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WARREN JEFFS AND THE MORMON ART OF FORGETTING

By Hugo Olaiz

He was one of the best known leaders of polygamy in America and a wanted man. His picture was posted everywhere, with a substantial reward offered. When he was apprehended by federal agents in Nevada and returned to Utah to be jailed, the arrest set off a media frenzy, with stories appearing in the national media, in addition to the Deseret News and the Salt Lake Tribune. The news of his arrest came as a shock to his followers. He himself maintained that he was the victim of religious persecution.

I am speaking of George Q. Cannon, who in February 1886 was arrested in Humboldt Wells, Nevada, en route to Mexico. If you do not remember this episode from the LDS past, you are far from alone. “Mormons study the art of forgetting what they have seen and heard,” U.S. district attorney P. T. Van Zile wrote sarcastically in 1887. “It often happens that a Mormon . . . goes upon the witness stand, and testifies that he cannot remember having performed a marriage ceremony that took place within a week past.”

Just as our noble pioneer forebears had trouble remembering the polygamous marriages that could land them in jail, so we 21st-century Mormons cultivate the art of forgetting our polygamous past. And we are not just forgetting that past: We become outraged when someone dares to remind us of it.

In a section on the Church’s website, www.lds.org, titled “Comments on the News,” LDS officials recently published a litany of protests against the media for sins ranging from calling Warren Jeffs a Mormon and using the expression “Mormon Polygamist,” to airing a show on polygamy from Salt Lake City with Temple Square in the background.

Are such protestations legitimate or a public relations ruse, part of the “we’re-not-weird” campaign?

Long after having abandoned polygamy, we wish we could forget it. Polygamy led Joseph Smith to lie, Brigham Young to defy the government, John Taylor to become a fugitive. Yet, ironically, most Latter-day Saints would likely agree that despite the temporary discontinuation of its practice, the Principle hasn’t really been abolished—that polygamy will be restored during Christ’s Millennial reign.

After all, a form of polygamy is still practiced today by LDS men who, after divorcing their first wives or becoming widowers, have a second wife sealed to them. For this reason, a recent campaign protesting Elder Russell M. Nelson’s support of a “defense of traditional marriage” petition bluntly accuses the apostle of practicing “cestial polygamy.” As historian Martha Sonntag Bradley explains, despite the abolition of the practice, we “are left with the same unanswered doctrinal questions as were Church members a hundred years ago.” So the question must be asked: When members of the media mix up Mormons with polygamy; are we upset because we perceive them to be distorting our religion, or because they are throwing a spotlight on an aspect of our religion we desperately want to forget? When we bristle at the possibility that the public will confuse the LDS with the FLDS, does our concern arise from our being aware, at some level, of the many genuine similarities between the LDS of the 1880s and the FLDS of today?

Consider, for example, the rhetoric of war that Warren Jeffs used in a speech to FLDS members captured on tape before he went on the lam: “Our prophet and the Celestial Law, the principle of revelation, are under attack,” Jeffs declared. “There is a combined effort in the state of Utah and the state of Arizona to come against our prophet and our people, trying to stop the work of God.” How far is Jeffs’s rhetoric from that of ardent polygamist and LDS president John Taylor, who once stated that “the people of the rest of this country are our enemies”? “We must not yield to them,” Taylor urged. “When they enact tyrannical laws, forbidding us the free exercise of our religion, we cannot submit.”

Consider, for example, the rhetoric of war that Warren Jeffs used in a speech to FLDS members captured on tape before he went on the lam: “Our prophet and the Celestial Law, the principle of revelation, are under attack,” Jeffs declared. “There is a combined effort in the state of Utah and the state of Arizona to come against our prophet and our people, trying to stop the work of God.” How far is Jeffs’s rhetoric from that of ardent polygamist and LDS president John Taylor, who once stated that “the people of the rest of this country are our enemies”? “We must not yield to them,” Taylor urged. “When they enact tyrannical laws, forbidding us the free exercise of our religion, we cannot submit.”

Or consider how the Saints were galvanized around their belief in the approaching end of the world. What fear could 19th-century “cohabs” have of the federal government when their beloved prophet John Taylor had prophesied that the nation would “fall and crumble until it is no more”? Jump to the present: In 1999, when FLDS leaders predicted impending apocalypse, a Hildale family cavalierly amassed $47,612 in credit card debts. More recently, when Warren Jeffs reportedly announced that the world would end on 6 April 2005, an army of followers worked night and day in Eldorado, Texas, to finish an FLDS temple just in time for the momentous event.

