
SUING THE TANNERS

Legal Action to Suppress Diaries About Joseph Smith

In the last issue of the *Messenger* we reported concerning the anti-Tanner movement and some individuals who were using aliases in an attempt to discredit our work. In a notice accompanying that newsletter, we also announced that the Federal Government approved our non-profit organization, Utah Lighthouse Ministry, and that “any gifts given to the ministry are tax-deductible.”

Since publishing the March newsletter things have been very exciting at Utah Lighthouse Ministry. On May 7, 1983, we were served with a summons to appear in court. The paper made it clear that we were being sued for reproducing extracts from William Clayton’s diaries. This is the first time that anyone has actually taken legal action against us. In 1961 the Mormon Apostle LeGrand Richards threatened to sue us, and in 1965 Apostle Mark E. Petersen made a similar threat. Neither of these men followed through with any action (see *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality?* pages 12-13). The plaintiff in the suit that has been filed against us is Andrew F. Ehat, and the attorney is listed as Gordon A. Madsen, the “authorized agent of Religious Studies Center” at the Mormon Church’s Brigham Young University. In the Complaint, we find the following:

4. The plaintiff is a research historian . . . having received a Master’s Degree from Brigham Young University . . . During the course of said graduate historical research, plaintiff was given permissive access to the private, heretofore-unpublished Nauvoo Journals of one William Clayton then deposited with the Office of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, from which he permissively extracted certain notes, quotes and extracts.

5. From said notes plaintiff, in collaboration with one Lyndon W. Cook, produced a book titled “The Words of Joseph Smith,” the proprietary interest and copyright interest of which were assigned by Ehat and Cook to the Religious Studies Center, an agency of Brigham Young University, . . . At no time has the plaintiff given the defendants, or either of them, any permission to publish or print any notes taken by him from the William Clayton Journal.

The complaint alleges that we violated Mr. Ehat’s rights when we produced the book *Clayton’s Secret*

Writings Uncovered. The suit asks for damages of up to “the sum of \$50,000,” and the costs of the action to the plaintiff, which could, of course, amount to thousands of dollars. The plaintiff also requests that we “be ordered to deliver up on oath for destruction all infringing copies of said notes, together with all plates, molds, matrices and other means for making such infringing copies.”

WHY THE LAWSUIT WILL FAIL

We feel that this suit cannot be successful because it is based on an erroneous assumption—i.e., that Ehat can copyright the writings of William Clayton. We find the following plainly stated in Section 103(b) of Title 17, United States Code:

The copyright in a compilation or derivative work extends only to the material contributed by the author of such work, as distinguished from the preexisting material employed in the work, and does not imply any exclusive right in the preexisting material.

Since Ehat’s notes are composed of extracts from “preexisting” material (the diaries of William Clayton), he cannot claim copyright protection. If Mr. Ehat had made a unique compilation or translation of Clayton’s words, he could have sought protection under the copyright law. The notes which we have published do not meet either of these requirements. They are only typed quotations which are not organized for publication. They could not, therefore, be considered to be a manuscript prepared for publication. Although they are typed out, they would only be considered to be equivalent to photocopies of a document.

Because Mr. Ehat was able to put a copyright on the book *The Words of Joseph Smith*, he seems to feel that he has the exclusive rights to the quotations from William Clayton’s diaries. Using the same reasoning, we could maintain that Moody Press (the publisher of our book *The Changing World of Mormonism*) holds a copyright on the recently discovered sheet containing characters which were supposed to have been taken from the gold plates of the Book of Mormon. We could argue that a

photograph of the document appears in the book, and since the book has a copyright at the front, it must cover this important document. We could also put a copyright on the three Joseph Smith diaries we have published and claim we have the exclusive rights to these diaries. Such claims, of course, would be ridiculous and would never hold up in court. If such a thing could be done, it would have some serious implications for the Mormon Church. For instance, an ex-Mormon by the name of Chuck Sackett has recently published the Mormon temple ceremony with a copyright at the front of the pamphlet. According to Ehat's reasoning, this would mean that a non-Mormon now owns the literary rights to the temple ceremony. It is, of course, true that Mr. Sackett can copyright his own introduction, comments, footnotes, etc., but the text of the ceremony is in the public domain.

