofty privilege, that of being a priest in his God's service, and the child's mind is filled with a subtle kind of poison.

"A person who has been taught such ideas in Sunday School, during his most impressionable years, can scarcely avoid becoming insensitive to the many injustices and discriminations that exist in our society for the people he believes his God has cursed. This insensitivity towards the pain and hurt and indignity inflicted upon fellow human beings, is one of the hardest things to understand about Mormon people, who themselves know that they too, in times past, were a minority that received harsh and discriminatory treatment from fellow citizens . . . Our three representatives to the Utah Legislature from Cache Valley and Spiritual leaders of the Church, were so insensitive to the indignities and discriminatory actions to which our fellow American Negroes, dark skinned foreign students in our schools and universities and tourist of Negroid appearance are subjected, that they cast the negative votes that defeated the Civil Rights bill this session." (*A Critique of Mormonism and the Negro*, by George A. Meyer, quoted in *A Negro on Mormonism*, pp. 23-24)

Jim Todd made this observation:

The tragedy of this denial of the LDS priesthood is not that it is unfair to the handful of Negroes actually in the LDS church. The odious part of this doctrine is that it serves to rationalize all other forms of temporal

discrimination. Therefore, this denial indirectly affects all Negroes who come in contact with members of the LDS Church. . . .

People who have been taught since childhood that Negroes are “cursed by God” and therefore cannot hold the priesthood, probably find it perfectly natural to conclude that Negroes must be inferior—why else would God curse them?—and could not possibly make desirable neighbors, business associates, or sons-in-law.

The indirect cost of this doctrine in human misery and wasted potential can only be guessed at. (*The Daily Utah Chronicle*, University of Utah, November 22, 1966)

Wallace Turner makes these interesting observations concerning this matter:

The most serious problem facing the LDS church today is the Negro question. . . . A man can have skin black as a moonless night—and he can be a full-fledged member of the Mormon priesthood. But he can have blue eyes, white skin and blond curly hair and have an African Negro in his ancestry and find himself rejected by the Mormons as an applicant for priesthood. . . . Priesthood membership is a requisite for an office in management of the church’s temporal affairs. So Negroes are barred from office. As we will understand in the unraveling of the theology, the Mormon discrimination against the Negro is the ultimate that can be had on racial grounds. (*The Mormon Establishment*, pp. 218–219)

The LDS church practices racial discrimination. It clings to that practice in a nation which is going through terrible struggles to overcome the pernicious influence of other organizations with anti-Negro bias. The philosophy is completely unAmerican. It resists the American view that no man should be penalized for his race.

So long as the LDS church clings to this racist practice, it is a political and social cancer. . . . the overwhelming Mormon response to the current drive by Negroes to better their condition in American life has been indifference, inattention, irritation and smug self-satisfaction that few Negroes live in the Mormon centers. (*Ibid.*, pp. 226–229)

So the ultimate effect of this aspect of LDS doctrine is as racist as anything asserted by the Theodore Bilbos and Robert Sheltons in the bigoted corners of the southern states. . . . the LDS church actually is one of the most influential organs of racial bigotry in the United States. . . . there exists a current of powerful strength that for generations has carried racial bigotry wherever the missionaries carried the Restored Gospel of Joseph Smith.

True, this is all done in a cloak of Christian piety and concern for the brotherhood of man. Seldom is there

any surface cruelty. Yet until the federal government outlawed slavery, the Mormons bought and sold Negroes in Salt Lake City. (*Ibid.*, pp. 244–245)

David L. Brewer made this comment:

. . . the Utah situation has become significant for two reasons: (1) Before 1964, the year this study began, Utah was the only “Northern” state without civil rights legislation. (2) The Mormon church, which prevails in Utah, does not accord religious equality to Negroes. (*Utah Elites and Utah Racial Norms*, by David L. Brewer, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, August, 1966, p. 160)

J. D. Williams has written a pamphlet in which he compares the discrimination in Utah to that in Mississippi. He states:

Thirteen hundred miles, as Jim Crow flies, separate Oxford, Mississippi and Salt Lake City, Utah. Yet history and social patterns go far to bridge that distance.

. . . Oxford, Mississippi is really no farther removed from the Utah Capitol than the nearest Salt Lake City restaurant that refuses to serve a Negro.

Thus it is no accident that Mississippi and Utah, miles apart by land, should find themselves simultaneously confronted in 1962–63 with vexing questions concerning the rights of man. (*Mississippi, Utah, and Civil Rights*, by J. D. Williams, pp. 26 and 27, copy at the Utah State Historical Society)

The *Salt Lake Tribune* published the following on April 18, 1962:

Since Utah’s population is 98 per cent white, it is hard to convince legislators and others that the minorities need special attention. Some discrimination no doubt does exist in housing, public accommodations and employment.

Elmer R. Smith stated:

Young Negro students become frustrated “problem children” in the schools because of the knowledge of discrimination in the job and professional market place in Utah. They see no reason for school when they will not be given an equal chance to use their knowledge and training in the open market. (*The Social Status of the Negro in Utah*, A paper presented at the Symposium on the Negro in Utah, presented at the Fall Meetings of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, Social Science Section, held at Weber College, Ogden, Utah, November 20, 1954, p. 2, copy at the Utah State Historical Society)

The *Pearl of Great Price* is sometimes quoted in justification of segregation. The Mormon writer Arthur M. Richardson states:



That the seed of Cain were black and segregated is verified from the writings of Moses, as revealed through the Prophet Joseph Smith.

And Enoch also beheld the residue of the people which were the sons of Adam; and they were a mixture of all the seed of Adam save it were the seed of Cain, for the seed of Cain were black, and had not place among them.

Segregation of the Blacks from the Whites has a very ancient, honorable and authoritative history behind it. (*That Ye May Not Be Deceived*, by Arthur Richardson, p. 9)

On page 15 of the same book Mr. Richardson states:

But what is worse is the total lack of Christian leadership in the so-called Christian world, a leadership which for the most part endorses present-day programs that would rob the White race of its earned and God-rewarded place in the scheme of things.

However, there is no lack of that leadership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Today, as of old, His Church is in line with the preserved word of God. Its Living Oracles hold to the color line drawn by God. By following the precepts of the latter-day restored Church no one need stumble over the racial question.

D. H. Oliver, who was a Negro attorney in Utah for many years, made this statement:

In medicine, the cause of a disease is first determined and then the proper remedy prescribed for the cure. This same principle is true in the economic life of society.

We all know that racial discrimination does exist in Utah as indicated above and the problem is to determine the cause of such and apply the appropriate remedy.

It is not my purpose to antagonize any one or to jeopardize the campaign of our candidates, God forbid, yet I do feel that the racial problem should be approached forthrightly, at its source, in the spirit of humility, with malice towards none and charity for all.

We all know that the major cause of discrimination against the Negro in Utah springs from a doctrine of the LDS Church which holds that the Negro is cursed and not entitled to the blessings of the Priesthood. (*A Negro on Mormonism*, by David H. Oliver, p. 14)

On page 20 of the same book Mr. Oliver stated:

Different from the general concept of race prejudice, Utah has one distinctly all its own, designed

to nullify the Constitution of the United States, reverse the decisions of the United State's Supreme Court, ignore the mandates of the Presidents of the United States, and degrade Negroes to a position of servitude and economic slavery by their religious doctrines.

On page 21 of the same book Mr. Oliver stated:

Because of the doctrines, already pointed out, and constant pressure from Church leaders, employment opportunities for Negroes in Utah is confined to menial labor and positions of servitude and, thus, they find themselves faced with greater difficulties in securing employment commensurate with their qualifications than Negroes in the deep South. Every Negro child with ambition and fortitude enough to prepare himself for a better and higher station in life has to leave his home State and go elsewhere to get employment commensurate with his qualifications.

On pages 30 and 31 of the same book Mr. Oliver stated:

By reason of their numerical strength the Mormons elect most of the public officials throughout the entire state, and here is where conflict begins. In most instances these elected public officials, conscious of the spirit concealed behind the walls of the Temple, adhere strictly to the doctrines of their church in the performance of their public duty and thereby refuse to employ or appoint any Negroes in any position of authority or trust.

. . . it is claimed that the failure of the 35th session of the Utah Legislature to pass any Civil Rights legislation was due to hidden and behind the scenes opposition from the Mormon Church. Some of our ardent and staunch supporters insist that the Mormons have as much right to their religious beliefs as any, or all, other church groups, and, therefore, should not be censored for what they honestly believe. With this we agree, but we should keep in mind that there is a vast difference between the words "believing" and "doing." As indicated by President Kennedy's Physical Fitness Program, every man has a right to believe in, and exercise his muscles by swinging his fists in the open air but his right ceases at the point where the other man's nose begins. . . . Any church has a right to believe what it will but it has no right to impose those beliefs on others against their will, and when those beliefs are detrimental to the welfare of others to the extent of infringing on their right to earn a decent living, such a church has no right to use the machinery of the state to enforce those beliefs.

A Negro by the name of Harmond O. Cole made this statement:

I am a person of Negroid ancestry. I have lived in Utah for 38 years, and was employed by the United States Post office in Lake City until my retirement a few years ago. My wife and I been active in a number of church and social groups; our children have attended the Salt Lake City public schools. It is with this background that I present my story to you today.

The Negro finds himself in a peculiar position in Utah; he has no stated laws of the Jim Crow type, but he still cannot act as a free citizen in his community. This is so because of the "understood discrimination" against him. Let me give you a few examples from my own experience:

My son was graduated from the Salt Lake City high school system. He could not find himself a suitable job for his training—graduate work in engineering. This sort of situation presents a grave problem for our young people. There is no incentive for them to become better trained and better educated since they cannot use their training in free competition with other residents of Utah.

. . . A few months ago, my wife was asked to come to a hotel in Salt Lake City to call on a Caucasian friend. She was asked at the desk to take the service elevator to her friend's room, since Negroes were not allowed to use the passenger elevator. . . .

We of the Negro race in Utah and elsewhere do not desire special privileges. All we ask is to be treated equally as other citizens so we shall be able to contribute our due share to the building of a strong and free state and nation. (*Status of the Negro in Utah*, a paper presented at the Symposium on the Negro in Utah, at the Fall Meetings of the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, held at Weber College, Ogden, Utah, November 20, 1954, copy at the Utah State Historical Society)

The following appeared in an article in the *Salt Lake Tribune* for August 12, 1957:

A guest from Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, reported in Salt Lake City Sunday that, after a 2½-month tour of the northern United States, he had encountered in Utah his first rejection of himself because of his race.

. . . .  
 "I have been in all major northern cities from New York to Buffalo, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit and others," Mr. Vambe said. "I was rather shocked to be turned away from restaurants in Salt Lake City because of my race."

D. H. Oliver made this statement concerning hotels in Salt Lake City:

During World War II the Extension Division of the University of Utah invited Dr. Ralph Bunce to Salt Lake City for a lecture. Reservations were made for him at the Utah Hotel, a Mormon owned enterprise. Upon his arrival, the Hotel refused to accept him, but after much pressure, from high places, he was allowed to stay in the hotel on condition that he have his meals in his room and not come to the dining room. Marian Anderson had the same experience at the same hotel . . .

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell and his wife, Hazel Scott Powell, had a similar experience at the Temple Square Hotel in Salt Lake City. Such practice is prevalent throughout the State, except that in recent years, the Utah, Newhouse and Temple Square Hotels and many other places of public accommodations in and around Salt Lake City have changed their policy in this respect, for which they are to be congratulated. (*A Negro on Mormonism*, p. 23)

Dr. Glen W. Davidson made this statement :

The campaign in California last fall to strike down legislation which would bar discrimination in housing was openly supported from the pulpit by a number of local Mormon bishops and stake (district) presidents. This came as a shock to the liberals of the church. It is an even greater embarrassment for them to learn that until the California mission headquarters was moved to Oakland in 1964, the church went to court on several occasions to block Negroes from moving into the San Francisco neighborhood in which the headquarters was located. (*The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, p. 1184)

A Negro by the name of Daily Oliver wrote the following letter which was published in the *Utah Chronicle* (the student newspaper published at the University of Utah) on May 28, 1965:

Dear Editor:

In answer to Mr. Johnson:

I am a Negro who has lived in Salt Lake City for several years too long. Why am I still here? I don't know!!!

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of an experience I had with the LDS Church.

When I was a Boy Scout my troop was located in a local LDS Ward. It was necessary for me to attend (Mutual) weekly meetings in order for me to be a Boy Scout.

Making a long story short, I was in the recreation hall one day when the bishop called me to the side and told me that I could not come to the recreation hall again. The reason being I was a Negro.

With this experience and many others with the LDS Church, I have formed negative attitudes toward your Church. Subjectively, then, my views of the LDS Church cannot be false.

Daily Oliver

The Mormon Apostle Mark E. Petersen related the following:

Some years ago, back in 1936 to be exact, I became acquainted with a Negro family in Cincinnati, Ohio. . . . I went to Church there and became acquainted with [the] family of a Negro man named Len Hope. Accidentally he had found some of our tracts when he lived down in Mississippi. He read them and became interested. He wrote to the mission headquarters for a Book of Mormon, and by his own study, converted himself. . . . Then they moved up to Cincinnati to escape the "Jim Crow" law.

Up in Cincinnati, some of the members of the Church became extremely prejudiced against this Negro family. They met in a group, decided what to do and went to the Branch President, and said that either the Hope family must leave or they would all leave. The Branch President ruled that Brother Hope and his family could not come to church meetings. It broke their hearts. But, the missionaries went out to the Hope home and there conducted Sunday School every Sunday, and served them the Sacrament. (*Race Problems—As They Affect the Church*, p. 6)

The Mormon Church has found itself in trouble with the NAACP. Dr. Glen W. Davidson relates the following:

Throughout the spring and summer of 1963 the Salt Lake chapter of the N.A.A.C.P. tried unsuccessfully to meet with the members of the first presidency in regard to civil rights matters. Frustrated in its efforts, the chapter decided to picket Temple Square during the 133rd semiannual L.D.S. General Conference in October of that year unless the first presidency made known its stand on civil rights. . . . The N.A.A.C.P. chapter, which includes a number of Mormons, knew it would need the support of the L.D.S. Church if legislation were ever to be passed guaranteeing basic civil rights for minority groups in Utah. Utah had become the only western state without such laws. (*The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, p. 1185)

On October 5, 1963, the following statement appeared in the *Deseret News*:

Albert B. Fritz, NAACP branch president, said at a civil rights meeting Friday night that his organization

promised not to picket the 133rd Semi-Annual General Conference of the Church on Temple Square.

He added, however, that the NAACP will picket Temple Square, next Saturday if the Church does not present an "acceptable" statement on civil rights before that day. (*Deseret News*, October 5, 1963)

The Mormon leaders apparently feared the bad publicity that would result from this demonstration, for on October 6, 1963, Hugh B. Brown, a member of the First Presidency, made a statement to the effect that the church supported civil rights. In 1965, however, the Mormon leaders again found themselves in trouble with the NAACP. Dr. Glen W. Davidson made this statement:

Discussion of the race issue was stymied in the Council of Apostles until the spring of 1965. The Utah state legislature had before it several civil rights bills. Rumor fanned speculation that the church was working behind the scenes for defeat of the bills. . . . Again, after great difficulty representatives of the local chapter of the N.A.A.C.P. were allowed to meet with the first presidency. Again, McKay was absent. . . .

As a compromise—and to get the delegation out of their office—the two counselors agreed to place an unsigned editorial in the *Deseret News* supporting a fair employment and housing bill. Though the editorial was to be unsigned, readers of the church-owned daily would understand it to have the support of the first presidency. But no editorial appeared. Asked why, President Tanner replied, "We have decided to remain silent." . . .

Next day, Sunday, the N.A.A.C.P. organized and led a prayer march which called on Mormon leaders to use their influence in behalf of moral justice. Approximately 300 people participated in the march from the federal office building to the steps of the church administration building. (*The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, pp. 1185–1186)

The Mormon newspaper, the *Deseret News*, printed an article concerning the march on the obituary page. The following appeared in that article:

About 250 persons demonstrated in front of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints offices Sunday, asking for a statement on civil rights.

. . . .  
Mr. Driver said the NAACP is asking for a civil rights statement because the Legislature "has used the position of the Church to stymie the fair employment bill . . ."

He added:

"We feel we should protest the official silence of the LDS Church when the image of the Church is being used to stymie the bill." (*Deseret News*, March 8, 1965, p. B-11)

While the news of the march was on the obituary page of the *Deseret News*, the headline of the *Utah Chronicle* (the student newspaper published at the University of Utah) read as follows:

MARCHERS PRAY AT LDS DOORSTEP

In the article which followed this information appeared:

The marchers—about 300 strong—walked silently up the east side of State St. and west on South Temple, congregating under the imposing granite columns of the Church office building.

Three young people, leading the line, carried a neatly-printed banner reading, “LDS Leaders, use your influence for moral justice.” . . .

Wednesday, a committee from the NAACP reportedly met with high LDS officials in an effort to gain support for bills before the legislature.

...  
The NAACP committee reportedly left the meeting holding the “belief that a public statement would be forthcoming.” When none did and after Thursday’s defeat of the Civil Rights Commission bill—which Holbrook said was the most likely rights bill to pass—NAACP leaders called Pres. Nathan E. Tanner of the LDS First Presidency.

They reported that he indicated that the Church has chosen to “remain silent.”

In a speech during yesterday’s solemn demonstration, John Driver, NAACP local president, said “to remain silent is the greatest sin.” (*The Daily Utah Chronicle*, March 8 1965, pp. 1 and 4)

This demonstration did not end the Mormon leader’s troubles with the NAACP. The following appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

DENVER—A proposal protesting policies of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was passed unanimously Saturday for consideration in September at the national board meeting by delegates to the annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The measure was introduced by the Salt Lake City and Ogden branches of the organization.

The original proposal was not approved outright by the convention because of a legal technicality, said Steve Holbrook, Bountiful, a Salt Lake delegate.

The measure calls for the organization to petition foreign embassies to refuse to grant visas to LDS missionaries. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, July 4, 1965, p. A-3)

The following is from the July 2, 1965, issue of the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

The proposed resolution was offered by the Salt Lake City and Ogden branches of the NAACP. It also urged that embassies in South America, Asia and Africa “refuse to grant visas to missionaries and representatives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints . . . until such time as the doctrine of non-white inferiority is changed and rescinded by that church and a positive policy of support for civil rights, is taken by the same church.

Dr. Glen W. Davidson has made this statement concerning this action by the NAACP:

. . . the N.A.A.C.P.’s resolution against the Mormons is the first instance of a civil rights group’s calling a church to task on theological grounds. . . . Like many 19th century Protestants, the Mormon apostles read missionary statistics as a sign of divine favor. . . . The N.A.A.C.P. discovered in 1963 that the apostles will act swiftly to safeguard the image of the mission program. The effect of the N.A.A.C.P.’s accusation will be determined almost entirely by the threat made to that image. The N.A.A.C.P. must count not only on the “other churches” but also on the emerging nations to be outraged by racist doctrine in whatever form, from wherever it comes. Denying entry visas to Mormon missionaries to South America, Asia and Africa is one of the most effective threats that can be made. (*The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, p. 1186)

The following appeared in the *Chicago Sun-Times*:

SALT LAKE CITY (AP)—Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, a distinguished critic and authority on Mormonism, thinks time is running out on the Mormon Church to exert any influence or leadership on what he called “the greatest moral struggle of our time”—civil rights. (*Chicago Sun-Times*, April 5, 1965)

On May 3, 1966, this article appeared in the *Deseret News*:

The Salt Lake City board and membership of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People issued a sharply worded resolution Monday night attacking The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The resolution charged that the Church “has maintained a rigid and continuous segregation stand.”

The resolution also charged that the Church has made “no effort to counteract the wide-spread discriminatory practices in education, in housing, in employment, and other areas of life.” The statement said the discrimination was due, in part, to the “official race policy of the LDS Church.”

The statement ended by warning all branches of the NAACP to “be skeptical concerning any favorable support for civil rights by Church members.”

The resolution was signed by Salt Lake City branch president John Driver, secretary Mary Adams and D. Stephen Holbrook—head of the local NAACP branch’s press and publicity. (*Deseret News*, May 3, 1966)

### Athletes Protest

On April 14, 1968, *The Arizona Daily Star* contained the following statements:

SALT LAKE CITY, Utah (AP) — A Mormon Church leader said Saturday that a boycott by eight Negroes of a Brigham Young University track and field meet “is the action by some extremists who have gotten the wrong idea of what the church position is.”

The University of Texas-El Paso athletes stayed away from Saturday’s competition at the church-operated BYU at Provo, Utah. They said there was a belief on the campus “that the blacks are inferior and that we are disciples of the devil.” . . .

President Hugh B. Brown, a member of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Mormon, said the athletes apparently are unclear on the church’s doctrine denying Negroes membership in the Mormon priesthood.

“At the present time we do not give Negroes the priesthood. Priesthood, in our view, is leadership. There is not enough leadership among Negroes to warrant establishing him as a member of leadership,” President Brown said. (*The Arizona Daily Star*, April 14, 1968)

In December, 1968, the Brigham Young University was again in trouble with the Negroes. The following is taken from the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

SAN JOSE, CALIF. (UPI) — San Jose State’s black athletes voted Monday to turn in their scholarships because of the revocation of scholarships of seven football players who did not play in Saturday’s game against Brigham Young University.

The football players protested what they called the “racist philosophy” of BYU. The Provo, Utah, university is operated by the Mormon Church which the Negroes said is discriminatory in its tenets. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, December 3, 1968)

Another newspaper clipping gives this information:

SAN JOSE, CALIF. (AP) — Classes for San Jose State College’s 24,000 students returned to normal Wednesday after a day of violence. . . .

Classroom invasions, beatings, vandalism and small trash fires were used Tuesday in an attempt to enforce a strike such as the one which has closed San Francisco State College . . .