Or consider how both conflicts quickly became national obsessions—the one sensationalized in anti-polygamy novels, the other in cable news, talk shows, and blogs. In the 19th century, national discourse bent toward fantastic claims about rape, incest, and genetic abnormalities. But in an ironic twist, current media stories about polygamy sug-
gest there may have been grounds for those nineteenth-century fears. Themes of sexual and domestic abuse may seem more imagined than real when we read them in Mormon Wives and other 1950s anti-polygamy novels—but not today, when polygamists are indicted for rape and incest. Predictions by scientists of the 1860s that polygamy would result in genetic abnormalities may not have been realized in the days of Brigham Young,14 but last February, both the Deseret News and the Salt Lake Tribune reported that perhaps as many as twenty FLDS children suffer severe mental retardation because of a rare genetic disorder blamed on inbreeding.15

Or consider how, in both cases, the moral and legal campaigns against deviant sexual behavior (bigamy in the 19th century, sex abuse in the 21st) led men to disappear from their communities and turned religious leaders into wanted fugitives.

Those who did not submit to arrest had to be constantly on the move,” wrote Richard S. Van Wagoner in his description of the Raid that drove the LDS Church’s First Presidency and Quorum of the Twelve into hiding.16

Women and children were left to provide for themselves as best they could. Secret codes were employed in letters and messages, and children were taught to be evasive under questioning so as not to give away the details of polygamous relationships.17

The same could have been written of the situation currently faced by FLDS families.

Or consider how, in both conflicts, religious leaders on the run availed themselves of loyal accomplices, shadiy legal maneuvers, and the sacrifices of devoted followers. As John Taylor grew old and frail, George Q. Cannon, a recaptured fugitive, forfeited a then-astronomical $45,000 bail bond so that he could continue running the Church from the underground. Warren Jeffs reportedly bled the coffers of the FLDS so that he could stay out of jail. “The people say that you and Cannon and [Joseph F.] Smith have run away and left the masses to go to the penitentiary or humiliate themselves before the courts,” a frustrated Mormon complained to John Taylor, who was then in hiding. “You will force men to go to the pen when you will not go yourselves.”20

This uncomfortable part of our past (who wants to remember our prophet as a fugitive on the lam?) made a dramatic “return of the repressed” when Warren Jeffs’s brother Seth was captured with $140,000 in cash and a donation jar labeled “Pennies for the Prophet.” When Warren himself was apprehended, riding in a luxurious Cadillac SUV, he had with him more than $67,000 in cash.19

Or consider how, in both conflicts, women of polygamous marriages, stereotyped as passive, silent victims, showed themselves empowered to speak out both for and against the Principle. In the 19th century, women such as Ann Eliza Young and Sarah M. Pratt wrote passionate denunciations of polygamy. Their work is echoed in the contemporary denunciations of Andrea Moore-Emmett and Rachel Strong.22

Not only in the court of public opinion, but also in the courts of law, a woman’s testimony is as important for making a case against polygamist men today as it was in the 1860s. One of the turning points of the landmark case Reynolds v the United States occurred when Amelia Jane Schofield Reynolds, uncoached, testified that she had been married to George Reynolds by the man who only moments earlier had told the court he could not recall performing the ceremony.23 Recent legal testimony by Mary Ann Kingston, LuAnn Kingston, Ruth Stubbs,24 and others suggests that cases built against polygamist men continue to rely heavily on the testimony of wives who, either willingly or under pressure, are more forthcoming and less forgetful than their husbands.

JUST like their pioneer forebears—who are also our pioneer forbears—members of the FLDS Church retreated to remote deserts so they could worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Like our great-grandparents, they created an imperium in imperio, a modern-day theocracy, and exalted loyalty and obedience to their prophet as supreme virtues. When they are left alone by the government, they survive and even prosper. When the government falls upon them, they resist fiercely because, unlike us, they still remember Rudger Clawson’s 1884 dictum: “I very much regret that the laws of my country should come in conflict with the laws of God, but whenever they do I shall invariably
choose the latter.25

If we protest today when we see CNN’s Anderson Cooper hosting a show on polygamy with Temple Square in the background, is it because we fail to understand how Mormonism could possibly be associated with the crimes ascribed to the FLDS? Or is it, rather, because we know that Temple Square was once Polygamy Central—and that knowledge sits uncomfortably with us? If we resent it when the media call these polygamist groups “Mormon,” is it because we know that Temple Square was once Polygamy Central—and that knowledge sits uncomfortably with us? If we resent it when the media call these polygamist groups “Mormon,” is it because we genuinely believe the practice of polygamy is inconsistent with that label—that they have abandoned the faith of our forebears?26 Or is it because we don’t want to be reminded that polygamy was—is?—a defining characteristic of a brand of Mormonism we have long since forgotten?
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