When we printed the extracts from William Clayton's diaries we took special precaution to see that we did not violate Mr. Ehat's rights. In the Introduction to *Clayton's Secret Writings Uncovered*, we wrote:

. . . several months after Mormon scholars began circulating the typed extracts, we were given permission to make a copy. At first we were reluctant to print the material. Andrew Ehat was vigorously opposed to anyone publishing the material. In fact, one man who was preparing to print it, received a letter from Ehat's lawyer which threatened legal action if he did not desist. We tried to weigh the rights of the Mormon people to know the truth about the diaries their leaders had suppressed against Ehat's desire to keep the extracts out of the hands of the public. From what we were able to learn, Ehat could not copyright the material taken from Clayton's diaries. However, he could possibly claim a copyright on his own comments which appear in the manuscript. Comments of Lyndon Cook also appear in the margins. To solve this problem we have cut off the sides of the photocopies and blacked out Ehat's notes which appear in the text. Therefore, we have a photographic printing of the document which does not violate Ehat's manuscript rights. . . . we feel we have arrived at a good solution to the problem.

One thing about Ehat's notes which really interests us is that they appear to have been typed on four different typewriters. The typewriter styles change frequently throughout the manuscript. It is possible, of course, that Ehat typed all the pages on different typewriters, but there is reason to suspect that at least some of them came from a different source or sources. One Mormon scholar claims that the manuscript is actually a compilation of material from three individuals—Andrew F. Ehat, Lyndon W.

Cook and James B. Allen. Allen, who formerly served as Assistant Church Historian, used some of these quotations in an article on William Clayton which was published in *Journal of Mormon History*, vol. 6, 1979, pages 37-59. This was an excellent article, but Allen was apparently fearful of revealing that these diaries were in the First Presidency's vault. In a footnote on page 42, he only revealed that they were in "private custody": "William Clayton, Journals, November 1842 to January 1846 (in private custody and used here by special permission), 9 February 1843."

A handwritten note at the beginning of the manuscript which Ehat claims as his own says that the portions which have been underlined (at least 43 places) have been published by Allen. We cannot help but wonder if these are the original pages Allen used to prepare his article. We will probably get to the bottom of this when we take the depositions of Ehat, Cook and Allen. In any case, the book by Ehat and Cook contains a footnote which could destroy Ehat's entire case. It seems to indicate that the quotations used in *The Words of Joseph Smith* really came from James B. Allen:

23. William Clayton 1842-1846 Diaries. Citations from these diaries are used by permission and were provided by Dr. James B. Allen, professor of history at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. In sharing with us these quotations, Dr. Allen has substantially assisted this work. (Hereafter cited as William Clayton Diary.) (*The Words of Joseph Smith*, page 263)

There seems to be a number of other serious weaknesses in Ehat's case which we intend to point out as the suit progresses. We will probably find it necessary to take testimony from a number of Church officials and to seek access to the original Clayton diaries because they contain material which is important to our case.

"IT COULD DESTROY THE CHURCH"

Although Ehat claims in the suit that he will suffer "irreparable harm, damage and injury" if we are allowed to continue printing the Clayton material, we feel that there are probably other reasons for his actions. The devastating nature of the material in the diaries probably has a great deal to do with Ehat's attempt to sue us. The *Seventh East Press* told how copies of the Clayton notes began to circulate around Brigham Young University. When Ehat found out, there was a real confrontation in "a campus office." According to individuals who were present, "Ehat was extremely upset and at one point said, 'if this gets out