The United Black Students for Action had called the strike to enforce demands for cancellation of Saturday’s football game with Brigham Young University.

The year 1969 brought even more serious trouble for the BYU football team. Steve Rudman gives this information in an article published in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

The sleek jet bounced down the runway on the outskirts of Phoenix, screaming to a halt near a modernistic terminal surrounded by palm and eucalyptus trees.

Someone muttered that a protest march would be held before the football game that night. . . .

That evening 250 Arizona State University students, most of them black, marched militantly under torchlight, wearing black armbands and carrying placards protesting the allegedly racist policies at BYU.

The group’s leader, John Mask . . . led the demonstrators in an evening-long chant, “Down with BYU,” and “Get Rid of the Racists.”

BYU players were called “racist” by demonstrators on their way to the dressing room, with Mask leading the verbal assault. . . .

“The thing is,” Mask said adamantly as he wiped the sweat from his face, “we know BYU is a racist school and we know the Mormons who run it are racist.”

“BYU and the Mormons believe we are second-class citizens,” echoed Dave Edhoms, another black demonstrator. “It says so in their scripture.”

. . . it was a disheartened BYU team that flew back into Salt Lake City later that night. . . .

Some of the Cougars were angry, some were mixed up; but most were hurt that they had been the objects of a racial protest. They had no idea at the time but the incident under Arizona’s midnight sun on the evening of Oct. 4 was only the beginning of a full-scale racial upheaval and a bitter autumn of discontent. . . . the BYU team bus rolled toward Laramie on a chilling Friday afternoon, Oct. 17 . . . at that moment in Laramie a crisis of intense magnitude was developing. Fourteen black football players, six of whom were starters, had been dismissed from the team by Coach Lloyd Eaton.

Sympathizing with a Black Students Alliance protest of BYU, the players wished to wear black armbands in their game with the Cougars. Eaton had informed his players any open demonstration would not be tolerated.

Early Friday morning, wearing armbands, the players entered Memorial Fieldhouse to discuss the matter with Eaton. When he saw the blacks he threw them off the team . . .

Two hours before game time the BSA began its boycott. An original estimate of 50 to 60 students began to protest, but as kickoff time neared the number swelled despite cold weather and a blanket of snow on the ground. . . .

“We know BYU and the Mormons demean a person on the basis of skin color. We can join their church but we can’t advance because we are black. Now is that discrimination, or not?” Black asked.

The effect of this second protest was obvious in the Cougars’ performance against the depleted Cowboys. Wyoming wiped out BYU, 40–7.

Embarrassed and frustrated, the Cougars dressed hurriedly and left Laramie, angry dejected and stunned.

“Those protests have an impact on your play,” said Jeff Slipp, another defensive end. “I think it affected us tremendously against them.”

Fullback Nichols, visibly shaken, said, “I have never seen anything like that. I looked out the bus window and saw those people carrying signs, cutting the church, I think that’s worse than what they accuse us of.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 30, 1969)

On October 25, 1969, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported:

LARAMIE, WYO. (UPI) — Civil right attorney William Waterman said Friday he would seek a federal district court injunction for reinstatement of 14 black football players dismissed from the University of Wyoming team Oct. 17.

Waterman, an NAACP attorney from Detroit, said the dismissals would have “far-reaching effects” on black athletes throughout the nation.

“If we are not able to get this injunction, we will seek other civil action with damages,” Waterman said. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, October 25, 1969)

Another article on the same page contained this information:

TUCSON, ARIZ. (AP) — The student senate at the University of Arizona has asked both the school and the Western Athletic Conference to break ties with Brigham Young University.

By a vote of 18-5-1 the student senate passed the resolution condemning racial discrimination at BYU. The action came also as a slap at the University of Wyoming for suspending 14 black football players . . .

On October 29, 1969, this information appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

PHOENIX, ARIZ. (AP) — Several Western Athletic Conference athletic directors Tuesday warned

of a possible break-up of the conference because of racial policies at Brigham Young University, the *Arizona Republic* reported.

“There is a distinct possibility that this could break up the WAC,” Sports Editor Verne Boatner said he was told by a “prominent” athletic director. . . . “A telephone survey of seven of the eight ADs indicated BYU will be on the spot at the meeting,” Boatner said. . . .

One AD reportedly said he’d “just as soon see” BYU withdraw from the conference.

Steve Rudman gives this interesting information in his article:

. . . tension festered around the Western Athletic Conference to the point that WAC Commissioner Wiles Hallock was forced to admit: “I think this thing is growing to crisis proportions.” . . .

But while the winds of discord swirled through the league, the BYU campus remained unaffected.

“Most students are unconcerned. They look at it as a matter that the church will have to decide. You have to understand we are taught unquestioning obedience,” said Jim Briedl, a BYU junior. . . .

Two days before facing BYU, San Jose State, with the backing of Coach Joe McMullen, unanimously voted to wear armbands in the game with the Cougars.

Spartan defensive end Tony Jackson drafted the team statement. It was endorsed by San Jose’s acting president, Hobert W. Burns.

Jackson, a black player, was baptized into the LDS Church when he was nine years old. He left the church, he said, when he discovered Mormon scripture teaches that black skin is a mark of the sin of Cain.

“I know about the church,” Jackson said. “Negroes cannot hold the priesthood because they have black skin.” . . .

Some irate BYU students decided black armbands were nonsense and voted to wear red armbands because San Jose does not actively recruit Indians. BYU has a large Indian population.

So the Spartans played BYU wearing black armbands, and in the stands BYU students wore red ones.

“I think it’s a shame San Jose doesn’t have Indians,” a BYU sophomore, Joe Detral, said. “I think it’s stupid that other schools protest against us because we don’t have blacks when those schools don’t have Indians like we do.” . . .

But BYU’s dean of students, J. Elliott Cameron, had a different opinion: “I think these BYU kids are real naive. They don’t realize what this means elsewhere.” . . .

But the biggest blow occurred the following week when Stanford, a member of the Pacific-8 Conference, severed all relations with BYU. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 30, 1969)

On November 13, 1969, the *Salt Lake Tribune* announced that Stanford University had decided not to play Brigham Young University in any games after December 1970. In this issue we find the following statements:

STANFORD, CALIF. (UPI)—Stanford University announced Wednesday it will schedule no new athletic or other competitions with Brigham Young University because of alleged racial discrimination by the Mormon Church. . . .

President Kenneth Pitzer said Stanford . . . will not schedule any further meetings, including debates and other non-athletic competition.

“It is the policy of Stanford University not to schedule events with institutions which practice discrimination on a basis of race or national origin, or which are affiliated with or sponsored by institutions which do so,” he said.

Top officials of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which sponsors BYU, have told Stanford University officials that the church currently has policies stating that no Negro of African lineage may have the right of priesthood. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 13, 1969)

Obert C. Tanner, professor of philosophy at the University of Utah, called Stanford’s action “easily the sharpest criticism of the Mormon religion in this century” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 7, 1970).

On November 14, 1969, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported that William Wyman, special assistant to President Kenneth Pitzer, stated that if Brigham Young wants to play Stanford teams in the future the Mormon Church will have to “reinterpret God’s word and establish doctrines compatible with Stanford’s policy.”

Ernest L. Wilkinson, President of Brigham Young University, was very disturbed with Stanford’s action. In a speech delivered in the Devotional Assembly at BYU, Dr. Wilkinson stated:

During the past year or two, Brigham Young University has received national attention because of protests and boycotts involving our athletic teams. . . . President Kenneth Pitzer . . . publicly announced to the nation that Stanford would no longer schedule competition with BYU . . . we have received scores of letters from Stanford alumni, most of them are not members of our Church, apologizing for the action of President Pitzer . . . we have never refused to play any team regardless of the race, religion, or color of the opposing team members and have never attempted to dictate the racial composition of opposing teams. . . . students from every state in the nation and 56 foreign countries have selected BYU as the university of their choice.

Their color ranges from black to brown to yellow to white. Every race and so-called minority group is represented. . . . True, there are not many black students

on our campus. Just how many there are I do not know for we do not require students to indicate their color or racial origin. . . . I do not know the precise number.

Their decisions may have been based on their belief that their social life would be curtailed. . . . as far as we know there is not a single negro family residing in the entire county in which BYU is located, and this we are told by Negroes is an important factor in the decision black students make in not coming to BYU.

You should be informed that we have had Negro athletes. . . . we welcome black athletes at BYU provided they satisfy our entrance requirements and are willing to abide by our standards.

We shall continue to try to bring them to BYU, . . . (*The Daily Universe*, Brigham Young University, December 15, 1969)

Many people felt that Dr. Wilkinson had misrepresented the situation at BYU. The following appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune* on January 7, 1970:

In an open letter to the presidents of Stanford and Brigham Young universities, Obert C. Tanner, professor of philosophy at the University of Utah, criticized both university administrations . . .

In a comment directed toward the Brigham Young University president, he said, “You should not say there is no discrimination at BYU. There is, and especially so, since it would attempt to identify God with this discrimination.”

A “random survey” by the student newspaper at BYU revealed that some of the students felt that there was some prejudice against the Negro at their campus. Karen McDonnell stated: “I think BYU students tend to be a little racially prejudiced because of the Mormon doctrine. I hate to feel that way, but being realistic, I think it’s true” (*The Daily Universe*, December 15, 1969, p. 2). Mike Bosser stated: “Yes, I think there’s a hidden prejudice here” (*Ibid.*, p. 2). Vandra Paullin remarked: “The prejudice here at BYU is built-in because we’re white, not because we’re Mormon. Everyone tries to blame our prejudices onto the Church. But much of it is because of our geographical background, and the way we’ve been brought up” (*Ibid.*, p. 2). Dave Berg stated: “I’ve grown up with Negroes and I think I can recognize prejudice people. Students here say they’re not prejudiced, but I think some are” (*Ibid.*, p. 3). Nancy Ranta, on the other hand, made this statement: “I won’t accept anything anybody says about our being racists. They don’t know the situation. The Stanford charges were idiotic.”

In the same issue of *The Daily Universe*, we find an article entitled: “Vital Questions & Answers.” This article contains the following:

Protests at several universities and ballgames have accused BYU of being racist. Is BYU racist?

No. There is no policy or practice at BYU which discriminates in any way whatsoever against any race, creed, or color.

Then why do these people make such charges?

They are uninformed and the victims of a protest movement.

....

You haven't mentioned Negroes yet. Are there any at BYU?

Yes. Three that we know of. There have been more in past years.

....

Why are there so few blacks?

That is a result of their decision, not our policy. They are welcome. As far as we know there is not a single black family in Utah County, where BYU is located. That alone would reduce the number. In addition, Negroes tell us that is an important factor in the decision of black students in not coming to BYU.

Are any black athletes on BYU teams this year?

No.

Has BYU ever had black athletes?

Yes.

....

Since you don't have any black athletes, will you try harder to get them?

Let's put it this way: We shall continue to try to recruit them. . . . (*The Daily Universe*, Brigham Young University, December 15, 1969)

While it is true that the BYU has had black athletes, the record for recruiting them has not been very impressive. The *Salt Lake Tribune* gave this information concerning this subject:

BYU has had no varsity black athletes since the late 1950s when two Negroes were on the track team. No Negroes have ever played on the varsity football or basketball teams, school officials have said. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 26, 1969)

Steve Rudman gives this information in his article:

"To prove our point and show where we stand in this league," said Joe Williams, one of Wyoming's banished 14, "one of our black players, Ted Williams, recently took out his papers in the Mormon Church. He wanted to go to BYU to play football. But they told him his grades weren't good enough to get in." (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 30, 1969)

On January 9, 1970, the *Deseret News* carried an article which stated that a Negro wanted to come to BYU to play football:

CHICAGO (AP) — A 26-year-old Negro Mormon living in Chicago says he would like to play football for Brigham Young University, target of repeated racial demonstrations during the past two years.

"I really want to go there," said Paul Devine . . .

BYU officials, however, said they knew nothing of Devine's interest.

"We have been trying all along to recruit black athletes," said Athletic Director, Floyd Millet. "But I know as of now, we haven't signed anyone." (*Deseret News*, January 9, 1970)

Because of the many protests the Brigham Young University will probably be forced to recruit black athletes in the future.

Dr. Wilkinson claimed that Stanford had broken relationships with Brigham Young University on "hearsay evidence." The following appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, president of BYU, charged this week that Stanford was therefore guilty of "religious discrimination on hearsay evidence."

But Pres. Brown disclosed Wednesday that Willard Wyman, assistant to Stanford's president, Kenneth Pitzer, had contacted him one week prior to the severance of relations with BYU and that he had VERIFIED the racial doctrine. Pres. Brown also disclosed that he had told Wyman that "The church is not prejudiced in any way but this one, but I think that will change." . . .

Yet Dr. Wilkinson said Wednesday:

"President Brown told me that Stanford did not contact him before the announcement (of severing athletic relationship). On two occasions, President Brown said he never knew about this until after it was over with; that Stanford had not contacted him until after the announcement."

The BYU president concluded:

"There has been a misunderstanding here because I checked with President Brown on this. Maybe he thought I was asking about Stanford's scheduling instead of Stanford inquiries about doctrine. . . ."

Contacted later Wednesday night in Salt Lake City, Pres. Brown confirmed that he had been contacted personally by someone, presumably the Stanford University representative (Wyman), but could not remember whether it was before or after Stanford's announcement about severing athletic relationship with BYU. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, December 25, 1969)

However this may be, Stanford's ban against BYU will probably be in effect until the Mormon leaders change the doctrine against the Negro. The *Salt Lake Tribune* carried an article in which the following statement appeared:

STANFORD, CALIF. (AP) — The Stanford University Student Senate has voted overwhelming approval of the institution's ban against sporting events with Brigham Young University over a racial question. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, December 25, 1969)



As the football season ended Steve Rudman predicted that there may be more trouble ahead for Brigham Young University: "BYU's ordeal of constant protest with no letup for this season seems over and there is a chance for the embers of protest to cool. But a long winter of discontent may be awaiting in basketball" (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 30, 1969). On January 6, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* carried this statement:

TUCSON, ARIZ. (UPI) — The president of the Tucson branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has requested permission to hold a protest rally at the University of Arizona before the Arizona-Brigham Young university basketball game Thursday.

Three days later the *Tribune* reported:

. . . Brigham Young University . . . lost to Arizona, 90-77, in a game marred by racial protest. . . .

The scheduled protest of BYU's racial policies went off as planned. With 1:40 to play in the first half, nine Negroes, some of them wearing black wristbands, walked out on the basketball floor while the game was in progress.

As the Negroes filed onto the court, play stopped and BYU Coach Stan Watts pulled his team from the floor. The blacks were on the court for only a few minutes, however, when police and security officers ushered them away. . . .

Other student demonstrators broke a window and screamed, "Stop the Game," but that was the extent of the protest. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 9, 1970)

Coach Stan Watts of BYU is deeply disturbed by the trouble his team has encountered. Hack Miller reported the following:

Anyone who thinks that BYU players, being protested against, have no feelings in the fuss are a bit titled in their thinking, Watts contends.

"At Tucson we had heard all day long about protests. We had security people with us. We were told we would be taken to a side entrance so we would not be molested.

"At the gymnasium we were confronted with one of the protesters who made dirty signs at us, with threats and said we could go home that the game was over.

"One wonders, as we walked into the place, if the building would burn down, or be dynamited.

"Of course there is concern—on both sides." (*Deseret News*, January 10, 1970)

On January 10, 1970, the *Deseret News* reported:

TUCSON, ARIZ. (AP) — Two top student body officers at the University of Arizona were charged Friday with inciting to riot in connection with a violent protest during the Arizona-Brigham Young basketball game Thursday night.

Student Body President Mark Ginsbert and Student Vice President Bill White were among nine students charged in connection with a demonstration . . .

In a statement released late Friday, Harvill said charges will be filed against about a dozen persons.

The demonstration was the latest in a series of protests against The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) because the church bars Negroes from its priesthood. BYU is owned and operated by the church. (*Deseret News*, January 10, 1970)

Just five days later the *Deseret News* carried these statements:

TUCSON, ARIZ. (UPI) — Some 3,000 University of Arizona students participated Wednesday in a two-hour rally, demanding that the school sever relations with fellow Western Athletic Conference member Brigham Young University.

Speakers at the rally, in front of the university administration building, called for the resignation of President Richard Harvill and demanded that charges be dropped against nine persons arrested at the Arizona-Brigham Young basketball game here a week ago. (*Deseret News*, January 15, 1970)

These protests will undoubtedly continue until the Mormon leaders decide to allow Negroes to have the Priesthood.

### Dissatisfaction

That many members of the Mormon Church are dissatisfied over the doctrine is very evident. The Mormon writer John J. Stewart stated:

Yet, because of the popular beliefs and traditions of the world, there are at least two points of doctrine and history of this Church about which many LDS themselves—to say nothing of many non-members—feel ill at ease or critical. One of these is its doctrine regarding the Negro. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part I, p. 7)

The following appeared in the *Reader's Digest*:

Negroes may be admitted to Mormon membership but not to the priesthood. Thus, in effect, they are accorded only second-class status theologically—a situation that Mormon "modernists" are trying to correct. (*Reader's Digest*, May 1962, p. 120)

In 1952, Lowry Nelson, a “nationally prominent sociologist” and a member of the Mormon Church, criticized his church’s policy in regard to the Negro. His criticism appeared in *The Nation Magazine*, May 24, 1952. In this issue Mr. Nelson stated:

According to Mormon theology the status of the Negro on earth was determined in the “pre-existent” state, . . . Thus the blessings of the Mormon Church cannot be extended to anyone with Negro “blood.”

This unfortunate policy of the church is a source of embarrassment and humiliation to thousands of its members (the writer among them) who find no basis for it in the teachings of Jesus, whom all Mormons accept as the Saviour. The issue has become increasingly important as members of the church outside of Utah and adjacent states have increased rapidly in recent years and are brought into direct contact with Negroes, and who see their fellow-Christians engaged in programs to reduce racial prejudice—programs in which they cannot fully participate. Such persons would like to see the policy altered in the interest of peace and simple humanitarianism.

The doctrine of white-race superiority, so much the vogue in the early nineteenth century when Mormonism had its beginning, has been so thoroughly debunked as to catalogue its adherents today as either grossly uninformed or victims of traditional irrational prejudice, or both. Mormons as a group are not ignorant people; they rank high informal schooling, with an extraordinarily high proportion of college graduates. Many of them naturally find it difficult to reconcile what they learn in college about racial differences and equalities with the stand taken by their church. . . .

A very real difficulty is the fact that those who disapprove the church’s attitude have no way of expressing their point of view. It is safe to say that most of the one million members give passive assent to the present policy. For most of those living in Utah and adjacent states the Negro question is academic; they hardly ever see Negroes, much less live in the same community with them. In any case, they would find comfortable agreement with the white-supremacy idea because of latent historical prejudices which they share with so many other white people. However, my knowledge of the deep humanitarianism of the Mormon people leads me to think that if the question could be openly discussed they would line up on the side of justice.

Such open discussion, especially in print, however, is a perilous undertaking for any member. It automatically leaves him open to the charge of “disobedience to constituted authority” which may lead to his being excommunicated. The upshot is that discussions by interested persons are largely subrosa. So widespread are such discussion groups that they might be said to constitute a “Mormon underground.” The participants are not disloyal church members; rather they are

generally active in the church and rationalize their conduct by weighing the many admirable features of their religion against the features with which they disagree. (*The Nation*, May 24, 1952, p. 488)

On March 8, 1960, Sterling McMurrin gave a speech at the Trinity A.M.E. Church in Salt Lake City. In this speech he stated:

I am a member of the Mormon Church, and though I am not especially orthodox in the Mormon religion, I feel very close to my church and have a great love for my people. I feel very keenly the situation in which the Mormon people find themselves, entertaining a religious doctrine of racial discrimination, which certainly is unworthy of a Church and unworthy of a religion and, I believe myself, unworthy of what is in many respects the praiseworthy and great tradition of the Mormon Church. I frankly deplore the entertainment of such a doctrine and the attitudes that may accompany it in my Church. I have a very sincere hope that in some way or another this belief will eventually be dissolved in the teachings of the Mormon Church and the beliefs of the Mormon Church, and whatever practical attitudes that are conducive to what I would regard as immoral in our social life may result from this doctrine be thereby overcome.

. . . One of the difficulties, I think, is that the Mormon Church has always been involved in the notion of revelation, and it is one thing to have an interpretation of the Bible changed after 50 years or so if you decide some other interpretation is more satisfactory and thus change the picture and belief, but it is another thing to be a Mormon and some way or other get it established that this is a divine revelation. We don’t change revelation in the same manner than [that?] you change Bible interpretation. I say this in spite of the fact that I really believe, if I don’t die in the very near future, I will live to see the time when this doctrine is dissolved. I don’t mean repudiated. The Mormon Church is like the Catholic Church, it doesn’t repudiate doctrines that at one time or another were held to be revelation or absolute truth. They didn’t repudiate the doctrine of polygamy. I use the word dissolve, and I imagine by some technique they will dissolve the doctrine on the Negro, rather than repudiate it. . . . I have discussed this with some of the leading officials of the Mormon Church and I find very often there is far more of a liberal attitude in the matter than many people would suspect, and one of the leading officials of the Church told me not very long ago (and by a leading official I mean a general authority, not a bishop or a stake president)—he told me not very long ago that he did not believe that the Negroes were under any kind of curse and so far as he was concerned this was not a doctrine of the Church, and never was, but certainly a number of people believe that it is and was. This is not a kind of solid front being set up by an institution against the

Negroes, but it is a situation which is shot through with all kinds of ambiguities with regard to the problem and an institution in which there are many people of very liberal attitudes who simply do not believe the doctrine and who are embarrassed by it. To them it is a problem to be got rid of. I am not speaking for the heretics and the liberals, nor the occasional liberal Mormons who may affiliate with the N.A.A.C.P., but that is the attitude of a very great number of orthodox Mormons who have moral feeling that dictates that this kind of theological nonsense should not be palmed off on the people. It is not only nonsense, but bad nonsense; it is immoral. ("The Mormon Doctrine and the Negro," a speech by Sterling McMurrin, March 8, 1960)

In the October 22, 1963, issue of *Look Magazine*, Jeff Nye, a young Mormon, wrote the following:

The Mormon Church taught me that the Negro was not equal to the white in terms of religious rights and opportunities. It taught me that the Negro was cursed with loss of God's priesthood and that the evidence, or mark, of this curse was his dark skin. Consequently, the Negro could not hold the priesthood in the Mormon Church and was thus unequal to the white in a very important sense. . . .