it could destroy the Church” (*Seventh East Press*, January 18, 1982, page 11). Mr. Ehat was apparently horrified when he learned that a copy he had given to Lyndon Cook was secretly duplicated by a member of a bishopric who shared an office with Cook. The same article says that “Ehat implied he had made copies for others as well, but declined to mention any names” (*Ibid.*, page 1). In any case, Ehat felt a personal responsibility to keep this embarrassing material from getting into the hands of critics of the church. After Mr. Ehat discovered the leak, he worked diligently to try to retrieve all of the copies that were in the possession of students and faculty at Brigham Young University. His efforts, however, were to no avail. He claimed that the situation “cost me getting a master’s degree here at the university in the sense that I lost twelve weeks of my life trying to track down all the people who had copies” (*Ibid.*, page 11). According to *Seventh East Press*, the “unauthorized circulation of Andrew Ehat’s notes from William Clayton’s Nauvoo diaries . . . and other materials from the Historical Department of the Church prompted President Holland last November to appoint Noel Reynolds, Vice President over General Education, Religion, and the Honors Program to investigate the situation and retrieve unauthorized historical materials” (pages 1 and 10).

It was only about a month after *Seventh East Press* reported on the Ehat affair that the Mormon leaders began to implement very repressive measures to see that no more sensitive material comes to light. James L. Clayton, a historian from the University of Utah, became very disturbed about the matter, and in a speech delivered February 25, 1982, he protested:

More recently, indeed, just within the past few days, I understand that the archives of the LDS Church have been closed to all research in the diaries, the letter books and other sensitive materials of the First Presidency and the Quorum of the Twelve back to the 1830s—diaries and letters long open to and currently used by scholars. Many projects of considerable worth are now stymied or will be finished with incomplete sources.

At a recent meeting of the Mormon History Association, David Whittaker, University Archivist at BYU, has admitted that the Church has tightened up its policy as far as access to documents is concerned:

. . . It’s clear that there are collections closed, presidential collections for example, now closed in Salt Lake. It’s clear that there are some collections closed. Some scholars see it as closing the barn door after the horse is gone . . . I was one of those for a number of years that had pretty full access. . . . like most private libraries, those who criticize much of the policies of both BYU, for example, or the church archives, fail to see that they’re

basically private libraries . . . it’s obvious that there are a lot of collections that from my point of view ought to be open. Part of the criticism has to do with material in the vault. For example, the first presidency. Which material has never been available. It was never available even in the sixties. (Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Mormon History Association, May 6, 1983, typed copy)

At any rate, Mr. Ehat is probably deeply troubled because his notes have caused so much embarrassment to the Church. It is possible that one of Ehat’s motives for filing the suit is to vindicate himself in the eyes of the church leaders. If this is the case, Ehat has made a great mistake. The suit is only going to cause more embarrassment to church leaders. Since we feel that we have a very good case, we do not intend to make any compromises. We will continue publishing the Clayton extracts, and the publicity surrounding the suit will certainly tend to make more people aware of the whole affair.

In the Introduction to *Clayton’s Secret Writings Uncovered*, we show that the Clayton diaries cast early Mormonism in a very bad light. William Clayton records that Joseph Smith told his first wife, Emma, he would “relinquish all” his plural wives for her sake, but in reality he didn’t intend to “relinquish any thing.” According to Clayton, Joseph Smith was willing to go so far as to initiate a fake excommunication against him to cover up the practice of polygamy: “Says he . . . I will give you an awful scouring & probably cut you off from the church and then I will baptise you & set you ahead as good as ever” (William Clayton Diary, October 19, 1843, typed extracts). Joseph Smith’s secretary’s diaries clearly show that Smith used “untruth” as an important tool to advance his work. Not only was he deceiving the outside world, but he was deceiving his own wife and other members of the Church.

The diaries also contain important evidence that the *History of the Church*, which the Church claims was written by Joseph Smith himself, was actually compiled after his death. Portions of Clayton’s diary were plagiarized and changed to the first-person to make it appear that Smith was the author. Furthermore, instead of confirming Joseph Smith’s famous prophecy concerning Steven A. Douglas, the Clayton diary provides devastating evidence against it.

The Mormon leaders should have come to grips with these important matters, but instead they have been engaged in a cover-up. They kept the Clayton diaries locked in a vault, and after the extracts leaked out, they took measures to see that other sensitive materials did not come to light. The Mormon “underground” (a group composed mostly of liberal Mormon scholars) spread

many copies of the notes to different parts of the United States. Most of those who received copies were very careful to see that they did not fall into the hands of critics of the Church. Finally, several months after Mormon scholars began circulating the typed excerpts, we were given access to a copy of them. As we have already stated, we printed them under the title, *Clayton's Secret Writings Uncovered*, and neither the Mormon Church nor Mr. Ehat made any attempt to stop us. Mr. Ehat allowed us to continue printing them for almost a year, then suddenly he filed a suit in which he claimed he would suffer "irreparable harm, damage and injury" if we were allowed to continue. This all makes a very unusual story and certainly provides further evidence that the Mormon Church is based on a very shaky foundation.

In any case, *Clayton's Secret Writing Uncovered* is still available from Utah Lighthouse Ministry for \$3.00 a copy. Those who buy and circulate this book are helping to break down the suppressive policy of the Mormon Church.

THE MORMON "INQUISITION" BEGINS

For a number of years we have been predicting that Mormon scholars are in for some very rough times. For instance, in the January 1979 issue of the *Messenger*, we wrote that, "There is reason to believe that Benson [Ezra Taft Benson, the man who will become the next president of the Church if he outlives Kimball] wants to remove Arrington from his position as Church Historian." As our readers now know, Dr. Arrington was removed from his position and the 16-volume *History of the Latter-day Saints*, which had been approved by Church leaders, was aborted because it proved to be too revealing. When we made our assessment of the situation four years ago, a number of Mormon scholars disagreed with us. They felt that we were exaggerating and that there was no need for concern. Recent developments, however, prove beyond all doubt that Mormon scholars who print the truth stand in danger of being punished by the Church. One scholar has been forced to resign from his job with the Church, and the *Salt Lake Tribune* for May 26, 1983, said that there has been an "Inquisition" Reported."

One of the reasons for this "inquisition" is that Mormon leaders feel that Church scholars are putting too much ammunition into the hands of critics. The so-called "anti-Mormon" movement is now prospering to the point that Mormon leaders feel drastic action must be taken to save the Church. They want to isolate us from Church

scholars, and to be sure that nothing they print will help our cause. This was made very plain in an article which recently appeared in the *Provo Herald*:

Latter-day Saint stake presidents and bishops are warning Mormon writers who publish intellectual material to write faith-promoting stories or their church membership will be in jeopardy.

The writers say the stake presidents and bishops are acting under orders from high-ranking general authorities, a charge LDS officials neither confirm nor deny. . . .

Linda and Jack Newell, co-editors of *Dialogue*, a 17-year old independent historical journal, say the integrity [*sic*] of Mormon writers is being questioned.

"We are aware that some Mormon scholars have recently been questioned by (LDS) church authorities about their research, some of which has been published in *Dialogue*," said the Newells in a prepared statement.

"We are gravely concerned that the faith of any Latter-day Saint would be questioned on the basis of his or her commitment to legitimate scholarship."

James Clayton, a Utah professor of history, says, "This type of behavior is despicable. Interviewing writers will have a chilling effect on scholarly research and it will drive intellectuals out of the church."

Scott Faulring, a writer for *Seventh East Press*, an independent student newspaper banned at Brigham Young University, said his stake president warned him to be cautious in his writings.

"My stake president refused to tell me who had asked him to talk to me," says Faulring. "He admitted, however, that he had never read my stories." . . .

Gary Bergera, who has published articles in *Seventh East Press* and *Dialogue*, also has been questioned by his stake president in Provo.

"My stake president told me that if the prophet told me to do something wrong, I would be blessed if I obeyed," said Bergera. "He said what I had written was anti-Mormon because it wasn't uplifting."