Today, if a Negro becomes interested in the Church, he can join, and he can be baptized and confirmed a member by the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. He can come to most of the church meetings. But he cannot pass the sacrament, as the 12- and 13-year-old boys do. He cannot prepare the sacrament, as the 14- and 15-year-olds do. Nor can he bless the sacrament or perform baptisms, as the 16-, 17- and 18-year-olds do. Nor can he perform any of the other duties of the lesser, or Aaronic, priesthood.

. . . .  
Lacking the priesthood, a Negro can never hold any position of leadership in the Church, because the priesthood is the prerequisite for any position of authority.

. . . .  
. . . If we Mormons believe that God is directing our Church, we can hope that God is preparing a new revelation that will revise our present Negro doctrine. If we do not believe this, we can hope that the more liberal element of the Mormon leadership will produce a doctrinal change as the problem intensifies. JEFF NYE ("Memo from a Mormon," *Look*, October 22, 1963, pp. 74, 76 and 79)

The following appeared in the Editor's Note just under Jeff Nye's article:

William B. Arthur, managing editor of *Look*, asked President Smith of the Church of Jesus Christ of

Latter-day Saints to comment on the article during an interview with him last summer at his office in the Mormon Church's office building in Salt Lake City, Utah. [This is referring to an article written by Joseph Fielding Smith.]

"I stand by every word in the article." President Smith said. ". . . the Negro is capable of great achievement, as great and in some cases greater than the potentiality of the white race. He can become a lawyer, a doctor, a scientist, and he can achieve great heights. The word "inferior" is indeed unfortunate.

Mr. Arthur asked President Smith if a Negro boy can pass the sacrament in the Mormon Church, as 12- and 13-year-old white Mormon boys do. President Smith replied, "No." He then was asked whether Negro boys could prepare the sacrament, as 14- and 15-year-old white Mormon boys do. The answer was "No." "Can he bless the sacrament or perform baptism, as the 16-, 17- and 18-year-old white Mormon boys do?" Mr. Arthur asked. Again the reply was, "No."

"The Negro cannot achieve priesthood in the Mormon Church," President Smith said. "No consideration is being given now to changing the doctrine of the Church to permit him to attain that status. Such a change can come about only through divine revelation, and no one can predict when a divine revelation will occur.

"I would not want you to believe that we bear any animosity toward the Negro. 'Darkies' are wonderful people, and they have their place in our Church." (*Look Magazine*, October 22, 1963, p. 79)

The November 1, 1963, issue of *Time Magazine* contained a letter by Donald Ira French Jr. In this letter Mr. French stated:

Sir: As an elder in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, it has long seemed incredible to me that a church with so much forward vision in social welfare and higher education can be so backward in its outlook on a segment of the human race that is also supposed to be among our brothers. . . .

The revelation that the church is talking about with respect to the Negro and the priesthood should have been sought 50 years ago—not now when we are forced into looking for one. Even if a revelation should come now, we have compromised our position because it looks as if we have been forced into seeking it, which will be true.

On December 30, 1963, a newspaper reported that the President of the Mormon branch in Eccles, England had resigned his position because of the Mormon Church's policy of discrimination against the Negroes:

EXETER, England, Dec. 30 (UPI) — A 25-year-old elder of the Mormon church said today he resigned because of a “color bar” operating within the church.

Richard Riley said he quit as president of the Mormon branch at Eccles, England, and no longer attended meetings . . .

Riley said Pacific islanders with dark skins can “enjoy full privileges of the church because they have no Negro blood,” but Africans are barred from these privileges.

“How they can make an exception in one case but not in the other stuns me,” he said. “Quite simply it is a color bar.”

Wallace Turner observes:

A ferment is working in the Mormon community over the Negro question, particularly among the intellectual element. The mistreatment of Negroes by the LDS church is the reason given by many intellectuals who candidly admit that they have become silent, concealed apostates.

Even among many who cling tenaciously to their belief, there is a swelling opinion that the church is dead wrong on this issue . . .

J. D. Williams . . . can swiftly announce his faithful adherence to the LDS church and just as swiftly reverse his position on the Negro matter. (*The Mormon Establishment*, p. 246)

The following statement appeared in an article in *Time Magazine*:

Outwardly secure and successful, the unique religion created by Joseph Smith and carried to Utah by Brigham Young is nonetheless at a testing time. Much as in the churches of mainstream Christianity, Mormonism is being prodded out of its old ways by a new generation of believers who temper loyalty to the faith with a conviction that its doctrines need updating. Worried about the relevance of Mormonism, some of them are all but openly critical of the policies fostered by the church’s venerable, conservative hierarchy, . . . The doctrine most under fire within the church is the traditional teaching that Negroes, the cursed sons of Cain, are not eligible for the priesthood, . . . Williams [J. D. Williams] calls it “un-Christian and theologically unsound,” says that the teaching “looks so anachronistic that it engenders hostility in the world around us.”

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, a Mormon who describes himself as “deeply troubled by the issue,” says that the church’s policy “is like granting citizenship and saying ‘you can’t hold office.’” (*Time*, April 14, 1967, p. 104)

Paul Hughes, publisher’s consultant of *Reveille Magazine*, wrote an article in which he stated:

George Romney has precipitated a crisis in the Mormon Church that may well rank with the plague

of the locusts, and this time there are no providential gulls in sight.

. . . Romney can point to a commendable civil rights record . . . As one of the Latter-day Saints, Romney is compelled at the same time to point to a church which officially sanctifies race prejudice and which declares today, as it has for over a century, that people with black skins are inferior creatures because that’s just the way the Lord wants them.

This may eventually fragment Romney into warring halves. More important, it could thrust the Mormons, who have always referred proudly to themselves as a “peculiar people,” completely outside the pale of American life. There is, however, a third threat which is not nearly as well known: Interior tensions, accelerating now for many years, may shatter the church beyond all redemption . . . the Mormons themselves do not know exactly how they painted themselves into this suffocating corner. They quote vague traditions. They refer to conflicting scriptural justifications. They consult their highest officers, and the truth is that they don’t really know, either. (*The Oregonian*, Portland, Oregon, April 2, 1967)

The *Salt Lake Tribune* for May 4, 1967, carried an article in which the following appeared:

LANSING, MICH. (UPI) — Gov. George Romney said Wednesday the Mormon Church’s doctrine barring Negroes from priesthood of the church is “not a racist position.” . . .

“People don’t understand this church position,” Romney said. He declined, however, to explain it.

“I’m not going to get into a discussion on it because it would inject the church into public affairs,” Romney said. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, Thursday, May 4, 1967, p. 8A)

In another article on the same page we find the following:

In the question-answer period after George Romney’s speech . . . Negro students were ripping into him with a barrage of hostile questions on the Vietnam war, and the governor of Michigan didn’t like it a bit.

He scanned the basketball court . . . for a friendly face. “Can’t we get onto something else?” Romney said. “I want a question from a woman.” . . .

A stout, middle-aged Negro woman came to the platform and identified herself as Dr. Anna Grant, a professor of sociology . . . she explained that she had studied Romney’s Mormon faith and that she had reasons to believe that Mormons are taught the kind of anthropological untruths that would make them believe Negroes are inferior. . . .

“I must confess,” she went on, “that I don’t feel too comfortable about the fact that the Mormon position has not changed . . . and that you feel that the church does not preach a racist doctrine. I know you cannot change Mormonism but I just wonder how you can be as comfortable in your beliefs as you indicated?”

The basketball court and the flanking wooden bleachers rocked with applause from 1,000 persons and the man whom the political pollsters today regard as the sole Republican who could defeat President Johnson in 1968 nervously swept his fingers through the white panels that line his black hair. . . .

He was facing a moment of truth, much as John F. Kennedy had in 1960 when he faced the Protestant ministers in Houston during his quest for the presidency.

"I appreciate this question being asked," Romney said, "because I know from your reaction that it's a question you're interested in."

The audience laughed, softly and nervously.

"It is not true," Romney told them, "that my faith preaches a racist doctrine. Now it is true that a Negro cannot hold the priesthood in my church." Romney paused to bring his fist crashing down on the podium. . . . "I have been raised from childhood with the firm belief that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are divinely inspired documents, and as a result of my background I have fought in my private life to eliminate social injustice and racial discrimination."

One of Romney's political managers stared at the floor of the basketball court. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, May 4, 1967)

The following statement concerning Romney appeared in *Life Magazine*:

Also, it is clear that Romney would wish his church's position on the Negro's right to the priesthood to change, if that were theologically possible: "A lot of people don't understand this. If my church were a church where you could get the bishops together and discuss this, then maybe I could do something about it, undertake to politic in some manner. But my church just isn't that kind of church." (*Life Magazine*, May 5, 1967)

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall wrote a letter which was published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*. The following appeared in this letter:

It was inevitable that national attention would be focused on what critics have called the "anti-Negro doctrine" of the L.D.S. Church. As the Church becomes increasingly an object of national interest, this attention is certain to intensify, for the divine curse concept which is so commonly held among our people runs counter to the great stream of modern religious and social thought.

We Mormons cannot escape persistent, painful inquiries into the sources and grounds of this belief. Nor can we exculpate ourselves and our Church from justified condemnation by the rationalization that we support the Constitution, believe that all men are brothers, and favor equal rights for all citizens.

This issue must be resolved. . . . It must be resolved because we are wrong and it is past the time when we

should have seen the right. A failure to act here is sure to demean our faith, damage the minds and morals of our youth, and undermine the integrity of our Christian ethic. . . .

My fear is that the very character of Mormonism is being distorted and crippled by adherence to a belief and practice that denies the oneness of mankind. We violate the rights and dignity of our Negro brothers, and for this we bear a measure of guilt; but surely we harm ourselves even more.

What a sad irony it is that a once outcast people, tempered for nearly a century in the fires of persecution, are one of the last to remove a burden from the most persecuted people ever to live on this continent. (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Summer, 1967, pp. 5-6)

On the other hand, a number were opposed to Udall's statements. Paul C. Richards made these comments in his reply to Udall:

Mr. Udall must think the Church is made up of extremely gullible people. Otherwise he never would have set himself up as he did to try to influence the members.

The Church is either true or it isn't. If it changes its stand on the strength of the "great stream of modern religious and social thought," it will be proven untrue. If that happens, the more serious members would do well to join the Cub Scouts. It's cheaper and there is less work and less criticism. . . .

If the Church is true, it will hold to its beliefs in spite of its members. If it is false, more power to the easy-way-out philosophers who claim to know the "imperious truths of the contemporary world." (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Autumn, 1967, p. 6)

On June 22, 1968, the *Ogden Standard-Examiner* printed an article in which the following appears:

SALT LAKE CITY (AP)—The Mormon Church will lose tens of thousands of members because it refuses to modify its "anti-Negro policies and practices," a former U.S. Commissioner of Education predicted Friday evening. . . .

A Mormon himself, McMurrin spoke at a banquet of the Salt Lake City chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"In the future, if I read correctly the signs of the times, the Church will completely lose tens of thousands of its members who will refuse to identify with an institution which fails to come to grips with one of the foremost moral problems of our times," the educator said. . . .

He expressed difficulty understanding "how people who are otherwise typically intelligent and moral can believe and defend such crude immoral nonsense." . . .

He expressed belief the time would come when “the Mormon people for the most part will have to abandon their crude superstitions about Negroes because their children forced them to.”

But he said there will be those who will remember “with sadness and moral embarrassment the day when their Church could have done great things to hasten the achievement, but failed.” (*Ogden Standard-Examiner*, June 22, 1968)

In a letter published in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Allen Sims made these comments:

This last General Conference stands as damning proof of the proposition that the Mormon Church stands impotent to face the great moral issues of our time. . . .

I for one refuse to allow myself to be put at the mercy of events and history. I cannot wait for my Church to recognize the issues—it is too late for that. . . .

An undercurrent of racism finds welcome acceptance in this Church. A member unable to cure his tobacco habit will find himself subject to a number of formal and informal sanctions. But a member unable to kick the hate habit finds no sanctions or help. But he quickly finds that he now can hate and feel righteous about it through a number of thinly disguised myths, fairy tales, and rationalizations available for misuse in the Church. It is the adherence to this kind of priority scale and myth that insures the irrelevance and impotency of any action the Church takes.

The projected effort necessary to attack the myths and attempt a reformulation and the likelihood of success are unknowns that trouble me. If it is the case that the Church is to remain the captive of the disease that grows within it, then I must discard it as I would a worn garment that has long ceased to serve its purpose and usefulness . . .

Instead of devoting valuable time and energy in a dubious attempt to drag the Church out of the bunny hole of Alice’s Wonderland, we should be investing our time in organizations geared to the real world and to the solution of our moral problems. This conclusion requires that I withhold my substantive support and participation to the extent that it may be given at the expense of support and participation in other organizations with a proper moral perspective.

I commend those who remain committed to help the Church gain a “moral initiative” for their optimism and faith, but the question still remains whether that course is the most efficient allocation of a very scarce resource. (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Autumn 1968, pp. 6–8)

### A Burning Issue

The *Los Angeles Times* for August 27, 1967, carried an article in which the following appeared:

The deeply rooted Mormon attitude apparently discriminating against Negroes because of their race is becoming a burning issue in that church—and beyond the church . . .

The increasing heat of racial pressures in the country has brought it into focus as one of the few uncracked fortresses of discrimination.

Wallace Turner states: “The bigots and race baiters who make up much of the radical right want to make common cause with the LDS church in regard to the Negro” (*The Mormon Establishment*, p. 324).

The Mormon Apostle Ezra Taft Benson has openly opposed the civil rights movement. The *Deseret News* reported him as saying:

LOGAN, Utah—Former agriculture secretary Ezra Taft Benson charged Friday night that the civil rights movement in the South had been “fomented almost entirely by the Communists.”

Elder Benson, a member of the Council of the Twelve of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, said in a speech at a public meeting here that the whole civil rights movement was “phony.”

“The whole slogan of ‘civil right’ as used to make trouble in the South today, is an exact parallel to the slogan of ‘agrarian reform’ which they used in China,” he added.

#### “Part of Red Plan”

“The pending ‘civil rights’ legislation is, I am convinced, about 10 per cent civil rights and 90 per cent a further extension of socialistic federal controls,” Elder Benson said. “It is part of the pattern for the communist take-over of America.” (*Deseret News*, December 14, 1963)

In the 135th annual general conference of the Mormon Church, April 1965, Ezra Taft Benson made the following statement:

“What are we doing to fight it? Before I left for Europe I warned how the Communists were using the civil rights movement to promote revolution and eventual takeover of this country. When are we going to wake up? What do you know about the dangerous civil rights agitation in Mississippi? Do you fear the destruction of all vestiges of state government?”

“Now, brethren, the Lord never promised there would not be traitors in the Church. We have the ignorant, the sleepy and the deceived who provide temptations and avenues of apostasy for the unwary and the unfaithful, but we have a prophet at our head and he has spoken. Now what are we going to do about it?”

## Do Homework

“Brethren, if we had done our homework and were faithful we could step forward at this time and help save this country.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, April 7, 1965, p. A-5)

This speech evidently caused the Mormon leaders a great deal of trouble. A member of the Mormon Church wrote a letter to the editor of the *Utah Chronicle* stating that Ezra Taft Benson had told a “lie” and that he was “no longer worthy of his high office . . . and should be removed” (*The Daily Utah Chronicle*, April 12, 1965). When Ezra Taft Benson’s speech was reprinted in the *Improvement Era* (the official organ of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), 112 words were deleted without any indication. It reads as follows:

“What are you doing to fight it?

“Brethren, if we had done our homework and were faithful, we could step forward at this time and help save this country.” (*The Improvement Era*, June 1965, p. 539)

The leaders of the Mormon Church are beginning to realize they are faced with a dilemma. If they continue to bar the Negro from the priesthood the Mormon Church will suffer a great loss of prestige throughout the world. One writer stated that this doctrine of discrimination against the Negro has “seriously hurt the public image of the Mormon Church.” Even though the Mormon Church is winning friends among the segregationists, this is no real consolation since segregation is losing ground throughout the nation. Jan Shippis stated:

Understandably, with the pressure on the South for integration, an increasing number of Southerners have turned to the Mormon Church with its belief in the inferiority of the Negro race in order to try to shore up and preserve lifelong emotional beliefs. (“Second-class Saints,” by Jan Shippis, *The Colorado Quarterly*, Autumn, 1962, p. 189)

In a bulletin published by segregationists, in Atlanta, Georgia, the following comment appeared concerning the Mormon Church:

Did you know that, aside from a small group of Methodists known as the “Southern Methodist Church,” with headquarters at Orangeburg, S.C., the only substantial religious body that will not admit negroes to its clergy is the Utah branch of the Mormons? If you wish a confirmation of that statement, you can get it by writing to the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah. (*The Sandtown Story*, Bulletin 50, June 1963, p. 5)

Dr. Glen W. Davidson stated:

A second reason President Brown feels that the Church of the Latter-day Saints needs to change its practice is to offset the influx of die-hard segregationists into the church in this country. From interviews with recent converts in the south, and to a degree in the rest of the nation as well, I have found his fears well founded. A number of former Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists confess to becoming Mormons because, as one woman put it, “I’m fed up with being told by some preacher that these nigras are equal to me.” A number of missionaries working in the south this summer claim that there has never been more interest in Mormonism and that “our race doctrine is of the greatest interest.” Conversion statistics from the area confirm this claim. (“Mormon Missionaries and the Race Question,” by Dr. Glen W. Davidson, *The Christian Century*, September 29, 1965, p. 1184)

### A Revelation

If the Mormon Church should decide to give the priesthood to the Negro they will be making a doctrinal change which could cause dissension within the church (especially among the segregationists who have been drawn to the church because of its doctrine of discrimination against the Negro). To make a doctrinal change of this magnitude would be to place all of the other doctrines of Mormonism in question.

On Saturday, October 28, 1865, the Mormon Church paper *The Millennial Star* issued a statement to the effect that none of the church’s leading principles could be rejected without renouncing all of the doctrines of the church:

“Mormonism” is that kind of religion the entire divinity of which is invalidated, and its truth utterly rejected, the moment that any one of its leading principles is acknowledged to be false, . . . (*The Millennial Star*, October 28, 1865)

The Mormon writer John J. Stewart stated:

If we as members of the Church are going to pick and choose among the Prophet’s teachings, and say “this one is of God, we can accept it, but this one is of man, we will reject that,” then we are undermining the whole structure of our faith, and for our own personal sake we cannot afford to do that. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, by John J. Stewart, p. 19)

It would appear that, regardless of the consequences, at least some of the Mormon Church leaders feel that a change must be made. These leaders realize that their policy of discrimination will become more and more evident as the whole nation, as well as the other churches, begin to integrate.

In the Western Edition of the *New York Times* for June 7, 1963, Wallace Turner stated that the Mormon Church leaders were seriously considering the consequences of making a change:

SALT LAKE CITY, June 3 — The top leadership of the Mormon church is seriously considering the abandonment of its historic policy of discrimination against Negroes.

From its earliest days, the Mormon church has admitted Negroes to simple membership, but it has not permitted them to progress beyond this to the church's priesthood.

Because the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has a lay priesthood to which almost every adult male member belongs, the effect has been to limit Negroes to second-class membership.

One of the highest officers of the church said today that the possibility of removing this religious disability against Negroes has been under serious consideration.

"We are in the midst of a survey looking toward the possibility of admitting Negroes," said Hugh B. Brown, one of the two counselors serving President David O. McKay in the First Presidency of the Mormon church.

"Believing as we do in divine revelation through the President of the church, we all await his decision," Mr. Brown said.

Mr. Brown, a 79-year-old former attorney, said he believed that if the change were made, it would be a doctrinal revision for Mormonism of a magnitude matching the abandonment of polygamy in 1890.

"The whole problem of the Negro is being considered by the leaders of the church in the light of racial relationships everywhere," Mr. Brown said. "We don't want to go too fast in this matter. We want to be fair."

... A major doctrinal change would be discussed within high church councils before its enunciation by President McKay.

The church also has forbidden Negroes the right of marriage in a Mormon temple. In addition, the marriage of Negroes to members of other races is forbidden by the church.

The Mormon church, Mr. Brown emphasized today, has never closed the door to Negroes, nor to the possibility of removing the limitation on their participation in church affairs. (Western Edition of the *New York Times*, June 7, 1963)

In a telephone conversation, June 8, 1963, Mr. Brown stated that he was misquoted in the part concerning the change in policy, however, he expressed his approval of the article by saying it was "on the whole very fair."

After talking to Mr. Brown we wrote to the *New York Times* and told them that Mr. Brown claimed he was misquoted. The *New York Times* sent the following reply:

In connection with your request for further information about the article on the Mormon Church, we submitted the article to the officials of the Church with a request that they provide us with further comment either in confirmation of the matter as we presented it or in denial, and they advised us that they preferred to say nothing on the subject. (Letter from the *New York Times*, dated June 18, 1963)

Wallace Turner, the reporter who interviewed Hugh B. Brown, made these statements concerning this matter:

That interview marked the beginning of my lessons in the Mormon doctrine on Negroes. I was checking a report that the LDS church was about to change its position on Negroes.