Bergera says his stake president objected to the headline of an article Bergera had written entitled "Anti-Mormons Prompt Better Church History." He says the stake president also disapproved of an article Bergera had written about anti-Mormon publishers Jerald and Sandra Tanner.

"My stake president said it was clear in the article that I didn't support the Tanners," says Bergera. "But because I interviewed them I came close to supporting them."

Free-lance LDS history writer George Smith, from San Francisco, says he knows of eight writers who have been interviewed by their stake presidents, and three "told me told me [*sic*] LDS Church general authorities had initiated these interviews."

“The writers felt intimidated,” says Smith. “We say we value honesty but to intimidate those who are honest is to discourage integrity in the Mormon community.”

David Buerger, a free-lance LDS history writer from Campbell, Calif., says his stake president questioned him about his writings.

“At the recent request of a member of the LDS Church Council of the Twelve, my stake president initiated an inquiry with my bishop regarding my writing of LDS Church history,” says Buerger. “I was informed that this apostle was concerned about me and the possible negative impact my writing might have among some church members.” (*The Herald*, Provo, Utah, May 22, 1983)

We have always maintained that the original records of the LDS Church are the most “anti-Mormon” documents in existence. In other words, these records are extremely embarrassing to the Church and also contain doctrines that are diametrically opposed to the teachings of present-day Church leaders. The attempt by the General Authorities to suppress these records and the present “inquisition” against church scholars who want to study these documents certainly shows that the Church’s own documents are far more damaging than the vicious attacks of anti-Mormons like John C. Bennett.

The *Salt Lake Tribune* for May 26, 1983, contained this interesting information:

In a Wednesday article in the *Provo Daily Herald* newspaper, reporter Dawn Tracy said she had talked to 14 Mormon writers in four states who said they had been questioned by their local bishops or stake (diocese) presidents and told the church was worried about their faithfulness.

Three of the 14 writers are faculty members at the church-owned Brigham Young University. All of the authors had contributed to *Dialogue*, a bimonthly magazine called *Sunstone*, or a former independent BYU student newspaper called the *7th East Press*.

Earlier this year, BYU officials banned the *7th East Press* from campus sales outlets, and the paper soon folded.

Roy Doxey, former BYU dean of education, said Mormon Church Apostle Mark E. Peterson ordered the investigations of the writers.

Richard Cracroft, dean of BYU’s College of Humanities and a stake president in Provo, said recent anti-Mormon activities prompted church leaders “to closely examine Mormon writers.”

Cracroft said, “All good LDS (Mormons), including scholars, must accept the judgment of the church’s General Authorities. If this is what the brethren want, then good LDS must say it is appropriate. This may be difficult for scholars, but obedience is an important concept of the Mormon Church.”

However, University of Utah political science Professor J. D. Williams called the questionings of writers “an inquisition.”

Williams, who is a member of the church, said, “Passing ecclesiastical judgment on writers who have conducted serious, historical research is a denial of everything the church stands for.”

We have been asked by one Mormon scholar for our assessment of what the future holds for historians in the Mormon Church. While we do not really know the answer to this question, an examination of the seniority structure in the Church points to a grim future for thinking Mormons. To begin with, President Spencer W. Kimball seems to be close to the point of death. The first in line to succeed him is Ezra Taft Benson, a man who has constantly fought the advancement of true historical research in the Church. Benson seems to have been instrumental in the suppression of the book *The Story of the Latter-day Saints*. The *Sunstone Review*, March 1983, page 2, maintains that Benson was the one responsible for stopping the sale of the *Seventh East Press* at Brigham Young University:

Whether the decision to ban *Seventh East Press* was made by the Board of Trustees . . . or the school administration, Richards wouldn’t say. Our sources confirm that it was . . . the initiative of one man—Ezra Taft Benson. . . . His efforts to ban the *Press* were resisted by President Holland, but finally Holland bowed to the demand. Huffaker also said that at least two sources have confirmed that Benson was responsible for the banning.

However this may be, the reader will find more information concerning Benson’s anti-historical views in our publication *Answering Dr. Clandestine*, pages 40-43.

Mark E. Petersen is second in line to the presidency of the Church. Petersen has spent a great deal of his time searching for heretics in the church. We have already quoted the *Tribune* as saying that Roy Doxey, former BYU dean of education, claimed that Petersen “ordered the investigation of the writers.”

As we go on down the line, we find three others who have given historians a bad time. Gordon B. Hinckley, for instance, is fifth in line. We have seen documents linking Hinckley with the suppression of the 16-volume history. Boyd K. Packer, who is seventh in line, made a scathing attack on Church historians who want to “tell it like it is” (see *BYU Studies*, Summer 1981, pages 259-278). In position number nine we find Bruce R. McConkie. McConkie, of course, is the Apostle who warned the Mormon scholar Eugene England that he held “the scepter of judgment” over him. In the same letter McConkie stated:

. . . It is not in your province to set in order the Church or to determine what its doctrines shall be. . . It is your province to teach to the Church what the doctrine is. It is your province to echo what I say or to remain silent. . . . If I lead the Church astray, that is my responsibility, but the fact still remains that I am the one appointed with all the rest involved so to do. . . . if I err, that is my problem; but in your case if you single out some of these things and make them the center of your philosophy, and end up being wrong, you will lose your soul. . . .

Now I hope you will ponder and pray and come to a basic understanding of fundamental things and that unless and until you can on all points, you will remain silent on those where differences exist between you and the Brethren. . . . if you do not, perils lie ahead. (Letter from Apostle McConkie, dated February 19, 1981, photographically reprinted in our publication *LDS Apostle Confesses Brigham Young Taught Adam-God Doctrine*)

It would appear that the Apostles who believe in absolute obedience and suppression of history are now in full control of the Mormon Church, and there in nothing to indicate that there will be any change for the better in the near future. In fact, these same Apostles can also keep any who are sympathetic to the historian's point of view from coming into leadership positions in the Church.

In June 1945, the church's official publication, *Improvement Era*, counseled Mormons to blindly follow their leaders: "When our leaders speak, the thinking has been done" (page 354). Today, many members of the Church are faced with a situation where they must choose between blindly following their leaders' suppressive policies or stand up for the truth and face excommunication. The General Authorities are asking them to follow a course which they know is morally wrong. We must agree with James Clayton's observation that the inquisition now taking place will tend to "drive intellectuals out of the church." The Bible warns against putting trust in men. It says that we are to rely only on God and put our trust in Him. In Jeremiah 17:5 we read: "Thus saith the Lord; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord."

JACK ANDERSON TO EXPOSE CRITICS

The *Latter Day Sentinel* for May 6, 1983, reported the following:

The country's most famous investigative reporter, Jack Anderson, has a new target: Anti-Mormon groups.

The well-known newspaper and TV personality has announced he plans to a [*sic*] publish a magazine later

this year titled *For Mormons Only* which will investigate and expose Mormon hate groups in America.

"We don't plan to do it in a negative way," Brother Anderson, a high priest in the Chevy Chase Ward, Washington D.C. Stake, told the *Latter-day Sentinel*. "We're not interested in getting into any rhetoric exchanges. We want to look into their backgrounds and let Mormons know what they're doing.

"What we want to do is isolate these hate groups and keep this sewage from seeping into the respectable and responsible press. Once our findings are published under my name, then responsible journalists are going to have to deal with me before they use their (the hate groups') material."

He said the magazine, to be published monthly, will be produced by a team of investigative reporters completely separate from his own corps of column writers.

"I'm not doing this for any purpose except to help the Church and my fellow members," . . .

Brother Anderson said he decided to start such a publication when he was approached by a number of "high-powered Mormons" who offered to come up with the financing of such a project.

He said the idea has received "neither approval nor disapproval" from Church leaders.

The idea of Jack Anderson and his "team of investigative reporters" looking into the backgrounds of critics of the Church might intimidate some people. We feel, however, that since we have nothing to hide, the publicity would only do us good.