The first man I saw was Theodore Cannon, Jr., the press spokesman for the church. . . .

Cannon said the report of a change in the Negro position was erroneous. But he offered to arrange an appointment with one of the top leaders, and it turned out that only Hugh B. Brown was in town that day. We went to the church Administration building and Brown's office. With us was Jack Goodman, my friend and the *New York Times* representative in Salt Lake City. After Cannon's statements, it appeared that the report to be checked was wrong, and we expected Brown to tell us so.

Instead, Brown stated:

"We are in the midst of a survey looking toward the possibility of admitting Negroes. Believing as we do in divine revelation through the President of the church, we all await his decision."

Cannon looked incredulously at Brown, who continued:

"The whole problem of the Negro is being considered by the leaders of the church in the light of racial relationships everywhere. We don't want to go too fast in this matter. We want to be fair."

There was more to the interview—for example, Brown said the change, when and if it came, would be a doctrinal upheaval of the magnitude of the abandonment of polygamy. Then it was finished and



the three of us walked out into the street. Cannon was distraught. He insisted that I had misunderstood Brown. But Goodman's notes and understanding coincided with mine. I went to my room in the Hotel Utah and wrote an account of the interview. Then Cannon came to look at it. . . .

He objected to some of the quotes as not being precisely what his notes showed. I changed them to follow his wording. . . . When we had finished all this, he agreed that the copy now reflected what he had heard and seen and the background he had given me.

But he implored me not to send it to New York. It would just cause trouble, he said, for the church was not about to make a change in spite of what Brown had just told us. Of course I was not to be persuaded and sent the story.

The *Salt Lake Tribune* is a subscriber to the *New York Times* News Service. . . . It was widely printed, but it was never printed in Salt Lake City. The story came in, and was checked for comment with President Hugh B. Brown. He insisted that it not be run. The *Tribune* did not run it. I have never been able to determine whether at that time he denied the story and the quotations attributed to him in it. Later his position was that the story's emphasis was wrong, but that otherwise it was straightforward. Of course, he was in no position to deny what he had said; the quotes attributed to him were those approved by his own press representative. (*The Mormon Establishment*, pp. 258–260)

In *The National Observer* for June 17, 1963, the following appeared:

The Mormons abandoned polygamy in 1890. Soon they may abandon another historic policy also frowned upon by many of their fellow Christians—the exclusion of Negroes from positions of authority within the church.

. . . Mormon leaders concede that they have been discussing the Negro question in their highest councils. And it's evident that many Mormons around the world are increasingly restive about the church's attitude towards Negroes in these days of racial tension.

. . . .  
Negroes, then, cannot progress beyond simple membership to the church's priesthood. Since nearly every male Mormon enters the church's priesthood at the age of 12 and serves for the rest of his life (the church has no paid ministry), the prohibition against Negroes restricts them to a kind of second-class status. (*The National Observer*, June 17, 1963)

*Newsweek* magazine also carried an article on the same subject. In this article the following was stated:

. . . Negroes, while being admitted to membership in the Mormon Church, have always been excluded from the priesthood.

. . . .

This discrimination against Negroes was being given new and timely thought last week—timely particularly because Michigan Gov. George Romney, a Mormon and a potential 1964 Presidential candidate, could be embarrassed by his church's stand. "The whole problem of the Negro is being considered by the leaders of the church," said Hugh Brown, one of the two counselors to President David O. McKay. (*Newsweek*, June 17, 1963, p. 60)

On October 27, 1963, the following appeared in the *Arizona Star*:

At least one Negro leader, Charles Nabors, feels Utah "has potentially the worst race problem in the United States." Nabors is a member of the Executive Board of the Utah Chapter of the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People.

"If a state of one million people can't include 5,000 Negroes in its social, economic and political structure in a Christian, democratic, civilized way," he says, "the state is in a completely deplorable condition."

. . . .

But the Utah Negro also feels there is some religious motivation to discrimination against him.

The Mormon Church . . . bars them from the priesthood, . . .

As a result, the church claims no more than a handful of Negroes among its approximately two million members throughout the world.

The reason the Negro is excluded is not entirely clear. Many Mormons believe the Negro is a descendant of Cain and therefore carries the curse God put on Cain for slaying his brother Abel.

There are some references to this in Mormon literature.

However, Hugh B. Brown, 79-year-old counselor to Church President David O. McKay and one of the three top officials of the church, said he knows of no firm church doctrine that prevents the Negro from having rights of the priesthood.

"He simply is not in sufficient numbers in the church and is not advanced to the position where he could assume leadership," Brown said.

"Just when the Negro will be ready," he said, "we have no way of knowing on earth. Any change has to come as the result of revelation from God, and revelation doesn't come on request." (*Arizona Daily Star*, October 27, 1963)

Wallace Turner gives the following information:

Every scrap of information I've gathered about Mormons and Negroes points to Hugh Brown as the

liberal voice at the top of the church. I suspect that when he told me those things in that interview in 1963, he hoped the change was to come.

However, the odds are all against its coming anytime soon in the terms he described—a revelation by the president of the church. David O. McKay is the most liberal LDS president in sight for a long time to come. Yet, he made it plain in 1964 that he felt it unlikely that any revelation would come that would lift from Negroes their historic disability in LDS doctrine and practice.

He was in Oakland, California, in November, 1964 to appear at the dedication of a new Temple there. . . .

The Negro matter came up quickly, and he dodged for an answer or so among the underbrush of theological imprecision in the framing of the questions. But then the question was asked directly, in the proper words to discover whether the prophet, seer, and chief revelator thought doctrine on Negroes would be changed to allow them to hold the priesthood. He said:

“Not while you and I are here.”

That would seem to end for many years the possibility of a revelation on that subject. (*The Mormon Establishment*, pp. 261–262)

Actually, there is good reason to believe that David O. McKay did not really believe that Negroes were cursed by God, although this was not publicly known until just before his death. On August 26, 1968, Sterling McMurrin wrote a letter to Llewelyn R. McKay (David O. McKay’s son) in which he stated:

I am writing this letter, with copies to your brothers Lawrence, Edward, and Robert, to tell you of a conversation with your father in the Spring of 1954. He had requested the meeting, which was in the Auerbach building of the University. We talked for an hour and a half or two hours. There were no others present.

I recall telling you of this conversation not long after it took place, but I’m interested now in detailing a small part of it in writing, as I believe it is of such importance that it should be part of your family record. On some other occasion I would like to give you an account of the entire discussion, as your father made several statements which I regard as important for the Church and which would be of interest to you.

Our discussion centered on the question of orthodoxy and heresy and the general problem of dissent in the Church. The views which President McKay expressed to me on these matters were remarkably liberal and deserve to be known by the general membership of the Church.

At one point in the conversation I introduced the subject of the common belief among the Church membership that Negroes are under a divine curse. I told him that I regarded this doctrine as both false and morally abhorrent and that some weeks earlier, in a class in my own Ward, I had made it clear that I did not accept the doctrine and that I wanted to be known as a dissenter to the class instructor’s statements about “our beliefs” in this matter.

President McKay replied that he was “glad” that I had taken this stand, as he also did not believe this teaching. He stated his position in the matter very forcefully and clearly and said with considerable feeling that “there is not now, and there never has been, a doctrine in this Church that the Negroes are under a divine curse.” He insisted that there is no doctrine of any kind pertaining to the Negro. “We believe,” he said, “that we have scriptural precedent for withholding the priesthood from the Negro. It is a practice, not a doctrine, and the practice will some day be changed. And that’s all there is to it.” He made it clear what scripture he had in mind by mentioning the well known passage in the *Pearl of Great Price*, Abraham 1:26-27. He made no reference to the Bible or the Cain and Able Story.

I told President McKay that I thought his statement on the Negro issue was of major importance and that it should be made public both in print and in a Conference statement in order to clear up the confusion of thousands of people in the Church believing in the “divine curse” teaching. To this he gave no reply except to reiterate his position, saying, “There is no such doctrine and as far as I am concerned there never was.”

I am able to report your father’s words with near accuracy because they were strongly impressed upon my memory and because within a few hours after our meeting I made a detailed recording of the entire discussion.

This matter, of course, is of very great importance to the Church and its future, considering not only the moral quality of our religion, which is relieved of a great burden if there is no official doctrine, but also the problem of eventual change in the practice of withholding full fellowship from Negroes. Such a change could be somewhat difficult if there were an official doctrine.

Your father showed great wisdom in taking this position and it has been a disappointment to me that the Church has not clarified the issue on the terms which he stated. His position conforms to the historical facts and as far as I am concerned his word in this matter is authoritative. Without mentioning his name for fear of in some way compromising him, I have on a number of occasions convinced writers of articles and books on Mormonism, when they have consulted me, that they would be in error if they described the “divine curse” belief as official doctrine.

In two addresses before the Salt Lake Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in 1960 and more recently in June of 1968, I stated President McKay’s position as the official Church position, doing so in virtually his own words but without mentioning his name. Needless to say, these statements have occasioned a barrage of letters, directly and by way of the newspapers, accusing me of ignorance of the Church doctrine on the Negro. I frankly wish I could feel free to make President McKay’s statement to me on this subject a matter of public record, as I believe this would be a very good thing for the Church and would help to clear up a great deal of confusion in the minds of many of its members.

You know of my sincere esteem and affection for your father. I hope that you will express them to him. I leave to your own good judgment whether or not you show him this letter. (Letter written by Sterling M. McMurrin to Llewelyn R. McKay, dated August 26, 1968, typed copy)

The reader will remember that in his speech at the Trinity A.M.E. Church, March 8, 1960, Sterling McMurrin stated that one of the leading officials of the Church had told him “that he did not believe that the Negroes were under any kind of curse and as far as he was concerned this was not a doctrine of the Church . . .” In a telephone conversation in 1963, Dr. McMurrin told us that he was referring to David O. McKay when he made this statement.

In an article published in the *Salt Lake Tribune*, January 15, 1970, David O. McKay’s son, Dr. Llewelyn R. McKay, confirmed the fact that his father had made the statements Sterling McMurrin attributed to him:

President David O. McKay of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was quoted Wednesday as saying as early as 1954 that “There is no doctrine in this church and there never was a doctrine in this church to the effect that the Negroes are under any kind of a divine curse.”

Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and now E. E. Erickson Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and dean of the Graduate School at the University of Utah, recalled a conversation in which President McKay also said, “As a matter of fact, there is no doctrine in this church whatsoever that pertains to the Negroes.” . . .

The philosophy professor, himself a Mormon, emphasized that he made detailed notes immediately following the 1954 conversation. And on Aug. 26, 1968, he wrote a three-page letter to President McKay’s son, Dr. Llewelyn R. McKay, recalling the church leader’s belief that Negroes were not cursed by God.

Copies of the letter were sent to President McKay’s three other sons, David Lawrence McKay, Dr. Edward R. McKay and Robert R. McKay.

Dr. Llewelyn McKay “told me later that he read the letter to his father, and that his father told him that it was an entirely reliable report of what happened and what he said,” Dr. McMurrin stated.

Letter Confirmed

This was confirmed Wednesday by Dr. McKay, who said there is “nothing contrary to what President McKay said,” in the letter. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 15, 1970)

Three days after this statement was published President McKay died. It is strange that David O. McKay chose to remain silent on such an important subject. We must remember, however, that it was McKay who announced the mission to Nigeria in 1963. If this mission

had been successful, the entire doctrine concerning the Negro would probably have been changed. This matter was still troubling the Mormon leaders in 1966, for Hugh B. Brown, David O. McKay’s first counselor, wrote a letter in which he stated:

I understand your anxiety in these matters, sympathize with your view point, but can only say that the discussions had by the General Authorities of the Church have not as yet brought a satisfactory answer to the vexing problems to which you refer.

World conditions in general, and especially in the under-developed and over populated areas, are such as to give great concern to all of us. They are problems which have an international flavor and which in the very nature of things must be handled on a governmental or political basis.

The specific question to which you refer, having to do with the giving the priesthood to the Negro, is one which must be resolved by the spirit of revelation, and I am convinced that that will come in the own due time of the Lord. . . . Postponing of the granting of the priesthood to the Negro while here on earth may seem to be unjust, but there are problems involved affecting many nations which, if we let down the bars now, might involve us in international complications which we would not be able to handle. . . . We, of course, must not attempt to regulate His time piece by ours, and though we become impatient at His reticence, we must continue to believe that He is all-powerful, all-wise and is the Father of all mankind.

We are just now wrestling with the problems in Nigeria, where some five thousand people have applied for baptism into the Church but where the government officials are opposing us and where, if we should baptize them, we would involve ourselves in financial problems which could very well bankrupt the Church . . . Conditions in the Southern part of the United States, in fact, all over the United States, affecting the Negro are such that for us to take positive action might involve us in controversies to which as yet there seems to be no definite inspired answer. (Letter by Hugh B. Brown, dated February 10, 1966)

When George Romney announced that he wanted to run for the presidency of the United States, national attention was focused on the Mormon leaders to see if they would have a new revelation concerning the Negro. Under these circumstances it would have been almost impossible for David O. McKay to have changed the Negro doctrine. In 1967 *Life Magazine* gave this information:

It would require a revelation through the present Prophet, David O. McKay, to open the priesthood to the few Negro Mormons who presently exist, and First Counselor Brown warns, “I think it would be detrimental to him for the Church to come out with a revelation right now. It would have a reverse effect”—i.e., that of appearing to revise God’s word to assist a possible candidacy. (*Life Magazine*, May 5, 1967, p. 92)

By this time David O. McKay was well into his nineties, and many people began to give up all hope for a revelation under his leadership. On December 15, 1969, the Mormon Church leaders issued a statement in which the following statements appeared:

In view of confusion that has arisen, it was decided at a meeting of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve to restate the position of the Church with regard to the Negro both in society and in the Church . . . we believe the Negro, as well as those of other races, should have his full Constitutional privileges . . . Each citizen must have equal opportunities and protection under the law with reference to civil rights.

However, matters of faith, conscience, and theology are not within the purview of the civil law. The first amendment to the Constitution specifically provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The position of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints affecting those of the Negro race who choose to join the Church falls wholly within the category of religion. It has no bearing upon matters of civil rights. In no case or degree does it deny to the Negro his full privileges as a citizen of the nation. . . .

From the beginning of this dispensation, Joseph Smith and all succeeding presidents of the Church have taught that Negroes, while spirit children of a common Father, and the progeny of our earthly parents Adam and Eve, were not yet to receive the priesthood, for reasons which we believe are known to God, but which He has not made fully known to man. . . .

Until God reveals His will in this matter, to him whom we sustain as a prophet, we are bound by that same will. . . .

Were we the leaders of an enterprise created by ourselves and operated only according to our own earthly wisdom, it would be a simple thing to act according to popular will. But we believe that this work is directed by God and that the conferring of the priesthood must await His revelation. To do otherwise would be to deny the very premise on which the Church is established. . . . the question of bestowing or withholding priesthood in the Church is a matter of religion and not a matter of Constitutional right.

This statement was signed by Hugh B. Brown and N. Eldon Tanner of the First Presidency and was sent to "General Authorities, Regional Representatives of the Twelve, Stake Presidents, Mission Presidents, and Bishops." The Mormon leaders did not intend for this statement to go to the world. This fact was made very plain in an article that appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

A statement by officials of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints concerning the church's policy regarding the Negro is reported to have been sent to stake presidents, mission presidents and bishops last week.

President Hugh B. Brown, first counselor in the First Presidency, confirmed that such a statement was mailed to the church's leaders. He said that the statement was released by Elder Harold B. Lee, member of the Council of Twelve Apostles.

A spokesman for Elder Lee said the contents of the statement are not for release to the general public but were read to members of many LDS wards. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 1, 1970)

While this article was printed in one edition of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, it was deleted from the edition which was delivered to the homes in Salt Lake City. The Mormon leaders obviously did not want the press to know anything about this statement. Nevertheless, a member of the Church became disturbed that the statement was suppressed and sent a copy to the *New York Times*. The *New York Times* printed it on January 9, 1970, and it was mentioned in newspapers throughout the United States. The Mormon leaders apparently felt that there was no point in suppressing it any longer, and so the next day (January 10, 1970) it appeared in the Church Section of the *Deseret News*. It was prefaced by this statement: "President David O. McKay has authorized publication in the Church Section of the *Deseret News* of the following letter sent to various Church officers December 15, 1969: . . ." (*Deseret News*, Church Section, January 10, 1970, p. 12).

By December 25, 1969, less than two weeks after the above statement was prepared, Hugh B. Brown, first counselor to President McKay, had made a statement which seems to contradict the one sent to Church officials. The following is taken from an article which appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

SAN FRANCISCO — The Mormon Church's denial of its priesthood to Negroes of African lineage "will change in the not too distant future," according to Hugh B. Brown, one of the highest ranking officials of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Lester Kinsolving, religious columnist for the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported Wednesday.

Pres. Brown, who is first counselor to Pres. David O. McKay, told Mr. Kinsolving that admission of Negroes to the priesthood will come about "in the ordinary evolution of things as we go along, since human rights are basic to the church."

#### Cause of Rift

When asked if he thought that this change would come about during Pres. McKay's presidency, he replied:

"Well, that's impossible to predict. He's ill right now." . . . Pres. Brown disclosed Wednesday that Willard Wyman . . . had contacted him . . . Pres. Brown also disclosed that he had told Wyman that "The church is not prejudiced in any way but this one, but I think that will change." (*Salt Lake Tribune*, December 25, 1969)

The Mormon writer John L. Lund argues that the Mormon Church cannot have a revelation to change the Negro doctrine:

Brigham Young revealed that the Negroes will not receive the Priesthood until a great while after the second advent of Jesus Christ, whose coming will usher in a millennium of peace.

Revelation?

In view of what President Young and others have said, it would be foolish indeed to give anyone the false idea that a new revelation is immediately forthcoming on the issue of the Negroes receiving the Priesthood. . . . our present prophets are in complete agreement with Brigham Young and other past leaders on the question of the Negro and the Priesthood. . . .

Social pressure and even government sanctions cannot be expected to bring forth a new revelation. This point is mentioned because there are groups in the Church, as well as out, who feel that pressure on the Prophet will cause a revelation to come forth. It would be wise to emphasize that all the social pressure in the world will not change what the Lord has decreed to be. Let those who would presume to pressure the Prophet be reminded that it is God that inspires prophets, not social pressure. . . . It is not the responsibility nor the stewardship of any person on earth to dictate to the Lord or the Lord's servants when a revelation should be given. . . .

The prophets have declared that there are at least two major stipulations that have to be met before the Negroes will be allowed to possess the Priesthood. The first requirement relates to time. The Negroes will not be allowed to hold the Priesthood during mortality, in fact, not until after the resurrection of all of Adam's children. The other stipulation requires that Abel's seed receive the first opportunity of having the Priesthood. . . . the last of Adam's children will not be resurrected until the end of the millennium. Therefore, the Negroes will not receive the Priesthood until after that time. . . . this will not happen until after the thousand years of Christ's reign on earth. (*The Church and the Negro*, 1967, pp. 45-48)

Those who would try to pressure the Prophet to give the Negroes the Priesthood do not understand the plan of God nor the order of heaven. Revelation is the expressed will of God to man. Revelation is not man's will expressed to God. All the social, political, and governmental pressure in the world is not going to change what God has decreed to be. (*Ibid.*, p. 109)

If Mr. Lund would take a closer look at the history of the Mormon Church he would find that social pressure has brought a number of changes in Church doctrine. On November 23, 1969, the *New York Times* carried an article in which the following appears:

Reed Durham, a Mormon historian, noted last week that Mormon revelation, like biblical dietary laws, has always been "bound up in history and the needs of particular times."

The revelation on Negroes, for instance, came to Joseph Smith at a time when Mormons in Missouri were under pressures from local slave owners. Polygamy was abandoned when President Wilfred Woodruff had a vision of the disasters that would befall the church if it held on to the practice.

A new revelation on the race issue under social pressure therefore, would not be seen as a repudiation of the divine origins of doctrine but confirmation that truth continually unfolds itself in response to changing conditions and the spiritual fidelity of the Mormon faithful.

"The Mormon who sees revelation as coming out of the clear blue sky," said Dr. Durham, "simply doesn't understand his own history." (*New York Times*, November 23, 1969)

If the Mormon Church should decide to change its policy and allow Negroes to hold the priesthood, it will not be the first time that Mormon doctrine has been revised to fit a changing world.

Twenty-five years before the Mormon Church gave up the practice of polygamy they were declaring that no such change could be made. In the *Millennial Star*, October 28, 1865, the following appeared:

To return to our starting point, the great question of what Congress demands. We have shown that in requiring the relinquishment of polygamy, they ask the renunciation of the entire faith of this people. . . .

There is no half way house. The childish babble about another revelation is only an evidence how half informed men can talk.

As the pressure increased against polygamy, Wilford Woodruff issued the Manifesto (now claimed to be a revelation) which suspended the practice of polygamy. In the *National Observer* for June 17, 1963, the following statement appeared:

As Federal pressure enforced a major doctrinal change in polygamy, many Mormons consider it inevitable that the pressures of the present day will force a major change in the doctrine about the Negro. (*The National Observer*, June 17, 1963, p. 9)

One Mormon stated: "It would be inaccurate to contend that the church is not deeply concerned about this problem or attempting to do something. However, since its resolution requires serious examinations of fundamental claims, it is not going to be easy. No matter how the problem is resolved, many people will be offended."

If the pressure continues to increase on the Negro question, the leaders of the Mormon Church will probably have another revelation, or (as Sterling McMurrin said) "by some technique" they "will dissolve the doctrine on the Negro."