The reader will notice that Anderson claims that the Church itself is not sponsoring his activities. Instead, he says "He was approached by a number of 'high-powered Mormons' who offered to come up with the financing of such a project." *Newsweek* for March 14, 1983, page 15, says that it will be a "nonprofit publication." Although we cannot actually prove it, we feel that this new organization is suspiciously similar to another group set up by the Church itself last year. *Sunstone Review* learned of this Church group and reported that Jack Anderson was a part of it:

Ending a long tradition, which goes back at least as far as Brigham Young, of disregarding all the barbs and errors regarding the Mormon people, the Church has decided to fight back. It has formally organized a "Public Communications Advisory Council" which will be composed of twenty-five prominent media representatives and business leaders from all over the country. They met for the first time on April 2, 1982, in Salt Lake City under the direction of Gordon B. Hinckley of the First Presidency of the LDS church and will continue to meet semi-annually . . .

According to Heber Wolsey, managing director of LDS Public Communications Department, “We have organized this group to coalesce the best thinking of those familiar with or involved in the media.” . . .

At the initial meeting . . . items of press coverage were mentioned and ways of handling them were discussed, for example, the *60 Minutes* presentation of the Baum lawsuit against the Church . . . Jack Anderson suggested, however, that we should have organized a large-scale letter campaign as well as numerous phone calls from well-placed Mormons in the media. We should be applying subtle pressure, he said, so they begin to realize they can’t get away with that sort of irresponsibility . . .

The Church’s media problems surrounding the Equal Rights Amendment and, specifically, the excommunication of Sonia Johnson were of obvious concern. . . . Anderson proposed that one-half of the speeches given at General Conference be by women, but his idea was met with some resistance . . . When the *Sunstone Review* called Wolsey for a list of members of the committee, he seemed both surprised and a bit rankled at the request. . . . he refused to give out the names . . . Such secrecy does not bode well for the future of this group. One inside observer called it “the Public Communications Council of 50” (referring to a nineteenth-century secret Mormon political group.) . . .

Other questions arise from the formation of such a committee. Once a group becomes institutionalized (in this case, it is a Church “calling” and therefore a religious obligation), it is forced to protect institutional interests. It then becomes suspect as an objective source for information . . . Does the presence of non-media, high-powered corporate representatives indicate a willingness to use economic or political pressure to insure a positive media image? Would the group in any way attempt to abort potentially damaging news items even if they were true? (*Sunstone Review*, May 1982, pages 1 and 5)

There are a number of reasons why we suspect that Anderson’s group may be an outgrowth of the Church committee. To begin with, both groups were set up to deal with criticism of the Church. The *Sunstone Review* claimed that at the initial meeting of the Church committee, “there was some talk of modelling this group after the Jewish Anti-Defamation League.” This is very interesting because after Anderson announced the formation of his organization, *Newsweek* reported: “Anderson will also alert his readers to criticism of the church in the press and elsewhere, in the manner of the Anti-defamation League of B’nai B’rith” (March 14, 1983, page 15).

In both cases powerful Mormons seem to be involved. According to *Sunstone Review*, the famous businessman J. Willard Marriot, Jr., president of the Marriot Corporation is involved with the Church committee. Jack Anderson

admits that a number of “high power Mormons” are in his organization. When we add to all this the fact that Anderson himself is involved in both groups, we cannot help but wonder if the publication *For Mormons Only* is a part of the plan formulated by the original Church committee. The Church, of course, would probably not want to give any outright endorsement to Anderson’s work. If his efforts were to fail, this would give Church leaders “deniability” and save the Church from embarrassment.

According to the *Latter-Day Sentinel*, Jack Anderson says “he plans to use some of the material produced by the Religious Research Association based in Mesa.” This is the organization headed by Robert Brown, a man who has used misrepresentation in an attempt to discredit us. It is also a non-profit organization and has asked for a donation of \$1,000 for Charter membership. Mr. Brown has some important Mormon businessmen on the board of his organization. The *Latter-Day Sentinel* for May 6, 1983, reports that, “Henry W. Richards, president of Granite Furniture” is now serving on the Board of Directors. The addition of Mr. Richards is a very important development because of the “special” work he does in behalf of the Church. The *Sentinel East* (not to be confused with the *Latter-Day Sentinel*) reported the following on January 17, 1980:

Regional Representative Henry W. Richards . . . has served in various church assignments . . . He is also under special assignment from the First Presidency to work directly with Elder Mark E. Peterson regarding apostate groups or apostate related problems.

From all this the reader will see that we have some “big guns” pointed at us. Jack Anderson and Robert Brown will undoubtedly have large sums of money to use to try to discredit us. In addition to all this, we have a lawsuit facing us. While we have no fear of losing the suit, it may cost thousands of dollars to win it. In spite of all this opposition, we feel that we have the truth on our side. If we can obtain the necessary support from our readers, we are confident that we will prevail. As we indicated earlier, any gifts give to Utah Lighthouse Ministry are tax-deductible. The most important thing, however, is the prayers of God’s people. Prayer is the most powerful force in all the world.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED

“... _____ and I have been reading, researching, and cross referencing your excellent book, *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality*. The Good Spirit has attended us and the Lord continues to give His Light and love. Your work, in its thoroughness and accuracy and completeness, has given us the strength, information, and direction to come out from the company of Joseph the sorcerer.” (Letter from California)

“I have just finished reading your book, *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality*. . . . I to[o] would like my name taken off the church membership. I have always believed in the church but now I feel free.” (Letter from Texas)

“I’m over half-way through your book *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality?* and thought I should let you know

how marvelous that book is. I have been a Mormon for seven years now but have always had doubts. Your book answered my doubts plus showed me so much more. . . .

I have asked to be excommunicated and am looking forward to truly being free.” (Letter from Wisconsin)

“We are a small group here who are interested in the truth of the Mormon Church as we are all Mormons. We would like some literature and a copy of *Shadow or Reality* . . . Please send unmarked as I’m sure you understand.” (Letter from Utah)

“I feel compelled to tell you that I am just coming out of the Mormon Church. . . . have found the *truth* through Jesus Christ, and the Bible. I now know that nice, peaceful feeling I had longed for. . . . Your book, *Mormonism—Shadow or Reality?* did complete my separation from the Church.” (Letter from Oregon)

NEW BOOKS

LDS Apostle Confesses Brigham Young Taught Adam-God Doctrine. Contains a photographic reproduction of a ten-page letter written by Bruce R. McConkie. Also includes photographs of manuscripts in the Church Archives which prove Brigham Young taught that Adam was God and that Jesus Christ was his son. In addition this book has a six-page introduction by Jerald and Sandra Tanner. PRICE: \$2.00

Clayton’s Secret Writings Uncovered. Extracts from the diaries of Joseph Smith’s secretary William Clayton. A very revealing glimpse into Joseph Smith’s private life in Nauvoo. These diaries, which have been suppressed for 140 years, throw a great deal of light on the doctrine of plural marriage. PRICE: \$3.00

Mormonism, Magic and Masonry. By Jerald and Sandra Tanner. Contains photographs of Joseph and Hyrum Smith’s magic material and a study of its significance. Also deals with the question of spiritualism and the temple ceremony. PRICE: \$3.00

Our Relationship with the Lord. By the Mormon Apostle Bruce R. McConkie. An attack on the concept of a personal relationship with Christ. A very shocking speech given by one of the highest officials of the Mormon Church. PRICE: \$2.00

Joseph Smith’s 1838-39 Diaries. Transcribed and edited by H. Michael Marquardt. Contains an important reference to the secret band known as the “Danites.” PRICE: \$2.00

(Mail orders add 10% for postage and handling.)

**UTAH LIGHTHOUSE MINISTRY
PO BOX 1884
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84110**