### Joseph Fielding Smith

David O. McKay died on January 18, 1970. He was 96 years old at the time. On January 24, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported: “President Joseph Fielding Smith, 93-year-old president of the Council of Twelve Apostles, Friday became the tenth president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.”

The chances for a new revelation on the Negro under the leadership of Joseph Fielding Smith appear very slim indeed, for he is the man who has been responsible for much of the anti-Negro feelings in the Church. In his book, *The Way to Perfection*, Joseph Fielding Smith made these statements:

We have learned through the word of the Lord to Abraham that spirits in the pre-existence were graded. That is, some were more intelligent than others, some more faithful . . . It is a reasonable conclusion however, that there were many who did not stand valiantly with Michael in the great battle for the protection of the free agency and the plan for the merited exaltation of mankind, although they may not have openly rebelled. . . . We naturally conclude that others among the two-thirds did not show the loyalty to their Redeemer that they should. . . . They were not denied the privilege of receiving the second estate, but were permitted to come to the earth-life with some restrictions placed upon them. That the Negro race, for instance, have been placed under restrictions because of their attitude in the world of spirits, few will doubt. It cannot be looked upon as just that they should be deprived of the power of the Priesthood without it being a punishment for some act, or acts, performed before they were born. (*The Way to Perfection*, Salt Lake City, 1931, pp. 42–43)

Not only was Cain called upon to suffer, but because of his wickedness he became the father of an inferior race. A curse was placed upon him and that curse has been continued through his lineage and must do so while time endures. Millions of souls have come into this world cursed with a black skin and have been denied the privilege of Priesthood and the fulness of the blessings of the Gospel. These are the descendants of Cain. Moreover, they have been made to feel their inferiority and have been separated from the rest of mankind from the beginning. Enoch saw the people of Canaan, descendants of Cain, and he says, “and there was a blackness came upon all the children of Canaan, that they were despised among all people. . . .”

But what a contrast! The sons of Seth, Enoch and Noah honored by the blessings and rights of Priesthood! . . . And the sons of Cain, denied the Priesthood; not privileged to receive the covenants of glory in the kingdom of God! . . . we will also hope that blessings may eventually be given to our Negro brethren, for they are our brethren—children of God—notwithstanding their black covering emblematical of eternal darkness. (Ibid., pp. 101–102)

The name of Ham is also rather significant, for it means “swarthy” or “black.” It is possible that this is an appellation given to the third son of Noah because of the part he played in preserving through his lineage—and that most likely, as we have tried to show, through his wife Egyptus—the race of blacks upon whom the curse was placed. . . . Ham, through Egyptus, continued the curse which was placed upon the seed of Cain. Because of that curse this dark race was separated and isolated from all the rest of Adam’s posterity before the flood, and since that time the same condition has continued, and they have been “despised among all people.”

This doctrine did not originate with President Brigham Young but was taught by the Prophet Joseph Smith. . . . we all know it is due to his teachings that the Negro today is barred from the Priesthood. (Ibid., pp. 110–111)

Since the Church has run into trouble because of the anti-Negro doctrine, Joseph Fielding Smith has become more guarded in his statements. Notice that in his book, *The Way to Perfection*, page 101, Joseph Fielding Smith stated that the Negroes are “an inferior race” yet when the Church was in serious trouble because of George Romney’s political ambitions, Joseph Fielding Smith stated that the Mormons have never described the Negro as “belonging to an ‘inferior race’”:

The ignorance on the part of writers who do not belong to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in relation to the view of the “Mormons” on the status religiously or otherwise of the Negro is inexcusable. There is no doubt that in the campaign of George Romney enemies will play up the Negro question to the very limit.

The pity of it all is that they start with a false premise and therefore they will naturally end with a false conclusion.

The Latter-day Saints, so commonly called “Mormons” have no animosity towards the Negro. Neither have they described him as belonging to an “inferior race.” (*Deseret News*, Church Section, June 14, 1962, p. 3)

Although Joseph Fielding Smith has had to compromise his position somewhat in public statements, he still maintains that the Negroes are descendants of Cain and cursed with a black skin. The following appeared in the *Nashville Tennessean*:

SALT LAKE CITY (AP)—Apostle Joseph Fielding Smith, next in line for the Mormon Church presidency, says Negroes should be treated “in the true sense of equality as declared in the Declaration of Independence.”

But Smith, the president of the church’s Council of Twelve Apostles who will be 89 in July, insists the Negro cannot be ordained into the priesthood because he is a child of Cain whom God cursed and marked with a black skin for killing his brother Abel. (*Nashville Tennessean*, May 3, 1965, p. 18)

Wallace Turner made these observations concerning Joseph Fielding Smith:

SALT LAKE CITY, January 24 — When the Mormon presidency passed this week to Joseph Fielding Smith, a 93-year-old strict theologian, it ended for a time the hope of church liberals for a change in the practice of refusing membership in the priesthood to Negroes.

Mr. Smith is known throughout the Mormon world for his writings that justify the church policy of limiting Negro participation . . .

Mr. Smith's writings make it appear highly unlikely that he will ever issue an order that Negroes be admitted to the priesthood. . . .

During his long years as a church historian and theologian, Mr. Smith wrote many times about the Negroes, and developed the theological presentation that they were punished, as Cain's descendants, for the murder of Abel. He has written such things as this:

....  
 "Not only was Cain called upon to suffer, but because of his wickedness he became the father of an inferior race . . ."

There are many Mormons who disagree with all the points made by Mr. Smith in the statements printed here. (*New York Times*, January 25, 1970)

In the same article Wallace Turner stated:

Among the first acts taken by the new president was the selection of a set of councillors who do not include Hugh B. Brown, a councillor to Mr. McKay and the liberal voice in the hierarchy. This was seen by liberals here as notice that there would be no change in the Negro doctrine.

But other observers, within and without the church, caution that this may not be so.

Joseph Fielding Smith did retain N. Eldon Tanner as his second counselor. This may not be a good sign however, for just two years ago Tanner was quoted as saying that the anti-Negro doctrine could not be changed:

Even such harsh criticism has done nothing to budge Mormon officials from their adamant position. "The church has no intention of changing its doctrine on the Negro," N. Eldon Tanner, counselor to the First President, told Seattle during his recent visit here. "Throughout the history of the original Christian church, the Negro never held the priesthood. There's really nothing we can do to change this. It's a law of God." (*Seattle Magazine*, December 1967, p. 60)

On January 24, 1970, the First Presidency of the Church held a press conference, but they refused

to discuss the anti-Negro doctrine. The following statement appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

All questions were submitted in writing to the First Presidency before the press conference. President Smith and his counselors, Harold B. Lee and N. Eldon Tanner, considered the queries in a private conference, then met the news media representatives. Newsmen were advised in advance that the leaders would not consider any questions regarding the Church's position on Negroes. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 25, 1970)

It is very obvious that the Mormon leaders are trying to hide from this important question. They will probably find, however, that they will have to face this issue. We know that the pressure from within the Church for a change in policy has been increasing through the years. Several years ago Joseph Fielding Smith admitted that the Church leaders had received "a flood of correspondence" from Church members asking why the policy cannot be changed:

During the past decade there has arisen in this country, the United States, a wave of "non-segregation," that is, that there should be an equality in all things between the white races and the black or Negro race. . . . This matter of amalgamation to a great degree has been enforced by the Supreme Court of the United States. This tendency for "equality" in all things, has brought a flood of correspondence from all parts of the Church asking how it is that The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day stands out in opposition and teaches a doctrine of segregation denying the Negro the right to hold the priesthood. Some of these letters border on a spirit of resentment and claim the Church is guilty of a great injustice, since "all men were created free and equal." (*Answers to Gospel Questions*, Vol. 2, p. 184)

In a letter, dated February 14, 1963, Joseph Fielding Smith finally declared:

I am getting a little fed up on the idea that so many people think I am responsible for the Negro not holding the priesthood.

The pressures from outside the Church will probably increase. The following appeared in the *Denver Post* on November 15, 1969:

The Rev. Roy Flournoy, minister of the Church of the Black Cross, 2825 Fairfax St., this week called for reform of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) in what he alleged is a practice of racism against blacks.

“If a church can make blacks second-class Christians, then it’s easy to justify making them second-class citizens,” Flourney said.

The Church of the Black Cross, a new denomination seeking to improve black people’s position in society both through religion and active community work, is calling for:

—Boycott of Mormon goods, such as record albums of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir.

—Discouraging tourist travel to Utah, home state of the church.

—Taxpayer petitions to the government asking that the Mormon church’s tax-exempt status be abolished.

Flourney said the Mormon church denies the priesthood and marriage within the church to blacks and teaches the doctrine that blacks are denied a place in heaven.

“Religious racism may seem harmless, but it’s a type of racism that justifies racism in housing, jobs and education,” he said.

Flourney added that he believes the average member of the Mormon Church would willingly remove such doctrines from his religion and would welcome outside pressure to do so. . . .

“I believe racism has been forced upon Mormons by its leaders, and isn’t the philosophy of the people,” Flourney said. (*Denver Post*, November 15, 1969)

A Mormon replied to Roy Flourney’s charges. In his reply he stated:

I would like to reply to Rev. (Roy) Flourney’s remarks . . . I am a hard-core, die-hard, Mormon convert.

God is the one who created you with a black skin and not the Mormons. So don’t try to blame us for the “curse” that was placed upon you. . . . the Mormons have been driven from five states and denied the privileges of American citizens, just as the Negro. The Mormons have experienced all the degradations the Negro has, maybe even more. But with the Lord’s help, we have overcome.

The reader will notice that the Church of the Black Cross is calling for a boycott “of Mormon goods, such as record albums of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir.” Shortly after this article appeared the Mormons decided to bring some Negroes into their choir. Wallace Turner states:

Recently the Mormon Tabernacle Choir took in two Negro women as second sopranos, and reportedly, is about to welcome a Negro tenor. (*New York Times*, January 25, 1970)

While we feel that this is a step in the right direction, it still does not solve the real problem. As long as Negroes are barred from the Priesthood there is bound to be contention.

### An Honest Solution

The honest solution to the problem facing the Mormon leaders is not to have another “revelation” but to repudiate the doctrine. They must admit that Joseph Smith, Brigham Young and other Mormon leaders taught doctrines that cannot be accepted as coming from God. For instance, Joseph Smith gave a revelation in which he stated:

Cursed are all those that shall lift up the heel against mine anointed, saith the Lord, and cry they have sinned when they have not sinned before me, saith the Lord, but have done that which was meet in mine eyes, and which I commanded them.

But those who cry transgression do it because they are the servants of sin, and are the children of disobedience themselves.

And those who swear falsely against my servants, that they might bring them into bondage and death—

Wo unto them; because they have offended my little ones they shall be severed from the ordinances of mine house.

Their basket shall not be full, their houses and their barns shall perish, and they themselves shall be despised by those that flattered them.

They shall not have right to the priesthood, nor their posterity after them from generation to generation. (*Doctrine and Covenants*, Sec. 121, verses 16–21)

Notice that those who “lift up the heel” against the leaders of the Church, and “cry they have sinned” shall “not have right to the priesthood, nor their posterity after them from generation to generation.” They were to be cursed in the same manner as the Negro. The Mormon leaders, however, did not take this curse too seriously. In the *History of the Church* under the date of October 24, 1838, the following statement is attributed to Joseph Smith:

Thomas B. Marsh, formerly president of the Twelve, having apostatized, repaired to Richmond and made affidavit before Henry Jacobs, justice of the peace, to all the vilest slanders, aspersions, lies and calumnies towards myself and the Church, that his wicked heart could invent. He had been lifted up in pride by his exaltation to office and the revelations of heaven concerning him, until he was ready to be overthrown by the first adverse wind that should cross his track, and now he has fallen, lied and sworn falsely, and is ready



to take the lives of his best friends. Let all men take warning by him, and learn that he who exalteth himself, God will abase. Orson Hyde was also at Richmond and testified to most of Marsh's statements. (*History of the Church*, by Joseph Smith, Vol. 3, pp. 166–167)

Now, it would seem (according to Joseph Smith's revelation quoted above) that Orson Hyde and Thomas B. Marsh should "not have right to the priesthood, nor their posterity after them from generation to generation." Just eight months later, however, this statement appears in the *History of the Church*:

I attended a conference of the Twelve, at which time Brother Orson Hyde made his confession, and was restored to the priesthood again. (*History of the Church*, Vol. 3, p. 379)

Nineteen years later Thomas B. Marsh came back to the Church. In a sermon delivered September 6, 1857, Brigham Young made this statement concerning him:

He manifests the same weakness to-day. Has he the stability of a sound mind? No, and never had . . . He has not wisdom enough to see that he has betrayed us once, and don't know but what he will again. (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 5, p. 212)

Some time after Thomas Marsh came back to the Church, he was ordained a high priest. The Mormon Historian Joseph Fielding Smith stated:

Thomas B. Marsh, at a later day (1857), also returned to the Church. . . . he was later ordained a high priest. (*Essentials in Church History*, by Joseph Fielding Smith, p. 227, footnote)

It is very strange that Thomas B. Marsh and Orson Hyde should be restored to the priesthood, and yet the Negroes cannot hold the priesthood because of a sin which was supposedly committed thousands of years ago.

Brigham Young, the second president of the Mormon Church, said that slavery was a "divine institution," and that the Civil War could not free the slaves (see *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 14, p. 250). However, the Civil War did free the slaves, and Brigham Young was wrong. If Brigham Young was wrong when he said that the Civil War could not free the slaves, what assurance can we have that he was not also wrong when he said the Negroes could not have the Priesthood?

Brigham Young said that if a person who belongs to the chosen seed mixes his blood with the Negro the penalty is "death on the spot." (This is found in the *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 10, p. 110.) Obviously, the Mormons do not believe this statement by Brigham Young or they would be putting many people to death. Brigham Young called this the "law of God" and said that "This will

always be so." Now, if Brigham Young was wrong about this, what assurance have we that he was right when he said that the Negro could not hold the Priesthood? Why should we disregard this teaching, which Brigham Young called the "law of God," and yet hold to his teaching that the Negro can not have the Priesthood?

Brigham Young's statement that "any man having one drop of the seed of Cain in him cannot receive the priesthood," is as impossible to believe as his other two statements. At the very time Brigham Young said this Elijah Able (a Negro) was holding the Mormon Priesthood. Elijah Able lived longer than Brigham Young, and was still "a member of the Third Quorum of Seventy" in 1883. Thus we see that all during the time Brigham Young was President of the Mormon Church there was a Negro in the Priesthood. And at the very time the Mormon Apostle Mark E. Petersen gave the speech in which he stated that a person with "one drop of Negro blood" could not hold the priesthood, Elijah Able's grandson was an Elder in the Mormon Church.

We are told that 28 million Americans who are classified as white have some Negro ancestry. How would it be possible for the Mormon Church to keep these people out of the Priesthood?

### Papyri Undermines Doctrine

The reader will remember that we quoted Sterling McMurrin as saying:

President McKay . . . stated his position in the matter very forcefully and clearly and said with considerable feeling that "there is not now, and there never has been, a doctrine in this Church that the Negroes are under a divine curse." He insisted that there is no doctrine of any kind pertaining to the Negro. "We believe," he said, "that we have scriptural precedent for withholding the Priesthood from the Negro. It is a practice, not a doctrine, and the practice will some day be changed. And that's all there is to it." He made it clear what scripture he had in mind by mentioning the well known passage in the *Pearl of Great Price*, Abraham 1:26–27. He made no reference to the Bible or the Cain and Able Story.

This statement by Dr. McMurrin was confirmed by David O. McKay's son (*Salt Lake Tribune*, January 15, 1970), and seems to be in agreement with a statement which appears in a letter written by David O. McKay in a letter dated November 3, 1947:

I know of no scriptural basis for denying the Priesthood to Negroes other than one verse in the Book of Abraham (1:26); however, I believe, as you suggest, that the real reason dates back to our pre-existent life. (*Mormonism and the Negro*, part 2, p. 19)

Since the Book of Abraham contains the verse which is used “for denying the Priesthood to Negroes,” it should be examined with a very critical eye. Joseph Smith claimed that the Book of Abraham was a translation of a roll of Egyptian papyrus which he obtained in 1835.

While Egyptologists questioned the authenticity of Joseph Smith’s work because of his interpretation of three drawings included in the printed version of the “Book of Abraham,” they were unable to prove that the text of the book itself was mistranslated because the original papyrus had become lost. On November 27, 1967, however, the entire picture changed, for the *Deseret News* announced that “A collection of papyrus manuscripts, long believed to have been destroyed in the Chicago fire of 1871, was presented to the Church . . . by the Metropolitan Museum of Art. . . . Included in the papyri is a manuscript identified as the original document from which Joseph Smith had copied the drawing which he called ‘Facsimile No. 1’ and published with the Book of Abraham” (*Deseret News*, November 27, 1967, p. 1). While the Church leaders were willing to admit that the drawing which Joseph Smith used for Facsimile No. 1 in the Book of Abraham was among the manuscripts, they were reluctant to admit that the fragment of papyrus from which Joseph Smith “translated” the text for the Book of Abraham itself was among the collection. In the *Salt Lake City Messenger*, March 1968, we pointed out that the fragment of papyrus which Dr. Nibley labeled “XI, Small ‘Sensen’ text (unillustrated)” was the fragment Joseph Smith “translated” the Book of Abraham from. In the Mormon publication, *Improvement Era*, May 1968, Dr. Nibley finally admitted that the papyrus Joseph Smith used “in preparing the text of the Book of Abraham” had been located. At a meeting held at the University of Utah, May 20, 1968, Dr. Nibley stated: “Within a week of the publication of the papyri students began calling my attention . . . to the fact that, the very definite fact that, one of the fragments seemed to supply

all of the symbols for the Book of Abraham. This was the little ‘Sensen’ scroll. Here are the symbols. The symbols are arranged here, and the interpretation goes along here and this interpretation turns out to be the Book of Abraham.”

This fragment of papyrus has now been translated by three different Egyptologists, and they have all come to the conclusion that it is in reality an appendage to the Egyptian “Book of Breathings,” and has nothing to do with Abraham or his religion. Therefore, the Book of Abraham has been proven to be a spurious work.

Dee Jay Nelson, one of the Egyptologists who translated the papyrus, is a member of the Mormon Church. Mr. Nelson’s research has led him to the conclusion that his Church must give up the Book of Abraham. In a letter dated July 13, 1968, he stated: “I have been swamped lately by letters and long distance telephone calls from troubled people. Almost every one of them asks if I really believe that the Book of Abraham is untrue and each seems almost pleadingly eager for me to defend it. To each I have said that I do not believe it.” Mr. Nelson informed us that in one week he “received 33 letters and 19 long distance calls about the Book of Abraham & the papyri.” Previous to this he had counted 40 letters in a “two month period.” This whole matter concerning the Book of Abraham is treated in detail in our publication, *The Case Against Mormonism*, Vol. 2.

Since David O. McKay, the ninth President of the Mormon Church, has stated that he knows of “no scriptural basis for denying the Priesthood to Negroes other than one verse in the Book of Abraham,” and since the Egyptologists have declared that the Book of Abraham is a fraud, it appears that there is no real basis for this doctrine.

We hope that the Mormon people will reject the Book of Abraham and the other false teachings of Joseph Smith and Brigham Young and return to the “faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3).



## APPENDIX

### The Situation Grows Worse

The fact that the Mormon Church is in serious trouble because of their anti-Negro doctrine is becoming more obvious all the time. It now appears that even Brigham Young University's basketball team is divided over the issue. The following statements appear in an article which was published in *Sports Illustrated*:

Ending a 10-game ordeal on the road, the Cougars last week limped home to Provo, Utah with a 4–10 record, one of the worst starts in Stan Watts' lengthy coaching career. That was depressing enough, of course, but the boys from "The Y" . . . were bedeviled by a special problem: a gathering wave of protest against a recently reaffirmed doctrine of the Mormon Church that Negroes be denied admission to priesthood. As much as the Cougars would like to ignore them, the protests have grown in intensity to the point where they have almost transcended all else.

"You try not to think about it," said one of the Cougars, "but it does affect your play. Sometimes there are phone calls—'Look out, we're going to get you'—and other threats. And there's always tension in the stands."

"The thing that worries me and the boys," said Watts, . . . "is how far will it go?" Then, leaning over and lowering his voice, he added, "One of these days, you know, somebody might pull a gun or something." . . . This season's protests have included the wearing of black wristbands by some San Jose State players, the booing of the Y's dancing Cougarettes during the Quaker City Tournament in Philadelphia and the throwing of eggs on the floor at Arizona State. By far the most serious trouble, however, came on January 8, when the Cougars went to Tucson . . . Vandals poured lighter fluid on the gym floor and set it afire, . . . All five Arizona starters—three of them black—wore black wristbands. . . . the Arizona coach, Bruce Larson, is a bishop in the Mormon Church, so, in effect, the Wildcat players and fans were protesting against their own coach. . . . Even on the Brigham Young team, five of the 12 varsity members not only do not belong to the Mormon Church but have some surprising ideas about the church's policy and the protests.

There is Jim Miller, for instance. He is a 6'5" junior, a starting guard, . . .

"I don't know that much about church doctrine, but as far as calling the institution racist, well, I think most whites are racist," Miller said. . . .

"I think the protesters have a lot of legitimate gripes. I'm just wondering what they can achieve, what their motives really are. I think they have a legitimate argument in many ways. If some good comes out of it, then I would say it's all right."

Veikko Vainio, a 6'9" junior center . . . is embarrassed by the situation.

"I have to represent the school," he says, "but I see the cause, too. I had never been taught any kind of racial discrimination, and I can't see any justification for it. The church tries to justify it, but it's not enough for me.

"I've already told my son that the worst thing that can happen to him is to grow up in Provo. It's like living in a little box, no outside influences. That's one of the main reasons why I'm going back to Finland after I graduate. Sometimes I get so discouraged with the school and its standards that I feel I might want to go home now, . . . I think I've opened my wife's eyes, gotten her to see the other point of view. She is a Mormon, but now I've gotten her to read more and accept more things. . . ."

Then there is Larry DeLaitre, a 6'7" junior forward from Simi, Calif. His married older sister is so active in the NAACP that she pleaded with Larry not to attend Brigham Young. . . .

"I get phone calls from her almost every week, wanting to know if it's really that bad," said DeLaitre. "I really do sympathize with the protesters because I've been brought up that way. . . . I see their point and I really get uptight when we come out and I see the cold stares. . . ." (*Sports Illustrated*, January 26, 1970, pp. 38–39)

According to Hack Miller, a writer for the Mormon-owned *Deseret News*, Stan Watts claimed his players had been misquoted in this article. Miller maintains, however, that it "is not possible to believe" that they did not make the statements attributed to them:

Coach Stan Watts of Brigham Young University said, in his post-game radio program Thursday night, that *Sports Illustrated Magazine* misquoted his three basketball players in this week's anti-BYU story.

Jim Miller, Larry Delaitre and Veikko Vainio (the big Finn) were featured in the *S-I* spread. They explained to writer William Reed their views on the BYU situation regarding the Negro.

Vainio, in particular, slandered his host school. Vainio involved his Mormon wife and her beliefs. He was reported to have told Reed that Provo was no place to raise a family and that he (Vainio) had started to warn his 3½-month-old child about the pitfalls of the place.

It is not possible to believe that what the three Cougar players were quoted as saying was not said. Maybe the wording was not just as they desired it, but there was enough published to show to some degree how they feel about playing for Brigham Young University.

Coach Watts said he never lets newsmen talk to his players. This is sort of different. A withdrawal of his college men from the press world might be all right before a game, but in ordinary ways one would wonder about the wisdom in this restriction.

If a newsmen saw a player downtown, or at a luncheon or dinner, what right would any coach have to keep those two men from conversing? None.

Stan Watts is to be admired for going the last mile for his players. Most coaches are that way and bless them for it.

But to excuse these three men for what they told William Reed on the grounds that they were misquoted is carrying this issue quite a ways. Stan asked that students and fans be tolerable.

#### Don't Hang the Host

That they will, but students don't like the slander either. Especially when these men harass their hosts who have housed and fed them, educated them, fellowshipped them as only college kids can do, brought one of them into this country on a special permit, provided him and his family with the kind of culture that anyone in the world would like to have.

No one with manners would go into another's house and hang his host, a gracious host at that.

Surely the students and the BYU backers would resent such statements as these men made.

If the statements were not true, certainly the men have actions against *Sports Illustrated*. At least the statements should be refuted. There is that obligation upon them.

Maybe BYU athletic leaders should forget the justifications and take another reading on what these men said. They might have meant it.

It's very possible, also, that this is what is wrong with BYU's basketball team—and the coach is not willing to accept it. Like one parent often says to another, "listen to the young man—maybe he's trying to tell you something."

All three men are juniors and frankly they haven't given BYU much basketball. One might say they've hardly been worth their athletic bread and broth.

They have another year. But if they continue as guests of the BYU they will have to contend against the atmosphere that they themselves have spawned. (*Deseret News*, January 30, 1970)

Bill Coltrin, a writer for the *Salt Lake Tribune*, tried to smooth things over by stating:

People are wondering if the article about Brigham Young University in a national magazine is correct. . . .

The Cougar players tell me that they have been getting almost obscene telephone calls this winter, all complaining about a simple fact of sports . . . that one team loses.

Now how anyone, young or old, could pick up a telephone and "tell off" some young man who may have missed a shot or two during a basketball game, is puzzling.

They, maybe, should see a doctor.

However in trying to figure out why fans get so upset about a team losing, the following conclusion must be reached.

#### Someone Lost Couple of Bucks

Someone has lost a couple of bucks betting on the wrong team.

Fans have been heard saying that the Cougars aren't trying. They're wrong . . . the reverse more likely, is true. The Cougars just might be trying too hard and they can't relax and play as well as they should.

People who want Coach Stan Watts' neck in a noose, and who are saying that the Cougar players are not trying are the same fans who were hailing Watts as a basketball magician last year and who were saying that Doug Howard, Scott Warner, Paul Ruffner, Jim Miller and Bob Davis were almost superstars. . . .

These kids, you will remember, were vital cogs in last year's team which won the conference championship.

How can anyone in his right mind, love these young men who are barely old enough to vote last year and lash out at them as if they were subversives this year? A lot of real basketball fans and the solid BYU fans are beginning to be just a little bit fed up with the critics of this year's team.

No one can defend the record in wins and losses the Cougars have this year. However any sensible person, it seems to me, can defend the kids, . . .

Granted, the Cougars have made a lot of mistakes on the basketball floor this winter. But they haven't made as big a mistake as the fans who must have a few greenbacks on the line.

The fans who bet surely know better than to wager on human beings. And if they don't know better than this, they should at least act like a professional—accept the loss and try again next week. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 3, 1970)

On February 1, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported the following:

SEATTLE (AP) — A garbage-throwing demonstration by about 20 blacks, protesting what one of them said was "racism" practiced by Brigham Young University, delayed the start of a gymnastics meet between Washington and BYU here Saturday afternoon.

The blacks walked onto a mat just before the first event and broke eggs and poured oil catsup and

salad dressing onto the mat, officials said . . . After tipping over chalk trays, throwing chairs onto the mat and throwing a pail of water into Hughes' face, the demonstrators departed.

Three days later the following appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

SEATTLE (UPI) — University of Washington Athletic Director Joe Kearney said Tuesday inquiries are under way regarding the school's future athletic relationships with Brigham Young University.

He said the review was prompted by a garbage-throwing incident . . .

Police escorted the BYU team to the airport following the match. The team stayed overnight in Portland rather than Seattle, as originally planned . . .

"Any policy of curtailment in the area of scheduling should not be undertaken hastily," Kearney said. "In fairness to everyone concerned, I feel it is necessary to seek the counsel and advice of the groups that would be directly affected by such a policy.

"I therefore have instituted meetings with our black athletes, the department of sports programs advisory committee of faculty and students, department of coaches and administrators and other concerned campus officials," he said.

Kearney said he considered Saturday's demonstration very regrettable, adding that such acts could only lead to negative results.

"Any action taken regarding the scheduling of BYU will be done in spite of, and not in answer to, such pressure tactics," he said. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 4, 1970)

In a move to offset the impending crisis, Brigham Young University has now announced that they are definitely going to have a Negro football player on their team this year. In an article published in the *Salt Lake Tribune*, February 3, 1970, we find the following:

PROVO — Ron Knight, a Negro defensive back from Northeastern Oklahoma A & M, has enrolled at Brigham Young University and has signed a letter of intent to play football for the Cougars.

According to a BYU spokesman the 5-10, 175-pound Knight, will start classes on Wednesday and will be available for spring practice in April.

This move will probably have little effect on those who are protesting against the anti-Negro doctrine of the Church. As long as Negroes are denied the Priesthood, there will, no doubt, continue to be trouble. The *Salt Lake Tribune* for February 4, 1970, carried this article:

LARAMIE, WYO. (AP) — The Black Student Alliance of the University of Wyoming said Tuesday it will stage a nonviolent rally Saturday to protest the racial policies of the Mormon Church and Brigham Young University. . . .

A spokesman for the BSA said: "This rally is necessary in view of the reaffirmation of the racist policies of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints."

Another article on the same page contained this information:

FORT COLLINS, COLO. (AP) — Colorado State University President A.R. Chamberlain rejected a proposal Monday from the Black Student Alliance for a halftime demonstration at the Brigham Young University – Colorado State University basketball game here Thursday night.

"I said no to their specific request because of judgment on my part that a protest on the floor at an athletic event inside a building occupied by several thousand people was not an alternative," Chamberlain said.

On February 6, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported that at Fort Collins, Colorado, the BYU team was met with the "most violent demonstration" it had ever encountered:

FORT COLLINS, COLO. — The most violent demonstration yet against Brigham Young University by black students protesting the Provo school's allegedly racist policies took place here Thursday night before, during and after the Cougars' 94-71 WAC basketball loss to a hot-shooting Colorado State University . . .

The protest of BYU by the blacks was expected to be peaceful, but it quickly turned into something much more as black students scuffled with Colorado State University police before the game began and after it was over.

The real violence, however, erupted at halftime when approximately 100-150 black students shuffled out of the stands and walked out on the court.

The violence occurred as campus police tried to remove the blacks from the floor.

During the scuffle, a photographer from the *Rocky Mountain News* in Denver was struck on the head with a metal object and was taken to a Fort Collins hospital.

#### Fighting Erupts

Fighting erupted in one corner of the court and shortly before the two teams were scheduled to come back on the floor to resume the game, an object described as a Molotov Cocktail, huge and flaming, was tossed on the court. It was quickly brushed off the floor by an alert attendant.

The game was delayed approximately 30 minutes, but it did not signal the end of the trouble.

Police broke up several fights after the game, some in the stands, and some outside the gymnasium.

Fans kept the players on their toes by tossing eggs onto the court at various times during the game. This required official time-outs, during which attendants were out to clean up the mess.

The Cougars, primary objects of the protest, had no better of a time on the basketball floor against the Rams, as they missed almost everything they threw at the hoop. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 6, 1970)

Hack Miller, of the *Deseret News*, made these comments:

They permitted the protesters to enter the court before the game started. There were 17 of them who stood with arms locked right under the BYU basket while the visitors were warming up . . .

They allowed one of the protesters to utter the prayer before the game which was not a prayer at all but an indictment against BYU and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Never before has Colorado State University had prayer before an athletic event. They allowed about 150 protesters in one group to walk on the floor at halftime and this is what triggered the riot that ensued. It sent one photographer to the hospital . . . fortunately the *Rocky Mountain News* photographer was only incapacitated and not decapitated.

Another threw a fire bomb on the floor. Something of a Molotov cocktail . . .

Just as someone went to sleep while the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, so President Chamberlain and his henchmen went to sleep on this. They had agreed that only the campus police would be on hand. That the city police would be kept in the Health Center two blocks away . . .

By the time the local police came on the scene, it was too late. Suddenly the rioting group had control of the situation. It was a dangerous deal . . .

It would seem that the militants backed President Chamberlain into the corner before the game had ever started. And it appears now that someone was afraid of what might happen. So afraid that is, that what they could have avoided with a little courage happened. . . .

You can bet that President Chamberlain—who is to be inaugurated into his office in the next few days—has a divided citizenry around him. . . . One prominent editor in town said that this was the end of Dr. Chamberlain. He couldn't survive this blunder.

The event—nasty and frightening as it was—should have given every college and city in the nation a reading as to what could happen when you are granting minority groups special concessions. (*Deseret News*, February 6, 1970)

The following day Hack Miller made these statements:

It was a demonstration of the magnitude that this city shall not soon forget, nor will CSU. . . .

By now CSU and every other college city and school, should know what can really happen if another situation like this happens. . . .

Unless sports can get hold of itself in these matters we stand to have our games played strictly in private.

...

“Let's not have basketball if we have it under these conditions,” one CSU coach said, “Or football or anything else.” . . .

The pressmen had their eyes opened Thursday night. One of the militants raced across the floor, cursing and frantic, leaped up the stairs to the press box and almost broke the door down.

We stood there shocked by the wildness of this intruder. He was foul mouthed, raging. Officials finally got him out of the press box.

Radio men had been warned that the militants were going to grab the mikes and spit their venom to the listeners. Most of the radio people were ready to cut the wires if this happened.

All this happened because of a few concessions—to a minority group, only two-thirds of which was students (CSU estimates).

The only solution is to stop the concessions. Rioting or inciting to riot is unlawful and should not be tolerated. (*Deseret News*, February 7, 1970)

The *Deseret News* carried this statement in an editorial on February 11, 1970: “Fortunately, only one person was injured in the CSU incident. Given the provocation and the number of persons present, it is conceivable that many more could have been injured or killed.”

There was no violence at the game at Wyoming, but there were many policemen on hand to prevent any trouble. John Mooney reported:

LARAMIE, WYOMING — It was just like basketball in the old days Saturday in the War Memorial Fieldhouse as Wyoming whipped BYU, 98–73.

There was one small difference. White helmeted policemen with substantial billy clubs sat behind each basket to thwart the potential riots. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 8, 1970)

In another article in the same issue, Mr. Mooney stated:

The Black Student Alliance held a protest meeting late Saturday afternoon and announced a peaceful protest march on the War Memorial fieldhouse.

Never was a fieldhouse more aptly named.

Seventy-five uniformed and plain clothes officers—campus police, Laramie City police and 20 members of the Wyoming Highway Patrol—were stationed inside the building at strategic points around the floor. . . . outside the fieldhouse was a bus waiting to transport any transgressors to the city bastille.

And three quarters of a mile away officers of the Wyoming National Guard were in two-way communication with the fieldhouse. . . .

The fieldhouse gates were under police scrutiny Saturday because reports of bomb threats had been received at Fort Collins and the police did not want to

take any chances of anyone getting inside who might plant a bomb.

All these precautions were taken just so BYU and Wyoming could play a Western Athletic Conference basketball game. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 8, 1970)

In an article published February 13, 1970, John Mooney admitted that he was very “pessimistic” about BYU’s future in sports:

The Western Athletic Conference is facing its severest challenge in the recurring protests which break out when a Brigham Young University athletic team is competing.

Generally, the questions we are asked are “Has BYU resigned from the WAC?” or, “Has the WAC kicked out BYU?”

Actually, there is no way the conference could kick out BYU. . . . it is possible that the conference might vote to disband and perhaps form a new league, without BYU. . . .

As for BYU resigning its WAC membership at this time—well, the Cougars point to their record and clean bill of health. BYU would argue it has no reason to resign, since it has done nothing wrong.

Yet, I cannot help feeling pessimistic about the future of big-time athletics at Brigham Young University. . . . I keep remembering a conversation with a BYU staff member at the conference spring championship meets in Tempe last year. In effect, this man said, “If this racial pressure keeps up, BYU will be out of athletics in five years.”. . .

In viewing the future in a pessimistic mien, I think two factors must be considered:

1. Will potential opponents outside the conference wish to risk another campus confrontation threat just to play BYU, or will many of these take the easier path and schedule someone else?

2. In recruiting athletes, will BYU find many of the brighter stars would hesitate to align with a school and a team which may be under racial-religious pressures for the next four years? . . .

In this area, where the militants and even the organized minority groups make up but a small percentage of the students and fans, crowd control can be accomplished by a show of force by the police.

But, short of fighting a full-scale battle skirmish, can the potential danger be controlled in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles or most any large city?

A lot of universities may take a second look at a schedule if there is a possibility such a game with BYU could trigger a campus confrontation and a riot. . . . you may as well face it, this pressure won’t dissolve overnight, or over the summer. . . .

The fact BYU has recruited a colored football player and is seeking other Afro-American athletes and students may alleviate some of the pressure.

But, you will notice the protest this year attacks a church doctrine. I am afraid BYU could field a basketball or football team dominated by black athletes, and the protests still would flare over the policies of the sponsoring church. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 13, 1970)

Just three days later the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported the following:

SAN LUIS OBISPO (UPI) — Fifty to 75 chanting demonstrators marched outside a wrestling match between Brigham Young University and Cal Poly Saturday night in protest of the alleged racial policies of the Mormon Church.

The group, which carried signs reading, “Stop Mormon Racism,” was sponsored by the Black Students Union and the Students for New Action Politics. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 16, 1970)

On February 17, 1970, we find this information in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

TUSCON, ARIZ. (AP) — Five demands, including the breaking of all relations with Brigham Young University, were handed University of Arizona President Dr. Richard A. Harvill Monday. . . .

Harvill decided Friday to meet with the students after they and about 30 others camped on the administration doorsteps and refused to leave until they were granted a meeting.

The reader will remember that Dr. Wilkinson, President of Brigham Young University, made this statement: “. . . we welcome black athletes at BYU provided they satisfy our entrance requirements and are willing to abide by our standards” (*The Daily Universe*, Brigham Young University, December 15, 1969). Tom Hudspeth, head football coach a BYU, has made some very revealing statements concerning this matter. He admits that in the past Negro athletes have been discouraged from coming to BYU and that one of the “rules” at BYU is that there is to be no “inter-racial dating.” The following appeared in the *Daily Herald*, published at Provo, Utah:

SPRINGVILLE — The protests and demonstrations which are being launched against BYU are just an easy entrance into other problems the Negroes feel they have, Tom Hudspeth, head BYU football coach, told the Springville Chamber of Commerce recently at an early morning breakfast meeting.

“The shame of all this is that these young men are victims of circumstance. The shame of it is that many of these young men are being forced into the situation. The only answer is to stand fast, and we are going to do that. We will not change our policies,” he declared.

Negro Here

Coach Hudspeth pointed out that he has a young Negro man on the campus now, and they feel this is the time to bring him into the athletic program. “In the past we felt we should discourage the Negroes because we felt they would not be happy in the social situation here. We have certain rules and regulations which we won’t change. They must meet academic standards. We will not allow inter-racial dating. We are only 35 minutes from Salt Lake City where there is a Negro community, and we are setting up appointments and introductions there.”

"If this doesn't work out, we won't have to hang our heads; it wasn't meant to be," he declared. . . .

Coach Hudspeth declared that the young Negro man is from a junior college in Oklahoma. He was located through relatives of the Hudspeths who are on the staff there. "We felt we could work out something to relieve a little of the pressure. This is the only way we have changed our policy," he said. . . .

Coach Hudspeth indicated that "a lot of people are mad at me right now because they feel we are giving in." . . . "When we played Arizona State, they had to pay an extra \$5800 for control. You can't take this out of a tight athletic budget and survive. We are trying to show the other universities that we want to cooperate with them." . . .

Coach Hudspeth reviewed the football team's experiences, telling how they had to be escorted by the police when they played at San Jose. (*Daily Herald*, Provo, Utah, February 16, 1970)

The *Salt Lake Tribune* has finally reported the fact that "Black faces are among the sea of white ones in the 375-voice Mormon Tabernacle Choir" (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 21, 1970). This report comes almost a month after Wallace Turner reported the fact in the *New York Times*. In the *Tribune* article we find this interesting information:

The two new members of the 122-year-old choir are Negroes Wynetta Martin and Marilyn Yuille. . . . Mrs. Martin . . . and her two small daughters, came to Salt Lake City in 1967 "because my stake president in San Diego said that I had a mission to do here, in his words 'to teach love among all people.' I sold everything I had and flew to Salt Lake," she said.

She first applied for membership in the choir after she arrived but her dream wasn't realized until last month. . . .

Miss Yuille "just happened into the Tabernacle Choir." . . . she came to Utah last summer and the group's conductor, Dr. Jay E. Welch . . . encouraged her to audition.

"I thought he was kidding but when he cornered me at a fireside and I discovered he was serious, I decided to audition," she explained. She auditioned for choir director Richard P. Condie on Dec. 2 and sang at her first performance Dec. 4. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 21, 1970)

It is interesting to note that Mrs. Martin waited two or three years to get into the choir, whereas Miss Yuille was singing in the choir only two days after her audition. This whole matter looks especially strange when we consider the fact that Miss Yuille was put in the choir less than three weeks after the *Denver Post* (November 15, 1969) announced that the Church of the Black Cross was calling for a boycott of "record albums of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir."

A reliable source within the Church reveals that the Church is considering taking two more Negroes into the Tabernacle Choir. There is, of course, opposition to this plan within the Church, so it is impossible to say whether it will actually work out.

The tense situation with regard to the Negroes has caused a great deal of fear among the people in Salt Lake City. The *Deseret News* reported the following:

Salt Lake Police are fully informed and capable of dealing with any organized, violent disruption of civil authority by extremist groups, should such action occur.

That was the thrust of the report given city officials and civic leaders at a meeting called Friday . . . to discuss public reactions to copies of a tape recording being circulated locally. . . .

The tape was made at a national conference of radical and revolutionary organizations in Oakland, Calif., in July. About 4,000 advocates of Black Power, Brown Power, New Left and various other left-wing viewpoints attended. . . .

Partially in response to inflammatory material on the tape, "as many as 50" groups in the Salt Lake area have sprung up with the purpose of mobilizing to protect property and preparing to defend against local revolutionary activities, Patrick said.

These groups are often lacking in essential leadership, tend toward vigilante action and, at best, offer a "patchy" response to the type of mobilization that would be needed in an emergency, Patrick said. . . .

"When the citizens of this area become alarmed and if that alarm gets out of hand, mass confusion and hysteria could result," Patrick said. . . .

Commissioner Barker said after the meeting that if any citizens wish to be useful in aiding police in preventing disturbance it would have to be done under "proper direction in a civil defense posture." (*Deseret News*, January 10, 1970)

On February 22, 1970, these statements appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

Chief Deputy Andrus said that communications have been intercepted which indicate that at least two militant minority groups are planning violence in the Salt Lake area. . . .

Every precaution to detect a possible outbreak of violence before it starts is being taken by both the city police and sheriff's office, Chief Deputy Andrus said.

"When the trouble comes, we will be ready to call in the U.S. Army to back us up," he said.

Policemen have been guarding the Mormon Church Office Building, and it has been suggested that a reserve force of 1,000 men be added to the police force. Kenneth Wood wrote the following concerning this matter in a letter to the Editor of the *Deseret News*: "Being a Salt Lake businessman and reserve police officer, I read with alarm your *Deseret News* editorial backing the public safety commissioner's plan to have a one-thousand-man reserve force in Salt Lake City. . . . Mr. Barker would have an organized mob instead of a one-thousand-man auxiliary force" (*Deseret News*, February 26, 1970). Dan Gilliland, on the other hand, made the following statements:



I commend you for your editorial of Feb. 20 in which you gave support to the concept of an expanded auxiliary police force. . . .

I view with alarm the growing number who are organizing armed groups for "neighborhood defense." Such uncoordinated groups lacking trained and responsible leadership could add to the chaos and casualties should frightening emergencies occur. I have often heard the remark: "We'll be ready when 'they' come." In a time of confusion and fear, the "they" who will be the target of these men might well be a car filled with long-haired youth who used poor judgment in selecting a time for a ride to see what's happening. It could also be a family of our fine Negro citizens who happened to get caught in the wrong place at the wrong time. . . .

It is well known that there are some groups who desire to cause turmoil in our area and the possibility of this occurring when our police force is undermanned is not a pleasant thought. The idea of an expanded and well prepared auxiliary force seems to be an excellent one. (*Deseret News*, February 27, 1970)

On February 22, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* carried the following:

FILLMORE, Millard County — Included in an emergency training program of the Millard County Jeep Posse is a riot control program calling for use of three-foot long riot sticks.

And because these sticks are not regularly available, students in the Millard High School shop class are doing their part in protec[t]ion of the town by constructing 22 sticks on lathes during class hours. . . .

Insofar as riots are concerned Sheriff Stewart has little fear of outside forces coming into the area. Rivalry between high schools and possible trouble during sporting events is the source of his concern.

But Kenneth Hare of Fillmore, commander of the Jeep Posse, said of the riot training: "What would you do if you were down here and a bunch of those Black Panthers came down here to take over the town?" . . .

"The posse is just getting ready for something that may never happen," Mr. Hare said.

The following day the *Tribune* contained an editorial in which these statements appeared:

A movement to organize church groups and even entire parts of the city into "vigilante strike-forces" has been reported in Salt Lake City. Just what or whom this bungalow brigade is planning to "strike" isn't clear, one of the main reasons the idea of such a people's posse is so dangerous.

Once organized, the extra-legal legionnaires might be worked into such a state of fear-fueled emotion that they would respond to bully boy missions most would have rejected as individuals. No matter what kind of patriotic sounding name is tacked on a group of citizen

enforcers, it is still a common mob that flows as passion directs without reason and without jurisdiction.

Persons attempting to expand the vigilante-type movement in the Salt Lake area apparently are using scare tactics in an effort to create a threat that is long on fear but short on fact. We prefer to rely on the intelligence gathering facilities of legal government agencies for news of any overt attempts to foment trouble and take over the valley or the country. To our knowledge there is no such plan afoot and, if there were, lawfully established police could handle it better than a gang of neighborhood night riders. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, February 23, 1970)

On February 27, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported:

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (UPI) — Bricks with the letters BYU stenciled on them crashed through the living room windows of the University of New Mexico's athletic director and two coaches early today, missing by moments track Coach Hugh Hackett and his infant child. . . .

Hackett, athletic director Pete McDavid and football Coach Rudy Feldman all said they "presumed" the attacks on their homes were related to Saturday night's game here between Brigham Young University and UNM. . . . The black students union at UNM planned a "non-violent" demonstration at Saturday's contest, a spokesman said.

Although this game was played, it was delayed by militants:

ALBUQUERQUE — A handful of militants, probably fewer than 20, forced 14,000 fans to wait for 30 minutes for the start of the New Mexico-BYU game here Saturday night after the agitators had tossed eggs and bags of liquid onto the floor.

The throwing came during the playing of the National Anthem and the liquid was said to have been kerosene by those clearing the hardwoods.

It must have been something fairly strong—it took the sealcoat off the boards and left ugly marks 30 feet long and 10 or 12 feet wide. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 1, 1970)

On March 3, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported the following:

FARMINGTON — Use of scare tactics, emotionalism and doctrine of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints [*sic*] as a means of forming neighborhoods into "vigilante strike-forces" was labeled dangerous and inadvisable by Davis County officials Monday.

The action followed a briefing by Salt Lake County Civil Defense officials on the activities of a group known as Neighborhood Emergency Teams (NET).

Davis County Sheriff Kenneth Hammon denounced formation of any neighborhood security forces, saying

“no vigilante groups of any type are needed in Davis County to assist law enforcement officers.” . . .

NET groups, apparently forming statewide within the last few weeks, have been claiming association with Civil Defense and law enforcement agencies and the LDS Church, said Walter J. Michelsen, Salt Lake County Civil Defense director.

Alvin Britton, Salt Lake County Civil Defense information officer, said 90 percent of the NET programs are well intentioned, but the advocating of turning neighborhoods into armed fortresses with security forces is inadvisable. . . .

Mr. Britton said NET leaders have claimed local government is no longer reliable for protection and for citizens to protect themselves by whatever means necessary.

“Though weapons are never advocated,” Mr. Britton said, “The group ends with that as an end product.”

NET leaders make a direct attack on all levels of government, Mr. Michelsen said, claiming all offices, from President Nixon down, are infiltrated by subversives. At the same time, Mr. Michelsen continued, the leaders claim association with local government agencies to gain a degree of officialdom.

Mr. Michelsen said NET groups claim to be affiliated with all county sheriffs, but none of the sheriffs contacted by him have had communications with any NET representative. . . .

Many organizers of NET, Mr. Michelsen said, are from out of state. They are using Mormon theology, he said, and the influence of being converts to the LDS Church to fulfill a prophecy to press their ideas.

Mr. Michelsen said he has been advised the leaders are determined to continue with their work at all cost.

Commissioner Smoot said NET organizers are very capable and “not to sell them short, for the end product is very dangerous.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 3, 1970)

The same day the *Tribune* published this information concerning the Neighborhood Emergency Teams, the Mormon leaders decided to issue a statement concerning this matter. Fortunately, the Church leaders chose to dissociate themselves from this organization. The *Deseret News* reported:

The First Presidency of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints today stated that the Church has no connection with the Neighborhood Emergency Teams (NET), nor does it approve of its members being active in such vigilante groups.

The Church has never authorized the organization of any such groups and does not now give any such authorization, the First Presidency said. . . .

Salt Lake County Civil Defense officials said at a briefing in Farmington Monday night that the NET group was using scare tactics, emotionalism and references to the Church as a means of organizing

neighborhoods into vigilante strike forces. . . . (*Deseret News*, March 3, 1970)

The following morning the *Salt Lake Tribune* reported:

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, civil defense and public safety officials Tuesday voiced opposition to the forming of Neighborhood Emergency Teams (NET) . . .

The official statement came a day after Davis County officials labeled “vigilante strike-forces” as “dangerous and inadvisable.” Salt Lake County Civil Defense officials briefed the Davis County officials on NET activities and said “vigilante strike-forces” use scare tactics, emotionalism and doctrine of the LDS Church as a means of organizing neighborhood teams. . . .

Bountiful Police Chief Dean O. Anderson, board member, Utah Peace Officers Assn., said that group met Tuesday and adopted an informal resolution that “any group which takes the law into its own hands is not desirable.” . . .

Elder Ezra Taft Benson, member of the LDS Council of Twelve Apostles, announced through a secretary that he has “no comment.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 4, 1970)

That night the *Deseret News* carried an editorial in which the following statements appeared:

Several days ago, this column advocated strengthening the city’s police force through the use of a citizen auxiliary. But a new organization which is forming neighborhood emergency defense teams is a different, and dangerous, animal.

Neighborhood Emergency Teams play on the fears of sincere, concerned citizens that police protection may be inadequate in a national emergency. To cloak its activities with respectability, it falsely claims association with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Civil Defense, and law enforcement agencies.

These teams may themselves be a threat to law and order . . . some of their emergency defense plans may actually be dangerous to those they seek to protect.

Law and order must be maintained, of course. Additional enforcement personnel are needed. . . . (*Deseret News*, March 4, 1970)

In the same issue of the *Deseret News* a letter was published which contained the following statements:

We as NET are not vigilantes. We are trying our very best to be spiritually and physically prepared.

Most all our husbands already had guns long before NET teams were even thought of. These guns have only been used for hunting deer, not policemen, which seems to be the “game” of the revolutionaries.

The next day the following appeared in the *Salt Lake Tribune*:

The First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has issued “strict instructions” to William Koerner, Neighborhood Emergency Teams (NET) spokesman, “that under no circumstances was he to use the facilities of the Church” for NET meetings.

The instructions were given Tuesday, the same day the First Presidency announced the church “has no connection whatsoever with the Neighborhood Emergency Teams nor does it approve of its members being active in such vigilante groups.”

The First Presidency also said Wednesday it had received reports that the group has used such facilities, ward houses, for example.

Mr. Koerner at first denied such facilities had been used. But, advised of the second First Presidency announcement, he said such facilities had been used “in a very few cases.”

“In each case we received permission from those in charge of the building and we did not use them except when we were unable to locate other locations,” he said.

He said he had written a letter to the First Presidency concerning what he termed “a misunderstanding.”

Meanwhile, a spokesman for Gov. Calvin L. Rampton said the governor has requested a report on NET activities from Raymond A. Jackson, state public safety commissioner. . . . (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 5, 1970)

Even though the Mormon leaders have stated they do not approve of NET, there can be no doubt that this group originated among the Mormon people. A woman from Davis County, Utah, made this statement in a letter: “Our Davis County is filled with NET or JBS—We don’t like it! Hope you realize the NET groups here are Mormons.”

Calvin L. Rampton, Governor of Utah, warned against vigilante-type groups which are forming in Utah:

Gov. Calvin L. Rampton Friday urged Utahns not to join “vigilante-type groups,” charged such groups use “scare tactics” and said they would do more harm than good in an emergency. . . .

Mr. Rampton said he had no accurate count of how many Utahns have joined such organizations. . . .

“There is a very substantial number—more than I like to see—more than I like to see because I think it reflects a fear and an uncertainty which is not warranted. But to say there are 5,000 or 10,000, I couldn’t do it.”

“During the last several weeks, in attempting to organize vigilante-type groups in Utah, certain scare tactics have been used which have caused concern among the citizens as to our competency here to deal with any type of riot or civil unrest. . . . let me assure you that in the unlikely event we did have any type of a riot or civil insurrection, the vigilante-type organizations would not contribute to the solution of the problem. They’d become part of the problem. . . .

“To you people who might have been frightened into joining one of these groups, let me assure you that your activities in the unlikely event that we did have an emergency would not protect your loved ones but would add to their danger.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 7, 1970)

On March 10, 1970, the *Salt Lake Tribune* announced that Neighborhood Emergency Teams were through holding meetings:

Neighborhood Emergency Teams (NET) meetings have been terminated, William E. Koerner, who identified himself in a news release as a “concerned citizen,” said Monday. . . .

Here is the text of Mr. Koerner’s news release . . .

“To Whom It May Concern:

“The last official meeting of the N.E.T. program was held Saturday, 7 March 1970, at which time the N.E.T. program was terminated.”

Thanks Leader

“Bill Koerner thanked neighborhood program leaders and notified them that the purposes and goals of the N.E.T. program had been accomplished. He enumerated these goals as:

“1. To call the local citizens to repentance and alert them to the problems rapidly developing in this nation. (Well over 10,000 sincere citizens have been alerted.)

“2. To encourage food storage. (Local merchants and grocers can attest to the effectiveness of this part of the program).

Cites Preparedness

“3. To bring the problems of our unpreparedness to the attention of our local authorities. (Response has been received from both religious and civil leaders).

“4. To expose the extent of bias of the news media.

“Mr. Koerner stated that the services of the N.E.T. program were offered to the local authorities and officials. However, Governor Rampton and local Civil Defense officials have stated that these services were not needed . . . in closing, the N.E.T. program challenges the Governor and Civil Defense Authorities to produce immediate proof of this alleged completed preparedness program to a concerned citizenry.”

The news release was signed by “William E. Koerner, Concerned Citizen.” (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 10, 1970)

The same day the *Deseret News* printed an article which contained the following:

BOUNTIFUL — Citizens were assured here Monday night that official organizations, such as police and civil defense, could easily handle any conceivable riot or civil disturbance in Utah.

The meeting, sponsored by the Bountiful police department, was marked by an announcement . . . that Neighborhood Emergency Team (NET) meetings have been discontinued.

Also at the meeting, Bishop Victor L. Brown, second counselor in the Presiding Bishopric, reaffirmed the position of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints that its members should not join so-called vigilante groups.

Koerner, who has made wide-ranging talks urging people to prepare for riots and other disturbances, read a statement saying that objectives of the NET program had been accomplished. . . .

Bishop Brown commented briefly in answer to questions regarding the Church's position on vigilante groups and reports of armed guards on Church property. . . .

He said the Church does have and always has had armed guards to protect Church properties, some of which are invaluable and irreplaceable. He affirmed that two guards are stationed at the Church Office Building. . . .

Nick Morgan, representing the Salt Lake County sheriff's office . . . said, there is such a relatively small number of black people in Utah that any significant buildup of black militants from outside would stand out like a sore thumb.

Most of the 150 present at the meeting appeared reassured by the statements, but one Davis County man challenged the police officials to "prove" their statements. (*Deseret News*, March 10, 1970)

On March 9, 1970, the *Deseret News* printed an article which contained the following statements:

Handicapped over lack of funds for more police protection, Salt Lake City is embarking immediately upon a four-pronged community police support program.

Announced today by Public Safety Commissioner James L. Barker, Jr., the program could provide from 200 to 400 trained volunteers to patrol city streets and neighborhoods besides the regular police patrolmen. . . .

"We are reviving the three-year-old police auxiliary plan and will quadruple our present police reserve corps," Barker said. Also, public safety officials will provide another volunteer civilian corps of trainees for security of city property and other public installations when needed. . . .

"The reserves are highly trained, public spirited civilians and we plan to have about 200 in their ranks by the middle of spring," Barker said. He disclosed plans for a second 35-man training class of reserves to be sought immediately. . . . He said he wanted the public to understand clearly that the city's volunteer groups would be given the same training as police and would be under close supervision of the police department. (*Deseret News*, March 9, 1970)

While the Mormon people have been arguing over vigilante groups and police protection, there has been a great deal of trouble at the University of Washington because of the anti-Negro doctrine. An article in the *Salt Lake Tribune* contained the following statements:

SEATTLE (UPI) — Student protesters ran riot over the University of Washington campus for more than an hour Friday but the crowd that had swelled to 2,500 broke up when word went out that police were on their way.

The students were protesting the refusal of the university's administration to sever relations with Brigham Young University immediately. They claimed BYU is a "racist" school. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, March 7, 1970)

On March 9, 1970, the *Deseret News* contained an article which stated:

SEATTLE (UPI) — The University of Washington announced late Sunday night athletic relations with Brigham Young University would be dropped when present contracts run out in 1972. . . .

When informed of the action, President Ernest L. Wilkinson of BYU said the University of Washington had apparently broken its promise to take no action without conferring with BYU.

The next day the *Deseret News* printed an article in which we find the following:

The Black Students Union pressed the administration of the University of Washington for more concessions today, demanding that athletic ties with Brigham Young University be severed immediately. . . .

"If there is good reason to end the contract in 1972 there is good reason to end it now," a Black Student Union spokesman said.

Some 3,000 students, led by the BSU, paraded peacefully on the school's campus in Seattle Monday over the issue of alleged racism at BYU.

Meanwhile, Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, BYU president, said he was "surprised and shocked" at the step taken by the leaders of the University of Washington.

And Dr. John Hogness, executive vice president of the latter school, said the step was taken to protect the lives and safety of persons on the university campus.

The demonstrations "pose an extremely hazardous and explosive situation," Dr. Hogness said. (*Deseret News*, March 10, 1970)

# **Race Problems – As They Affect the Church**

An Address by the Mormon Apostle  
Mark E. Petersen

A copy of this speech is in the LDS Church  
Historian's Library in Salt Lake City, Utah.

# Race Problems — As They Affect The Church

Address By  
Elder Mark E. Petersen

At the Convention of Teachers of Religion on the College Level,  
Brigham Young University,  
Provo, Utah

August 27, 1954

The discussion on civil rights, especially over the last 20 years, has drawn some very sharp lines. It has blinded the thinking of some of our own people, I believe. They have allowed their political affiliations to color their thinking to some extent, and then, of course, they have been persuaded by some of the arguments that have been put forth.

It is a good thing to understand exactly what the Negro has in mind on this subject. I'll be talking about other races besides Negroes, of course, but it is the Negro question which pinpoints it, so I would like to talk first of all about the Negro and his civil rights. We who teach in the Church certainly must have our feet on the ground and not be led astray by the philosophies of men on this subject any more than on any other subject.

I would like to begin by quoting from an interview conducted by the United States News with Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., a very prominent Negro leader, and a member of the Congress of the United States. The United States News published this interview in its September 5, 1952, issue. That was before the supreme court decision, as you recall. Congressman Powell was asked a number of questions, and he answered them. The first question:

Q. The question of civil rights in connection with segregation, Congressman Powell, opens up the often-mentioned subject of social equality, and I was wondering: What is the viewpoint of the leaders of the Negroes in this country today on the broad subject of social equality?

A. Of course, social equality is something that covers so many different things that it would have to be defined more closely.

Q. Well, would you say that, in principle, the desire is for social equality?

A. No. I would say that there is a demand for social equality in all public places. Any place that is operating publicly, regardless of what its nature may be, should not have the right to refuse anyone. For a club or a private institution, that may be another question.

Q. But it would include hotels, restaurants and, of course, all forms of transportation?

A. That's right.

Q. Would that mean the ending of segregation on the railroads in the South?

A. Yes, that would.

Q. What is the status of that controversy? Is segregation on railroads now forbidden by law?

A. No, it is not forbidden by law. But, under Supreme Court rulings in the past years, there is no longer any segregation allowed in dining cars, no longer any allowed on busses in interstate transportation—

Q. What about Pullmans?

A. This is an optional thing which the Pullman company itself has been instituting. Nevertheless, now and then, you will meet an individual Pullman conductor who interprets it on his own terms of bigotry. That, however, is rapidly changing. The only place still left is the so-called "Jim Crow" car, and even that has been abolished on through trains leaving Northern cities.

Q. What is the basic reason for the opposition to the ending of segregation?

A. I think it is just inherited public opinion of days past when the Negro was not as mature and educated and advanced as he is today—and neither was the white man. I think a private poll would produce tremendous statistics supporting the fact that the vast majority of people in the South are changing, but they are afraid of having their views become public.

Q. Is there any similar point of view in the North where there are now large numbers of Negroes? Is any opposition manifest there to non-segregation?

A. Yes, indeed, I think that the problem is one that is sort of leveling off and is no longer a strictly sectional problem—

I will now skip some. Let us now go into the matter of intermarriage with the Negroes. I continue to read from this interview:

Q. Do you think many of the people who oppose discontinuing segregation are afraid breaking down of the social lines may lead to intermarriage?

A. That is the great bugaboo used to scare them, when the truth is that when two people are in love—black, white, Jew, Gentile, Protestant, Catholic—no one can stop them.

Q. What is the attitude of the Negro leaders toward the intermarriage question? Do they feel that it is a probability over a long period of time?

A. Yes, they do, but not as any conscious thing to go out and campaign for.

Q. They think that, ultimately, intermarriage will be commonplace in this country?

A. Personally, I do.

Q. How far away would you say that is?

A. Well, that is hard to say. I never thought India would be free in my lifetime, but today India is free. I didn't think that Africa would have a black Prime Minister, but they do today in the Gold Coast.

Q. Do you think there is much intermarriage today between whites and Negroes in this country?

A. No, very little. But it is the idea of the old sore thumb—it stands out so when it does happen.

Q. Do you think that the presence of a good many Negro troops in Europe where there's been intermarriage has affected the problem?

A. No, I don't, because I have just come back from an official five-month trip through Europe and the Near East, and there is no problem over there.

Q. You mean intermarriage is accepted?

A. Yes. They don't understand our fears here in America.

Q. Do you think there is much intermarriage in Europe?

A. Oh, yes, a great deal.

Q. Could you say in what countries it is more frequent? Is there a country that you could name?

A. I don't think I could say. I saw it all through Scandinavia. I saw it all through the Benelux countries and in Italy.

Q. But isn't it a small minority?

A. No. In comparison with the number of Negroes there, it was large.

Q. In comparison with the number of intermarriages in the United States, would you say that it was an equal or a greater number or a lesser number?

A. On a percentage basis there is no comparison. It is more prevalent abroad. In fact, the rare thing in Europe and England is to find a couple that is not an interracial marriage. I saw very few marriages of two Negro people.

Q. It was mostly Negro and white?

A. That's right.

Q. What is the attitude of the Negro in the United States on the subject of intermarriage? Is it discussed frequently in the press?

A. Yes, but on an objective basis. In fact, an increasingly large number of Negro leaders are marrying whites of extremely stable and respected families.

Q. Is there much more fraternizing in the Northern cities between Negroes and whites, especially in the large Negro centers like Harlem, than there used to be?

A. Yes, much more.

Q. Is there any tendency among the Negroes to reject that, or are they welcoming it?

A. They are very definitely welcoming it. An increasing number of fine leaders on both sides are marrying.

Q. Is there in New York City a greater number of interracial marriages than there has been?

A. Yes, but interestingly, the largest number of interracial marriages occur in Milwaukee and Los Angeles.

Q. To what do you attribute that?

A. I can't figure it out. Milwaukee has always been a very liberal city. Los Angeles, However, I can't figure out at all.

Q. What is the argument that is used by Negro leaders in answer to the point that is sometimes made that, if intermarriages continue in the next 25 or 30 years, then the races will be adulterated somewhat as they are in Cuba and Brazil?

A. I have heard that argument, but it doesn't amount to any argument at all from my standpoint, because if we are fighting for integration, well, then, there it is. I mean, you can't fight against segregation and want separation. We must be consistent.

Q. I'm not sure that is clear—

A. The Negro leaders are fighting against segregations. Therefore, they can't have a position on one hand against segregation and on the other hand against interracial marriage.

Q. What I meant was, do you believe that the quality of the white race would be reduced by intermarriages?

A. No. Anthropologists, like, Boas of Columbia and the late Malinowsky of Yale and Hooton of Harvard, especially, have shown that such a thing would be a benefit. That is a scientific fact.

Q. They contend that it would not change the quality of one race or the other?

A. That is correct—either not change it or actually improve the stock of both groups.

I think I have read enough to give you an idea of what the Negro is after. He is not just seeking the opportunity of sitting down in a cafe where white people eat. He isn't just trying to ride on the same street-car or the same Pullman car with white people. It isn't that he just desires to go to the same theater as the white people. From this, and other interviews I have read, it appears that the Negro seeks absorption with the white race. He will not be satisfied until he achieves it by intermarriage. That is his objective and we must face it. We must not allow our feeling to carry us away, nor must we feel so sorry for Negroes that we will open our arms and embrace them with everything we have. Remember the little statement that we used to say about sin, "First we pity, then endure, then embrace."

How different is the Chinese attitude on intermarriage! Sister Belle S. Spafford, president of the Relief Society, has been attending the conference of the International Council of Women in Europe. I asked her what she learned there about inter-racial marriages as affecting other races than the Negroes. She said there was one outstanding figure in the conference who expressed herself most emphatically on this subject. She was the Chinese representative, Matilda Ng. She is chairman of the Chinese council and heads the moral welfare section of the I.C.W. and this is what she said:

In Hong Kong there are two and one-half million people living in very crowded conditions. The population has more than doubled during the past five years bringing many serious social problems. The presence of so many men in the armed services has also created social problems extremely difficult to handle. A large number of illegitimate children have been born to Chinese girls, fathered by men of other races who are in the armed services. Neither the Chinese nor the Whites will accept these children.

The Chinese are bitterly opposed to Eurasian marriages or to marriages between Chinese and persons of any other race, even under the most favorable circumstances, and children born out of wedlock to Chinese mothers with white fathers are in an extremely unfortunate position. The Chinese mothers themselves are in a very difficult position. They have strong maternal instincts and traditions and because of this most of them make determined effort to keep their children, frequently turning to prostitution to support them.

What should be our attitude as Latter-day Saints toward Negro and other dark races? Does the Lord give us any guidance? Is there any Church policy on this matter? Is segregation in and of itself a wrong principle? Are we as individuals against segregation as a matter or principle? Just where should we stand?

Before going into this, there are a few fundamentals that I would like to mention on which, of course, we must all be agreed.

1. God is the creator. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made."

2. The purpose in His creation of this earth was to provide a habitation for His children.

3. God just. He is fair. He is no respecter of persons.

4. We must accept the fact of pre-existence, and that in our pre-existence we had free agency. We could be lazy there, or we could be industrious. We could be obedient or careless. We could choose to follow Christ or to follow Lucifer.

5. The Gospel is eternal. It is as eternal as God, and He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. His course is one eternal round.

6. The Lord has a definite method of dealing with both sinners and Saints, based on the way we personally live. We shall be judged in accordance with our own acts. We shall be punished for our own sins and not for Adam's transgression, nor for anybody else's transgression.

I like a quotation from Ezekiel very much. It is found in the 18th chapter beginning with the fourth verse:

Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die.

But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right,

And hath not eaten upon the mountains, neither hath lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither hath defiled his neighbor's wife, neither hath come near to a menstruous woman,

And hath not oppressed any, but hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment;

He that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase, that hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man,

Hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly; he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God.

And if he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood, and that doeth the like to any one of these things,

And that doeth not any of those duties, but even hath eaten upon the mountains, and defiled his neighbor's wife,

Hath oppressed the poor and needy, hath spoiled by violence, hath not restored the pledge, and hath lifted up his eyes to the idols, hath committed abomination.

Hath given forth upon usury, and hath taken increase; shall he then live? He shall not live; he hath done all these abominations; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him.

Now, lo, if he beget a son, that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like,

That hath not eaten upon the mountains, neither hath lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither hath defiled his neighbor's wife,

Neither hath oppressed any, hath not withholden the pledge, neither hath spoiled by violence, but hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment,

That hath taken off his hand from the poor, that hath not received usury nor increase, hath executed my judgments, hath walked in my statutes; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live.

As for his father, because he cruelly oppressed, spoiled his brother by violence, and did that which is not good among his people, lo, even he shall die in his iniquity.

Yet say ye, Why? Doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live.

The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.

I think that is a marvelous statement of policy on the part of the Lord—a great announcement of doctrine.

Now I would like to come to the Ten Commandments for a moment:

I am the Lord thy God which hath brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the House of bondage. Thou shalt have no other Gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of anything that is in the heaven above or that is in the earth beneath or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow thyself down to them or serve them, for I the Lord thy



God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.

I draw your attention to the fact that many people in reading this scripture stop before the sentence stops. They think in terms of visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation—period, and they forget that the Lord goes on and says, “of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.”

This scripture clearly indicates that He shows mercy to those who love Him and keep His commandments, but visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children of them “that hate me.” In other words, we reap what we sow. The souls that sinneth shall die. We will be punished for our own sins but not for anybody else’s. We must accept that as a policy together with the thought that God is just to everybody, and that the Gospel is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

7. Since the Gospel is eternal and God is the same yesterday, today, and forever, and since He is dealing with the same group of spirits, meaning you and me and the rest of us on earth, both in the pre-existent state as well as here, is there any reason why the Lord’s method of dealing with sinners and saints in the pre-existence should be different from His method of dealing with them here?

8. For sins we commit here we will be given places in the eternal world, in the Celestial, Terrestrial, and the Telesial kingdoms, and as one star differeth from another in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead. There will be wide variations of classifications in the hereafter, all based on our performance here in this life.

9. Is there any reason to think that the same principles of rewards and punishments did not apply to us and our deeds in the pre-existent world as will apply hereafter? Is there reason then why the type of birth we receive in this life is not a reflection of our worthiness or lack of it in the pre-existent life? We must accept the justice of God. He is fair to all. He is not a respecter of persons. He will mete to us according to what we deserve.

With that in mind, can we account in any other way for the birth of some of the children of God in darkest Africa, or in flood-ridden China, or among the starving hordes of India, while some of the rest of us are born here in the United States? We cannot escape the conclusion that because of performance in our pre-existence some of us are born as Chinese, some as Japanese, some as Indians, some as Negroes, some as Americans, some as Latter-day Saints. These are rewards and punishments, fully in harmony with His established policy in dealing with sinners and saints, rewarding all according to their deeds.

I would like to read to you now from *The Way to Perfection*, by President Joseph Fielding Smith. I believe the chapters in this book, there are three of them primarily, provide the best statement of our interracial position that I know anything about, and I certainly highly recommend

them to you. I will begin to read under a section, “Pre-assignment to nation or tribe.”

Our place among the tribes and nations evidently was assigned to us by the Lord. That there was an assignment of this kind before earth life began is a declaration of the scriptures. Certain spirits were chosen to come through the lineage of Abraham, and this choice was made in the beginning. Other selections were also made and the nations determined upon by the councils in the heavens. When Paul was speaking on Mars Hill, he said to the Athenians, “Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious, for as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, ‘To the unknown God.’ Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men’s hands as though he needed anything. Seeing He giveth to all life and breath and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation.”

If the Lord appointed unto the nations the bounds of their habitation, then there must have been a selection of spirits to form these nations. And I think we must recognize that. There must have been a selection of spirits to form these nations. In greater clearness, Moses has declared the same thing. President Smith quotes from Deuteronomy next:

“Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations. Ask thy Father and He will show Thee, thy Elders, and they will tell thee when the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel, for the Lord’s portion is His people . . . Jacob is the lot of His inheritance.” That is Deuteronomy 32.

“If bounds were set according to the number of the children of Israel, and they were the Lord’s portion—that is those with whom He made covenant, when the Lord divided the sons of Adam it must have been done before this earth life began, for in these days of old when this division was made, the nation of Israel had not been brought into existence on the earth.

“Is it not a reasonable belief that the Lord would select the choice spirits to come to the better grades of nations? Is it not reasonable to believe that less worthy spirits would come through less favored lineage? Does this not account in very large part for the various grades of color and degrees of intelligence we find in the earth? Is not the Lord doing the best that can be done in accordance with the laws of justice and mercy for the people of the earth? In His mercy He has a salvation with some degree of exaltation even for the heathen and for those who die without law. However, we must not be unmindful of the fact that these worldly conditions have also been brought about in large degree by rebellion and disregard of the laws of God in this life. Retrogression has come upon mankind because they have rejected the counsels and commandments of the Almighty. Advancement has come largely because man has been willing to walk, in part at least, in the light of divine inspiration.”

Now, I have always been interested in Jeremiah's own statement, that is quoting the Lord, of course, for the Lord tells Jeremiah that before He formed him in the belly He knew him and chose Him to be a prophet unto the nations. Why was Jeremiah chosen before he was born? Because along with all of the rest of us, in the pre-existent life, he had his free agency. He had the right to go with Lucifer if he wanted to. He had the right to be lazy or industrious or he had the right to study the Gospel and come with full allegiance to the banner of the Savior. Because he came with full allegiance to the banner of the Savior and was loyal, and because he developed himself both in faith and otherwise in the pre-existent life, he came to a point of development where the Lord was glad to have him as one of His leaders, and so He chose him for one of His prophets even before he came into the world.

You remember the vision of Abraham when he was shown the spirits of certain great ones, and the Lord told him, "Abraham, thou art one of them." Why were these spirits chosen above anybody else? Is the Lord a respecter of persons? Again it was a reward based upon performance in the pre-existent life, and people who came in the lineage of Abraham received their blessing because of their performance in the pre-existent life. People who had not performed well enough in the pre-existent life obviously were given some other birth. I think this statement of Brother Smith's here is wonderful.

Another paragraph in the next chapter, under "Traits developed in the World of Spirits," says:

In the parable of the talents, the Lord makes use of this very significant expression, "For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country who called his own servants and delivered unto them his goods, and unto one he gave five talents, to another two and to another one. To every man according to his several ability." Without doubt, these characteristics were born with us, in other words, we developed certain traits of character in the world of spirits before this earth life began. In that life, some were more diligent in the performance of duty, some were more obedient and more faithful in keeping the commandments. Some were more intellectual and others manifested stronger traits of leadership than others. Some showed greater faith and willingness to serve the Lord, and from among these the leaders were chosen. Because of this condition, the Lord said to Abraham, "These I will make my leaders 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." There must be leaders, presiding officers, and those who are worthy and able to take command.

During the ages in which we dwelt in the pre-mortal state we not only developed our various characteristics and showed our worthiness and ability, or the lack of it, but we were also where such progress could be observed. It is reasonable to believe that there was a Church organization there. The heavenly beings were living in a perfectly arranged society. Every person knew his place. Priesthood, without any question, had been conferred and the leaders were chosen to officiate. Ordinances pertaining

to that pre-existence were required and the love of God prevailed. Under such conditions it was natural for our Father to discern and choose those who were most worthy and evaluate the talents of each individual. He knew not only what each of us could do, but also what each of us would do when put to the test and when responsibility was given us. Then, when the time came for our habitation on mortal earth, all things were prepared and the servants of the Lord chosen and ordained to their respective missions.

And then he goes on and shows how some were appointed to greater missions than others. I would like to recommend chapters 7 and 8 and chapters 15 and 16—four chapters in this very wonderful book.

Now let's talk segregation again for a few moments. Was segregation a wrong principle? When the Lord chose the nations to which the spirits were to come, determining that some would be Japanese and some would be Chinese and some Negroes and some Americans, He engaged in an act of segregation. When he permitted the banishment of Hagar and Ishmael again He indulged in segregation. In the case of Jacob and Esau, He engaged in segregation. When He preserved His people Israel in Egypt for 400 years, He engaged in an act of segregation, and when He brought them up out of Egypt and gave them their own land He engaged in an act of segregation. We speak of the miracle of the preservation of the Jews as a separate people over all these years. It was nothing more nor less than an act of segregation. I'm sure the Lord had His hand in it because the Jews still have a great mission to perform. In placing a curse on Laman and Lemuel, He engaged in segregation. When He placed the mark upon Cain, He engaged in segregation. When he told Enoch not to preach the Gospel to the descendants of Cain who were black, the Lord engaged in segregation. When He cursed the descendants of Cain as to the Priesthood, He engaged in segregation. When He forbade inter-marriages as He does in Deuteronomy 7th chapter He established segregation.

You remember when the Israelites were about to come into Palestine and there were evil nations there, the Lord was anxious to preserve His own people by an act of segregation. He commanded His people Israel: "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them, Thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son." It was a law for the preservation of Israel and it certainly was an act of segregation.

Who placed the Negroes originally in darkest Africa? Was it some man, or was it God? And when He placed them there, He segregated them. Who placed the Chinese in China? The Lord did. It was an act of segregation. When He placed only some of His chosen people in the tribe of Judah, the royal tribe, wasn't that an act of segregation? And when He gave the birthright only to Ephraim, wasn't that an act of segregation?

The Lord segregated the people both as to blood and place of residence. At least in the cases of the Lamanites and the Negroes we have the definite word of the Lord Himself that He placed a dark skin upon them as a curse—as a punishment and as a sign to all others. He forbade intermarriage with them under threat of extension of the curse. (2 Nephi 5:21) And He certainly segregated the

descendants of Cain when He cursed the Negro as to the Priesthood, and drew an absolute line. You may even say He dropped an iron curtain there. The Negro was cursed as to the Priesthood, and therefore, was cursed as to the blessings of the Priesthood. Certainly God made a segregation there.

And do you remember in Section 76 where the Lord is talking about the Terrestrial kingdom and those who shall go there? He mentions those who were without law. I presume He means that all during mortality the people referred to were not permitted to have the law of the Gospel and He assigned them directly to the terrestrial kingdom. Isn't that segregation?

Let's look at it another way. In the world to come, some of us will go to the Celestial glory, some to the Terrestrial, others to the Telesial, and we are told that as one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is resurrection of the dead. So there will be a wide variation there. But isn't that segregation? And you remember that He, himself, said with respect to some of them: "Where God and Christ dwell, they cannot come, worlds without end." That is segregation.

So, do the Latter-day Saints believe in segregation as a principle?

Let us consider the great mercy of God for a moment. A Chinese, born in China with a dark skin, and with all the handicaps of that race seems to have little opportunity. But think of the mercy of God to Chinese people who are willing to accept the Gospel. In spite of whatever they might have done in the pre-existence to justify being born over there as Chinamen, if they now, in this life, accept the Gospel and live it the rest of their lives they can have the Priesthood, go to the temple and receive endowments and sealings, and that means they can have exaltation. Isn't the mercy of God marvelous?

Think of the Negro, cursed as to the Priesthood. Are we prejudiced against him? Unjustly, sometimes we are accused of having such a prejudice. But what does the mercy of God have for him? This Negro, who, in the pre-existence lived the type of life which justified the Lord in sending him to the earth in the lineage of Cain with a black skin, and possibly being born in darkest Africa—if that Negro is willing when he hears the Gospel to accept it, he may have many of the blessings of the Gospel. In spite of all he did in the pre-existent life, the Lord is willing, if the Negro accepts the Gospel with real, sincere faith, and is really converted, to give him the blessings of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost. If that Negro is faithful all his days, he can and will enter the Celestial kingdom. He will go there as a servant, but he will get a celestial resurrection. He will get a place in the Celestial glory. He will not go then with even the honorable men of the earth to the Terrestrial glory, nor with the ones spoken of as being without law.

In the great mercy of God, He allows all men to rise above themselves. Isn't this a great testimony to the principle of repentance, that if a man does the best he can to rise above conditions and if he is faithful and devoted, the Lord recognizes him and lifts him up? I think that is one of the great evidences of the mercy of God.

Some years ago, back in 1936 to be exact, I became acquainted with a Negro family in Cincinnati, Ohio. I was back there for three months in connection with a newspaper assignment. I went to Church there and became acquainted with the family of a Negro man named Len Hope. Accidentally he had found some of our tracts when he lived down in Mississippi. He read them and became interested. He wrote to the mission headquarters for a Book of Mormon, and by his own study, converted himself. Later he met the Elders and joined the Church. Then he joined the army in the first World War. When he came back, having carried a Book of Mormon with him all through the war and studied it carefully he converted his Negro sweetheart whom he married and she was baptized. Then they moved up to Cincinnati to escape the "Jim Crow" law.

Up in Cincinnati, some of the members of the Church became extremely prejudiced against this Negro family. They met in a group, decided what to do and went to the Branch President, and said that either the Hope family must leave or they would all leave. The Branch President ruled that Brother Hope and his family could not come to Church meetings. It broke their hearts. But, the missionaries went out to the Hope home and there conducted Sunday School every Sunday, and served them the Sacrament.

I had the privilege of visiting with the Hope family. I was in their home. I saw how their song book had been literally worn out and likewise their *Doctrine and Covenants* and Book of Mormon. As soon as I got to my hotel that Sunday afternoon, I wrote home to my wife and had her send them a supply of books.

They were very faithful people. Brother Hope died just a little while ago. He was a man who was as thoroughly converted to the Gospel as any one I know. He was a full tithing payer all through the depression. He earned the most meager kind of living, but he never failed to pay his tithing. The Branch President showed me the tithing records, and all through the depression Brother Hope paid \$1.50 a week. It was a full tithing. Sometimes Brother Hope didn't even have that, so he went into the hills and picked berries and sold them on the streets of Cincinnati to get enough money to pay that \$1.50 tithing.

And then Brother Hope told me, as a testimony, that in the Negro area of Cincinnati where he lived, during the depression he didn't know of one man who had a job. But he said, "I had a job. I paid my tithing and during that whole depression, I didn't lose one day's work. Sometimes I didn't make much money on that day, and I did have to go out into the hills and get berries, but I always had an income."

Brother Hope asked me if it would be possible for him to have baptisms for the dead done in the temple on behalf of members of his family who had passed on. I went to President Smith and he said "Yes, you get their records and we will take them over to the temple and have the baptisms done for them." I did, and we performed vicarious baptisms for these Negroes. Only the baptisms and confirmations—nothing else, but we did that much. Again I thought of the great mercy of Almighty God, and how He is willing to lift people up if they do their part.

Well, what about the removal of the curse? We know what the Lord has said in the Book of Mormon in regard to the Lamanites—they shall become a White and a delightful people. I know of no scripture having to do with the removal of the curse from the Negro. I think that we should not speculate too much about that. As long as the scriptures are silent on the subject, we should not try to determine on our own what the ultimate end of the Negro is going to be. I don't think we have a right to do that, do you? It is speculation.

We do have a few suggestions from the early brethren as to their own views, but I assume that these are their own private ideas—I don't know whether I am wrong in that, President Smith, but that has been my assumption—that when the brethren spoke about the removal of the curse from the Negro, they were expressing their own views. But there is no scripture on it, and therefore, I don't think any of us, as teachers of the gospel, should speculate on it.

You remember that Brigham Young has said, "Cain conversed with his God every day, and knew all about the plan of creating this earth, for his father told him. But for the want of humility and through jealousy and an anxiety to possess the kingdom and to have the whole of it under his own control, and not allow anybody else the right to say one word, what did he do? He killed his brother. Then the Lord put a mark on him. When all of the other children of Adam have had the privilege of receiving the Priesthood and of coming into the kingdom of God, and of being redeemed from the four quarters of the earth, and have received the resurrection from the dead, then it will be time enough to remove the curse from his posterity. He deprived his brother the privilege of pursuing his journey through life, and of extending his kingdom by multiplying upon the earth, and because he did this, he is the last to share the joys of the kingdom of God."

President Woodruff added, "The Lord said, 'I will not kill Cain, but I will put a mark upon him, and that mark will be seen upon every face of every Negro upon the face of the earth.' And it is the decree of God that mark shall remain upon the seed of Cain, until the seed of Abel shall be redeemed, and Cain shall not receive the Priesthood until the time of that redemption. Any man having one drop of the blood of Cain in him cannot receive the priesthood. But the day will come when all that race will be redeemed and possess all the blessings which we now have."

---

---

I couldn't add to that because I don't know anything more than that, and I will leave it there. We should not go into the mysteries of what is going to happen to the Negro in the eternities far off, because the Lord has been silent on that subject.

Now what is our policy in regard to inter-marriage? As to the Negro, of course, there is only one possible answer. We must not intermarry with the Negro. Why? If I were to marry a Negro woman and have children by her, my children would all be cursed as to the priesthood. Do I want my children cursed as to the priesthood? If there is one drop of Negro blood in my children, as I have read to you, they receive the curse. There isn't any argument, therefore, as to inter-marriage with the Negro, is there? There are 50 million Negroes in the United States. If they were to achieve complete absorption with the white race, think what that would do. With 50 million negroes inter-married with us, where would the priesthood be? Who could hold it, in all America? Think what that would do to the work of the Church!

Now we are generous with the negro. We are willing that the Negro have the highest kind of education. I would be willing to let every Negro drive a Cadillac if they could afford it. I would be willing that they have all the advantages they can get out of life in the world. But let them enjoy these things among themselves. I think the Lord segregated the Negro and who is man to change that segregation? It reminds me of the scripture on marriage, "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Only here we have the reverse of the thing—what God hath separated, let not man bring together again.

What is our advice with respect to intermarriage with Chinese, Japanese, Hawaiians and so on? I will tell you what advice I give personally. If a boy or girl comes to me claiming to be in love with a Chinese or Japanese or a Hawaiian or a person of any other dark race, I do my best to talk them out of it. I tell them that I think the Hawaiians should marry Hawaiians, the Japanese ought to marry the Japanese, and the Chinese ought to marry Chinese, and the Caucasians should marry Caucasians, just exactly as I tell them that Latter-day Saints ought to marry Latter-day Saints. And I'm glad to quote the 7th chapter of Deuteronomy to them on that. I teach against inter-marriage of all kinds.